

## An International State

A. C. Umbreit

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

A. C. Umbreit, *An International State*, 3 Marq. L. Rev. 55 (1919).  
Available at: <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr/vol3/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Marquette Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marquette Law Review by an authorized administrator of Marquette Law Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [megan.obrien@marquette.edu](mailto:megan.obrien@marquette.edu).

## AN INTERNATIONAL STATE

A. C. UMBREIT, A.M., LL.B., PROFESSOR OF  
INTERNATIONAL LAW

The world war is over. The nations of the world are anxiously awaiting the terms of peace soon to be determined. The belligerents, other than the United States, are intensely interested in the provisions for indemnity and distribution of territory. Our chiefest interest is centered in the provisions for the safety of democracy in the world, our one great purpose in entering the war. The safety of the democracy of the world lies in a permanent universal peace. Every nation and every people demands that the impending peace conference devise ways and means that will make war in the future impossible, at least, make it impossible for one or two nations, "single and alone," to throw the world into a cataclysm of slaughter. Is this demand a mere tapestry of dreams, or is its fulfillment possible?

Permanent world peace is possible—otherwise religion and civilization are delusions. World peace is imminent, but the only question is—how can it be made permanent? It appears to be the concensus of opinion of the statesmen of civilized nations and international law experts that a League of Nations answers this question, and that, if the coming peace conference creates such a league, universal peace will be permanent and enduring. Is such opinion justified?

The idea of a League of Nations is not a new one. It is as old as mankind. Such leagues have been formed ever since man ceased to be a solitary rover and sought to establish and maintain some form of communal life. The first league of which history tells anything at all, was the Latin League, composed of thirty small nations, organized in 753 B. C., designed to establish a lasting peace throughout Latium, and continued until overwhelmed by Rome, with whom then an alliance was concluded and the Eternal City became the president of the league. The original league thereupon disintegrated and disappeared. From the date of the formation of this first International League to 1902, history records the formation of one hundred and forty-one International Leagues, each one of which had for its object, directly or ultimately, the establishment and maintenance of a permanent universal peace. In this object they all failed.

During the last two centuries the nations of Europe have formed a number of leagues or alliances to maintain the "balance of power" on that continent. The doctrine of this "balance of power," when rightly understood and honestly practiced, necessarily results in permanent peace. Yet this very doctrine has given rise to many wars and been made the pretext for much unjust aggression and interference. The three partitions of Poland are examples. It was solemnly asserted by great diplomats and statesmen that the maintenance of this "balance of power" by the great nations of Europe in reality created a European commonwealth, the result of which was that states kept a watchful eye on each other, and when a very great increase of power was coupled with an ambitious and aggressive policy in any one state, the other states could combine and take such measures as would curb and restrain the dangerous member. Previous to the recent world war, nothing was better understood in European diplomacy than the fact that a primary overlordship was vested in a league or combination composed of Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Austria and Italy, whose primary duty it was to maintain the "balance of power." It is true this combination was divided into the triple alliance of Germany, Austria and Italy on the one hand, and the entente, composed of France, Russia and Great Britain on the other. When these guardians of the "balance of power" began fighting among themselves, the world war resulted and thus the league of the greatest and most civilized nations of the world failed in maintaining peace.

The most ambitious, and at the time considered the most successful, attempts at formation of an International League, were the Hague Peace Conferences, held in 1899 and 1907. A third conference was to meet in 1915. The very name of these conferences indicates their purpose—peace. The proposal for the first meeting of this conference came from the Czar of Russia, a significant fact, and the purpose stated in the invitation issued by the Czar is also significant, namely, disarmament. The first conference concluded and executed three conventions and one declaration, and the second conference thirteen conventions and one declaration.

The first title of the first convention of each of these conferences was—"Maintenance of General Peace" and the opening sentence of the preamble of these titles—"Animated by the sincere desire to work for the maintenance of general peace." Confining our attention to the peace conference of 1907, we find

that the "Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes" was signed by forty-four nations, among them all of the active belligerents of the late war. These were Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Roumania, Russia, Serbia, Turkey, and the United States. It is a significant fact that neither of these peace conferences reached any determination, hardly any consideration of even, on the question of disarmament, the purpose announced for the first conference. President Wilson in his fourteen peace propositions on this point merely suggests reduction of armaments.

It was universally believed after these peace conferences at the Hague that a world war was absolutely out of the question. It was confidently asserted that these conferences had resulted in making certain a permanent world peace. Especially the second conference, it was asserted, had finally accomplished the desired aim of a universal world peace. Thus an executive officer of the "World Peace Foundation" said:—"It (the second Hague convention) taught nations that from now on legality and cooperation, mutual and deferential conference, instead of national selfishness, impulse or isolation, must rule the world, that the new era of these things has come, and come to stay. This is the supreme result of the Hague conferences. Those conferences were sessions of the world's constitutional convention, 'on the sky's dome, as on a bell' their action 'struck the world's great hour' of unity and organization, pledging the family of nations at once a legislature and a judgment seat, and transforming the world's peace party into a world federation league, instinct and electric with confidence in holier triumphs yet to come." This was said in 1910, and in the light of the world's experience of the last four years, we know how well this poetic prophecy was fulfilled.

