THE JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

A WORLD CONSCIOUSNESS AND FUTURE
PEACE*

By MORTON PRINCE

I

THE INDIVIDUAL CONSCIOUSNESS

THE newer Western psychology is giving us a deeper insight into the human mind than was possible by the older psychology. It is laying bare the hidden yearnings and aspirations and strivings of human beings whether as individuals, or collectively as families, civic communities or nations. And therefore it enables us to discover the real, the true motives which, underlying the superficial motives and apparent motives, determine human conduct, whether that conduct be an individual striving to accomplish his ambition, or a nation striving for World Empire.

This newer Western psychology is teaching us that the older psychology, the academic psychology of the universities is, as our great and lamented William James aptly expressed it, but the clanging of brass cymbals—much noise but without real meaning. The academic psychology is superficial in that it does not touch the profounder motives and mechanisms of human nature.

If we would understand the human mind we must dive beneath the surface of consciousness, beneath the momentary ebullitions of thought. These, we are learning, are but the superficial, phenomenal and momentarily fragmentary manifestations of a larger and profounder consciousness. The teachings of modern investigations, and of our Western

*Address before the "Concordia Association" of Japan, at Tokyo, at a garden party given by Baron Shibusaya, June 13th, 1916.

Copyright 1917, by Richard G. Badger. All Rights Reserved.

philosophical thought which those investigations have stimulated, is to regard our conscious thought as only a superficial consciousness and but a fragment of a larger mind which we term the subconscious or unconscious mind. As an English student, the late Frederick Myers, in his studies of "Human Personality" has expressed it, our thoughts and impulses at any given moment are but uprushes from this larger reservoir of consciousness. And, therefore, if we would discover the motives and springs to human action, the components and realities of human personality we must seek them by exploring not the superficial consciousness but below its threshold in the great underlying consciousness and primitive inborn instincts of each individual. In this underlying subconsciousness, in this larger mind we find the solution of the riddle of personality and, more pragmatically important, the solution of the problems of what we may call the collective consciousness of communities.

By collective consciousness I mean, speaking generally, that unity of thought, those common ideals and that common will which take possession of the soul of a people—whether of small communities or of nations. Just as there is a personal consciousness peculiar to the individual alone, so there is a larger family consciousness, a community consciousness, a civic consciousness and a national consciousness shared in common by the members of the group.

The larger subconscious mind can be reached by various devices: for instance, by putting ourselves in a state of deep revery or profound contemplation—that is, abstracted from all awareness of the immediate environment. Then there wells up a wealth of images and emotions and thoughts; and memories reaching, perhaps, far back into the past, and knowledge of the previously unknown. And of all this subconscious knowledge in our ordinary state of mind we were profoundly ignorant. But now we may see translucently, with almost a supernatural clearness and brightness of vision, what before was obscure or hidden. Thus to my way of thinking modern Western psychology and philosophy are reaching a point of approachment with Eastern philosophy, for it would seem to me, that it was this same subcon-

conscious mind that Buddha probably reached by profound contemplation. It is only a question of interpretation. Indeed, some Western thinkers, like Frederick Myers, would bring this great subconscious mind into close relation with a transcendental cosmic consciousness of which perhaps the individual consciousness is but one focus of intensity—a sort of vortex in a universal consciousness, or the energy of the Universe.

But we need not enter into that larger metaphysical question which is far beyond my purpose. I want rather to treat of human personality and its ethical and pragmatic bearing upon individual and collective conduct. What then is the great subconscious mind that plays so large a part in personality?

It is impossible for me in such a brief address as this to treat this great subject with any fullness and you will not expect me, or indeed wish me, to do so. I should tire you if I did. It is indeed the great problem of the future. As M. Bergson, the French philosopher, has recently said: "To explore the most sacred depths of the unconscious, to labor in what I have just called the subsoil of consciousness, that will be the principal task of psychology in the century that is opening. I do not doubt that wonderful discoveries await it there, as important, perhaps, as have been in the preceding centuries the discoveries of the physical and natural sciences. That at least is the promise which I make for it, that is the wish that in closing I have for it."

