convictions and liberty, must be respected. Private property cannot be confiscated." There are, of course, various prohibitions of the destruction of property.

Lord Roberts's proclamation relates chiefly or only to districts "in British occupation," and the section of the Convention from which we have quoted specifies that military occupation must be effective. Now, the fifth Article on "Prisoners of War" provides that they can be confined—a word which must presumably cover deportation—"only as an indispensable measure of safety." The question inevitably suggests itself—if the British army is in effective occupation, how can a decree of wholesale arrest and deportation of civilians be described as "an indispensable measure of safety"? Or, if it is such a measure, how can the occupation be described as effective? But it would seem not only that such a draconic proposal is not contemplated in international law, but that the mere threat of such a step is prohibited.

Sanguinary journalists of the school of the St. James's Gazette and Globe may also be reminded that prisoners of war are now secured honourable and even comfortable treatment. They are to be maintained, "as regards food, quarters, and clothing, on the same footing as the troops of the Government which has captured them," having secured to them "all their personal belongings except arms, horses, and military papers." But not only would wholesale deportation be a very costly measure; politically, it would be quite futile, since, by Article XX. of the Convention, it is directed that "after the conclusion of peace, the repatriation of prisoners shall take place as speedily as possible."

England narrowly escaped an intervention of the Great Powers on the strength of the Arbitration Convention. An intervention on the basis of the rules of warfare would be, for us, a still more shameful and perilous event.

---

THE HAGUE CONVENTIONS:
WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH THEM?

By HODGSON PRATT.

O

n the 28th of August, 1898, the Tsar invited all civilized nations to secure for themselves deliverance from the rule of the sword. He declared that by their increasing armaments "national culture, economic progress, and the production of wealth are either paralysed or checked in their development." With a view to rescue the peoples from this gigantic evil, he invited Presidents and Sovereigns to send delegates to a conference on the remedies to be adopted. Accordingly, able and distinguished men came together, and they resolved that there were three courses of action in particular which would secure relief for the burdened nations. They were as follows: (1) Mediation and good offices to be offered by friendly Powers to those involved in a serious dispute; (2) impartial investigation as to questions of fact when such disputes arose; and (3) the establishment of a permanent Court of Arbitration. The last-named provision would, of course, afford the greatest possible security against War, and it is one which has always proved successful when resorted to. The urgent question now before the world is how to realize the fullest advantage from the proposals thus formulated. It must be borne in mind that resort to the tribunal by the disputant Powers was not made compulsory. The Bureau to be constituted at The Hague need not take action when a quarrel arises, and the States involved are as free as ever to refuse recourse to arbitration. Unless and until the citizens and electors everywhere compel their rulers to avail themselves of the facilities now offered, it may be long before relief is obtained from the burden of militarism and the danger of war. Hitherto governments have only resorted to arbitration when they thought it convenient, and when what they call "the national honour," or prestige, or territorial extension was not involved. They may continue to deprive the peoples of this great boon unless adequate pressure is brought to bear upon them. How, then, shall The Hague agreement bear fruit and produce the beneficial results for which millions have hoped?

At the recent Inter-Parliamentary Congress, held at Paris, much stress was laid by Count Apponyi and M. Charles Beauceron on the supreme importance of educating the populations in favour of the idea of arbitration. And this has been the mission of the Peace Societies for many years, but with what inadequate result—we are bound to add, when we witness such a state of feeling as exists in Great Britain at the present time! However, the Hague Conference has now supplied the workers for this cause with a vantage ground they never possessed before. They can now place before the populations a definite and practical aim which has been endorsed by all civilized Powers. The urgent question to be now considered is whether the existing organisations are sufficient for their great task? Nothing less than a universal evolution of public opinion is needed. Such a crusade as that which took place in the winter before last in England should be set on foot throughout Europe. What is wanted is a Federation or International Union having branches in all the chief towns. The general objects may be stated to be the substitution of a régime of international unity for the régime of latent conflict, hostility, and militarism, to be obtained by the
methods prescribed by last year's Conference. To carry out such a crusade, men able to arrest public attention, convince, and arouse enthusiasm must be found, and well paid for such important services. They would not only hold meetings, but organise branches or national societies, with the help of all existing organisations of arbitration and peace. It would probably be necessary to create a Central Bureau or enlarge the Peace Bureau now existing at Berne. Such a central organisation would have two objects. One of these would be to carry on the agitation on behalf of a universal resort to the High Court at The Hague; the other would be to carry out a thorough investigation into all international questions which may lead to conflict. This latter object has long been urged by a member of our Association, and received formal approval at the Peace Congress of 1897.