What would result from the re-formation of a new league of nations at the coming peace conference? Merely more conventions and treaties, international or intra-national. What would be the result of more conventions? Let history answer.

Take our own national diplomatic experience. From 1776 to 1913 the United States entered into five hundred and ninety separate treaties with separate nations and became a party to and signed seventy international conventions. If all of these treaties and conventions had been kept by the parties thereto, it would have been impossible for the United States to become involved in a war with foreign nations. Yet, we have been engaged in

four wars with foreign nations, with Great Britain in 1812, with Mexico in 1846, with Spain in 1898, and with Germany and Austria in 1917. We need not look further for what would result from the creation of more conventions and treaties than our own experience.

Why have all these attempts at world peace by means of leagues and conventions failed? Simply because there was no central power vested anywhere, strong enough to enforce the covenants of these conventions. A league is nothing but an alliance or coalition of the ruling powers of different states for the promotion of common objects or interests. The violation of league covenants by a single member of the league, *ipso facto* dissolves the league for all practical purposes. Conventions of mere leagues have hitherto been enforceable merely by an appeal to the moral obligation of the members. If the coming peace conference will not devise means for the enforcement of its conventions, drastically different from what has hitherto been done in this direction by international conferences, the hope of a permanent world peace as the result of this conference will die at its birth.

History thus failing to give much promise of the establishment of a permanent world peace by means of forming a league of nations, must this hope be surrendered? Not at all. The nations of the world now certainly are in a mood and attitude where any working scheme, no matter how drastic, which will result in causing the peoples of the earth to live in peace and harmony, will not only be tolerated but welcomed. What scheme will bring about universal peace? Not a league or alliance, not conventions or treaties, but a union of the civilized nations, a United States of the World, a World Commonwealth, an International State. This international state could be formed in accordance with the plan of government adopted by the United States and successfully operated for one hundred and twenty-nine years. This scheme of an international commonwealth should include three departments of world government, an executive, a legislative and a judicial department. The executive of the United States of the World might be an individual or a small commission, elected or selected, for a reasonably short term of years, without power of succession. The legislative department should consist of representatives from all of the states of this world commonwealth and meet once in two or three years. The world court should be elected or selected from the best legal

talent of the composing states and the tribunal thus created should be in a practically continuous session. The coming peace conference at Versailles should resolve itself into a constitutional convention for the purpose of forming this world union, or should at least provide the method and the time for the calling of such a constitutional convention. Under this plan there would be an executive to enforce the covenants of the convention adopted by the representatives of the nations, assembled in conferences as a world legislature. There would be a supreme judicial tribunal to interpret these covenants or legislative acts and apply them to concrete cases arising between the component states. There would be a world police force to keep recalcitrant nations within the bounds of their agreements or to enforce such agreements. The scheme of world government suggested here should not be too complicated, but it would appear that such scheme is workable among forty-four nations just as well as it has proven workable among the forty-six states of the United States.

Nations are like individuals. They will observe the rights of others if they are compelled to do so by reason of a strong restraining or compelling executive and judiciary. All our municipal laws governing the conduct of individuals should be worse than useless if we did not have an executive force to compel observance, or courts to punish violations. Under the plan herein suggested, nations are substituted for individuals, and the governmental scheme which has successfully operated in this country is merely expanded so as to apply to the civilized nations of the world. The theory may appeal to the idealist in international law, but, of course, the question of supreme importance is the one of its practicability.

First of all, who is to compose this international state? The free nations and those practically free—and by free nations are meant those that have a representative government, that is, where the people have a voice in selecting those who make, execute or interpret the laws that govern them—should constitute the original thirteen states. If asked to name these nations, these are suggested: United States, Great Britain, including her free colonies, France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Portugal, Japan, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Brazil and the Argentine Republic. Among these nations named it is true that such states as Italy, Japan and the Scandinavian states should take some steps to make their respective state governments more representative. If these states would agree to form an international commonwealth, based

upon the form of government established by the constitution of the United States, the question of the safety of democracy for the world would be solved.

But what of the other nations of the world, among which, previous to November 11, 1918, were some of the largest nations? The other nations not named should constitute, for a time at least, what is in international law known as "protected states," the equivalent to territories in the United States. Such protected states or world territories would consist of Germany, or the nations into which it may be subdivided, Russia, Austria-Hungary, or the nations into which it may be subdivided, the Balkan states, Turkey, China, Mexico, Poland, Holland, and other nations. Those should continue as "protected states" or territories of the United States of the World until they had firmly established a representative form of government, when they could be received as sovereign states into this international state, the same as territories are received as states into the United States.