I shall little more than touch upon it, sufficiently only to elucidate the main subject of my address.

PERSONALITY AS EVOLVED BY THE CREATIVE FORCE OF THE EXPERIENCES OF LIFE

In this great underlying subsoil of consciousness are to be found the memories of a vast mass of experiences of life, extending, we may almost say, from the cradle to the grave. Most of them are beyond voluntary recall as memory. By the term "experiences of life" you must understand all our conscious experiences of both our outer and inner life, our conscious experiences with the external world of men and

things about us and our inner thoughts—our soul's thoughts. The subconscious thus includes the deposited experiences not only of our ephemeral everyday life, but of our whole acquired education, acquired from childhood to the grave—our pedagogical, our social, our religious, our ethical, our civic, our political and our patriotic education. It includes everything that has come to us by teaching from our ancestors and predecessors.

Within it, therefore, are to be found the formulated memories of codes of right conduct, codes of ethical precepts and of ideals. These when acquired in early life may have been repressed and lost sight of by the individual who, in later years, developed in an environment governed by antagonistic codes or allowed himself to be governed by instinctive impulses and interests of a conflicting character. But nevertheless they may still be subconsciously conserved ready to be called again into being by favoring influences.

A great mass of such experiences we conceive of as deposited as memories and dispositions to behavior, dispositions that may strive to find expression below the threshold of consciousness in the subconscious realm.

And then among the experiences of the inner life must be reckoned the strivings and conflicts of the soul—all that pertain to the innermost sanctuary of personality and character, the intimate communings with self, the doubts and fears and scruples pertaining to the moral, religious and other problems of life, and the struggles and trials and difficulties which beset its paths; the internal conflicts of the soul with the world, the flesh and the devil—conflicts which each individual may have undergone in efforts to adapt himself to the conflicting circumstances of his real life.

Memories of all these inner experiences, and of these and other unsolved problems of life are deposited in the subconscious mind. Sometimes it happens that, as in sudden religious conversion, they undergo subconscious incubation or reasoning and burst out into flower as a sudden realization of a religious truth.

By the creative force of all these life's experiences cooperating with the inborn primitive instincts—inborn in every individual—the subconscious mind is formed.

And out of the subconscious mind, as the acquired experiences of life, and these instincts are evolved and organized those tendencies, traits, ideals, and habits of mind and action which we term personality and character. I would, indeed, emphasize the primitive instincts because, besides all these acquired dispositions to behavior, there are, of course, inherited dispositions, by which we understand the primitive instinctive impulses coming from all the inborn instincts of human nature. I mean the instincts of fear, and love, and anger, and aversion, and the sexual life, and their kind which motivate human nature.

THE SUBCONSCIOUS AS THE DYNAMIC SOURCE OF CONDUCT

But a small fraction only of all these subconscious memories emerge as conscious processes of thought. The greater portion remain beneath the threshold and tend, unconsciously, to shape and determine our conscious processes—our judgments, ideals, beliefs, conventions, points of view, habits and the tendencies of our mental lives. Whence these come, how they were born, we often have long ceased to remember. For they have not only their roots but the springs which motivate them deep down in the subconscious past. Indeed there is reason to believe that in profound thought it is the subconscious that does the real work. Drawing upon the deposited experiences of the past for the conscious needs of the moment, it thrusts up into consciousness for consideration a selected series of germane ideas. From these our consciousness at such moments does little more than choose those judged adequate to meet the conditions of the problem.

As I said at the beginning, though we cannot by conscious effort attain to all our subconscious knowledge, yet, by special devices, like profound meditation, abstraction, revery, etc., we can bring a large amount to the full light of consciousness.

