

Bound
Periodical

446656

Kansas City
Public Library



This Volume is for
REFERENCE USE ONLY

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

From the collection of the

j f d
y z n
x m k
o Preinger h
u v q g Library a
e
b t s w p c

San Francisco, California
2007

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF
ART AND HISTORY
OF THE
CITY OF
NEW YORK

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 1

January, 1924

New Year Perspectives

Digitized by the Internet Archive

The Conduct of Foreign Affairs

in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A Soldier on the Causes of War

Zoroaster's Panacea for War

Scandinavian Parliamentarism

World Problems in Review

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING

<http://www.archive.org/details/advocateofpeace86americh>

PRICE 20 CENTS

Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace!

—*Lord Alfred Tennyson.*

Sound
Periodical

446656

MAR 23 1975

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	3
EDITORIALS	
The New ADVOCATE OF PEACE—New Year Perspectives—Perfect Clarity—Success of French Policy—United States and the Permanent Court—American Peace Award—Editorial Notes.....	5-12
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
German Reparations—Internal Conditions in France—French Debt—British General Election—Czecho-Polish Boundary Dispute—Tangier—World Court or Hague Tribunal—Japan after the Earthquake.....	13-25
GENERAL ARTICLES	
An Irreducible Minimum in the Conduct of Foreign Affairs.....	26
By James Brown Scott	
Basic Causes of War.....	27
By Major C. R. Pettis	
Zoroaster and War.....	33
By Behman Sorabji Banaji	
International Peace—a Sermon.....	37
By Theodore Stanfield	
The German Food Situation.....	39
By C. E. Herring	
Scandinavian Co-operation.....	41
By A. Lauesgaard	
History v. Patriotism.....	45
By Lucia Pym	
Forbearance (a Poem).....	47
By Ralph Waldo Emerson	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
President Coolidge's International Policies.....	48
Recognition of Soviet Russia.....	49
Allied Notes to Germany.....	51
Senator Borah's Resolution.....	53
INTERNATIONAL NOTES.....	54
LETTER BOX.....	59
BOOK REVIEWS.....	60

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It is ninety-five years old. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right think-

ing in the United States for nearly a century; which has done more for the men, women, and youth of America by the reaction upon them of the spirit of justice and fair play than it has done even for the peace workers themselves, who have been the special object of its effort; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

OFFICERS

President:

HON. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, Miami, Florida.

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON, former President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

HON. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Lawyer, Washington, D. C.

HON. JAMES L. SLAYDEN, Member Council Interparliamentary Union, San Antonio, Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

HON. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, *ex officio*.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *ex officio*.

GEORGE W. WHITE, *ex officio*.

HON. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, University, Alabama.

DR. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

WALTER A. MORGAN, D. D., 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., 808 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

HON. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, President Fairmont Seminary, Washington, D. C.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 West 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

HON. HENRY TEMPLE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., 30 Koun Machi, Mita Shiba, Tokyo, Japan.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

Pres. WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, Bloomington, Ind.

GEORGE BURNHAM, JR., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. H. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Esq., Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

Mrs. PHILIP N. MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salda, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective: and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

JANUARY, 1924

NUMBER
1

EDITORIALS

THE NEW ADVOCATE OF PEACE

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE begins its nineteenth year in this its new format. Since 1868—for fifty-four years—the magazine has been printed practically nine by twelve inches. The reasons for changing the form and size have grown out of the need for more space and out of other necessities incident to the growth of our work.

Because of the evolution of magazine practice, the present style will readily appear as more appropriate for a monthly magazine. Its new column will be more easily read. The change will be welcomed by news stands, libraries, and travelers. We are sure that our readers will view the change as an improvement. While it costs more than the regular subscription to pay merely for the mechanical construction of the paper, there has been as yet no increase in the subscription price.

OUR NEW YEAR PERSPECTIVES

THERE is something about the beginning of a new year that challenges us to examine into our perspectives. Most men, especially would-be peacemakers, we must grant, get their perspectives awry very easily.

During the year just closed there has been, for example, a renewed emphasis upon the necessity for additional machinery for the promotion of international peace, quite as if there were no means al-

ready in existence for the adjustment of international differences save by war. Advocates of more international machinery seem to forget the vast amount of international machinery which we have.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICES

There are, for instance, the diplomatic and consular services of the various governments. It is through these agencies that concrete international problems, some of them most difficult and dangerous, are handled daily. In the main they are handled with skill, for it is only the exceptional case that arouses any question of war. The diplomatic and consular services are peace-making agencies of the first order. There was no diplomacy in the Roman Empire; for, as pointed out by John W. Foster, "Diplomatic negotiations necessarily imply a certain equality of relations." The importance of diplomacy in these latter days lies in the fact that it is the art of conducting the intercourse of nations; as defined by Satow, it is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent States. Under the genius of our American institutions, this art is practiced by the President, acting, in the case of treaties and the appointment of agents, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Rules governing our diplomatic agents have been worked out with care. These agents operate under instructions. They are expected to maintain the dignity of the country they repre-

sent, not overestimating the importance of their posts. Matters of rank and precedence of diplomatic representatives were set forth in the Congress of Vienna in 1815, in the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. Our State Department incorporated certain of these rules in the instructions to diplomatic officers in 1897. While the term "ambassador" appears in the proceedings of the Continental Congress and in Article II of our Constitution, the United States had no diplomatic representatives of a higher rank than envoy prior to 1893, when we sent our first ambassador to Great Britain, and soon after to France, Germany, Italy, and Russia. The conduct of our own foreign relations under our system has not always been satisfactory. It is sometimes said that from an international point of view the United States is ideally organized for the purpose of getting nothing done. And yet, when foreign problems of crucial importance have arisen, a sufficient amount of concentrated authority has been developed to cope with them. In the main it may be said that nations, ours included, conduct their foreign affairs with ability and often with distinction. While it is inevitable that the conduct of foreign affairs will be controlled more and more by the people, to the end that the rules of conduct governing the private relations of citizens "be equally applicable to those of enlightened nations," the executive power will continue to be responsible. But the fact of importance here is that diplomacy, developed out of the need of States through a long period of history, has been the expression of the international aspiration toward the extension of law, of order, of justice between nations. Diplomatic and consular bodies are agencies of international peace. A recognized French authority, Garden, says that diplomacy has for its purpose, or ought to have, "the maintenance of the peace and of a right harmony between the powers." Our New

Year perspective across the world should not miss the achievements of diplomacy.

THE HAGUE SYSTEM

If our international perspective be clear, we shall not lose sight of the existing machinery for international arbitration, machinery for which the United States is in no small sense responsible. Here is a system which has operated in nearly a score of disputes, doing no violence to our traditional independence. For business or for politics, there is plenty of machinery for the application of the principles of good offices, mediation, inquiry, and conciliation. If nations were peacefully minded, there is machinery enough at hand to maintain the peace. If nations are war-minded, no machinery can stop them from war. We have international law. The World War did not destroy this international law; indeed, the war was fought in defense of international law. International law is the warp and woof of diplomacy and of all the other means of settling international disputes. The Hague system represents the most rational attempt the world has ever seen to advance international law. This Hague system still exists. It was not accident that led the League of Nations to place its new Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. The nomination of the judges for this new court comes from The Hague system. The Court of Arbitration established at The Hague in 1899 has settled nearly a score of international disputes to the satisfaction of the parties. There is a Hague secretariat capable of carrying on the details of a third Hague conference. To forget or to ignore these things would indeed reveal an utter lack of international perspective.

DISARMAMENT POLICY

International machinery is a necessity. We may need new international machinery. It is equally true that machinery does not operate itself. Our chief trouble

is not so much that we lack organizations as it is that we fail to utilize profitably the ones we have. The cheapest service one can render to society is to offer new and cleverly devised schemes for social salvation. The most difficult, costly, wearing, and valuable service is to do the thing needful. Tools are not ends in themselves. It is what we do with the tools we have that counts. Looking out across the New Year, we may wisely resolve to concentrate more vigorously than heretofore upon the sort of an international structure we wish to build with the tools at hand.

Our perspective for the New Year may see nothing for the nations except war. War there may be. At the banquet of the Lord Mayor of London the other day, Earl Beatty, a British admiral, and Earl Cavan, a British general, talked of the next war as a matter of course. All the nations are heavily armed. They are arming increasingly, our own included. The trouble here is not that we have the machinery of war. The danger lies in the policy behind it all. The challenge, therefore, now, perhaps, of all times in history, is not that we should worry about our machinery of war. It is that we should disarm—disarm in the only hopeful way possible, disarm policy. The only practical and important disarmament which right-thinking people must unanimously support is the disarmament of policy. Such a disarmament, to be effective, cannot be established by any one of the major powers alone. Even if it were possible, it will not be followed by any single State. The only practical hope for the disarmament of policy lies in the direction of a general co-operative effort on the part of all the nations.

To bring about this practical disarmament of policy requires little additional machinery. Any nation is at liberty to take the initiative in the calling of a world conference of duly accredited delegates for the definition of policy in the

terms of international law. All that is needed is the will to go about the business. It will be most unfortunate if we continue to lose ourselves in ill-tempered discussion over this or that new device, for it is not new devices that are needed so much as it is a new spirit. And this applies to the people of no one nation in particular, but to the peoples of all the powers.

OUR NEW YEAR RESOLUTIONS

It is not necessary now to argue for the overthrow of the war system. The World War has taught anew the lessons of its uncivilized ruthlessness, of its worse than beastly unreason, of its futilities. It has left us all in a condition of intellectual and moral shellshock.

Since, therefore, the methods of warfare seem so inadequate, and since so many of the new panaceas for the establishment of peace seem to have failed, why would it not be wise just now to recall that the function of States is the establishment of that justice without which there can be no desirable peace? Why not recall that the trouble with the war system is not that it kills and destroys, but that it in and of itself is incapable of establishing or promoting justice?

If only we can see the simple truth, then our resolutions for the New Year may well be substantially as follows:

We resolve to the best of our ability to study the facts of our international life, their background, and the significance for the immediate future.

We resolve to apply our influence, to the extent of our ability, in behalf of a conference of duly accredited delegates of all the nations, that there may be certain re-statements, amendments, reconciliations, and, if need be, new declarations of international law.

We resolve to do everything in our power to widen and to extend the available offices of diplomacy, mediation, inquiry, conciliation, and arbitration.

We resolve to stand for the development of an independent international court of justice, to which all civilized States shall of right have direct access, to the end that justiciable disputes may be settled in accordance with the principles of law and equity.

We resolve to go about this high business with less thoughtless emotion and fewer personal animosities than heretofore, and to bring to it, as best we may, the teachings of history, the rules of reason, and the integrity of common sense.

PERFECT CLARITY

SECRETARY HUGHES' statement rejecting the Soviet bid for a parley with the United States lacks neither in directness nor clarity. The President told us in his message to Congress, December 9, that "Russia presents notable difficulties." He went on to add that we have every desire to see these our traditional friends restored to their position among the nations of the earth, and that our government offers no objection to the carrying on of commerce among our citizens with the people of Russia, going so far as to say, "America is willing to make very large concessions for the purpose of rescuing the people of Russia." He closed with this optimistic note: "We hope the time is near at hand when we can act."

The Russian Government evidently looked upon this as something of an invitation, and suggested a conference between the two governments. Mr. Hughes, in reply, has served notice upon the Soviet Government that America will renew diplomatic relations with Russia only when the Russian policy has been changed in at least four particulars. Mr. Hughes demands: (1) the restoration of confiscated American property; (2) the recognition of the \$220,000,000 debt to this nation contracted by the Kerensky Government; (3) the abandonment of com-

munist propaganda in the United States, as now directed from Moscow; (4) the abandonment of the claim that this government is liable for damages to Russia arising out of the Allied blockade.

Surely there is no equivocation here. Our government might have demanded that the Russian Government abandon its social theories, so contrary to the social theories which we of America support. We might have suggested a mixed claims commission, such as we set up for negotiations with Germany. Our government might have done a variety of things. What Mr. Hughes has done, however, is to notify one of the world's greatest powers how it must act in one of the world's greatest problems. And this has been stated in one of the world's shortest international notes, clear and quite to the point. It does not strike us as an ill-tempered note. There is about it, rather, a moral directness which may help clear away at least a little of our international fog.

THE SUCCESS OF FRENCH POLICIES

FRANCE continues to have her victories no less renowned than war. Senator Paul Dupuy, incidentally owner of the *Petit Parisien*, the daily paper with the largest circulation, has been visiting in our midst. The Senator is a confidant of M. Poincaré. Before leaving our shores he informed us that a Franco-German entente is the fundamental desire of the French Government and of the French people. He added further, that "nothing could be more disastrous to us than the break-up of Germany." For the readers of this magazine, such statements will cause no surprise; but judging from the expressions from the anti-French in our country, they need to be repeated. Senator Dupuy told us again what we should already have known, that the French Government has not encouraged the separatist

movement; rather, that the problem of France is to accomplish the reconstruction of Germany.

Of course, the French are operating under the Treaty of Versailles, which constitutes the only basis they know of any permanent French security. In the face of the German refusal to pay under the terms of the treaty, France has occupied the Ruhr. Addressing himself to this phase of the situation, Senator Dupuy assured us that the occupancy is to extend only so long as the Germans persist in their refusal. This refusal has persisted longer than the French anticipated. The original plan was only "to send in engineers and technical men. But Germany added passive resistance to her refusal to pay, and we were obliged to send troops. Now, since passive resistance has been abandoned, we have begun to withdraw those troops. And when Germany begins, in real earnest, to meet its obligations, we will relinquish our hold even further."

Senator Dupuy reminded us of certain other facts in French policy. He said: "The French people are behind the present French Government. Even though efforts should be made to create an Anglo-German alliance, I do not believe our policy would be altered. What is needed is a Franco-British-German alliance to restore the whole of Europe."

To the charge, frequently heard in America, that France does not intend to pay her debts to the United States, Senator Dupuy said: "One of the last things M. Poincaré said to me before I sailed was this: 'You can tell the American people that France intends to pay its debt to the United States—every cent of it.' The reports which have been circulated so widely, that France does not intend to pay, sound to me very much like German propaganda. They are, most certainly, not the truth. The French people are a unit in their determination to pay."

It should be added that France has already made payments on her debt to the United States. On the approximately three billion dollars which we advanced to the Government of France, France has already paid something over \$64,000,000. She has also paid on account of interest nearly \$130,000,000. For the surplus war materials, amounting to over \$407,000,000, which we sold France, interest has been paid to date.

Furthermore, the consistency of French policy in the matter of reparations seems now to have won the support of Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, the United States, and Germany herself. The new European effort to solve the reparations tangle, calling for an investigation by two expert committees, one of which will consider means for balancing the budget of Germany and stabilizing her currency, the other for investigating the capital that has been spirited out of Germany, was proposed by Premier Poincaré. Thus French policy in this matter, following the failure of British and American effort, seems to have produced an agreement among the powers, and to have advanced materially the solution of the economic problems of Europe.

OUR UNITED STATES AND THE PERMANENT COURT

HOW the United States can become a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice and at the same time have nothing to do with the League of Nations has been explained to us with a metaphysical elaboration which is almost clear. When it comes to the election of judges, the Council of the League of Nations simply becomes the "electoral council" and the Assembly of the League of Nations simply becomes the "electoral assembly." They are then entities entirely distinct from the League of Nations. These new organizations elect the

judges of the court, after which they cease to be the "electoral council" and the "electoral assembly" and become simply the Council and the Assembly. All the United States would have to do, therefore, would be to sit down with the "electoral council" and the "electoral assembly."

After the election is over and the "electoral council" and the "electoral assembly" become the Council and the Assembly, all that remains for the United States to do is to take its hat. That is simplicity itself.

But when we turn to the protocol which we are asked to sign—albeit with reservations—when we turn to the statute under which the court operates, we find, under Article 4, that "the members of the court shall be elected by the Assembly and by the Council." Under Article 3 we read: "the number of judges and deputy judges may hereafter be increased by the Assembly, upon the proposal of the Council of the League of Nations." Under Article 14 it is provided that vacancies in the court shall be filled by the same method as that laid down for the first election. The salaries of the judges are provided for in Article 32, which says: "The judges shall receive an annual indemnity to be determined by the Assembly of the League of Nations upon the proposal of the Council." Article 33 provides that "the expenses of the court shall be borne by the League of Nations in such a manner as shall be decided upon the proposal of the Council."

All of this language would seem to indicate that the present Permanent Court of International Justice is somewhat dependent upon the League of Nations. In no section of the protocol or of the statute under which the court operates do we find any provision for an "electoral council" or an "electoral assembly." Real friends of the International Court wish these difficulties removed.

THE AMERICAN PEACE AWARD

IT IS our purpose to print the winning plan under the terms of the American Peace Award, offered by Mr. Bok, in the February number of this magazine. We are informed by the policy committee that the jury will announce its decision on or about the 1st of January. As we have previously said, we shall not only print the plan, but we shall print a ballot, and call upon our members to express their opinions as to whether or not they would wish to see our country adopt such a policy in substance. While we shall be but one of over 4,000 papers to do this thing, of course the vote from our membership will be of peculiar importance. No doubt our subscribers will welcome this opportunity to register their individual opinions as to what is the proper relation of the United States to any international action looking toward the prevention of war.

We have been told by the committee that 22,165 plans were received in competition for this \$100,000 award. The Jury consists of Elihu Root, chairman; General James Guthrie Harbord, Colonel Edward M. House, Ellen F. Pendleton, Roscoe Pound, William Allen White, and Brand Whitlock.

Probably the most important aspect of this competition will develop out of the referendum and the discussion which it will engender. Daily and weekly papers, cities, universities, and various organizations will take part in the referendum. The attention of millions will be riveted upon the plan. The committee wisely expresses itself as anxious to receive not hasty, unconsidered votes, but the real opinion of the voters.