That this proposition of the formation of an international state will result in a permanent and universal peace appears self-evident. The constitution of the United States of the World should contain at least two provisions of the constitution of the United States, the adoption of which would remove at once the cause for most of the wars in the past.

One of these provisions in Section 3, of Article IV: "New states may be admitted by the congress into this union; but no new state shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of other states; nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states, or parts of states, without the consent of the legislatures of the states concerned, as well as of the congress." Such a provision in the world constitution would prevent a nation or nations from seeking to expand its territory by seizing or attempting to seize the territory or a part thereof of other nations, generally the smaller nations, a disposition of doing which is characteristic of most of the nations of the world, and has been a most fruitful cause of wars.

The other provision of our federal constitution applicable to the proposed world situation is Section 4 of the same article: "The United States of the World shall guarantee to every state in this union a representative form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence." Such a provision would

guarantee a representative government to every nation and member of the international state, make democracy safe for the world and protect such nations against the violence of Bolshevism, or other violent disturbances resulting from social and industrial unrest.

It is not proposed to give herein a complete plan for the creation and operation of an international commonwealth. The object is merely to present a fundamental skeleton of what could and should be done either by the coming peace conference or another conference provided for by this one in the way of forming an international union which will insure to the nations of the world that peace for which all hope and pray. The details must be worked out by the experts of the various nations concerned.

Of course, objections to the plan proposed can, have and will be suggested. The first objection will be that the scheme is a visionary one, the dream of idealists. The answer is that our own form of government was first proposed as the result of visions of dreamers and idealists and was long condemned for that very reason. All substantial progress in this world has first found its suggestion in the brain of men who saw visions and who expounded these visions to a doubting world.

The second objection that will be urged is that the success of the plan depends entirely upon the adoption and observance by the various nations of the doctrine of the Golden Rule; that the jealousies and suspicions of the various nations would prevent that harmonious working out of the plan suggested in order to make it a success. This objection was strongly urged during the discussion preceding the drafting of our own constitution and was very strongly present in the discussions of the constitutional convention, and even existed when the question of ratification by the states was being considered. The jealousies and the selfishness of human nature will find a field of operation when the nations of the world attempt to devise some plan or means, no matter what the plan or the means, by which the recurrence of world or other wars will be made impossible and universal peace permanent.

Another objection that will be urged is that there is no way of uniting the large nations with the small ones in any formal union that would work, because you cannot give all the members an equal vote, and if an attempt is made to solve the problem by a proportional representation, an unwieldy deliberative body will result, a fruitful cause for intrigue. That same objection

was urged against the provisions of our constitution and yet, although our country is composed of some very large and some very small states, the question of equitable representation in national affairs has been successfully solved.

Another objection, especially urged in certain quarters of this country, is an economic one, namely, that such an international state would result in free trade. Under the conditions as they now exist in the world, the writer is a moderate protectionist, but if an international union is formed, free trade between the members of this union is not objectionable any more than free trade between the states of the United States is.

Many other objections may be urged, but this is not the time or place to consider all of them. An objection was urged in the United States senate the other day that such a plan as herein proposed would abrogate our Monroe Doctrine. If an international commonwealth is formed, there is no need nor excuse for any Monroe Doctrine or a European doctrine of the balance of power.

It has already been herein suggested that the idea of a League of Nations seemed to have gotten possession of the thinking statesmen and diplomats of the world. Nevertheless, this idea has been much less discussed in this country than in England. In that country three views of the question here under discussion have been promulgated. One view, which has been called the extremely progressive or radical view, proposes a plan quite similar to the one herein suggested, with the exception of not providing for an international executive. Another, and the most conservative, view suggests the formation of a League of Nations by strengthening some of the conventions of the second Hague conference and that if any nation makes war upon another nation without first submitting the grievance to the League, then the League conduct an economic boycott against that nation, thus proclaiming that wars in the future will be prevented by a mere economic boycott. The third view is a modification of the two views just referred to and provides merely a League of Nations, operating under the provisions of strong conventions for the maintenance of peace and proposes to prevent wars by suggesting that any nation which violates such conventions shall be subject to discipline by all the forces at the disposal of other nations, and especially contends that if the members of this League will police the world by sufficient naval and military forces, propor-

tionately provided by the various nations, continued and uninterrupted peace must result.

The fatal objection to the successful operation of all of these plans is the fact that none of them provides for an international executive power, continually existing, to enforce the obligations assumed by or imposed upon the members composing a League and to administer the details of this international body as they are presented from day to day.

If democracy or a representative form of government is a remedy for the evils of the world, if a universal and permanent peace is an attainable hope, and if civilization is worth the efforts that have been made to develop it, then now is the time for some most drastic rearrangement of the international affairs of the world, and now is the time for the creation of an international state, before the peoples of the belligerent nations have forgotten the horrors and price of brutal war. Any solution of the burning international questions of the day, to be permanent and effective, must be based on an efficient administration and execution of the covenants adopted by the international conferences. Such a solution of international affairs, both for the present and future, is possible only by the formation of a United States of the World.