Thus it comes about that our reactions to the environment, our moral and social conduct, our sentiments and feelings, our points of view and attitudes of mind—all that we term character and personality—are predetermined by

mental experiences of the past by which they are developed, organized and conserved in the subconscious mind. We react with hatred or with love, with loyalty or disloyalty, with sympathy or with aversion, to the traits, or character, or principles, or ideals, or behavior of some other being, or group of beings, or nation, because in the past there have been incorporated in our personalities and conserved in our subconscious minds sentiments, points of view, ethical principles, habits of mind, desires, tendencies, primitive instincts, etc., in harmony with or antagonistic to them. We are thus the offspring of our past and the past is the present. It may be that in certain cases such reactions are, as the newer psychology teaches, the outcome, the conscious expression of unrecognized conflicts with subconscious strivings or self-reproaches, if you like. But that is a detail of mechanisms with which we need not concern ourselves here as it does not affect the fundamental principle.

II

THE COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS

Thus far I have been concerned with the development of the consciousness peculiar to the individual—his personality.

But an individual is a unit in a community, and in the development of his personality he acquires systems of ideals and habits of mind and actions which are not peculiar to himself but are common to the community—*i. e.* to a group of individuals united by common ties, and associations, and traditions and interests. These systems may be called a *collective consciousness*, because they are possessed in common by a collection of individuals. Hence it is that we have what is commonly spoken of as the *social consciousness*. It needs but a little thought to appreciate that this embodies established habits of thought and ideals and sentiments which underlie the customs, manners and etiquettes, the habits and modes of living peculiar to social groups, the social, philanthropic and other obligations of one individual to another and to the body of the community; the accepted

principles of social morality. In recognition of such a collective consciousness and the social conduct regulated and determined by it, there has come into being a specialized field of study known as social psychology.

As there are many different kinds of social groups, and as different groups become united into larger groups with common ties, so there are many different collective consciousnesses, or community consciousnesses.

TYPES OF COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS

There is the *family* consciousness in which are embodied, among much else, ideals of affection and loyalty of each member to each of the others and to the whole as a unit.

There used to be the *clan* consciousness of feudal times. There is the *caste* consciousness, such as was that of the *samurai* of Japan, of the Brahmins of India, the ancient noblesse of France, the knights of the days of King Arthur in England; and there is that of the military caste of Germany today, and the democracy of America; and so on.

More important for us today from a political point of view and of modern civilization is the civic community consciousness common to groups of individuals united for purposes of commercial, industrial and social interests and orderly government. Thus the citizens of Tokyo and every city have a civic consciousness. And still more important there is in every nation a state or national consciousness.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS

Now the first point that I would like to make is that the same principle underlying the development of the consciousness peculiar to the individual and characteristic of his own personality brings about the organization of a collective consciousness. But here it is the creative force of *common* experiences. Through a common ethical and social education, and, in the case of political groups, political education common *habits of thought*, common *sentiments* and *ideals*, common *aversions*, common *desires*, and common *habits of action* are established and firmly conserved in the

consciousness of the members of the group. Similarly a common point of view and a common attitude of mind towards the circumstances of the social organization and of everyday life become developed. And, most important, as I shall presently point out, things and ideas of common experience become possessed of a *common meaning* for every individual.

Further, out of a collective consciousness by the force of common ideals and common desires, there necessarily develops a unity of thought, and common *will* which impel towards uniformity of behavior. But all is not explicitly conscious. The processes of the mind and conduct, in losing their plasticity and becoming fixed, necessarily become largely matters of habit and of second nature; which means that they have become organized below the threshold of consciousness and have their roots and sources of energy in subconsciously conserved experiences of the past. Each one of us would find it difficult or impossible to explain why he has the same view point as the rest of the community, why the same ideals, the same desires, the same will; why he regulates his conduct in the same way towards everyday life. He would give you undoubtedly an explanation, reasons that seem plausible to himself, but the real reason is that his social and ethical education have left dispositions to thought, dispositions to action—sort of phonographic records—in his subconsciousness, out of which have crystallized, as a sort of resumé, habit reactions. These govern him in spite of himself, even though he struggles hard against their impulses. And this is also in large part the case because through education the primitive instinctive impulses of human nature have been enlisted and harnessed to serve the habits of the social ideals, or brought under control and repressed in accordance with the aims of the community consciousness.