WHEN we start out to argue a proposition, there is nothing so indispensable as a fact. We are inclined to grant that there are economic, social, and

industrial sciences. If not, surely there are economic, social, and industrial facts enough out of which to build such sciences. Furthermore, such sciences are sorely needed. The hope of any permanent advance depends upon impartial investigation in these fields. Our colleges and universities, government departments, and special foundations, conscious of the need, are working, and for the most part with intelligence, to ascertain and to broadcast the facts. The "Economic Foundation" was organized in New York December 12 to act as a trust fund for donations made by persons who desire to have a group of impartial and scientific-minded men seek the important facts of social, economic, and industrial problems. The primary beneficiary is to be the National Bureau of Economic Research. Bankers, laborers, manufacturers, lawyers, teachers, agriculturists, social workers, and economists have been elected as officers of this new foundation. Every sane social movement will be benefited by efforts such as this.

QUERY: Are we awaking again to a livelier interest in books dealing with the World War? A French critic and journalist, Jean de Pierrefeu, has written a book about the war, "Plutarch Lied," of which 750,000 copies are reported to have been sold within several weeks. On this side of the Atlantic, Edith Wharton created widespread discussion with her recent novel about the war experiences of an American family in France—"A Son at the Front"—while Willa Cather won the Pulitzer Novel Prize this spring with her story, "One of Ours," whose hero fought in the A. E. F. Now Little, Brown & Company are publishing again, on January 2, "Gun Fodder," by Arthur Hamilton Gibbs, the story of four years of varied service with the English fighting forces. First published in the autumn of 1919, in the midst of a

wearying surfeit of "war books," it naturally failed to secure a wide reading; yet Arthur Symonds, the famous English author and journalist, told Mr. Gibbs' brother, Cosmo Hamilton (the author of "Another Scandal") that it was one of the six best books about the war. The same firm are also publishing, on January 2, a novel by Larry Barretto, "A Conqueror Passes." It describes the difficulty experienced by the returned soldier in fitting himself again into the pattern of civilian existence.

The war has a fateful effect upon the fortunes of the hero of "The Inverted Pyramid," the new novel by Bertrand W. Sinclair, to be published next month, but his experiences overseas with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces are merely incidental to the theme of the novel—the account of the vicissitudes of the Norquay family traditions and wealth in the hands of its modern generation. The reception that is accorded to all of these books, especially "Gun Fodder," will indicate whether "war books" are to be reinstated in public favor. We shall see.

MC. RORTY, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, made an arresting statement before the newly organized "Economic Foundation" at a meeting and luncheon held at the Bankers' Club, New York City, December 12. We are used to such statements from propagandists; but this comes from a scientific quarter. According to the *New York Times*, Dr. Rorty said:

"I have in the last few months seen a war in the making. I have talked with the statesmen, the journalists, and the bankers and industrial leaders of the two countries involved and on both sides they have said: 'We have nothing to quarrel about. We have not the slightest real cause for controversy. Why, then, should there be rumors of war and threats of war?' And when the facts are searched out, the only possible cause for conflict

appears to lie in the activities of two armament companies, who very successfully, for their own purposes, have aroused warlike feeling in the two countries."

MUSTAPHA KEMAL PASHA, President of the new Turkish Republic, is evidently faced at last with the realities of governing in time of peace his new political unit. Established by force, continued by force, the problem of promoting peace and prosperity is one of the most difficult of problems. Brigandage, we are told, has increased both in the rural districts and urban centers. Foreign capital has been slow in coming. The agrarian situation is serious. The Caliphate, indeed the whole of Constantinople, resents the snubs received from Angora. To separate the Church and the State is not proving to be easy. What will happen should Angora consent to free and independent elections is difficult to forecast. It may prove to be necessary to return the capital to Constantinople.

IT WOULD appear that the Permanent Court of International Justice will have to be unequivocally separated from the League of Nations before it can become acceptable to the United States Senate. George Wharton Pepper, one of the capable members of the Senate, declares that to be the case. He went on to point out that "if friends of the League object because it would weaken the League, they will be disclosing a greater interest in the League than in the court." In our judgment, that is the fact.

THE Chinese situation continues an interesting exhibit. Dispatches tell us of a new capture by Chinese bandits, this time including a French priest in Changli, of the Shantung province. The forces of General Chen Chiung-ming are within a few miles of Canton, at a time when it is reported and then denied that

Psaou Kun, recently alleged purchaser of the presidency of the Republic, has offered Dr. Sun one million dollars to leave the country for good. Dr. Berthold Laufer, curator of the department of anthropology of the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, announces that old conservative China is no more. Dr. Laufer, who has just returned from China, where he made an extensive archeological survey, finds that the Chinese people are quite "modernized." Quite so.

REPORTS from India state that the recent elections for the Indian provincial legislatures have resulted in sufficient victories for the Swaraj Party, now headed by Mr. C. R. Das, to make the work of carrying on the government through an unofficial majority extremely difficult. According to the British press, so far the success of the Swaraj Party will embarrass only the provincial assemblies, whose elections take place two years earlier than the all-India elections; but shortly the central legislatures will find themselves in an equally difficult position. It is said that the Liberal Viceroy might eventually be driven to government by ukase.

This unfortunate state of affairs is partly due to the alleged "subserviency" of the moderates and partly to the Kenya controversy, but mainly to Lord Reading's certification of the salt tax. The exercise by the Viceroy of his statutory power to certify or pass, on his sole authority, an unpopular tax, twice repudiated by the Indian Parliament, gave the Indians an excuse for asserting that the reforms were always meant to be a blind and a parody of self-government. Lord Reading's interference with the budget did much to consolidate the opposition and to send it to the Swaraj Party. According to the *London Times*, the position thus created brings on India the gravest crisis of recent years.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

GERMAN REPARATIONS

THE general economic and administrative disorder of the country, which had been increasing since the advent of Herr Stresemann to the leadership of the German Government, finally rendered untenable the position of the Chancellor and his cabinet. The suppression of the Ludendorff-Hitler coup d'état in Bavaria and the return of the Crown Prince to his estate at Oels, while providing material for considerable discussion and some menacing gestures on the part of the French Government, soon assumed their proper proportion, as sensational incidents in the disorganized daily life of Germany; but the unchecked fall of the mark and the consequent entire dislocation of essential commodity prices had an immediate repercussion on the Reichstag, which refused a vote of confidence to Chancellor Stresemann and his cabinet by 155 to 230. On November 23, therefore, the latter resigned, and the task of finding a new executive devolved upon President Ebert.

This, it turned out, was no easy thing to do. Dr. Friedrich Heinrich Albert, former Minister of Reconstruction in the Cuno Cabinet, was the first to attempt the formation of a cabinet. His idea was to organize a "cabinet of experts," which should be above party and command at least the toleration of the Reichstag; but lack of parliamentary support doomed him to failure. Intrigue for position naturally ran high as between the Nationalists, Socialists, and bourgeois parties in the Reichstag.

THE NEW CABINET

Following Dr. Albert's failure to form a cabinet, it was rumored that some sort of arrangements tending to a coalition of the bourgeois groups, with Herr Marx, of the Center, as Chancellor, had been arrived at in the Reichstag. Eventually Dr. Marx was called upon and succeeded in organizing the following cabinet:

Dr. Marx (Center), Chancellor.

Herr Jarres (German People's Party), Vice-Chancellor and Interior.

Dr. Stresemann (German People's Party), Foreign Affairs.

Dr. Gessler (Democrat), Defense.

Dr. Brauns (Center), Labor.

Herr Hoefle (Center), Posts and Occupied Territory.

Herr Emminger (Bavarian People's Party), Justice.

Dr. Luther (German People's Party), Finance.

Herr Oeser (Democrat), Communications.

Count Kanitz (non-Party, formerly German National), Food.

Herr Hamm (Democrat), Economic Affairs.

The post of Minister of Reconstruction was left vacant.

Herren Stresemann, Luther, Brauns, Gessler, Hoefle, and Oeser were all members of the former cabinet, from which that of Dr. Marx is chiefly differentiated by the omission of the Socialist members. Dr. Marx is a native of Cologne, where he was born in 1863. By profession he is a lawyer and was a member of the Prussian Diet from 1899 to 1918. In 1910 he was also elected to the Reichstag, where he became leader of the Center, or Catholic, Party on the death of Dr. Trimborn, in 1921.

The new cabinet is the last of the present Reichstag, and, since its existence depends upon the forbearance of the Socialists and the Nationalists, the only question is how long it will be allowed to survive. The eight-hour day and the abolition of the state of siege reigning in Germany are bones of contention likely to provoke the wrath of the Socialists and the Nationalists respectively, with neither of whose views can those of the cabinet be said to coincide.

SITUATION IN THE RUHR AND THE RHINELAND

Meanwhile the chaotic situation in the Ruhr and the Rhineland showed few signs

of abatement. The Separatist Movement, headed by Herr Mathes, met with varying and, on the whole, negative success. Both its achievements and its failures may be attributed to the general belief on the part of the population of the districts concerned that the movement was primarily instigated and encouraged by the French and Belgian authorities.

Coincident with the fall of Dr. Stresemann came the news that the somewhat protracted negotiations between the German mine-owners of the Ruhr and the Mission Interalliée de Contrôle des Usines et des Mines (the French Factory and Mine Control Mission in the Ruhr, usually known as the M. I. C. U. M.) had at last resulted in an agreement. This arrangement, which is said to represent a concession on the part of the French, since the coal to be delivered free is to be reckoned to reparation account, consists of six points and holds good until April 15, 1924. The principal features are as follows:

1. The arrears of coal tax from January 1 to October 1 are to be paid to the extent of fifteen million dollars.

2. A tax of 10 per cent is to be paid on every ton of coal sold.

3. Eighteen per cent of the net output of coal is to be delivered free to the Allies.

4. Stocks of coal accumulated up to October 1 to become the property of the Allies.

5. The export licensing system to remain in force. All stocks of iron and steel products are to be released only against payment of taxes due, and may be exported only in quantities equal to the average amount exported during 1922.

6. By-products of coal—sulphate of ammonia, benzol, tar, and creosote—are to form the subject of a special agreement.

This agreement was hailed as a great victory by the Paris press, which at the same time expressed its fear that some difficulty might be raised by Great Britain, whose contention has unvaryingly been that the occupation of the Ruhr is illegal.

On December 5 the French authorities officially intimated that passive resistance in the Ruhr would be considered at an end in a few days. A series of signed accords made it clear, stated the French, that the industrialists, the workers, and the Government of the Reich were ready

to co-operate with the French in the working of the Ruhr industry, and the nature of the occupation would, therefore, be modified, so as to place it on the "invisible" basis originally contemplated. Pardons would be granted to prisoners and deportees allowed to return.

MEETING OF THE REPARATION COMMISSION

The official communiques of the Reparation Commission provide the following statements:

At its meeting of October 30 last, the Reparation Commission decided, in view of the negotiations then proceeding between the Allied governments, to postpone the examination of the note transmitted to it on October 24 by the Kriegslastenkommission, the text of which was published on the same day (see Communiqué No. 219).

At the meeting held at three o'clock on the afternoon of November 13, under the chairmanship of M. Louis Barthou, the Reparation Commission resumed the examination of the above note.

At the opening of the meeting, M. Louis Barthou, as French delegate, made the following declaration:

The French delegation requests the Reparation Commission to fix at once the date on which it will accord the Germans a hearing on the questions contained in their note of October 24, and to make this date as early as possible.

Further, in order to assure the application of Article 234 of the Treaty of Versailles, and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 7 of Annex II, the French delegation considers that when the Germans have been heard a committee of experts belonging to the Allied and associated countries should be set up. This committee would be entrusted with estimating Germany's present capacity to pay, and with furnishing the Reparation Commission with information enabling it to determine the amounts of German payments to be made during 1924, 1925, and 1926. In the opinion of the French delegation, the experts, who will take the schedule of payments as the basis of their labors, will endeavor to estimate Germany's resources, internal as well as external, and in particular German assets abroad.

It will be for the Reparation Commission to

draw up a definite program of the committee's labors, after hearing the remarks of the German delegation; these observations may bring out some or all of the questions to be investigated.

For the time being, and without going fully into the question or its practical application, the French delegation desires merely to inform the Reparation Commission of the attitude which it intends to assume in regard to problems, the prompt solution of which concerns all the Allies.

THE BRITISH POSITION

In reply, Sir John Bradbury, the British delegate, made the following declaration:

The statement of the French delegate appears to me to raise two quite separate questions:

First. Should the Commission grant to the representatives of the German Government the hearing for which they have asked under Article 234 of the treaty, upon certain questions affecting the capacity of payment of Germany, and, secondly, assuming that this hearing is granted and takes place, what steps should be taken by the Commission after the hearing?

In regard to the first question, I cannot conceal from my colleagues the very grave doubts which I entertain whether, after the events of the past eleven months, the machinery of Part VIII of the Treaty of Versailles is not so completely compromised as to have become incapable of functioning.

In view of these doubts, my first inclination in regard to the present application was to follow the policy, which I have adopted since January last, of leaving the whole responsibility for dealing with the situation arising out of the action taken by certain Allied governments upon majority decisions of the Commission with which I was in disagreement with my colleagues, and to abstain from taking part in proceedings which, until certain fundamental questions of international law have been authoritatively settled, appear to me incapable of leading to any practical result.

I cannot forget, however, that the provisions of Part VIII of the Treaty of Versailles have still the force of international law, and that I remain, for the moment, at any rate, a member of an international tribunal which under its constitution has the duty of pro-

nouncing from time to time on the capacity of Germany to discharge her obligations, as formally defined under the Treaty of Versailles, and is required under paragraph 9 of Annex II of Part VIII—quite apart from Article 234, under which the present application is made—to hear evidence and arguments on the part of Germany on any question connected with her capacity to pay.

I cannot, therefore, be a party to any refusal to hear such arguments without an apparent denial of justice, however small may be the hope which I entertain in present circumstances of practical advantage resulting from the hearing.

To abstain from voting on the present proposal would, under paragraph 13 of Annex II, be tantamount to voting against it. I should indeed have preferred that the hearing should have been given under paragraph 9 of Annex II, rather than Article 234; but as the German application has been made under the latter article, and the proposal before the Commission follows the application, I shall give it my formal support.

As regards the second part of the declaration of the French delegate, I propose to maintain a suspense of judgment until after the audition.

Before prescribing remedies, a wise physician will complete his diagnosis of the disease.

I feel bound, however, to confess that at first sight the prescription of the French delegate appears to me to belong to the world in which a certain philosopher invented pills for the treatment of earthquakes.

I hold that the Commission, if it is to attempt to discharge its duties under the treaty, must investigate without fear or favor the whole of the causes which have led to the present desperate condition of Germany and must fearlessly apply (so far as it is within its power) and recommend to those who have power to apply them (in so far as they may be outside its own powers) whatever remedies it may, after such investigations, deem to be necessary.

After an exchange of views, it was unanimously decided that the representatives of the German Government would be heard as early as possible, the exact date of the hearing to be fixed by agreement between the Kriegslastenkommission and the General Secretary of the Commission.

(2) That the question of the appoint-

ment of a committee of experts would be resumed after this hearing had taken place.

GERMAN REPRESENTATIONS

The Reparation Commission met on the morning of November 23, at 10:15, under the chairmanship of M. Louis Barthou, to give the representatives of the German Government the hearing provided for in its decision of November 8.

The German delegation consisted of MM. Heyer, Fischer, Litter, Michaelis (interpreter), of the Kriegslastenkommission; Dorn and von Brandt, of the Finance Ministry; Schaeffer and Reichardt, of the Ministry of Public Economy; Wolf, of the Ministry of Communications, and Simon, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The chairman observed that the German Government had submitted various questions to the Reparation Commission in its letters of October 24 and November 2. He invited the German delegates to explain the points raised in these letters.

Herr Fischer first gave a general survey of the financial and economic distress in Germany, of the causes of this distress and of its repercussion on Germany's capacity of payment. He maintained the German Government's opinion that the occupation of the Ruhr was illegal.

He maintained that only the re-establishment of Germany's economic unity could enable her to restore her finances and her capacity. He proceeded to give a detailed account of the measures already taken or contemplated with a view to the restoration of German finance and currency; for instance, the placing of public receipts on a gold basis, a drastic reduction of expenditure without regard to vested rights or measures of social relief, the stopping of the printing of notes.

He explained that, in order to introduce these various reforms, the German Government found itself obliged to stop the execution of contracts concluded for deliveries in kind.

The German delegate indicated briefly the contents of a memorandum, which he handed to the Commission, on the Belgian technical notes.

He stated that, subject to his general statements, these notes might form the basis of negotiations for the solution of the reparation problem.

In conclusion, he laid stress on the gravity of the present situation and appealed to the Commission's sense of responsibility.

Herr Fischer alone spoke on behalf of the German delegation, and no questions were asked by the members of the Commission. The meeting rose at 12:30.

At its next meeting, following the address of Herr Fischer, the German delegate, before the Reparation Commission, it was unanimously decided to appoint two committees of inquiry with the object of determining Germany's capacity to pay. The Commission's resolution, which was supported by the British delegates, is as follows:

In order to investigate, in conformity with the terms of Article 234 of the Treaty of Versailles, the resources as well as the capacity of Germany, and after having given the representatives of that country an equitable opportunity to make known their views, the Reparation Commission decides to constitute two committees of experts belonging to the Allied and associated countries; one will be instructed to seek the means of balancing the budget and stabilizing the currency, and the other will investigate the means of valuing or causing to return to Germany the vanished capital.

This was the first time since the occupation of the Ruhr that the Reparation Commission came to a unanimous decision with regard to Germany.

INVITATIONS TO POWERS

Invitations were promptly extended to the powers concerned to recommend experts for appointment on these committees, and were accepted. No neutrals or Germans may, under the terms of the Reparation Commission's decision, be included.

According to the British press, the first of these committees is the one to which Great Britain attaches importance; the second appeals more especially to the French. English writers profess themselves unable to understand why M. Poincaré should have rejected the British suggestion for a committee of experts to inquire into Germany's capacity to pay and then have accepted another proposal, almost as far-reaching. There is, therefore, on the whole, no very marked opti-

ism in British circles as to the outcome of the inquiry.

American opinion seems to have been divided between a certain bewilderment and a tendency to hail the Reparation Commission's decision as "another victory for France."