This new development of the forces which make for international justice and concord has been occupying the attention of two well-known public men, and each, independently of the other, has been engaged in preparing a definite project. One of these men is a well-known ethical teacher and philosopher, Dr. Moncure Conway; and the other is the publicist who, with such remarkable and unsurpassed zeal, energy, and industry, has, as a journalist, denounced the war in South Africa—Mr. W. T. Stead. These men are in communication with each other respecting the common purpose they have at heart; and the European public will soon have before them definite proposals relating to the great object above described. A provisional committee has been formed in Paris to prepare a scheme of action, and such men as Frederic Passy, T. Moncet, H. La Fontaine, Charles Richet, and Gaston Moch, have joined it. It was constituted at the close of a meeting of some members of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference and of several Peace societies, who had been invited by Mr. Stead to consider the propriety of taking a new departure. His proposals were received with enthusiasm, and it may well be hoped that important results will follow.

To achieve the results desired there should be funds adequate to secure the services of first-rate agitators and organisers; and what better course could be adopted than to offer £1,000 a year to that most able and self-sacrificing man at Berne, M. Elie Ducommun, who for many years has been the Honorary Secretary of the Peace Bureau? Let him be asked to become the chief organiser of the international machine now proposed. There could be no better guarantees for its ultimate success. There remains the puzzling question of funds. The present writer can throw no light on that point, but Mr. Stead's Christmas book, entitled "Mr. Carnegie's Conundrum," indicates from whence funds may be forthcoming. The owner of forty millions sterling, who asks what he shall do with them, has evidently a strong conviction of his own on the subject. He has at heart the deliverance of the world from the scourge of war, the abolition of militarism, and the triumph of equity and justice in international quarrels. It would afford him profound happiness to devote one or more of his millions to that sacred cause. May we not then hope that the new "International Union" will afford him his greatly-desired opportunity of rendering to the world a magnificent and lasting service?

THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION.

By W. P. Byles.

The Inter-Parliamentary Peace Conference has been held in Paris since our last issue. It is the habit of this international Parliament of Peace to hold its annual session in one or other metropolis of Europe, and this year it naturally gravitated to the gay capital of France, which during these exhibition months is given over to Congresses. By common consent the Conference has been less successful, less inspiring, than usual. Why? Well, King Humbert fell the victim of an assassin on the very eve of the meeting. There was to be a very large delegation from Italy, but, of course, no one came, and those who had already started returned at once to their own country. The same tragic event robbed the meeting of its soirées and receptions. Banquets, garden-parties and réunions had been arranged for every night in the week; the distinguished Parliamentary visitors from all the countries of Europe were to receive various honours and hospitalities from the Presidents of the Republic, the Senate, and the Chamber of Deputies, and from the Municipality of Paris. But all these fêtes were abandoned out of respect for the mourning Court and the mourning people of Italy. Now, these festive occasions are an important part of the Conference, for it is then that members mix together, establish mutual understandings, remove or soften international asperities, and compare the progress of the Peace movement in different countries. Tout savoir est tout comprendre. So that the loss of these opportunities took the gilt off the gingerbread, and deprived the meeting of much profitable result. And then the irony of the situation! Everyone was inevitably conscious of it. Parliament men meeting to promote peace and arbitration, while the only two Protestant peoples of the world were destroying one another over some trumpery 'disputed claims'; while the great nation which has been pioneer of civilisation and Christianity was turning the ploughshare into the sword, and