Furthermore we see the collective mind manifesting the same reactions to subconscious processes as does the individual mind. Thus we frequently see the consciousness of a community or nation reacting to the conduct of another community or nation with aversion or hatred, just as Germany does today towards England. The ostensible and

given reason is because of some alleged immorality of conduct, like hypocrisy, that shocks the common ideal. But the real reason is because of a common baffled *subconscious* desire, or jealousy, or fear, dictated perhaps by self interest and unacknowledged, to which aversion or hatred is only the common conscious reaction.

A COMMON MEANING TO IDEALS ESSENTIAL TO A COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS

The unity of the collective mind depends in no small degree upon ideas acquiring a *common meaning* for all the members of the community. This principle has far-reaching consequences. I do not refer to the dictionary meaning, or the etymological meaning, but rather to the meaning which ideas connote through their associations and implications. The meaning of the national flag of every nation is easily defined in a dictionary as a piece of cloth of a certain color and design, but it has, over and above this, an additional patriotic meaning for all the people of that nation which it has for the people of no other. And the meaning, when it is awakened, sends a thrill of emotional impulses throbbing through the veins which no dictionary meaning could do. And likewise patriotism, duty, morality, virtue, truth, honesty, valor, humanity, culture, and such ideas too often connote a different meaning to people of different communities and different nations, as we unfortunately see exemplified in the present war. And similarly ideas of relationship like wife, father, emperor, subject, citizen; conceptions such as God, religion, temple, connote different meanings to different people, individually or collectively; and so on. And thus it is that according as ideas have a common meaning in this sense they play a large part in determining the unity of the social consciousness, on the one hand, and variations in the customs, manners and habits of different communities.

Let us not forget that it is one's own personal experiences of life that give that special connoted meaning to ideas which is peculiar to each one of us, and therefore that shape your and my points of view and attitudes of mind

towards the life about us. And according as these experiences are unique for each of us or are shared by the other members of the community, will the *meaning* of a given idea and the point of view and attitude of mind be purely personal or common to a group of individuals as part of a collective consciousness. Consider, for example, the difference in meaning of the word "son" for you and for me, according as the context shows it to mean *your* son or *my* son. Your son means something more and different to you than to me. Why? Because a large number of personal and intimate experiences have woven or systematized about the idea many sentiments and memories which give it a peculiarly personal meaning for you: and correspondingly in my case. And so our points of view and attitudes of mind towards your son and my son are different. But there is also a social meaning which we share in common. This is because, besides those experiences, intimate and personal, peculiar to ourselves, there are many experiences associated with this idea of filial relationship which are common to most members of the community. These are derived from a common social education and environment. They may be ideas held in common of paternal and filial duty and obligations and affections and inheritance, etc. In this way there emerges a collective meaning which belongs to the collective consciousness. The experiences which provide this connoted meaning is called in psychological language the "setting" or "apperceptive mass." But there could be no "setting" or "apperceptive mass" and no persistent connoted meaning to ideas—no persistent point of view—unless life's experiences were conserved when out of mind as subconscious dispositions.

This is one of the principles according to which the points of view and attitudes of mind and ideals of different communities—the collective consciousness of communities—may differ or be identical regarding even the fundamentals of the social organization and conduct. According to differences in the settings appear differences in the ideals of the collective consciousness of different communities, whether of a circumscribed locality or a nation. Such differences underlie the variations in the codes, customs, manners and etiquette of the different classes of society and of nations.

I hardly need say that the formation of a collective consciousness regarding many matters begins in child-life in the home; regarding others, such as political ideals, later in life in the social world. In child-life moral and social ideals begin to be formed. The formative influences here are the family, the school and social environment. The active forces are on the one hand repressive, and on the other creative. Either force may consciously or unconsciously be directed by the environment. Both, of course, are in principle educational. I suppose that in no country does repression play so dominant and large a part as in Japan. By repression the instinctive inborn impulses and tendencies in conflict with the ideals of the collective consciousness are inhibited and kept in check, and thus prevented from forming habits. On the other hand by the creative force of education ideas are instilled and systematized into a collective ideal that shall be a habit of thought. But from childhood and even infancy the individual begins to undergo repression and to accumulate the creative experiences that are to form the meaning of his ideas and establish his points of view. Many of these are the basis upon which manners, customs and etiquette rest. Indeed he is permitted, or directly required, to have these experiences because they are either the necessary resultant of the already existing habits of society or are demanded by society.