Paris circles, having satisfied themselves that the question of the Ruhr will be entirely excluded from the scope of the inquiry, have little or no remark to offer as to the practicality of an attempt to recover German capital from abroad.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN FRANCE

REPORTS from the United States Department of Commerce indicate that the character of current business in France is affected by a less favorable outlook, due to an increasing national debt, rising interest rates, weakening exchange, and skepticism as to the duration of co-operation under Ruhr adjustments. A certain cautiousness as to buying would seem to be denoted by the fact that, while activity in the textile trade is satisfactory, stocks of raw materials are low and forward orders are lessening. On the other hand, iron and steel production is increasing and there is an improvement in certain other markets, such as the fertilizer and chemical, while railroad operations are also on the mend. The falling exchange has hindered foreign purchases, while at the same time stimulating exports.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

The French Government recently asked for authority to renew the securities which are to fall due during the coming year, and also to issue thirteen billion francs in short-term bills, of which nine billion francs are to meet general budget expenses and four billion to meet special budget expenses.

A BILLION FRANCS FOR MILITARY ACTIVITY ABROAD

The Chamber of Deputies has voted for 1924 extraordinary credits totaling one billion francs, for military activities abroad. The 6 per cent short-term treasury bill issue, which closed early in November, has given final returns of over six billion

francs. The credit foncier is issuing 6 per cent lottery bonds to the amount of eight hundred million francs, with a nominal value of five hundred francs and an issue price of 475 francs, maturing within seventy years.

The statement of the Bank of France for November 29 shows note circulation of 37,330,000,000 francs, compared with 37,848,000,000 francs on November 2, while advances to the State are unusually low, at 22,800,000,000 francs, compared with 33,400,000,000 francs on the earlier date.

The instability and decline of franc value was continued at the time of writing.

Total exports from France in October were valued at 2,814,000,000 francs and total imports at 3,068,000,000 francs. In the first ten months of the year exports reached a value of 24,376,000,000 francs and imports 25,620,000,000 francs, leaving an adverse balance of 244,000,000 francs. The principal exports were manufactured articles, which totaled 13,142,000,000 francs, and the chief imports raw materials, totaling 16,163,000,000 francs.

LABOR CONDITIONS

Very little unemployment is reported from France, but there have been numerous strikes, for the most part unsuccessful. A compromise settlement was reached in the coal miners' strike which occurred in the Departments of the Nord and Pas de Calais.

The International Federation of Trades Unions reports that an extraordinary congress of the Unitary Federation of Trades Unions of France was held at Bourges in the third week of November, at which the question of surrender to the Communist Party and Moscow was hotly debated. The adherents of the Third Internationale were in the majority, the minority in general representing two sections, namely, the out-and-out opponents of the Red Trade Union Internationale, who regard the latter as mere tools of the Communist Internationale, which in this way seeks to subordinate the workers of all lands to the Soviet Government, and those who are not openly against affiliation with the Red Trade Union Internationale, but do not consider it necessary to be so very subservient to this organization.

A note from the Red Trade International urged the congress, in the strongest terms, to avoid a split, which was done. The second part of the note, concerning the question of help from German comrades, was also discussed, and a majority resolution, appealing to all workers' organizations for unity of action in order to assist the German proletariat in every possible way, and if necessary by means of a general strike, was adopted by 971 to 356 votes.

In other words, I should like to know as fully as practicable and as soon as convenient the exact situation with reference to this debt.

Very respectfully,

WM. E. BORAH.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT COMMISSION,
WASHINGTON, December 8, 1923.

MY DEAR SENATOR BORAH: I received your letter of the 1st instant, in which you make inquiry concerning the present status of the debt of the Government of France to the Government of the United States, and am glad to comply with your request.

The amount of the debt due by the Government of France to the Government of the United States, under two different categories, is as follows:

1. Total receipts from Liberty loans, \$2,997,477,800; less amounts repaid, \$64,212,568.04; leaves outstanding obligations of \$2,933,265,231.96. The total interest account on these obligations is \$779,621,604.80, of which \$129,570,376.13 have been paid. The accrued and unpaid interest as of November 15, 1923, was \$650,051,228.67.

2. French obligations due to the purchase of surplus war materials under the act of July 9, 1918, and payable in 1929-30, amounts to \$407,341,145.01. The total of the bonds, interest and supplies obligations is, therefore, \$3,990,657,605.64.

Interest has been paid as it came due upon these obligations.

Upon the obligations evidencing advances under category No. 1 above, the payments on account of principal, viz., \$64,212,568.04, were made as follows:

Item 1, January 8, 1919.....	\$3,384,000.00
Item 2, March 14, 1919.....	3,598,000.00
Item 3, March 31, 1919.....	588,000.00
Item 4, August 11, 1919.....	4,577,000.00
Item 5, June 21, 1920.....	17,246,490.00
Item 6, August 19, 1920.....	6,002,082.26
Item 7, August 26, 1920.....	13,300,275.29
Item 8, March 30, 1921.....	15,265,504.26
Item 9, September 14, 1922....	111,378.04
Item 10, February 23, 1923....	139,838.19
Total.....	64,212,568.04

Items Nos. 1 to 8 in the above schedule of payments constitute in reality the result of final adjustments of accounts. To explain this more fully, in certain instances where a

THE FRENCH DEBT

THE status of the French debt to the United States is fully described in the reply of Hon. Andrew W. Mellon, chairman of World War Foreign Debt Commission, to an inquiry of Senator William E. Borah. The two letters, which appeared in the *Congressional Record* on December 11, 1923, are as follows:

DECEMBER 1, 1923.

HON. ANDREW W. MELLON,

Chairman World War Foreign Debt Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MELLON: I am addressing you as chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission with a view of soliciting information touching the present status of the French debt.

I should like to be advised as soon as convenient of the present status of the French debt, giving the total amount now due, including principal and interest; the amount which has been paid upon the French debt since November 11, 1918; what steps have been taken looking toward the adjustment or settlement of the debt; what, if any, proposal the French Government has made relative to the settlement of this debt; whether or not the debt commission is advised at this time as to the terms and conditions upon which the French Government is willing to adjust the debt or how it proposes to ultimately deal with it, either in the way of adjustment, payment, or nonpayment. And, finally, whether the commission has anything in view at the present time in the way of a program or plan pending with the French Government for the settlement of the debt. What assurance has the commission of the intention of the French Government to adjust same?

credit had been established or an advance had been made to the Government of France for some purpose and the total amount of the credit or advance was not required, the balance of the credit was withdrawn or the unused portion of the advance was repaid and credited in part as a payment on account of principal. Items Nos. 6 and 7 are commented upon in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1920, page 58. Item No. 8 is commented upon in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1921, pages 37 and 38.

Items Nos. 9 and 10 represent claims of the French Government against the United States Railroad Administration. The checks for these amounts due to the French Government at the time the claims were liquidated were indorsed over to the Treasury and credited as a payment on account of principal of the obligations of the French Government.

At a meeting of the World War Foreign Debt Commission on April 19, 1922, the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to inform each of the governments whose obligations arising out of the World War are held by the United States, including obligations held by the United States Grain Corporation, the War Department, the Navy Department, or the American Relief Administration, of the organization of the World War Foreign Debt Commission pursuant to the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, and that the commission desires to receive any proposals or representations which the said government may wish to make for the settlement or refunding of its obligations under the provisions of the act."

In accordance with this resolution, the Secretary of State instructed the diplomatic representatives of this government at the capital of France to communicate to the French government the text of the resolution and of the act creating the World War Foreign Debt Commission.

The French Government in July, 1922, sent a special mission to the United States. Regarding the negotiations with this mission, I quote the following from the report of the World War Foreign Debt Commission for 1922 as follows (see page 26, Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1922):

"In July, 1922, the French Government sent a special mission, headed by Mr. Jean V. Parmentier, director of the movement of funds of the French treasury, to the United States to discuss with the commission the

French debt to this government. Mr. Parmentier upon his arrival placed in the hands of the commission certain data relating to the financial and economic situation of France. He explained to the commission the position of his government in respect to the funding of its debt to the United States, stating that he had been designated by the French Government to afford the commission complete information as to the financial condition of his government, but that the latter did not consider it possible at the present time to enter into any definite engagements for a funding or settlement of its debt. He further stated that it was his government's desire to postpone for an indefinite period consideration of this matter, until the financial situation of France should become more clear, particularly as to reparation receipts from Germany. The commission's position on the subject was explained to Mr. Parmentier, and especially its desire that a funding of the French debt should take place in the near future. On August 17, 1922, Mr. Parmentier informed the chairman of the commission that he had been keeping his government informed of the progress made in the negotiations and that he had received a cable instructing him to return for a full discussion with his government of the situation as it had developed. The chairman replied that, in his view, it could only be beneficial if Mr. Parmentier should in person discuss with his government the negotiations which had taken place between him and the commission. Mr. Parmentier returned to France shortly after this conference."

I also quote the following from the report of the World War Foreign Debt Commission for 1923 (see page 27, Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1923):

"An account of certain preliminary discussions held in July, 1922, with Mr. Jean Parmentier, director of the movement of funds of the French treasury and representative appointed by the Government of France to negotiate with the commission, appears in the previous report of the commission, on page 26 of the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922. Mr. Parmentier returned to France in August, 1922, for a full discussion with his government of the situation as it had developed here. No proposals or representations have been received since his departure."

The World War Foreign Debt Commission has no further information than that set forth in the above quotations.

You further ask whether the commission has anything in view at the present time in

the way of a program or plan pending with the French Government for the settlement of the debt.

In reply I would say that the commission has at the present time no program or plan pending other than as above indicated. It is, however, the intention of the commission to continue its efforts in every practicable manner to procure the funding of the debt.

Answering your inquiry as to what assurance the commission has of the intention of the French Government to adjust the debt, I have to say that such assurance is furnished by the conditions and stipulations upon the part of the French Government contained in the obligations evidencing the debt and the statements of Mr. Parmentier quoted above.

I trust that I have covered the information which you desire.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. MELLON,

Chairman of the Commission.

HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

THE BRITISH GENERAL ELECTION

TOWARD the middle of November the British Premier, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, declared his intention of appealing to the country on a protectionist platform. This decision to call for a general election met with surprise, not unmingled with resentment, even within the Premier's own party, where Lord Younger, the well-known political expert, is said to have predicted a reduction of the Conservative majority from 80 to 35. Preparations for a whirlwind campaign were immediately undertaken on all sides.

Nominations were completed by the end of November, only fifty seats being left uncontested. In round figures there were 540 Conservative candidates, 450 Liberals, and 430 of the Labor Party, with a few Independents. There were thirty-four women candidates. Notable among the unopposed members were Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London), Commander O. Locker Lampson (Birmingham), Sir Philip Sassoon (Hythe), Hon. J. Astor (Kent), all Conservatives; the Right Honorable Ian McPherson (Inverness), Liberal; Vernon Hartshorn (Glamorgan),

Labor, and T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool), Nationalist.

A flood of speechmaking then deluged the country. Mr. Lloyd George, returning from America, staged an elaborate and touching reconciliation with Mr. Asquith, whereafter divided Liberal hearts once more beat as one and platform manifestoes made their inevitable appearance.

PREMIER BALDWIN'S ADDRESS

Mr. Baldwin's election address, which was issued from Downing Street, declared that the most urgent problem facing Great Britain was that of unemployment. The Premier did not feel optimistic about the economic situation in Europe, to which this situation was largely attributable, and even, on the contrary, considered that British unemployment was likely to become further aggravated, owing to competition by foreign industries producing under a depreciated currency system, which gave them a price advantage over British manufactures. He proposed, therefore, with the consent of the country, as expressed in the coming general election, to impose duties on imported manufactured goods with the following objects:

1. Raising of revenue without further taxation of home production.
2. Special assistance to industries suffering from foreign competition.
3. To serve as a basis for commercial negotiation with other countries.
4. To promote imperial preference.

Mr. Baldwin expressly disclaimed any intention of imposing taxes upon foodstuffs, and further stated that special support would be given to agriculture by means of a bounty. He also noted the desperate position of the shipbuilding industry and declared the government's intention of laying down a number of light cruisers after the election.

LIBERAL PARTY'S MANIFESTO

A joint manifesto was issued by the Liberal Party, proclaiming unqualified adherence to the doctrine of free trade and also opposition to the Labor Policy of a capital levy. At the same time the foreign policy of the Conservative Party, especially with reference to the Franco-German situation and the Turkish Treaty, were condemned, and extended credit fa-

ilities for internal and imperial development were advocated, as well as extensive public works. The other points touched on dealt with housing, local option, revision of the insurance acts, and so on.

POSITION OF LABOR

The Labor Party's manifesto declared tariffs to be no remedy for unemployment, which was considered as a recurrent feature of the existing economic system, and called for an extended system of national work, including a national system of electrical power supply, development of transport, and improvement of national resources by land drainage, reclamation, afforestation, town planning, and housing schemes. An elaborate agricultural program was laid out, including a minimum wage for laborers, encouragement of co-operation, credit facilities, and re-equipment of the land-valuation department. Among the objects of the Labor Party's foreign policy were included a strengthening and enlarging of the League of Nations, and an international conference, including Germany, for the revision of the Treaty of Versailles, as well as the resumption of free trade and diplomatic relations with Russia.

Finally, a capital levy was stressed.

THE RESULTS

Polling took place on December 6, and resulted in a very marked loss of Conservative seats, which found itself unable to constitute a majority over the other two parties in the House of Commons. The combined Asquith and Lloyd George Liberals registered an almost invisible gain, the most marked success being that of the Labor Party. Sir Robert Sanders, Minister of Agriculture and originator of the subsidy proposal, was defeated. Seven or eight women, among whom were Lady Astor, the Dutchess of Atholl, Miss Susan Lawrence, and Miss Margaret Bondfield, were elected.

Owing to the refusal of any party to co-operate with another, the situation immediately following the election was one of extreme uncertainty. Finally it was decided by the Conservative Party, which still retains the actual plurality over any one other party, that Mr. Baldwin should remain in office until some clarification of the position could be made, either by

means of a working agreement with another party or even by another election, if necessary. Therefore, like Mr. Micawber, the Conservative Party may be said to be waiting for something to turn up.

THE CZECHO-POLISH BOUNDARY DISPUTE

A TENSE situation in Poland and Czechoslovakia was somewhat lessened on December 7 when the Permanent Court of International Justice handed down its advisory opinions in the Jaworzyna case. The opinions in question, which covered 57 folio pages, together with seven annexes, upheld the decision given by the Ambassadors' Conference on July 29, 1920, thus awarding the frontier village of Jaworzyna to Czechoslovakia.

The dispute submitted to the Permanent Court dates from 1920, when a plebiscite was to have been held in order to decide the fate of the Teschen-Spitz-Orawa territory, which was claimed by both Poland and Czechoslovakia. The difficulties of taking the plebiscite proved so great that finally both countries agreed to submit the question to the Council of Ambassadors and to recognize its decision. On July 28, 1920, the Council made known its decision, giving the town of Jaworzyna to Czechoslovakia.

IMPORTANCE OF JAWORZYNA

The local importance of this town, numbering some eleven hundred inhabitants, is almost entirely strategic. The heights above Jaworzyna command a pass leading from the Polish plains to the main line of the Czech Railway. The Polish government did not feel able to give up this position without a struggle, and requested the government of Czechoslovakia to continue negotiations, in the hope that some friendly arrangement might be arrived at. These negotiations came to nothing, and, the Czecho-Polish frontier commission having in the meantime proposed a modification of the boundaries determined in 1920, the matter was again carried to the Council of Ambassadors.

On July 27 last the latter decided to place the problem before the League of Nations and to request the League to suggest some means of solution. By this

time the question to be decided had slightly altered its complexion, and the Council wished to ascertain whether it was litigious or not, or, to put it in another way, whether, bearing in mind the Polish declaration of July 10, 1920, regarding the arbitration of the Council of Ambassadors, the decision given by the latter on July 28 definitely determined the Czecho-Polish frontier or not. This frontier line is that fixed by the Treaty of Neuilly, which Czechoslovakia has ratified, but Poland has not. The Council of Ambassadors further suggested to the League of Nations that the matter might be submitted to the Permanent Court.

ACTION OF THE LEAGUE

This suggestion was favorably received by the League, which communicated it to the powers interested. The Polish government pointed out that the litigation in question was based upon a note issued by the Council of Ambassadors on November 13, 1922, according to which the Council itself admitted that the frontiers established by its note of July 28, 1920, were not definite. On the other hand, M. Benes, foreign minister for Czechoslovakia, requested that the point of law thus raised be submitted to arbitration by The Hague Court. The Spanish delegate, Mr. Quinones, was then asked to investigate and report upon the matter on behalf of the League. Following his recommendation that the matter be submitted to an impartial tribunal, Count Ishii, the Japanese delegate, urged the League to decide that the investigating delegate and the representatives of the two parties to the dispute should come to an agreement regarding the method of procedure to be followed in order to submit the case to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The court's opinion further provides that the Ambassador's decision of July 28 must be applied in its entirety, including those provisions relating to the possibility of introducing into the line described in the decision modifications to be proposed by the delimitations commission and taking into account the local conditions in the neighborhood of the frontier. The zones of the Spitzka, Orava, and Teschen, states the decision, must be regarded as definitely fixed, independently of the conclusions arrived at by the court as re-

gards the Spitzka zone. This decision, which was submitted to the League of Nations on December 10, thus clarifies a state of affairs which might have proved very embarrassing to the Council of Ambassadors. An adverse opinion would also have created a difficult position for the Government of Czechoslovakia, where public opinion was sufficiently aroused to have demanded the resignation of Dr. Benes.

THE SETTLEMENT OF TANGIER

WITH the settlement of the Tangier dispute by France, England, and Spain a long-standing thorn in the flesh of Europe may be said to have been plucked out. The controversy, which had gone on wearily for many years, was finally decided on November 27 by special conference sitting in Paris.

