

THE
SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR.

IN order to promote the amicable adjustment of the disputes of nations, Peace Societies propose ARBITRATION as a substitute for WAR.

IN THE FIRST PLACE, by means of frequent Petitions to the Legislature, they ask that every new treaty with foreign governments may contain a clause referring any dispute that may arise to the friendly arbitration of some disinterested tribunal. This recommendation is considered as preparatory to the formation of a CONGRESS of NATIONS, for the purpose of agreeing upon a CODE of LAWS for regulating the intercourse of Nations; and the establishment of a Court of Nations whose office it shall be to adjudicate on cases of international differences according to those laws, leaving the executive in the hands of Public Opinion, the Queen of the World.

The following extracts from the Petition of the New York Peace Society, show the vast superiority of arbitration over war.

“First, it is observable that War pays no regard to the MERITS of the case. Its rule is *might not right*. But arbitration *does* consider those merits. Again, the stronger party being more likely than the weaker to be the aggressor, a resort to war in the case, renders it probable that the injured party will receive additional injury, instead of obtaining redress: whereas, by arbitration, that party would in all probability *obtain* redress. In cases where two parties are nearly equal in strength, by resorting to war, they generally leave off where they begin, nothing being decided, and both parties being sadly injured. Arbitration in *such* cases also, would answer a better purpose in both respects. And in cases where the stronger party is the injured one, although by a resort to war redress is generally obtained, how hard *the way* of obtaining it! Arbitration would afford it in an easier way. In every case, then, the ends of justice are better subserved by arbitration than by war, and all the evils of war are prevented besides.

“Furthermore, war is an infringement of the independence of nations. Surely it is such an infringement, for one nation to dictate to another, and to attempt to enforce its dictation, as is always done by one of the parties in war. But arbitration respects national sovereignty. Here is no dictation, no coercion, nothing but friendly counsel. Once more; by resorting to war, nations violate one of the plainest dictates of reason, viz., that parties should not be judges in their own cases, which they always assume to be in war. Arbitration respects this dictate, by providing a disinterested party as a judge. Then, again, the custom of war affords the strong an opportunity to oppress the weak, and the ambitious to pursue their schemes of conquest and aggrandizement. Arbitration is a check to oppression and ambition, and affords protection to the defenceless. And again, the custom of war is

one vast system of duelling. In war, nations take their position on what they denominate the point of honour, refusing to make the proper concessions and overtures for the preservation of peace, and sacrificing justice itself to resentment and pride. The principle of international arbitration is the principle of order and peace on a scale of equal magnitude. In short, every reason that can be urged in favour of the peaceful adjustment of individual disputes, and against a resort to individual violence, can be urged with as much greater force in favour of international arbitration, and against war, as the evils of war exceed in every respect the evils resulting from individual combat.

“ Now, then, if the ends of justice itself can be better subserved by arbitration than by war, and so much evil prevented, and so much good done, what plea remains for war ? ”

ARBITRATION IS FRIENDLY—WISE—EASY AND CHEAP. WAR IS FIENDISH—FOOLISH—DIFFICULT AND DEAR.

Arbitration has often been employed by the leading Cabinets of Europe for the adjustment of their differences, and the United States of America have in several instances resorted to it with a degree of success calculated to encourage its general adoption. When Great Britain and the United States disagreed about the interpretation of the first article of the Treaty of Ghent, it was referred to the Emperor of Russia in 1822, and was thus amicably settled. A short time since, the disputes between the United States and Mexico had brought them to the brink of a war, when the New York Peace Society handed to John Quincy Adams, information of the readiness of Mexico to refer the disputes for arbitration. The danger was immediately averted, by the affair being placed in the hands of the King of Prussia for disinterested adjustment.

About the middle of the thirteenth century, the inhabitants of Iceland were afflicted by the ravages of two contending factions, and in order to prevent the recurrence of such scenes, it was mutually agreed that all similar disputes should in future be referred to the King of Norway for adjustment, with the distinct stipulation, that on no pretext whatever should that monarch introduce an armed force into Iceland. This condition has never been violated, either by the Norwegian or Danish monarchs, and peace has been successfully maintained ; so that during nearly six centuries which have since elapsed, we are told that no military force has been raised in, or introduced to the island.

London Peace Society,

OFFICE, 19, NEW BROAD STREET.

London:—Printed by RICHARD BARRETT, 13, Mark Lane ; and sold by CHARLES GILPIN, 5, Bishopsgate Street Without, and at the DEPOSITORY of the Society.