Is it any wonder then that nations have a difficulty in understanding, and therefore have a lack of sympathy with the customs and manners and ideals of one another? Ideas through differences in the apperceptive mass come to have a different meaning for different nations. Even those of father, mother, son, daughter, virtue, morality, *set* in a mass of different associated ideas of duties, obligations, etc., have acquired social meanings that show marked variations for each nation corresponding with the social customs and codes of each, such as those of marriage and inheritance. That which is repressed by the social consciousness of one people may be entirely neglected or encouraged by that of another. In this particularly the Oriental and Occidental nations stand sharply contrasted. Note, as a simple example, nudity which is strongly repressed in everyday life

by occidentals, but is disregarded by orientals so that it becomes a commonplace fact of daily life for the child as well as adult. The result is that while with the former nudity has a meaning that excites lively reactions from its apperceptive mass—the social root ideas which have been both its source and the repressing force—with the latter it arouses no more emotional reaction than would pots, kettles and pans. Likewise exposure of the face with Moslems has a meaning and causes reactions that belong to exposure of other parts of the body with people having other social codes. It is impossible, therefore, for one nation to completely understand the meaning of many social ideas of another nation, and therefore the corresponding points of view, without acquiring the same apperceptive mass—that is to say, without undergoing the same social education from childhood to adult life.

Through this same principle we find the difficulty of some nations—nations that are composed of polyglot people, racially and in stock heterogeneous,—acquiring a national consciousness rich in common ideals. Such common ideals as exist are, for the most part, instinctive and of the kind found in primitive tribes. They may be limited to defense of the national domain against encroachments of territory or defense against military aggressions upon national sovereignty and national interests. Such, for example, must be the case of the Austrian Empire with its polyglot people—Magyar, Germans, Bohemians, Roumanians, Slovenes, Slovaks, Serbs, Croats, and others. The same difficulty besets, even if in less degree, the United States, with its one hundred millions of people drawn from every race on the globe and now in the “melting pot.” Out of that melting-pot will come some day a people with a national consciousness, common ideals, which will be the spiritual inspiring force of the nation. The same difficulty may arise even within homogeneous nations, wherein the disintegrating influences of modern economic, individual and political development have created heterogeneous class divisions based upon demoralizing social philosophy and selfish conflicting interest to the disregard of the interest of the national whole. Under such conditions the national consciousness becomes shorn of many of its

most spiritual, amalgamating and inspiring ideals that give unity and force to a nation. Among these are ideals of personal self-sacrifice at the behest of national duty, the obligation of the individual to subordinate private rights and selfish interests to the good of the State and the spiritual obligation of universal service in whatever field and wherever required by the State for its safety. In such a situation of disintegrated ideals England awoke at the outbreak of this war, and wondered with the whole world at her internal weakness. Nations like individuals, must sometimes be tried in adversity to find themselves, to recover their ideals. And so England, in the baptism of calamity has found herself, and in the finding has acquired ideals that have crystalized the soul of the nation into a spiritual force.

THE SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS AS THE REGULATOR OF SOCIETY

The second point I want to make is that the collective consciousness of the social organization—the social consciousness—plays a greater part in governing and regulating society than laws, or the military or police forces of even the most autocratic government. And this it does through the development of those habits of mind and action that underlie social customs and of an instinctive sense of social obligation which is the foundation of society. Lord Haldane, the former British Minister of War, dwelt upon this fact in a remarkable address just a year before the present war, and pointed out, as I shall also later argue, that it is not chimerical to hope that through the international extension of this type of collective consciousness, it may become a common consciousness of nations—a *world consciousness*. If so, the duties and obligations of one nation to another may be regulated by it, and future wars prevented.