Under the terms of the convention agreed upon by the plenipotentiaries, and which will be submitted to the governments concerned in due course, full power is conceded to the Sultan of Morocco, which satisfies the French, who control the Sultan. On the other hand, England's claim for neutrality in war time and the open door was admitted by France. As regards Spain, territorial concessions were made which will have the effect of consolidating the position in the Spanish zone.

Tangier thus becomes a new zone in Morocco, an integral part of the empire, under the sovereignty of the Sultan, whose régime is to be proclaimed by a decree and who has entire authority over Moslem subjects and Islamic law courts. Government services are under the Sultan's control, subject to intervention of the international municipality. The municipal council is to be composed of representatives of the various powers, including Moslems and Jews, with experts and technical advisers attached. This will really constitute the controlling force in the government of Tangier.

A scheme for the development of the port has also been laid out, which will do much to promote its growth. Tangier is one of the most important outlets for the Moroccan hinterland.

Mixed tribunals and sheriffian control of

the post-office form the principal remaining features of the agreement, which is of great importance to the peace of the world.

WORLD COURT OR HAGUE TRIBUNAL

Abstract of Remarks of Senator George H. Moses, of New Hampshire, at the Annual Dinner of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, Waldorf Hotel, New York City, Wednesday Evening, December 5, 1923.

THE HARD-WORKED SENATE

SENATOR MOSES admitted that he was a member of the United States Senate, which, he declared, was a much-misunderstood body, in spite of the fact that ninety-five of its Members are candidates for the Presidency of the United States. The Senate, Senator Moses averred, is really the hard-working branch of Congress, as might readily be seen by a summary of the business accomplished in the 67th Congress. In that Congress, the Senator asserted, there were introduced, in round numbers, 19,000 bills, of which 14,500 originated in the House and 4,500 in the Senate. The House passed only 968 of its 14,500 bills, or less than 7 per cent of the number which it originated, whereas the Senate passed 672 of its 4,500 bills, or about 15 per cent of the number under scrutiny. In final legislation the Senate gave its approval to 537, or more than half, of the 968 House bills which had passed the lower body, whereas the House adopted only 287, or less than 40 per cent, of the 672 Senate bills sent to it; and this took place, the Senator pointed out, under the existing Senate rules, which have endured for more than a century, which have been subject to violent attack, but which, the Senator declared, as the record shows, have never resulted in keeping any desirable or desired piece of legislation off the statute books.

These 19,000 bills, Senator Moses asserted, represent the present-day conception of the functions of government, which have widely changed in the last generation. To carry out the intent of a very large percentage of these measures would mean, the Senator declared, the addition of innumerable pieces of governmental ma-

chinery, the creation of more bureaus, the employment of more clerks, the granting of much larger appropriations, and the imposition of additional taxation.

THE WORLD COURT AND THE PASSION FOR MACHINERY

"This passion for machinery," said Senator Moses, "not only covers the entire field of our domestic activities—established, proposed, proper, improper, constitutional, or unconstitutional—but it seeks also to embrace in its scope the regulation of our foreign relations.

"For example, there is pending before the Senate now a proposal to bring about American membership in a so-called World Court, which has been created by, is subsidiary to, is paid by, has an advisory capacity to, and is essentially a part of the League of Nations—the latter an organization which has three times been rejected by the United States, twice by constitutional action of a representative body, namely, the Senate, and once in a great and solemn referendum which took the question direct to the people.

"This League Court, as I have said, represents the passion for machinery which has of late so inexorably seized the mind of man. It possesses no functions which are not already possessed by another organization with like purposes. It has no jurisdiction beyond that which already exists in another body and it is differentiated from an already-established tribunal only by the fact that its personnel is continuous and that it meets at stated intervals. It is mere duplication and surplusage, both in purpose and in scope, and it holds out no new hope, lays hold upon no new sanctions, and points to no new pathway for peace.

"It came into being and it exists now as an integral part of the League of Nations, from which it cannot be disentangled by a reservation or by any textual amendment short of the destruction of the entire protocol. Like the Treaty of Versailles, the League Court carried obligations and implications which the United States cannot undertake, unless we are prepared to repudiate the verdict of 1920 and to take the first step in a path which leads to the vortex of close and inescapable entanglement in European problems.

"Yet those of us who recognize the facts and who have the temerity to assert them are characterized as humanely strabismic and politically paralyzed. We are accused of mere obstruction and are taunted with having no constructive plan to offer as against one which promises so high a return that nothing short of an international blue-sky law can properly interfere with its operation.

"And this too in the face of a recent declaration by the newest of all Senators save one, that he clutches the key to the problem, possesses the formula for the solution of our difficulties, and can assure the peace of the world, thus proving once more the old truth, that many things, though hidden from the wise and prudent, are revealed unto babes and sucklings.

WHY NOT THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL?

"But from my point of view I look beyond the proposed League Court and I see another tribunal, in the creation of which the United States had no small part and to the strengthening of which the United States later made the greatest contributory suggestion—a suggestion which was rendered nugatory only because other nations were not then either sufficiently enlightened or sufficiently chastened to meet our advanced opinion. The Hague Tribunal, of which I am speaking, has a long and honored record. Once, at least, we invoked its functions in behalf of a weak Latin-American State which was menaced by an arrogant empire overseas; and within the last year we have gone to it with an irritating and troublesome controversy, the conclusion of which, though, as it seemed to us, unnecessarily severe upon us, was nevertheless accepted and carried out by congressional action. That which we did in the German-Venezuelan controversy twenty years ago, that which we have done within the last few months in a controversy arising between the United States and Norway, can be multiplied many times if we search the records of The Hague Tribunal. And, because of this record, to my mind The Hague Tribunal now, as from its inception, presents a firm foundation upon which to erect, if such a structure is necessary, an international temple of justice, permanent in its character, broad in its functions, paid by its representative nations, and a tribunal

to which all peoples may repair, knowing that its bench shall be impaneled from all countries signatory to The Hague treaties without submitting its judges to the indignity of running the gauntlet of any council or assembly whose authority has already been disdained and flouted and whose members feel that association with the United States means only a sanction and a prestige which the founders of the League of Nations have never been able to give it.

"Therefore, if it is really incumbent upon us to do anything, if our duty really is what salaried or sentimental propagandists say, if the strong word 'must,' shouted from abroad and unthinkingly echoed here, has entered at last into our concept of action, why should we not turn to The Hague Tribunal, give to it a high division, with permanency of personnel, with reassuring character, and with regularity of session—a high division of a tribunal already existing, to which the nations of the earth may repair—and thus make the beginning at least of that era so prayerfully sought, but, alas, apparently so far distant, when law, and not war, shall rule the relations of all peoples?

"We are daily assured by those who wish to profit by our power and our authority that we possess the moral leadership of the world. If so, why not assert it—in better phrase, why not reassert it—by turning again to The Hague Tribunal, a living body, which needs only to be nurtured to become what we once sought to make it? Why should we turn our back upon a child of our own creation in order to fondle the rag dolls of foreign diplomacy?"

JAPAN AFTER THE EARTH-QUAKE

THE insurance deadlock which has been retarding reconstruction plans in Japan seems to be gradually straightening itself out. According to cable information just received from Tokyo by the Far Eastern Division of the Department of Commerce, twenty-seven insurance companies of both Tokyo and Osaka have agreed to pay on a basis of 10 per cent of their losses resulting from the earthquake. This agreement was reached only after the Japanese Government had

agreed to extend long-time loans to the different companies at a very low rate of interest. These loans will probably extend over a period of fifty years and bear interest at not more than 2 per cent per annum, and will be repayable through the establishment of a sinking fund.

A considerable portion of the losses, about 17 per cent, were covered by policies of foreign insurance companies operating in Japan, and it has not been definitely settled yet as to what action they intend to take. So far, they have stood on the ground that they are not legally liable for losses incurred by the earthquake, since all their policies contained the "earthquake clause," which relieves them legally from all liability.

The question of reinsurance is also still unsettled. The Japanese insurance companies had spread their risks by reinsuring up to about 50 per cent of their risks in foreign companies. These reinsurance policies, of course, carried the "earthquake clause" and the insurers are not legally liable.

According to an estimate made by the *Nichi Nichi* (Tokyo daily newspaper), Japanese fire insurance companies, with few exceptions, could even without the aid of the government pay 10 per cent of their outstanding claims and still be in sound condition. The estimate of the *Nichi Nichi*, which is based on the condition of the different companies as of 1921 is further strengthened by the fact that during the two and one-half years that have elapsed each company must have added to its assets to some extent and would therefore be better off financially than the 1921 figures indicate. According to this estimate, the amount to be paid out exceeds the total assets in only three cases, and in one of these, the Mitsubishi Marine Insurance Company, the deficit is accounted for by the short career of the company.

COMPULSORY EARTHQUAKE INSURANCE PROPOSED

In the opinion of the *Osaka Asahi*, State earthquake insurance should be compulsory. It points out that, in view of the serious consequences of the recent earthquake, it is imperative that the State should undertake the earthquake insurance business. The Tokyo Chamber of Com-

merce holds the same view and has petitioned the government to immediately form a semi-official company for the purpose. It is suggested that this company might be organized at once, to take over the interests of the existing fire insurance companies and undertake earthquake insurance as well as ordinary fire insurance business. The *Asahi* estimates that the total number of houses throughout Japan is in the neighborhood of 12,000,000, and that the average charge of 5 yen per house per annum would amount to 60,000,000 yen. Considering that Japan is a country subject to earthquakes, it is pointed out that this minimum charge for earthquake insurance would be money well spent.

It is unlikely, however, that any semi-official company, as suggested, will be formed to take over liabilities of the recent disaster, but it is very probable that some action will be taken along the lines suggested above to prevent similar losses in the future.

ATTACK ON PRINCE REGENT

ON DECEMBER 27 an attempt was made to assassinate the Prince Regent of Japan. The prince was on his way to the Diet, when an unknown assailant fired a shot at his car. The would-be assailant was later on apprehended by the police, and proved to be a 20-year-old youth, who declared that his object in attempting to assassinate the Prince Regent was in the hope that thereby a social revolution would be provoked in Japan.

Immediately after this event, Baron Goto, the Minister of Home Affairs, resigned from the cabinet, declaring that he assumed responsibility for the attack. This led to the resignation of the whole cabinet.

According to the latest reports, the Tokyo police fears the possibilities of anti-Socialist riots. As a result, all Socialist centers are being guarded to prevent undesirable outbreaks. Baron Goto, former Mayor of Tokyo, has long been known for his radical sympathies, and strong guards have been posted around his house.

The assailant's bullet narrowly missed the prince's head, who proceeded to the Diet Building, went through the ceremonies of opening the session, and then returned to the Imperial Palace under heavy guard.

AN IRREDUCIBLE MINIMUM IN THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

By JAMES BROWN SCOTT

(A Translation of the Points with which the Author Closed His Course on "The Conduct of Foreign Affairs in a Democracy" at the Academy of International Law at The Hague.)

1. In order that the conduct of foreign affairs may be controlled by the people of a given nation, the government of that nation must be the agent of the people. While the form of the government, whether monarchical or republican, may be of little importance, it is essential that the executive power charged with the conduct of foreign affairs actually represent the general will, that there shall be a public opinion, and that that public opinion shall be in a position to control the activities of the executive power, both abroad and at home.

2. It is essential, as President Cleveland has said, that "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State be equally applicable as between enlightened nations."

3. It follows that the people must be familiar with these rules of conduct, so that public opinion, as enlightened as the opinion of the individual, may insist that the executive power conform its policy to them, exactly as the executive and the legislative powers bow to public opinion in domestic policies.

4. The most effective means of enlightening public opinion is by way of compulsory attendance upon the primary and secondary school, leaving it to the university to train the professor, the counsel, the expert. Collective opinion, like the opinion of the crowd, may differ greatly from the enlightened opinion of the individual. It is indispensable that public opinion should be instructed, so that the opinion of the crowd may be identical with that of the individuals composing the nation.

5. To this end it is incumbent upon the governments of all civilized nations to teach the fundamental principles of justice, and especially to furnish their citizens with adequate instruction in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and privileges.

The government should collect and give to the public day by day the facts of inter-

national life, in order that the people may have at hand the information upon which to form a reasonable judgment through the analysis of the facts and by the application of the principles of international law.

6. While the conduct of foreign affairs must be left in the hands of the executive power, the treaty or international agreement must be assimilated to a law of the nation. It must remain merely a project of the government until the legislature has given to it the force of law.

7. Just as the government lays a proposed law before the legislature for its approval, so the minister of foreign affairs should lay a draft of the proposed treaty or international agreement before the legislature. As a proposed domestic law must be considered and debated in public sessions, so the proposed treaty or agreement should be debated openly before it is approved by the legislative power.

8. Just as public opinion has an opportunity to crystallize, concentrate, and make itself heard in the legislative chamber in all that concerns internal policy, so this public opinion must prevail in foreign affairs.

9. While permitting the minister of foreign affairs to conduct negotiations without undue publicity, the democratic principle requires that public opinion and the legislative power be sounded in advance regarding the desirability of such negotiations. This should be the general rule. The minister of foreign affairs should keep public opinion informed of the progress of negotiations. Nevertheless much must be left to the discretion of the minister concerning the nature, frequency, and contents of the communiqués to be given to the public. But public opinion must exact that the minister conduct himself as an honest man and that he be responsible to the legislature and to the people for his actions.

In any case, the proposed treaty or international agreement laid before the leg-

islative power should be accompanied by a report of the negotiations, as any bill is accompanied by report and relevant documents.

The draft treaty and the report should be published, so that public opinion may be in a position to inform itself and make its voice heard.

10. No treaty should bind the nation before it has been approved by the legislative power; nor should it bind the people before it has been published or proclaimed, as in the case of any municipal law.

11. The minister of foreign affairs should participate in the debates of the legislative power and answer questions, as is required of any member of a parliamentary government.

12. In a non-parliamentary régime, like that of the United States of America, the Secretary of State should consult the Foreign Relations Committees before opening negotiations. He should also furnish them with the information which they

may need during the course of the negotiations, answering questions which one or the other chamber may address to him, as far as the nature and state of the negotiations permit.

13. The reports accompanying the treaty or other international agreement should be made public at the moment of the proclamation of such treaty or agreement, so that the public may know the nature and the extent of the obligations contracted and the reasons for their conclusion.

14. The minister of foreign affairs should, furthermore, publish special reports yearly, giving detailed résumés of negotiations or collections of the diplomatic documents pertaining thereto. The archives of the government should be open to the public, under rules and regulations to prevent abuse, so that by their exact knowledge of the past and the present the public may be in a position to foresee the future and to arrange for it accordingly.

ECONOMIC MALADJUSTMENTS—BASIC CAUSES OF WAR

As Illustrated by American Experience

By Major C. R. PETTIS, of the United States Army

IN THE normal development of the causes which lead to any particular war there are three phases, namely: Economic, political, ethical. This is the logical order of these phases, in accordance with the causal relations existing between them. Unsatisfactory economic conditions lead to political development. During the political discussions of the questions at issue, an ethical aspect is developed when the mass of the people reach the opinion that extreme measures are justified. If we are searching for the first cause of war, it is important that we recognize the causal relations here stated, in order that we may properly arrange and classify the varied events connected with the complex phenomenon of war.

The best way to test this statement is to note certain facts of history. While the dividing lines between the economic,

political, and ethical aspects are often dim and obscure, they always blend into one another to some extent. But if we test the phenomenon of war by the known facts of history, we shall see that the validity of our view holds in such a majority of cases as fully to justify the statement that economic maladjustments are the basic causes of war.

The meaning of the term "economic maladjustments" will at once be apparent to any student of history. In the discussion which follows, its meaning will be further developed and illustrated by certain specific instances.

The importance of economic maladjustments as causes of war is based upon two fundamental facts. One of these is human nature as it exists today, the product of many centuries of evolution; the second is our modern industrial fabric, the de-

velopment of which has taken place simultaneously with the intellectual development of man.

HUMAN NATURE

If we analyze the motives behind human actions, we find that they can be classified under certain so-called instincts. Two important instincts are acquisitiveness and combativeness. We can hardly think of war without some mental association with combativeness, since the relation is so obvious. The relation of acquisitiveness to war is more obscure and is easily lost sight of.

It is the healthy exercise of the instinct of acquisitiveness, combined with some other instincts, that causes a man to work, in order to obtain the income which is necessary in order that he and his family may live in comfort, that his children may be educated, and that they may gratify their desires, along artistic, religious, or other lines. On the other hand, acquisitiveness may cause a man to commit robbery. It is only when exercised within proper limits that acquisitiveness is a desirable trait. It may fairly be said that acquisitiveness has been one of the main underlying motives that helped to bring about our modern material civilization.

It would be impossible to maintain our present standard of living in the United States, even approximately, if we did not bring in raw materials from many nations. To this extent we are dependent on foreign trade. Some of us may flatter ourselves that we are not shopkeepers, and that we do not live by trade; but let us examine and see if such a position is tenable.

IMPORTANCE OF TRADE

From the United States census of 1920 we find that about 42 million persons over the age of ten were gainfully occupied. For the purpose of this discussion, we may divide them into two groups. In the first group let us place agriculture, forestry, mining, manufacturing, mechanics, transportation, and trade, together with certain professional, personal, and clerical services directly connected with the preceding. Since the main function of the farmer these days is to produce certain things which must enter into commerce before he can derive any benefit, we may designate

this first broad group as the "commercial" group. This group comprises 88 per cent of the population.

The second, or "non-commercial" group, includes the remaining 12 per cent of the population. In the second group we find such occupations as government employees, teachers, authors, artists, clergymen, lawyers, physicians, janitors, nurses, butlers, waiters, stenographers, and messengers. Physicians perform their services indiscriminately for sick people in both of our groups. We may say, in a general way, that the average physician receives 88 per cent of his income from the commercial group and 12 per cent from the non-commercial group. The same sort of statement could be made of the other occupations included in the second group. The conclusion seems inevitable, therefore, that we all have a very potent interest in the trade and commerce of the United States, whether we generally recognize the fact or not. The ultimate source of our bread and butter is to be found in production and distribution, and anything that disturbs the orderly processes of production and distribution has an adverse effect upon the entire population.

TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Contacts between two nations must necessarily be made through individuals of the nations concerned. The principal individual foreign contacts may be classified as (1) diplomatic and other government officials; (2) pleasure travelers, tourists; (3) scientific and research societies; (4) persons engaged in trade.

If secret treaties are taboo and diplomatic representatives properly perform their duties, certainly no cause for war should have its beginnings in diplomatic contacts.

People who travel for pleasure will avoid a country where the contacts are unpleasant, so that this class may be disregarded as a source of friction.

Societies which bring together people who have similar scientific, intellectual, or spiritual interests tend to promote peace rather than otherwise.

The interests of trade require many contacts between people of different nation-

alities. An economic map of the world, showing the sources of raw materials, would be as motley as a map based on race, language, or nationality. Manufactures are located with reference to labor, power, and other considerations; and factories are distributed no more evenly than raw materials. For these reasons, international trade is necessary for both the development and maintenance of our civilization.

Trade contacts are generally amicable, tending to promote good feeling. The maintenance of such satisfactory contacts is a matter of vital necessity to the individual trader and to the company that he represents. A failure of the trader to perform his function wisely may mean a shortage of some commodity that will be felt by the entire population of the trader's country. For this reason, friction arising out of trade often finds conditions favorable for its growth into something more serious than a simple quarrel involved in bartering for goods.

TWO CLASSES OF MALADJUSTMENT

The economic maladjustments which cause war fall into two general groups. In the first group we find friction, which arises from causes very closely associated with trade or the interchange of goods. For example, one nation may actively interfere with the shipping of another; or, in a more indirect way, it may pursue a policy which tends to hamper and restrict the commerce of the second nation. The commercial policy of a nation finds its expression in the laws of the country. In commercial matters it seems to be the policy of every nation to favor its own nationals to a certain extent; and the practice would appear to be justified as long as it does not work undue hardship on some foreign country. In international commerce, as in individual bartering, it is well to remember the Chinese precept to the effect that no trade is a good one unless both parties benefit; which is the Golden Rule applied to trade. Nations, as well as individuals, often permit their selfishness to carry them beyond the limit of fair play, which results in a bad national policy or a bad business policy, as the case may be.

The second group of maladjustments

which may lead to war arises out of broad economic conditions rather than from the more specific acts of commerce and trade. There is a tendency for agriculture and all other forms of industry to seek out the localities where a given amount of human effort will receive the greatest amount of productive reward. When the population of any country has increased to such an extent that its home fields have become comparatively less fertile than the fields of a neighboring territory, there must necessarily arise a temptation to aggression. The mind of man revolts from selfishness, at least in its crude and raw forms. Before selfishness can become a cause of war, it must be glossed over with a political and ethical veneer. This discussion deals with the economic aspects of the question.

Individual psychology cannot be applied *in toto* to a nation, but the motives which produce national action may be considered as an integration of the motives of a predominant element of the population. In the United States the predominant element approximates fairly close to the numerical majority. In 1914 the Kaiser was able to direct national action along certain lines because an overwhelming majority of the German people thought as he did and were with him.

Let us now check up these statements with history. In order to place a limit on the scope of this discussion, we will confine our examples to American history, in which we are naturally the most interested.

MALADJUSTMENTS WITH THE INDIANS

From the landing of the Pilgrim fathers almost to the present day, a struggle went on between the white man and the Indian in the territory that is now the United States. The number of white men gradually and continually increased. These white men were always in search of more fertile fields. Under stress of economic conditions, the white men kept pushing farther and farther west. They wanted land which they could cultivate intensively and localities suitable for building up industry and commerce. The Indians held broad areas by hereditary right and they resented the intrusion. The Indian brave roamed far in his hunt-

ing, while his squaw attended to agriculture and the babies. The economic maladjustments involved may be realized when we consider that in the limits of the United States three hundred years ago there were 850,000 Indians (estimated). At the present time there are 110 million inhabitants. In other words, one Indian was occupying an area which could potentially support, with ease, 130 white men. The more efficient methods of the white man and his superior utilization of natural resources are manifest.

An inevitable contest followed. The struggle was almost continuous, but only occasionally did it attain the political dignity of war. From the standpoint of the Indian, there is no doubt that he was often the victim of great injustice. The moral code of the Indian was different from ours, and some of us can remember the dime novels of our youth, in which the Indian was painted in such black colors that the killing of Indians seemed a most virtuous occupation. The main difficulty, however, between the races was economic.

BEGINNINGS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

In looking for the causes antecedent to the Revolutionary War, we find that from 1651 to 1775 the policy of England toward the American colonies was based on the "mercantile system," which may be summed up as follows:

(1) Colonial industries should be encouraged or forbidden, whichever would most benefit home industry in England.

(2) English merchants should have a priority in buying from the colonies and in selling to the colonies.

(3) English ships should have a virtual monopoly of colonial trade.

There were a number of Englishmen who gradually came to a realization that such a policy had necessary limitations, even though it was the universally accepted theory at that time.

Let us examine some acts in which the mercantile policy was expressed.

The Act of 1651 provided that all goods imported into England from America must be carried in English-owned ships, of which the master and three-fourths of the crew were English. The purpose of the act was to protect and encourage English

shipping, chiefly at the expense of the Dutch.

In order to help English merchants, Parliament in 1660 passed a law providing that sugar, tobacco, cotton, indigo, ginger, fustic or other dyewoods exported from an English colony should be sent only to England, Ireland, or Wales, or to some other English colony. At later dates this list of "enumerated" articles was increased by adding molasses, naval stores, rice, copper, and furs. Another act to aid the English merchants was that of 1663, which provided that the colonists must purchase all goods of European production through England.

English manufacturers secured the passage of the Act of 1699, which forbade the people of any colony to export woolen yarn, woolen cloth, or any manufactures of wool either to another colony or to a foreign country. In 1732 English hat manufacturers secured the passage of a similar law restricting the exportation of hats from the colonies.

The Molasses Act of 1733 was to benefit the English sugar planters of the West Indies, principally at the expense of the New England traders.

In 1750 the English iron manufacturers secured the passage of a law that no rolling mill should be erected or operated in the colonies.

The English corn laws prevented the colonies from shipping fish, wheat, corn, flour, or meat to England. The purpose of these laws was to aid the English farmers and agricultural interests by protecting them from colonial competition.

From the above it is plain that the laws mentioned, and numerous others of the same tenor, were passed by Parliament at the request and for the benefit of English farmers, shippers, merchants, and manufacturers. In other words, the entire population of England was receiving direct or indirect benefit from the various laws which embodied the so-called mercantile policy. There is no evidence here to support the popular fallacy that wars are brought about by the selfish interests of some one class of the population. Trying to place the blame for war upon some one class of the population, such as capitalists or munition-makers, is an argument that is only brought forward by those who

would advocate some particular political theory.

Up to the time of George III the various laws were administered mildly. The colonies had not developed to any great extent industrially. As a matter of fact, the laws, as a whole, did not prove a great hardship to the colonies. But the laws before 1760 formed a firm foundation upon which was built the events of the next few years. When George III came to the throne the English debt was 130 million pounds, which was considered a large sum in those days. He decided to carry the mercantile policy to its logical limit, and this he proceeded to do as opportunity offered. This was made manifest to the colonists by the Sugar Act, 1764; the Stamp Act, 1765, and various other acts following. The colonists resisted, and the quarrel assumed a political aspect. The colonial legislatures started out mildly, with petitions to the king. Later came associations for non-importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation; "Sons of Liberty," committees of correspondence, and a Colonial Congress, with a Declaration of Rights. In some places there was mob action—the Boston massacre and the Boston Tea Party. A commercial warfare started ten years before the Battle of Lexington.

During the political agitation certain ethical ideas began to take shape. The ethical concept found its full flowering in the Declaration of Independence.

WAR OF 1812

The War of 1812 was a result of the struggle between France and Great Britain, beginning in 1793. For nineteen years the United States tried to remain neutral; but finally gave it up as a hopeless task, due to the constant interference with American commerce on the part of both belligerents. There were no submarines in those days, but the story seems strangely familiar when we think of the period 1914 to 1917, some hundred years later.

In 1793 both France and Great Britain ordered their naval vessels to seize all neutral ships laden with grain. In 1807 Great Britain ordered that no neutral vessel should enter any European port without first stopping at a British port

and obtaining permission to proceed. Napoleon replied with the Milan Decree, which declared that any vessel complying with the British order should be subject to capture and confiscation, wherever found.

In 1810 Napoleon, on a flimsy pretext, seized ten million dollars' worth of American ships and cargoes in French ports; but the various restrictions contained in the British orders in council and the impressment of American seamen by the British seemed to arouse especial resentment and anger.

The United States, by the Embargo Act, the Non-intercourse Act, and "Macon Bill No. 2," tried to use economic pressure to force either one or both of the belligerents to give up the objectionable practices; but without success. The Embargo Act seemed to work a greater hardship on the people of the United States than on the people of Europe.

After nineteen years of this, Congress declared war on England two days after the objectionable orders in council had been revoked.

WAR WITH MEXICO

The economic conditions precedent to the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico were so closely similar to the maladjustment involved in the struggle between the white man and Indian, already described, that detailed consideration is not necessary. As a result, the United States came into control of a territory which is now the States of Texas, California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and a large part of Colorado.

THE CIVIL WAR

The Civil War is another illustration of our theory. By the time the war started, there seems to be but little doubt that political and ethical considerations outweighed the economic consideration, in the minds of most people, both North and South; but if we trace back the political and ethical aspect to its first cause, we find an economic maladjustment.

Even before the Revolution, the South placed its main reliance on agriculture, while the Northern colonies, in a more severe climate, were turning to manufactures and commerce. In the history of

the events preceding the Revolution, we frequently find differences of opinion between the Southern colonies and the Northern colonies, due to their divergent economic interests.

The lack of a complete community of economic interest between the Northern States and the Southern States, which condition finally resulted in the Civil War, was vividly brought out in the Constitutional Convention, 1787, which drew up the Constitution of the United States. The Northern States, whose interests were largely commercial, wanted the Government to have considerable latitude in protecting shipping and trading interests; the agricultural South was afraid that the policy of protection might result in taxation and high freight charges on Southern produce. The Southern States wanted to provide full protection to the institution of slavery, upon which they were building the economic structure of an agricultural South. The Constitution was, to a large extent, a compromise between conflicting interests. As a compromise, it was effective until 1861, when a violent adjustment took place by means of a war and a period of recovery lasting some forty years. The completeness of the readjustment at the present time is shown by the fact that many Southern people now think that the South is really the backbone of the nation, so to speak.

At the time of the Civil War the greater part of the South might be characterized as a one-crop country, in which King Cotton reigned supreme. From 1825 to 1860 the value of cotton exported was greater than the value of all other domestic exports of the United States combined. But the South had not even developed the financial and commercial machinery for handling its own crop.

The political aspect of the struggle can be traced through such acts as the Missouri Compromise, 1820; the South Carolina Nullification Ordinance, 1832, and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 1854.

The ethical basis for the North was largely centered in the question of slavery and the preservation of the Union. The ethical basis for the South was to be found in the principle of States' rights, very similar to the more modern principle of self-determination as applied to nations.

The strength of States' rights, as an abstract and theoretical principle, is shown by the fact that Southern West Pointers, almost to a man, went with their home States.

In the Civil War the North realized clearly that the breaking up of the Union would threaten the economic development of the country, both North and South. The South was afraid that, whether they remained in the Union or not, the very thing would happen that actually did happen—the breaking up of a prosperous economic system, the result of two centuries of labor, and a rebuilding from the ground up.

WAR WITH SPAIN

Turning now to the Spanish-American War, it may be stated that every person in the United States who likes candy, takes sugar with coffee, or smokes good cigars has some interest in the economic welfare of Cuba. This abstract interest very naturally includes within its scope any clashing of political conditions with economic conditions in the sister country. The battleship *Maine* was the dramatic incident which rounded out the scene, economically, politically, and ethically.

THE WORLD WAR

A superficial consideration of the causes which led the United States into the World War might lead to the conclusion that the World War and the War of 1812 can be placed in the same class; but of course the causes were much more deep-seated than is indicated by such a superficial view. Many books have been written on the subject, but the events are still so close that we have not acquired a historical perspective. Some historians already call the World War a "war of resources"; possibly future historians will call it a "war for resources."

The late war has been called a war to end war. Most of the soldiers knew that they were fighting for something much more practical and less visionary than that.

APPLICATION

If we assume that economic maladjustments are the basic causes of war, would this assumption have any practical application?

When a new disease appears, the doctors treat it vigorously, giving plenty of medicine. After the germ that causes the disease is discovered, the doctors treat the cause, rather than the patient, and the result is generally more satisfactory.

Plans to further the interests of peace must be founded on an accurate knowledge of the causes of war. Peace plans, to be of any value, must be based on history, economics, common sense, and re-

ligion; and the first of these is history. The facts of history furnish absolutely no hope for those who would abolish war completely, except as the result of an evolutionary process, which may require many centuries; but history clearly justifies the belief that intelligent and widespread effort to keep international economic conditions sound and healthy will result in decreasing the chance of war.

THE WARFARE OF ZOROASTER

By BEHMAN SORABJI BANAJI, Bombay, India

IF WE glance at the history of mankind, we find that from time immemorial men have been found fighting and killing their fellow-creatures for some cause or another. And this evil nature has not been brought under control as yet. Consequently, innumerable destructive wars of different nations have brought ruination to humanity. It appears that it is the weakness of human beings to learn only by sad experience. Thus, after the warfare of thousands of years and its destructive effects, now people think seriously to control in some way this evil nature of warfare. So various movements and organizations have come into existence.

One nation that has favored the idea of the abolition of war and worked for it for years together has been the United States of America. You Americans have supported The Hague Peace Conferences. In the World War you joined to bring its speedy end, and thus to avoid further destruction of humanity. It was through your President Wilson that the League of Nations came into existence, and by the grand American Red Cross organization and its arduous work millions of the wounded, widows, and orphans were saved from abject death, destruction, and misery.

THE PROPHETS

The first important step to conquer this evil of war is to train our young and old people in the spiritual teachings of the great prophets.

In these days of dull, cold materialism,

Satan very readily upsets the minds of the people to fight and to declare war for slight offense, because, owing to materialistic life, people disregard the great spiritual teachings of the great prophet, Christ, who said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "Thou shalt not kill" is a part of Christian ethics. This great war would never have caused such horrors and destruction if the Westerners had followed the teaching of their great Prophet, who foresaw what was going to happen in the future and who gave His teachings accordingly. And if these teachings are still not acted upon, an ill-fated time will surely come, when the whole of Europe will be destroyed in warfare with new scientific researches.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM

To abolish warfare is as much a psychological question as a political one. So the first important step we have to take is to change the psychology of the people. In the Western world young people are trained how to fight with one another, even in sports and pastimes, instead of how to love their neighbors. Hence there is no wonder that Western people launch into great wars. The whole psychological trend of the mind is trained toward fighting. This trend of the mind requires a healthy change, as suggested in Zoroastrianism. What is Zoroastrianism?

TWO OPPOSITE FORCES OF NATURE

When we study nature, we find that everywhere two conflicting forces, constructive and destructive, are working

actively. It should cause no wonder if the same forces be found working in human nature. The great work for humanity is to solve this problem in such a way as to utilize this fighting or destructive nature in some noble way. It is against the principle of religion to kill human beings or to destroy flourishing cities; but it is noble to fight against one's own evil nature. To kill one's fellow-creatures or to destroy cities is satanic; but to fight against one's own evil and to rise to perfection is called *spiritual warfare*. Of course, to fight in self-defense, for the preservation of one's government or nation against foreign aggression, may be permissible.

SPIRITUAL WARFARE AS TAUGHT BY ZOROASTER

Now, let us study what Zoroaster, the great prophet of Persia, has to say about this spiritual warfare as a means to abolish this brutal warfare.

Some thousands of years ago Zoroaster studied this great problem of evil, and was first to solve it. He declared to the world that two spirits, or forces, have been working in nature, one a "beneficent force" and the other a "destructive force." For the salvation of humanity, he strictly enjoined his followers to remain always on the side of the "beneficent force," and to control and conquer the evil force.

The great author, Samuel Laing, after studying Zoroastrianism, states that the prophet Zoroaster was the first to solve this problem of evil, and that these two forces are the two polarities of nature, which are found everywhere in the universe.

In this great warfare of nature the Zoroastrians are enjoined always to take part on the side of the good spirit, "Spirito Mainyush," and to fight against the evil spirit, Ahriman. Thus all Zoroastrians are spiritual warriors and every Zoroastrian is a soldier of God.

THE SYMBOLISM AND MILITARY UNIFORMS OF ZOROASTRIAN SPIRITUAL WARRIORS

Now, a soldier requires offensive and defensive weapons and armor to protect himself against his enemies and for destroying them. Zoroastrianism provides its soldiers for this grand spiritual war-

fare unique and most scientific armor, weapons, and symbolism. At the time of one's initiation ceremony, Zoroastrian symbolism, armor, and weapons are given to the initiate, or new soldier, for the grand spiritual warfare.

The following three symbols are held before the new initiate and explained to him, to carry on the spiritual warfare:

I. THE HOLY FIRE

First, the Zoroastrian symbol of holy fire is held before the initiate, or spiritual warrior, to teach him the ethics of spiritual warfare.

Just as the fire fights against the darkness and illuminates the path, so a Zoroastrian soldier has to illuminate the holy fire of his soul, and with its power he has to fight against the darkness or evils of the world.

Just as the fire destroys or consumes all dirty things of the world, which injure the happiness and progress of humanity, so the Zoroastrian soldier has to destroy in his fight all evils and vices which hinder the spiritual progress of humanity.

Just as the flames of the fire always point upward, never being attracted downward by the law of gravitation of the earth, so a Zoroastrian soldier has always to soar higher and upward toward spirituality, and never be attracted downward by the lower attractions and temptations of the world.

Just as the fire is consumed while giving light and heat to the world, so a Zoroastrian soldier should be ready to sacrifice his own self while giving spiritual light to the world.