He laid stress upon the fact that the Germans have a word which he thought may be used to designate this particular field of the social consciousness. It is *Sittlichkeit*. The German philosopher Fichte has defined *Sittlichkeit* as "those principles of conduct which regulate people in their relations to each other and therefore have become matters

of habit and second nature at the stage of culture reached, and of which, therefore, we are not explicitly conscious." But *Sittlichkeit* implies moral principles and it would seem preferable not to attempt to define too narrowly those principles, and therefore the kind of customs of society which perform this function. The fact requiring emphasis is that social customs become so much matters of habit that we are not explicitly conscious of the sense of social obligation and other principles which compel obedience to them.

This field of the social consciousness embraces a code of social ethics and of manners and customs to which the conduct of each member of the community must be conformed under penalty of the social *tabu*. And it embraces what we call the *social conscience* in which are crystalized the ideals, the soul of the community. It manifests itself through that great and powerful arbiter of private and community conduct, Public Opinion—the opinion of the collective consciousness. The code of the social consciousness embodies or connotes duties and obligations which each citizen owes to society and the common welfare and each other. It embodies customs and manners which respect the rights and liberties and happiness which every citizen is entitled to enjoy without molestation by his fellows. It is thus a *system* of thought and customs based upon common points of view and attitudes of mind towards community life, grown into habit, and under which social customs have become established. As the social conscience it is the censor which punishes with the moral reprobation of public opinion infringement by the individual of those customs and of the social codes which the social conscience has established.

Out of this ethical and social system there develops a unity of thought and a common ideal and "common desire which can be made to penetrate the soul of the people and to take complete possession of it."* And necessarily there follows in consequence of psychological laws a "general will with which the will of the good citizen is in accord." This will of the community (inspired by the common ideal and desires) is common to all the individuals composing it.

*Haldane.

Herein lies the power of public opinion to which all governments bow and which all governments seek for their own support. Public opinion contains the potential common will which if not heeded will enforce the ideals of the social conscience.

To realize the truth of all this we have only to examine our own daily social habits and customs and behavior in relation to society. We then see, although we are not explicitly aware of it, that these are dictated by the social consciousness and not by our own personal desires. For if we imagine any radical departure from them we at once feel within us the deterring force of social criticism.

It is interesting to note that such a collective consciousness, in principle, is analogous to Bushido, which Professor Nitobe has so charmingly explained to English readers was "a code of moral principles which the knights were required to observe in the regulation of the ways of their daily life as well as in their vocation." Only Bushido was the collective consciousness of a *caste*, while "sittlichkeit" is that of a whole community or state or nation.

Now it is a commonly accepted fact, as Lord Haldane, pointed out, that the citizen is governed in his social conduct only to a relatively small extent by statutory laws and physical force, on the one hand, and by the dictates of his own individual conscience and his instinctive desires and impulses on the other. To a much larger extent he is governed by the more extensive system of the collective consciousness whether of the civic, state or national community. Even laws, in a democracy at least, must be the expression of the community consciousness, that is to say, of public opinion and the common will, or else they cannot be enforced, and it is really this collective consciousness that is the power behind the law. And still more is it true that the individual in his everyday life is regulated and governed not by law, but by habits of mind and customs and codes. From the moment we rise in the morning to the time we go to bed at night our social behavior is governed not by legal law but by customs and habits. Nearly everything we do, even the time of getting up and the time of going to bed, as well as the kind of bed we sleep in—whether we lie on

the floor as in Japan or on a bedstead as in the western world; what we shall do and what we shall not do, and the way we shall do it; our manners and behavior towards one another; the way we shall live, our ceremonies and our etiquette; in short our daily conduct is regulated by customs established by the principles of the social codes. These become second nature, almost automatic and instinctive. They are, therefore, governed by systems of mental dispositions organized in the mind by the social education.

Indeed, from the very beginning of social life in the nursery, education consists in the repression of the barbaric instincts with which every child is born, bringing the savage impulses of his nature under control and adapting the child and the man to the customs and ideals of the civilization to which he belongs: in other words, to developing in him the community consciousness with its habits of mind and behavior.

Every child is born a savage; he only acquires culture and the common ideals and the common will of the social conscience.