Just as incense burnt on the fire gives fragrance, purifying the air and its surroundings, so a Zoroastrian soldier, by the incense of his good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, gives fragrance of purity to his surroundings.

These are the ideals held out before a Zoroastrian soldier through the symbolism of the holy fire.

II. MILITARY UNIFORM

(*"Sudreh" and "Kusti"*)

At the ceremony of the investiture, the officiating priest places in the hand of the initiate the sacred white cotton shirt, called "sudreh," and makes him wear it

after due ceremonies, and then the priest ties round the waist of the initiate a thin girdle, or belt, of white wool, called "kusti." This is called the armor, or military uniform, of the Zoroastrian soldier, the deep signification of which can be explained very briefly, thus:

"Sudreh," or white shirt, is made from thin cotton fabric, because whiteness shows purity. It is essential that we keep our characters white and spotless. It is made of very fine or thin fabric, showing that in order to preserve purity we should be very particular in minute things. It represents the whole *chart* or philosophy of Zoroastrianism. It is made of nine parts, which remind one at a glance of the nine leading principles of Zoroastrianism, and of the nine points of the campaign which the spiritual warrior has now undertaken.

Now, let us study the significance of these nine parts of the Sudreh for *ethical science* and how the ethical principles or Zoroastrian canons of morality must be practiced in one's life.

Part I. "Girdo," a small piece on the neck part of the shirt, signifies that a person should lessen the weight of his actions and responsibilities which lie on his neck by observing the canons of purity and by always doing righteous actions.

Part II. "Gireh-ban," a small bag or purse on the part near the heart, means the purse or the bag of righteousness. The symbolic significance of this is that a person should not only be industrious, to fill his bag or purse with money, but to fill it up with righteousness. The position of this bag is just on the heart, signifying that the heart should be always full of pure emotions and pure love for others, and that we should always be charitable in our feelings and actions.

Parts III and IV. These two parts are made of two angular forms called "tiris." They assume the shape of a triangle on the right side of the end of the shirt. The three sides of a triangle represent the well-known triad of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds.

Parts V and VI. The two sleeves of the shirt signify the law of polarity or duality. God is one, or absolute, while everything in nature works under dual laws, good and evil. We should always be on the side

of the good force and fight against the evil.

Parts VII and VIII. These two parts represent the front part and the back or rear part of the shirt. The front part, which we see, is the physical, material or manifested universe, while the back part, which we cannot see, is the invisible, spiritual world. They are sewn up at the sides together, reminding one of one's duties toward both the material and the spiritual worlds.

Part IX. A sewn small cut on the end of the left side of the shirt, called "samar tiri," shows the final spiritual union of the male and female halves into one individual soul.

These nine parts signify nine powers of the spiritual warrior, by the acquisition of which he becomes proof against evil forces. He thus makes his "sudreh" an armor, a protection against which all attacks of demon or evil forces become futile. Thus he becomes the real conqueror of evil powers.

THE SPIRITUAL GIRDLE OR BELT OF THE SPIRITUAL WARRIOR

Just as a belt is an essential part of the uniform of an ordinary soldier, to make his uniform quite fit to his body and to enable him to fight actively and energetically, so for the spiritual warrior a spiritual belt is necessary to enable him to fight energetically against the evil forces. With that idea in view, the great prophet, Zoroaster, has prepared a spiritual belt or girdle called "kusti." It is derived from Pahalavi and Persian language, meaning waist, direction, limit, or boundary. It is tied on the waist as a belt or girdle, so that lower passions may be checked downward.

This "kusti," or spiritual belt, is always made of white wool of the lamb. The lamb in all ages is considered to be the emblem of innocence and purity, and its wool also possesses the same quality. So the white wool of such a lamb used in "kusti" reminds a Zoroastrian to lead an innocent and pure life. This "kusti" is woven from 144 threads, first twisted double and made 72 threads. The doubling, or twisting of 144 threads, signify that the corporeal and spiritual worlds are intertwined or intermixed, and that we

have to keep connection with both and owe our duty to each. There are 144 kinds of actions which are to be spiritualized by 72 kinds of purity.

This "kusti" is woven hollow and all round. This hollow symbolizes the space between this world and the next. According to occult teachings, wool has great power to store up magnetic power. Thus this "kusti" is made of wool and woven hollow, so that it can store up all spiritual forces of sacred prayers chanted at the time of weaving it and also during daily prayers of a Zoroastrian. Also, both ends of this hollow tube are closed up, so that the magnetic circuit may not pass out immediately while it is charged. It is just like a storage battery of spiritual magnetism. The six laries, or tassel-like string ends, three at each end of the "kusti," symbolize the six "gahambars," or the six season festivals of a Zoroastrian year. The weaving, or the uniting together of all the threads into one, symbolizes universal union or brotherhood. This "kusti" has some symbolic significance like that of the cord worn by the Franciscan Fathers.

This "kusti" is untied and tied again five times a day. While untying, three strokes are made, repeating three times the word "Sakusté-Hariman." Thus the demon or evil force is broken down. In other words, these three slashes or whips are given to evil powers for breaking down their evil influences. This clearly indicates that "kusti" is the spiritual belt or girdle of the spiritual warrior, or soldier of God, to fight against the evil powers.

THE WEAPONS

What are the weapons with which this spiritual warrior fights against the evils? They are not the destructive weapons; namely, swords, rifles, guns. They are good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, together with the chanting of especially prepared prayers in the sacred Avesta language. How beneficial these weapons are, both to the warrior and his enemy! If such weapons are used in our warfare, what an amount of human carnage and bloodshed would be saved. If some such symbolic uniform and training be given to the youth, their minds would be diverted from brutal warfare and become concentrated on conquering evil

passions. Thus nobody would like to kill his own fellow-creatures. I do not mean that all should become Zoroastrians, but I wish that some such kinds of symbolic training might be made necessary for all young people.

THE SALVATION ARMY

Your Salvation Army works on principles quite similar to the Zoroastrians. The Salvation Army officers are always trained up as spiritual warriors to fight against the evils of men.

The following favorite hymns will show how they resemble Zoroastrian spiritual warriors:

Equip me for the war,
And teach my hands to fight;
My simple, upright heart prepare,
And guide my words aright;
Control my every thought,
My whole of sin remove;
Let all my words in Thee be wrought,
Let all be wrought in love.

Oh, arm me with the mind,
Meek Lamb, which was in Thee,
And let my knowing zeal be joined
With perfect charity;
With calm and tempered zeal,
Let me enforce Thy call,
And vindicate Thy gracious will,
Which offers life to all.

Oh, may I love like Thee!
In all Thy footsteps tread;
Thou hatest all iniquity,
But nothing Thou hast made.
Oh, may I learn the art
With meekness to reprove;
To hate the sin with all my heart,
But still the sinner love.

CONCLUSION

Thus we observe that gradually all human warfares must evolve into spiritual warfare. Instead of fighting against and killing our brethren for selfish purposes, how noble it is to fight against one's own evils and shortcomings. If each one be taught to fight against his own evils, the evils will soon disappear from the world. Then nobody would have to fight against the evils of others. Only in this way can warfare come to an end. May we all try to be soldiers of God rather than soldiers of satan, to kill our fellow-creatures.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE—A SERMON

By THEODORE STANFIELD

THE dark side of the outlook for international peace is Europe; the bright side is the God-given nature of man. Walter H. Page in 1913 wrote to Colonel House: "There's no future in Europe's vision—no long look ahead. They give all their thought to the immediate danger. The great powers are mere threats to one another, content to check, one the other! There can come no help to the progress of the world from this sort of action—no step forward."

Europe is always either at war, recovering from war, or preparing for war. At present, although it has not yet recovered from the recent war, it is already preparing for the next war. There are under arms in Europe today a million men more than there were in 1913. The relations to each other of the thirty-two States of Europe are governed by might, not by right. These nations are not even endeavoring to co-operate with each other to establish law and order among themselves, but are at present merely regrouping themselves under their war-breeding balance-of-power system. Many Europeans believe that, on account of their national rivalries, prejudices, and hatreds, peaceful co-operation is impossible. Impossible? As Edison well said, "The impossible is merely that which has not yet been done."

The sad fact remains that there is no hope that in the near future lasting peace will be established in Europe and in the rest of the world. But when we take the long look ahead, the prospect brightens, for we perceive that international peace is ultimately inevitable. We observe that science, which formerly was devoted to the service of human welfare, has now been dragged into the service of death; and that science is advancing so quickly that it will soon be possible to destroy life faster than to replace it. This peril makes international peace a pressing, a vital, necessity.

During the entire nineteenth century, with its Napoleonic wars and our Civil War, five million soldiers were killed. In the recent war of four years' duration ten million soldiers were killed, fifteen million were wounded, and tens of millions of civilian men, women, and children died of

starvation and misery. Formerly, war was conducted by armies consisting of a small percentage of the population of the belligerent nations. Now it has degenerated into a struggle between all the inhabitants of belligerent nations; and their every resource—human, industrial, and financial—is dedicated to war. In future there will be no civilian non-combatants. Indeed, the military effort may be directed toward the destruction of the civilians who supply the soldiers in the field as well as against the soldiers themselves. The next war threatens to exterminate most of the inhabitants of considerable sections of the earth's crust.

Will mankind abolish war before war abolishes mankind? There are those who think that mankind will annihilate itself and become extinct, as did those gigantic prehistoric monsters, that were as powerful as a locomotive and as big as a house. But who that has faith in God can accept this view? If we will but look closely at the nature of man, we will perceive that this very threat of extermination makes international peace inevitable. Already men and women sense what future wars will mean to their children and their children's children, and they are beginning to take serious and active interest in solving the problem of international peace. This is indeed a significant and hopeful sign. As you know, in former days only scholars and dreamers paid attention to this problem. It was a purely academic question. Nowadays it has become a practical one. Mankind is seeking for the practical steps to establish peace. That itself is a noteworthy step forward.

Notice, too, that the Permanent Court of International Justice, the League of Nations, The Hague Court of Arbitration, and international conferences are all of them attempts in the direction of a world governed not by brute force, as at present, but by justice. That is most encouraging, for as Sydney Smith said:

"Truth is the handmaid of justice,
Freedom is its child,
Peace is its companion,
Safety walks in its steps,

Victory follows in its train;
It is the brightest emanation from the gospel;
It is the attribute of God."

Will the problem be solved?

It may be that further wars, much more destructive of life than the recent one, are necessary to rouse the great mass of the earth's population to the danger of self-destruction. But who, surveying the marvelous accomplishments of man, a puny creature, scarcely six feet high, a mere speck in comparison with the earth's diameter of 42,000,000 feet, can believe that this conscious, reasoning, and moral being will not, before it is too late, perceive and avert this danger? Who can believe that mankind will commit suicide by war? Man's every instinct cries out against this view. Physically, man is ruled by his instincts of self-preservation and reproduction, which together form an instinct, common to the individual and to the mass, to maintain human life on earth. Spiritually, he is moved by his instinctive faith in the worth and higher purpose of life.

How have these powerful, these dominating, instincts of man reacted in the past to any menace to human existence on earth?

When, early in the nineteenth century, it appeared that the population of the world was increasing faster than the food supply, Robert Malthus pointed out that only by positive checks, such as starvation, disease, war, and misery in all its forms, or by preventive checks upon excessive births, could the world's population be kept within the bounds of the world's food supply. The world's population, which in 1810 was estimated to be six hundred and eighty-two million, has now risen to about one billion seven hundred million, and is increasing annually by about fifteen million. At this rate it would double in about sixty-five years; so that by the end of this century it would be three billion five hundred million. However, since the middle of the nineteenth century the birth rate in all civilized countries has steadily declined and is still falling. The population of France is already stationary, while England's population is expected to be stationary by about 1950.

The threat to human life of the possibility of an insufficient food supply has not been ignored by man's instincts. The

readjustment of population to food supply has not been left to the positive checks of starvation, disease, war, and misery, nor have the preventive checks upon excessive births been consciously and knowingly applied. Without our being aware of it, the life instinct has guarded the human race against the danger of too great a pressure of population upon food supply.

Scientific warfare is a much more serious threat. There is a limit to the rate at which population can increase, but science knows no limits to the forces it may discover and learn to control. The powers of destruction which the application of science to warfare will put into the hands of men are boundless. We can be confident that in the face of such a menace the life instinct will summon to its aid man's God-given conscience, reason, and faith, and thus prevent the human race from exterminating itself. That is why international peace is ultimately inevitable.

When will international peace be achieved? That depends chiefly upon the time when the great mass of men and women the world over are impelled by their divine instincts to take an active interest in the matter. It requires mass thinking and feeling to solve the problem. No one has as yet discovered just how international peace can be created; but as we perceive that it is inevitable, we know that the germ of the accomplishment must at this time be present in some human being somewhere. None of us can tell whether or not we ourselves are the custodian of that precious seed, which can only blossom by our own efforts for world peace.

What can we do about it? We need but picture to ourselves the horrors of future wars, or read such a book as Irvin Cobb's "The Next War," to rouse us to action. When aroused, each one of us will discover just what he can do. Mr. Bok found it by offering a prize for the best essay on world peace. As a result, over 300,000 people became sufficiently interested to ask for the conditions of the competition and over 22,000 studied the matter and submitted essays. Of course, not all of us are as rich as Mr. Bok, but each and every one of us in his own way can do his bit.

There is a story that the great and good Fenelon once said, "I love my family better than myself; I love my country better

than my family; but I love the human race better than my country."

We can express our love for the human race by developing within ourselves a sympathy for our fellow-beings which will enable us to understand and feel for those with whom we differ, and even those of whom we disapprove. We can teach our

children not to despise and hate the foreigner. We can teach them to cherish and love the good that is in every human being, irrespective of race, creed, or color, and to co-operate with them all for the uplift of man and the glory of God.

As the Bible says (Prov. 29:18), "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

THE GERMAN FOOD SITUATION

By C. E. HERRING

U. S. Commercial Attaché, Berlin, and Staff of the Department of Commerce

THE difficulties in the German food supply are threefold:

1. Inability of merchants or government to finance the usual margin of imports.

2. Breakdown of currency and consequently of distribution of domestic supplies from the farms to the cities.

3. Widespread unemployment, both in occupied and unoccupied Germany, and consequently inability of large masses of people to buy, even if supplies existed.

IMPORTS REQUIRED

This summer's harvest gave a yield of approximately nine and one-half million tons of bread grains, 30 million tons of potatoes, and 1,200,000 tons of sugar. The harvest a year ago gave about seven million tons of bread grains, 41 million tons of potatoes, and 1,450,000 tons of sugar. The total food values are, therefore, not far different in the two harvests, as the increase of bread grains is largely absorbed in the decrease of potatoes and sugar, although even this phase of the matter is further complicated by the considerable use of potatoes for industrial purposes.

The supplies of meats, fats, and dairy products in Germany are always less than her national needs, and have been particularly so since the war, owing to the constant shortage of imports of animal feed. During the year ending August 1, 1922, imports of fats were approximately 700,000 tons, including pork products, dairy products, vegetable oils, oil seeds, etc.

Taking last year as a basis, a rough approximation of the imports necessary

(provided normal distribution could be re-established) would indicate a minimum of at least 50,000,000 bushels of bread grains and the same quantity of fats and vegetable oils and seeds as last year—that is, about 700,000 tons. The volume of necessary imports is likely, however, to be increased by the factors arising out of the breakdown of internal distribution, referred to later.

Imports are still in progress by the exchange of diminishing exports, but supplies from this source are further limited by the tendency of exporters to hold their balances in stable currencies abroad or to devote them to purchase of raw materials which can upon manufacture be re-exported. This latter difficulty arises because to convert foreign currencies into German currency is to see them disappear in depreciation. Food merchants are unable to find foreign credits and the government cannot, without the consent of the various powers, establish commercial credits on its own behalf of a volume required to meet the situation.

BREAKDOWN IN INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

Normal distribution has practically broken down because of the failure of the old currency. The new rentenmark gives no immediate promise of solving the situation. It is difficult to induce a farmer to deliver his production of grain, potatoes, milk, meat, etc., so long as he cannot be paid in stable currency. It is, of course, quite impossible to compel bakers and other food distributors to receive paper currency which may have lost much of its

value before they can repurchase flour from the millers, potatoes from the wholesalers, and so on. One effect of currency collapse is that food dealers are compelled to demand very wide margins in order to protect themselves from the fluctuation in currency, and in consequence retail prices of foodstuffs have greatly risen and often exceed world price levels. These difficulties are further complicated by food riots in the cities, the plundering of food shops, and the seizure of food in shipment.

Thus far, government intervention has prevented the general closing down of bakeries and other food shops, and until very recently the government has also been able to compel food distributors to accept paper currency; but as the currency confusion and general dislocation increases, the number of shops is decreasing.

The breakdown results in such regulations as those in the cities, which provide for the maximum purchase at any one time of one pound of sugar, one-half pound of butter or margarin, and two pounds of flour; and even for these small amounts it is often necessary to stand several hours in line before police-guarded food shops. The population of Berlin recently has been receiving but 12 per cent of the fresh-milk supply of 1913; the proportion of butter is not much greater, and within the last two weeks a large portion of the meat shops have been closed for lack of supplies. The per capita meat consumption in the cities had declined from about 10 pounds per month in 1912 to a rate of 3 pounds per month before the recent final breakdown.

A further difficulty also arises from the fact that a large portion of the city populations usually purchase their potato supply before cold weather, but this year most of them have been unable to do so, partly because of the currency breakdown and partly because a vast majority of the wage and salary earners had no reserves and credit has long ceased to exist. Last year there was an orderly marketing of the potato crop, and currency and credit conditions permitted adequate provisioning of the city population before freezing weather made further transport impossible. This year the harvest was three or four weeks delayed on account of unfavorable weather, although food riots and threatened political disturbances caused premature digging

of potatoes in some localities. The lack of adequate credits and the currency chaos has thus far prevented the prompt shipment of normal potato supplies to the cities, while the inability to move more than a third or less of the normal supplies to occupied Germany, on account of transport paralysis and general political and economic confusion, is the crux of the famine prospects in the Ruhr. It is difficult to distribute potatoes in very cold weather, owing to the lack of insulated cars, and there is now little possibility of supplying the Ruhr and Rhineland population with the two-thirds or more of the winter potato supply they normally receive from middle and northern Germany; hence this food deficit must be compensated by imported grain or other foodstuffs.

The effect of the breakdown upon the agricultural classes has been to stimulate farm consumption of human food by the tendency to increase the feeding of bread grains, potatoes, sugar beets, skim milk, etc., to animals in spite of government efforts to prevent it. This is partly contributed to by the inability to import foreign cattle feed.

The ultimate effect of all the factors mentioned above is to make necessary an increase in the volume of imports unless currency is rehabilitated and normal distribution re-established.

REDUCED PURCHASING POWER

The purchasing power of millions of the industrial population has been so affected by the great unemployment that they can no longer provide a minimum ration for themselves and their families. It is estimated that on November 1 between two and three million were totally unemployed in unoccupied Germany and seven million on part-time work, of whom three million were on half time or less. This leaves about one and one-half to two million in unoccupied territory on full time. In the occupied area from 80 to 90 per cent of organized labor is still totally or partly unemployed.

The government doles for total or partial unemployment are entirely inadequate and the financial exhaustion of the German Government is so great that it is questionable how long even the present amounts can be continued. Thus, on October 18,

when serious bread riots were occurring in Berlin, a totally unemployed worker with a wife and two children received a maximum of 1,800,000,000 marks per week. These millions of paper marks meant in actual purchasing power the equivalent of 10½ pounds of bread, or two pounds of margarin, or 36 pounds of potatoes. A Berlin metal-worker on half time, also with a wife and two children, received that week, as wages and government allowance, 4,800,000,000 marks, or the equivalent of 2½ pounds of bread and half a pound of margarin daily for each member of the family.

GROUPS AFFECTED

The result of all these forces is bringing acute privation to about 20,000,000 of the

workers and professional groups in the cities and densely populated manufacturing areas. The agricultural population, those in smaller towns in the agricultural regions who can barter directly with the farmers, the well-to-do, and the more expensive restaurants in the cities are supplied from domestic produce. The casual tourist is often misled as to the true situation by the fact that meals can easily be secured at reasonable prices, according to American standards, ignoring the fact that the cost of two dinners on the tourist hotel circuit may easily represent more than the weekly wage of a skilled workman.

The children in the poorer quarters are showing grave signs of distinct undernourishment and generally the situation is one of rapid degeneration, unless remedied.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SCANDINAVIAN NATIONS

By A. LAUESGAARD, Secretary Danish Interparliamentary Group

(Translated from the Danish)

AFTER his visit to Denmark this summer during the Interparliamentary Conference, the editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* has desired to give his readers an impression of the co-operation between the Scandinavian countries—Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—which exists in so many domains. This desire is a natural consequence of the unique character of the co-operation which attracts general attention.

The homogeneity of the three Scandinavian countries as far as race, religion and language are concerned, although now three independent kingdoms, has been the natural basis of a political, cultural and economic co-operation. The co-operation is called forth and facilitated by unity not only in language, national character, religion, and sense of justice, but also in social and economic conditions.

GROWTH OF CO-OPERATION

After wars for centuries between the countries, Scandinavian co-operation has grown up and for many years the men

of science and practical life of the three countries have met together at conferences where not only questions of a professional character were discussed, but also questions of general interest to the countries such as the establishment of a common monetary unit and a postal union. Steps were likewise taken for the foundation of common Scandinavian organizations and of a homogeneous legislation for the countries. Particularly during the last decades this movement has greatly increased and the co-operation is now in many respects carried on on fixed lines which secure a good result. Unfortunately, space will not allow us to give an historical survey of this development. We shall only mention some of the common Scandinavian organizations which have proved their vitality, and give a general view of the numerous domains in which the Scandinavian countries have co-operated during the last few years, with the result that the experiences gained by one country have in a great measure been turned to account by the other countries.

THE SCANDINAVIAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Ever since the foundation of the Interparliamentary Union in 1888 the Scandinavian countries have with great interest taken part in its work and attended its meetings; this fact, however, did not bring about any intimate co-operation between the politicians in the three Scandinavian parliaments. Apart from the conferences of the Union there were no facilities for a regular exchange of opinion about international matters of the greatest importance, a fact which called forth coldness and reserve, at times even want of due appreciation or positive dislike. Leading statesmen such as Mr. N. Neergaard, the present prime minister of Denmark; Mr. Frederik Bajer, the pacifist; Mr. Bernhard Hanssen, member of the Norwegian parliament, and Carl Carlson Bonde, Swedish baron, to mention only a few, therefore joined together and founded the Scandinavian Interparliamentary Union, the object of which is co-operation between the Scandinavian interparliamentary groups, partly for the promotion of mutual interests and a good understanding between the Scandinavian nations, partly for the preparation of a joint action in international questions at the international peace conferences. The idea proved a great success, nearly all the members of the parliaments of the three countries joined the Union, and in 1907 the first Scandinavian interparliamentary meeting of delegates was held in Copenhagen; since that year annual meetings have been held almost uninterruptedly in the capitals of the three countries alternately. The committee is composed of representatives of all the countries, but the affairs are managed by the country where the annual meeting is held. In this way an organization has been established which is greatly instrumental in producing mutual good feeling and understanding, which imparts information about the social and political conditions of the countries and calls forth a craving for co-operation wherever it is possible and desirable. The meetings being open to the public, and the press having shown the debates great interest, the Union has been of great importance also beyond the circle of the members of Parliament. The

establishment of such a co-operation immediately after the dissolution of the union between Norway and Sweden in 1905 is very important; in all three countries the view prevailed that it was now necessary to re-establish the Scandinavian co-operation and to do so on a broader and firmer basis than before.

First of all, the subjects to be discussed at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union have been debated by way of preparation by the Union; further a number of subjects, particularly in connection with the law of nations, have been discussed with a view to making the said subjects easily accessible to all the members of the Union. Among such subjects may be mentioned the decisions made at the second Hague Conference, the question of the desirability of identical arbitration treaties between the Scandinavian countries and in this connection the establishment of a special court of arbitration for these countries, the neutralizing of straits and canals between seas, the reduction of armaments, the question of neutrality, the preparation of common Scandinavian legislation in various domains, questions of a social political and a commercial political nature, etc. Of great importance was also the continuance of the activity of the Union during the Great War, which did much to create a firm will to preserve neutrality, and which also afforded an opportunity of discussing a joint action after the war in the treatment of the great future question of the international legal system.

Finally, it should be mentioned that since 1918 the Scandinavian interparliamentary co-operation has been reduced to more settled forms by a change in the secretariat, so that the three special secretariats form a secretariat general, for the co-operation of which fixed rules have been given. Among the tasks of the secretariat general is the publication of a common Scandinavian interparliamentary year-book and of periodical communications from the groups containing a continuous account of the legislation of the individual countries and of the most important governmental measures which are of particular interest to the Scandinavian countries.

It should perhaps be added that the Scandinavian interparliamentary groups

were the only ones within the Union which during the Great War kept up regular meetings, thus greatly facilitating a continuation of the activity of the Union after the war; likewise an extraordinary support was given to the Union during the war in order to enable the secretariat general to continue its activity.

SCANDINAVIAN CO-OPERATION DURING THE GREAT WAR

The Scandinavian co-operation was naturally greatly influenced by events during the war. Important meetings of the Scandinavian kings and ministers took place in the years 1914-18, which gave rise to rather an intimate co-operation between the administrative authorities with conferences and debates of mutual benefit. The industrial organizations and private enterprises within trade and industry were implicated in the co-operation, and the necessity of this was increased by the distress which gradually arose in the three countries. The force of circumstances rendered it necessary to find ways and means which had hitherto been disregarded, endeavors in this respect being supported by the common language and common civilization. Such means were found within the domains of industry and the supply of food and what was wanted by one country was promptly placed at its disposal by the others. Even in the department of science an intimate co-operation was established, which to some extent warded off the bad effects of the interruption of connection with the great centers of culture.

This co-operation was decidedly of a practical character and was not borne up by a sudden outburst of feeling, created as it was by mature deliberation and with the understanding that the Scandinavian countries have much to give each other with no question of rendering services, but so that it becomes advantageous to each country. The co-operation was based on the experience of its utility to practical life and to mutual security, and by virtue of this a strong fellow-feeling grew up. A detailed account of this work would be too lengthy; it should only be mentioned that beside the great exchange of goods an exchange took place also in the domains of science and art; there was further

an exchange of technical remedies, organizing modes of procedure, etc., in short, in nearly all departments of life. By way of example may be mentioned the co-operation between the universities of the countries, the theaters, the various departments of science, agriculture, federations of employers and workmen, educational institutions, sport, etc., the press, a Scandinavian Press Union having been established, the schools, through Scandinavian school conferences, philanthropy, and particularly legislation. The fact that the Scandinavian countries gradually get the same statutory provisions in civil law and real law will greatly increase the understanding of the Scandinavian unity, which will be of importance in the future. It is true of the closely related Scandinavian nations as in any large family that friction may occur, but this will always be of a transient nature, because the three peoples, in spite of their independence, will always feel a great unity and through intimate and beneficial co-operation will always appreciate each other's good qualities.

THE SOCIETY OF "NORDEN"

The co-operation outlined above naturally led to the establishment of a central organ of all the Scandinavian endeavors with a view to securing a homogeneous system, avoiding a waste of energy in co-operation, and creating new initiative for the benefit of a concentrated and productive work. This idea was realized in 1918 through the foundation of corresponding but independent Scandinavian societies in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden started on a homogeneous basis for the purpose of becoming a central organ of all the Scandinavian endeavors. The societies publish a common year-book; the one last published (for 1922) gives a strong impression of the beneficial co-operation created and kept alive through the intervention of the societies.

Mention should also be made of the holiday course for young students held in summer by the Danish society at the historic castle of Hindsgavl in the island of Funen. This castle is, through its position in a splendid scenery and its beautiful rooms, an ideal meeting place for the young Scandinavian students, who here get an opportunity of hearing lectures

given by eminent men of science on literature, history, modern plastic art, the Danish schools for young peasants, trade and navigation, the labor question, social legislation, etc. Moreover, eminent artists make their appearance, and excursions are arranged to places of interest in the beautiful neighborhood, so it is no wonder that numerous and strong friendships should be made at these meetings between the young students from the three countries, friendships which in future will no doubt be of great importance to the mutual understanding in the three Scandinavian countries.

In connection with this course a similar one was held in the same year in Sweden for Danish and Norwegian teachers, and at the Norwegian Agricultural College a course was held for Danish and Swedish dairy farmers. In addition to these special courses a "study week" was held at Helsingborg (Sweden) under the patronage of the Swedish crown prince for the purpose of increasing the knowledge of culture in the three Scandinavian countries generally and of Danish and Swedish civilization in past and present ages on both sides of the sound.

Through the medium of the societies there has further been an exchange of university professors between the Scandinavian countries as well as of pupils of secondary schools and of teachers and pupils of schools for young peasants. It will thus be seen that an important cultural activity, which undoubtedly will leave its mark in the future, is displayed by the societies. Likewise arrangements are made for trips of school children and organizations of workmen, numerous lectures, the publication of instructive pamphlets, etc.

The societies have now carried on their activity between four and five years, and the results attained leave no doubt that there is a vehement desire among these closely related peoples to communicate with each other, and in practical as well as cultural domains to seek support and information from each other.

SCANDINAVIAN CO-OPERATION IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The foregoing is by no means an exhaustive account of the Scandinavian co-operation. Numerous associations have

been in existence for many years and new ones are continually being formed. Altogether we get the impression of three vigorous nations, which, while maintaining their own independence, try to obtain cultural development by co-operating with peoples of a kindred race, and thus create a unity and a wealth which will enable them to hold their own before larger nations.

It would be too tedious to enter into details, but a simple enumeration of some of the meetings and conferences held in the year 1922 will convey a vivid impression of the numerous departments in which the nations co-operate. Thus the twelfth conference of Scandinavian lawyers was held at Christiania, where about 600 members were present; among the questions discussed was a codification of the civil law of the Scandinavian countries. The Scandinavian Administrative Union held its second meeting at Stockholm, attended by upwards of 400 civil servants, and discussed questions about economy in the administration, the administration versus committees, about the libraries of the administrative authorities, etc. Relating to question of legislation, meetings have been held about family law, maritime law, insurance, right of proprietorship in industry, and aerial navigation. Relating to traffic questions, conferences were held about the postal service, the telegraph service, air traffic, tourist traffic, motor-car traffic, etc. Of great interest was an attempt made by the newspapers, the *Svenska Dagbladet*, the Norwegian *Aftenposten*, and the Danish *Berlingske Tidende*, to arrange Scandinavian days, mutual tourist visits to the three capitals with inspection of the local sights, excursions, and Scandinavian festivals. Each visit was attended by 400 to 500 people, and the whole of this triangular trip was a great success. It is also worth mentioning that quite a number of organizations of workmen and employers held meetings, at which questions concerning wages and questions of a technical nature were discussed. In the field of science conferences were held by archæologists, geologists, mathematicians, physicists, physicians, teachers, and undergraduates; in the domain of art there is likewise a constant and lively exchange. Further Scandinavian missionary meetings, boy-

scout meetings, meetings of female nurses, of housewives, allotment owners and unions of social-democratic young men and women were held. This certainly conveys a vivid impression of the comprehensiveness of the Scandinavian co-operation. The importance of it is perhaps best appreciated by looking at the fact that in spite of linguistic difficulties these meetings have of late years been numerous attended by people from Finland and Iceland.

The co-operation between the kindred nations of Scandinavia is the outcome of a sound feeling of consanguinity, an ideal

endeavor to form a connection among people who have the same interests and the same feelings, the natural outcome of the need felt by small nations to stand side by side over against the forces at work in the great world. This feeling of consanguinity manifested itself in the domain of economy, when the countries mutually supported each other to the best of their ability during the great war, and although this support is not continued to the same extent in time of peace, the uninterrupted cultural co-operation will always render it possible to resume the same, should the necessity arise.

HISTORY v. PATRIOTISM

By LUCIA PYM

THE periodical expose of British propaganda in the United States took place recently in New York City, where, under the ægis of Mayor Hylan, Commissioner of Accounts David Hirshfeld issued a report on the investigation of pro-British text-books of history in use in the public schools of the city.

THE INVESTIGATION

According to Mr. Hirshfeld, complaints were received by Mayor Hylan, from persons unnamed, concerning the following histories:

An American History. Revised 1920. By David Saville Muzzey, Ph. D. Barnard College, Columbia University.

A History of the United States for Schools. Revised 1919. By Andrew C. McLaughlin, A. M., LL. B., Head of Department of History, Chicago University, and Claud H. Van Tyne, Ph. D., Head of Department of History, Michigan University.

A History of the American People. Revised 1918. By Willis Mason West, some time Professor of History and Head of the Department of History, University of Minnesota.

Our United States. Revised 1923. By William Backus Guiteau, Ph. D., Director of Schools, Toledo, Ohio.

Burke's Speech on Conciliation. Edited 1919. By C. H. Ward, Taft School, Watertown, Connecticut.

A Short American History by Grades (Parts I and II). Revised 1920 and 1922. And American History by Grammar Grades. By Everett Barnes, A. M.

The investigation was conducted by Mr. Hirshfeld himself, who not only read the text-books in question, but, to use his own words, "did extensive research work"; and, further, held five public hearings, to which all interested were invited. At these hearings some twenty-two witnesses, prominent among whom were Mr. Julius Hyman, representing the National Security League and the Jewish Welfare Board; Mr. John Jerome Rooney, chairman of District School Board No. 15, Manhattan; Mr. William Pickens, Field Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People; Mrs. Marie Stuart, representing National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and Mr. Thomas P. Tuite, Executive Secretary of the Star Spangled Banner Association, appeared for what may be termed the prosecution, and two for the defense. No recognized authorities on historical questions were present.

The standpoint from which the investigation was conducted may best be explained in Mr. Hirshfeld's own words:

I do not for one moment contend that everything contained in our American history text-books prior to the pro-English propaganda in America was absolutely true.

However, those American histories were written from the American point of view, intended to awaken love for everything American, to instill patriotism in the breasts of the young, and to excite their admiration for the heroic men and splendid women who laid the foundation of our independence and made this nation a fact. If any of the old-time history books contained any inaccuracies of particular events, they erred in favor of Americanism, and I, for one, would rather have it that way.

MR. HIRSHFELD'S AMERICANISM

Bearing in mind the fact that Americanism, as implied both in Mr. Hirshfeld's own words and by his critical analysis of the text-books under investigation, cannot exist, as a patriotic institution, divorced from active hatred of the British Empire and all its works, the report assumes a certain seriousness. After careful examination of the accused histories, part quotations from which are reproduced in the report, together with Mr. Hirshfeld's expert comments on their veracity, the investigator comes to the categorically stated conclusion that there are certain recognized influences which have been working long and powerfully to suborn our college and university professors in order that our national history may be rewritten, the value of our national characters underestimated, and the fixed principles upon which our nation was built undermined. Prominent among these influences, which are working for a reincorporation of the United States into the British Empire, the New York Commissioner of Accounts cites, of course, the "international money and banking power," the Rhodes Scholarship Alumni; Elihu Root, chairman of the Carnegie Council; the various Carnegie endowments, such as the Carnegie libraries, the Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Division of Intercourse and Education, the Aid for Vocational Education, the Association for International Conciliation, and the Carnegie Pension Fund for American professors and judges. With these pernicious and subterranean powers are also cited the Sons of St. George, the English-speaking Union, the Sulgrave Institute, the Pilgrim Society, the Church Peace Union, the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through

out the World, the American Association for International Co-operation, the Magna Charta Day Association, the National Security League, and especially, either in connection with one or the other of the above societies, George Haven Putnam, John W. Davis, George W. Wickersham, Prof. Matthew Page Andrews, President Nicholas Murray Butler, President William Allen Nielson of Smith College, Frank A. Vanderlip, George E. Roberts, and so on.