The collective consciousness, then, is the foundation of the social organization; without it the organization would fall to pieces. If this be so, is it not because of the lack of an international collective consciousness, one of ethical codes and possessed in common by all the great peoples of the world—a world consciousness—that the world today has fallen to pieces in this holocaust of war?

A WORLD CONSCIOUSNESS

What hope does psychology hold out to civilization? The common ideals of a collective consciousness respect and protect the rights of individuals and regulate their relations to one another *within* the nation. May it not be that, with time, fostered by systematic worldwide teaching, there may be developed an international consciousness, or world consciousness so far as concerns international relations? And may it not be that the principles of such a consciousness will regulate the nations in their relations to one another to the same extent that the social and national

consciousness within a single nation regulate the relations of the people to one another, and, in the United States today, the relations of the sovereign states of the American Union to one another? In such a world consciousness there would grow up common habits of mind that would become second nature—common points of view, common ideals of right and wrong in the dealings of one nation with another.

Likewise conceptions of humanity, of liberty and of the obligations of one people to another would have a common meaning, which is not the case today. In a consciousness of this kind, among the international habits of thought would be that of respecting the rights and interests of other nations whether large countries like China or small ones like Serbia, and the habit of repressing desires which have for an object the selfish aggrandizement of a nation at the expense of weaker ones. Such a world consciousness would mean desire, grown into habit and customs, to respect the rights of foreign peoples under international law, which, in turn, would be truly the expression of world ideals and desires, not of selfish interests as today, and the habit of looking to arbitration and conciliation to compose the conflicting interests of nation. The imponderable force of such a consciousness would offer the strongest support to international law—the power behind the law,—and out of such ideals and such desires, when established, there would necessarily develop a general will to peace and a will to fulfil the obligations imposed by the ideals.

Theoretically the attainment of a world consciousness of this kind is psychologically possible, and if ever attained it would necessarily have the same binding force in regulating international conduct as has the social consciousness within a nation today. To reach such an end the old world-habit of mind—the habit of thinking in war terms, of turning at first thought to war as a necessary means of settling international disputes, must be broken. A world conscience will be the censor which, like the social censor, will threaten with the *tabu* a breach of treaties of international customs, codes and habits of conduct. The ideals of the German autocracy and of the German military caste as taught, by their philosophers and publicists like Treitschke and

Nietzsche and military writers like Bernhardt and their Kaiser, such ideals as "Might makes Right," "World Empire or Downfall," "It is the duty of great nations to make war on weak nations;" "Little nations have no rights which powerful nations are bound to respect," and "Nothing shall happen in this world without Germany being consulted," in short "Kultur" and the worship of force, all such military ideals must give place to the ideals of that collective consciousness of the German people that govern them in their relations to each other within the Empire and to a newly created collective consciousness of the world. The war attitude of mind of the German autocracy and military caste, which, like a mental disease has permeated and taken possession of the soul of the German people in its attitude towards other nations, must give place to a world consciousness.

If such a world consciousness should be developed, one nation will understand another because the ideals of the common consciousness will have the same meaning. We shall think in the same language though we do not speak it. It is not through militarism, nor by piling up armaments, nor by a "league to enforce peace" that a world peace can be perpetually maintained. Such methods can be only temporary. Nor in the future when all nations shall be equally armed to the teeth and all the peoples of all the nations mobilized into armies, as will be the case after this war, can even just aspirations be attained and international disputes and conflicts of interest be settled by arms, because there must result a dead-lock of force. Some other mode must be found. May not these legitimate aims be reached without war when the great nations arrive at an international consciousness, with common ideals, a common understanding, and a common will.*

A world consciousness in international relations—that is the vision I see, the dream that psychology permits us to have. May that dream come true!

*The thesis of such a world consciousness which Lord Haldane ably presented from a legal standpoint and which I have endeavored to develop along psychological lines necessarily, of course, assumes the cooperation of an international police of some kind, just as the social consciousness is supplemented by a civic and national police. There are "Apache" or bandit nations as there are bandits within the social organization of every nation, and in the case of revolutions the rights of foreign nationals must be protected from mob violence.