But this organized effort to pervert the young American mind by causing it to recognize the connection between English and American institutions, such as the Magna Charter and the civil liberties guaranteed by the American Constitution, English common law and the basis of American law, is not an isolated and unsupported movement. It is not enough to attempt to mitigate the historical and actual turpitude of the English nation as a whole by depriving an individual subject of a deep and constant desire to torture, oppress, and enslave the heroic and freedom-loving American colonist (descendant of a hitherto unknown but noble race, born, perhaps, like Aphrodite, from the sea). This whole scheme is, states Mr. Hirshfeld, part of a definite and open movement to "tie up for good the United States with England," which is being made by the "international bankers," who have "succeeded in gaining control of certain American ambassadors, United States Senators, congressmen, governors, legislators, judges, political leaders in both major parties, and others high in the councils of the nation," and now no longer hide their true purpose of "bringing about a British-American union, to be controlled by England." In the mind of Mr. Hirshfeld, these gentlemen's advocacy of the League of Nations, the Four Power Treaty, and the World Court has no other meaning than "their willingness to subordinate American interests to those of England."

A DISTURBING SITUATION

The situation thus vividly presented by the commissioner of accounts contains elements of perturbation. In view of the fact that no expert historian was called upon to refute the actual truth of the various texts examined, it may be taken,

on Mr. Hirshfeld's own statement, that it is less a matter of absolute historical accuracy that concerns Mayor Hylan and other protestants than the coincidence of this accuracy with the type of patriotism so aptly defined by George Bernard Shaw as a man's belief in the moral, spiritual, and material supremacy of his country because he was born there. Americanism, according to Mr. Hirshfeld and his patriotic associates, primarily consists of hatred and distrust of Great Britain, coupled with an unquestioning belief in "the people." Any alleviation of this feeling strikes at the very roots of American independence and American nationality.

Meanwhile the most renowned and respected citizens in the country, working through the various educational institutions, as well as through the better-known organizations devoted to the cause of international understanding and friendship, are bent upon destroying the independence of their native land and placing her once more, as a vassal, under the spurred heel of oppressing Britain. The plot reaches far. At any moment the patriotic citizens of New York may awaken to find that the "international banking interests" have hoisted the Union Jack over the Woolworth Building, and the British minions have seized Tammany Hall and thrown Messrs. Hylan and Hirshfeld into the deepest dungeon of the Tombs; what

time, perverted and misled, the public-school children chant "Rule Britannia," under the guidance of their bribed and subservient teachers.

Commander Owsley, of the American Legion, declares that we "must keep on the alert and not let this protest, that has been so well started, dwindle away into nothing for want of the real facts about the hostile influences at work."

SOME PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

Perusal of Mr. Hirshfeld's report and its conclusions gives rise to the question, Is watchful waiting sufficient at this juncture to meet the situation adequately? More drastic measures, such as the exclusion from public office of all persons of British descent, however remote; a complete revision of history text-books by a commission composed of Mr. Hirshfeld, Mr. Jeremiah O'Leary, and similar patriotic Americans; revision of the staffs of all educational institutions throughout the country by a commission appointed by Mayor Hylan; suppression of the *New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and various weeklies, all other publications to be censored by an Emergency Board headed by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, and immediate closing of all banks and monetary institutions, including the United States Treasury, appear to be called for.

FORBEARANCE

By RALPH WALDO EMERSON

HAST thou named all the birds without a gun?
 Loved the wood-rose and left it on its stalk?
 At rich men's tables eaten bread and pulse?
 Unarmed, faced danger with a heart of trust?

And loved so well a high behavior,
 In man or maid, that thou from speech refrained,
 Nobility more nobly to repay?
 O, be my friend, and teach me to be thine!

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The following extracts from President Coolidge's address to Congress, delivered on the occasion of its reassembly, December 9, deal with the international relations of the United States:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

For us peace reigns everywhere. We desire to perpetuate it always by granting full justice to others and requiring of others full justice to ourselves.

Our country has one cardinal principle to maintain in its foreign policy. It is an American principle. It must be an American policy. We attend to our own affairs, conserve our own strength, and protect the interests of our own citizens; but we recognize thoroughly our obligation to help others, reserving to the decision of our own judgment the time, the place, and the method. We realize the common bond of humanity. We know the inescapable law of service.

Our country has definitely refused to adopt and ratify the Covenant of the League of Nations. We have not felt warranted in assuming the responsibilities which its members have assumed. I am not proposing any change in this policy, neither is the Senate. The incident, so far as we are concerned, is closed.

The League exists as a foreign agency. We hope it will be helpful. But the United States sees no reason to limit its own freedom and independence of action by joining it. We shall do well to recognize this basic fact in all national affairs and govern ourselves accordingly.

WORLD COURT

Our foreign policy has always been guided by two principles. The one is the avoidance of permanent political alliances which would sacrifice our proper independence. The other is the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations. By example and by treaty we have advocated arbitration. For nearly twenty-five years we have been a member of The Hague Tribunal, and have long sought the creation of a permanent World Court of

Justice. I am in full accord with both of these policies. I favor the establishment of such a court, intended to include the whole world. That is, and has long been, an American policy.

Pending before the Senate is a proposal that this government give its support to the permanent Court of International Justice, which is a new and somewhat different plan. This is not a partisan question. It should not assume an artificial importance. The court is merely a convenient instrument of adjustment to which we could go, but to which we could not be brought. It should be discussed with entire candor, not by a political but by a judicial method, without pressure and without prejudice. Partisanship has no place in our foreign relations.

As I wish to see a court established, and as the proposal presents the only practical plan on which many nations have ever agreed, though it may not meet every desire, I therefore commend it to the favorable consideration of the Senate, with the proposed reservations clearly indicating our refusal to adhere to the League of Nations.

RUSSIA

Our diplomatic relations, lately so largely interrupted, are now being resumed, but Russia presents notable difficulties. We have every desire to see that great people, who are our traditional friends, restored to their position among the nations of the earth. We have relieved their pitiable destitution with an enormous charity. Our government offers no objection to the carrying on of commerce by our citizens with the people of Russia.

Our government does not propose, however, to enter into relations with another régime which refuses to recognize the sanctity of international obligations. I do not propose to barter away, for the privilege of trade, any of the cherished rights of humanity. I do not propose to make merchandise of any American principles. These rights and principles must go wherever the sanctions of our government go.

But while the favor of America is not for sale, I am willing to make very large concessions for the purpose of rescuing the people

of Russia. Already encouraging evidences of returning to the ancient ways of society can be detected. But more are needed. Whenever there appears any disposition to compensate our citizens who were despoiled, and to recognize that debt contracted with our government, not by the Czar, but by the newly formed Republic of Russia; whenever the active spirit of enmity to our institutions is abated; whenever there appear works meet for repentance, our country ought to be the first to go to the economic and moral rescue of Russia. We have every desire to help and no desire to injure. We hope the time is near at hand when we can act.

DEBTS

The current debt and interest due from foreign governments, exclusive of the British debt of \$4,600,000,000, is about \$7,200,000,000. I do not favor the cancellation of this debt, but I see no objection to adjusting it in accordance with the principle adopted for the British debt. Our country would not wish to assume the rôle of an oppressive creditor, but would maintain the principle that financial obligations between nations are likewise moral obligations which international faith and honor require should be discharged.

Our government has a liquidated claim against Germany for the expense of the army of occupation of over \$255,000,000. Besides this, the Mixed Claims Commission have before them about 12,500 claims of American citizens, aggregating about \$1,225,000,000. These claims have already been reduced by a recent decision, but there are valid claims reaching well toward \$500,000,000. Our thousands of citizens with credits due them of hundreds of millions of dollars have no redress save in the action of our government. These are very substantial interests, which it is the duty of our government to protect as best it can. That course I propose to pursue.

It is for these reasons that we have a direct interest in the economic recovery of Europe. They are enlarged by our desire for the stability of civilization and the welfare of humanity. That we are making sacrifices to that end none can deny. Our deferred interest alone amounts to a million dollars every day. But recently we offered to aid with our advice and counsel. We have reiterated our desire to see France paid and Germany revived. We have proposed disarmament. We have earnestly sought to

compose differences and restore peace. We shall persevere in well-doing, not by force, but by reason.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The foreign service of our government needs to be reorganized and improved.

RECOGNITION OF SOVIET RUSSIA

NOTE.—Following President Coolidge's reference to the question of recognition of the Soviet Government in Russia in his message to Congress; the Soviet Commissary for Foreign Affairs, George Chicherin, addressed, on December 16, a note to the Government of the United States, making a bid for negotiations on the matter. On December 18 Secretary Hughes caused a statement to be transmitted to Moscow, through the American Legation in Riga, enunciating the position of the United States Government on the subject. On December 19 Chicherin issued a statement dealing with the Hughes pronouncement. On the same day, Senator Ladd, of North Dakota, introduced a resolution in the United States Senate attacking the position of the State Department. Simultaneously with the Ladd resolution the State Department made public an intercepted set of instructions from Moscow to the Communist groups in the United States. Following is the text of these documents:

1. CHICHERIN'S NOTE

It has been the constant endeavor of the Soviet Government to bring about a resumption of friendly relations with the United States of America based upon mutual trust. With this in view, it has repeatedly announced its readiness to enter into negotiations with the American Government and to remove all misunderstandings and differences between the two countries.

After reading your message to Congress, the Soviet Government, sincerely anxious to establish at last firm friendship with the people and Government of the United States, informs you of its complete readiness to discuss with your government all problems mentioned in your message, these negotiations being based on the principle of mutual non-intervention in internal affairs. The Soviet Government will continue wholeheartedly to adhere to this principle, expecting the same attitude from the American Government.

As to the question of claims, mentioned in your message, the Soviet Government is fully prepared to negotiate with a view toward its satisfactory settlement on the assumption

that the principle of reciprocity will be recognized all around. On its part, the Soviet Government is ready to do all in its power, so far as the dignity and interests of its country permit, to bring about the desired end, of renewal of friendship with the United States of America.

CHICHERIN,
*People's Commissary for
Foreign Affairs.*

2. STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HUGHES

There would seem to be at this time no reason for negotiations. The American Government, as the President said in his message to the Congress, is not proposing to barter away its principles.

If the Soviet authorities are ready to restore the confiscated property of American citizens or make effective compensation, they can do so. If the Soviet authorities are ready to repeal their decree repudiating Russia's obligations to this country and recognize them, they can do so. It requires no conference or negotiations to accomplish these results, which can and should be achieved at Moscow as evidence of good faith.

The American Government has not incurred liabilities to Russia or repudiated obligations. Most serious is the continued propaganda to overthrow the institutions of this country. This government can enter into no negotiations until these efforts directed from Moscow are abandoned.

3. CHICHERIN'S COMMENT

For the peace of the world, it would be of great advantage if the United States came to an agreement with us—a great step toward the settlement of world conditions; but Mr. Charles Hughes is still using his influence against such a result.

His statement said that Russia must give back all the confiscated property, satisfy claims, and pay debts before he would even negotiate. We, then, on our part, might ask that all our counter-claims, all our demands for compensation because of American intervention, should be settled before there were any negotiations.

He said also that negotiations are impossible until Moscow ceases to be the center of propaganda. New York is also the center of propaganda. Many of the revolutionary parties have executives there. We have

many times declared that no support was given by our government to the revolutionary parties there. At the time Martens was expelled no evidence of such support was given.

So we declare that now and in the future we do not and will not give support from our government to the revolutionary parties in America; that our principle is non-interference with the internal affairs of another country.

We know that the section of public opinion in America which understands the advances of relations with us is gradually growing, and we continue to fix our hopes on a change in public opinion in America.

4. SENATOR LADD'S RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate, for its information, all papers, documents, or other matter in his possession pertaining to the indebtedness of the Government of Russia to the Government of the United States; the names of all persons, companies, and corporations, if any, owing allegiance to the United States, to whom the Russian Government is indebted, and the terms and circumstances under which the indebtedness was contracted.

The amounts of indebtedness to each person, company, and corporation heretofore mentioned, together with the rules, regulations, and requirements formulated by the Department of State, if any, which are made a condition precedent to the exercise of the incontrovertible right of every American citizen to exchange his products for the products of the citizens or subjects of a friendly nation, with whom we are not now and have never been at war; and information as to whether there exists at this time, or has existed since the armistice, any secret agreements, confidential understandings, diplomatic arrangements, or verbal compacts between officials of the Department of State and the officials of any foreign governments, with the view of prohibiting, restricting, or retarding trade between the peoples of these countries and the people of Russia; also all documentary evidence, if any, in the possession of the Department of State as to the activities of the Russian Government in spreading propaganda during the past three years, detrimental to our institutions and encouraging the overthrow of our form of government.

5. STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The Department of State made public today the text of instructions given by Zinoviev, President of the Communist International and President of the Petrograd Soviet, to the Workers' Party of America, the Communist organization in the United States.

The Department of Justice has assured the Department of State of the authenticity of these instructions. The Communist International, with headquarters at Moscow, is the organ of the Communist Party for international propaganda. The Soviet régime in Russia is the organ of the Communist Party for the governing of Russia. As Steklov, member of the Russian Communist Party and of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and editor of the *Izvestia*, official organ of the Soviet régime, has stated in his official paper :

The close organic and spiritual connection between the Soviet Republic and the Communist International cannot be doubted. And even if this connection had not been admitted many times by both sides, it would be clear to everybody as an established fact. . . . This connection is not merely of a spiritual, but also of a material and palpable character. . . . The mutual solidarity of the Soviet republics and the Communist International is an accomplished fact. In the same degree as the existence and the stability of Soviet Russia are of importance to the Third International, the strengthening and the development of the Communist International is of great moment to Soviet Russia.

Zinoviev's instructions are as follows :

The Communist International notes with great satisfaction that the work of the W. P. A. (Workers' Party of America) for the past year has been expressed in a satisfactory, broad, and real revolutionary work. Particularly pleasing to us is the fact that all dissensions existing up to the present time in the ranks of the party have finally been liquidated and we hope that the W. P. A., the advance guard of the revolutionary proletariat of the United States of North America, will now more successfully conduct its revolutionary work among the millions of American proletarians.

For more intensive revolutionary work we suggest that following instructions be adhered to :

1. All the activity of the party must at the present time be directed among the workers of the large industries, such as the railroad workers, miners, weavers, steel workers, and similar workers engaged in the principal industries of the United States.

2. Among these workers in the factories, mills, plantations, clubs, &c., there must be organized units of ten. The head of this unit

of ten must, in so far as possible, be an old trusted member of the party, who must once a week, together with his ten, study the Communist program and other revolutionary literature.

3. These units of ten must be organized by occupation and nationality.

4. The head of the unit must know intimately each individual member of his ten, his character, habits, the degree of his revolutionism, &c., and report everything direct to the central committee of the party.

5. Each of these units of ten must have had their own fighting unit of not less than three men, who are appointed by the leader of the unit with the approval of the central committee of the party. The members of the fighting unit, in addition to all other matters, must once a week be given instructions in shooting and receive some instruction in pioneer work (sapper work).

6. All the unit leaders of each district must meet once every two months to discuss the progress of their work and their plans for further activities in the presence of a member of the central committee of the party.

We are firmly convinced that work in the direction designated by us will give enormous results in the sense of preparing thousands of new propagandists, future leaders of the military forces of the party and faithful fighters during the social revolution.

With reference to the organization by the W. P. A. of the Federated Farmer-Labor Party, the Communist International expresses its complete satisfaction and its approval to the central committee of the party for its boldness and tact in putting this idea into effect. We hope that the party will step by step conquer (embrace) the proletarian forces of America, and in the not-distant future raise the red flag over the White House.

THE ALLIED NOTES TO GERMANY

The two Allied notes to Germany regarding the ex-Crown Prince and the resumption of military control are as follows :

The Allied governments take cognizance of the declaration made by the German Government, that it has no intention whatever of disputing the obligations imposed upon it by the Treaty of Versailles. They must, however, point out that the German Government notwithstanding persists in bringing forward reasons of fact for continuing to evade in practice the exercise of military control. It is true that the German Government in this instance does not base its case on the participation of French and Belgian officers in the control operations in order to escape them ; but it maintains that the resumption of the control would tend to aggravate the internal difficulties and would inevitably give rise to incidents.

The conference must first of all inform the German Government that the control operations have been impeded for many months past. It is unnecessary to dwell on the gravity of such a situation. The conference can still less permit it to be prolonged, as it would be entitled to question whether the obstacles thus raised to the fulfilment of the work of the Commission of Military Control have not precisely favored the development of disorderly elements, and thus contributed to the growth of the difficulties of which the German Government complains.

NO PRETEXT FOR INCIDENTS

The Allied governments cannot, moreover, admit that the resumption of control operations would be, in themselves, a fresh source of difficulties or would give rise to incidents. Not only do the major part of these operations, by reason of their character and carried out under these conditions, furnish no pretext for such incidents, but the Control Commission (and the German Government is not unaware of the fact) has always acted in the interest of the accomplishment of its mission, so as to facilitate the work of the German authorities (and its tact in this connection may be relied on).

In these conditions the Allied governments consider it necessary to uphold the right, which belongs to the Commission of Military Control as well as to the Air Control Committee, to carry out fully control operations. The Commission of Control and the Air Control Committee are, moreover, in a position to estimate the operations, the carrying out of which appears for the time being feasible and necessary.

The Allied governments remind the German Government that whenever the two commissions of control and observation may, according to rules already laid down and agreed, notify the German authorities that they intend making a visit, the German Government is compelled, according to article 206 of the Versailles Treaty, to afford the Interallied Commission of Control and their members all the facilities necessary for the carrying out of their work. Consequently the Allied governments have decided that the operations of military control and aircraft inspection should be resumed without delay, under conditions which will be notified to the German Government by the presidents of the respective commissions.

In the event of these operations being opposed either by the German authorities or by German subjects, the Allied governments reserve the right to take such measures as may appear proper for the carrying out of the treaty.

(Signed)

POINCARÉ.

THE EX-CROWN PRINCE

The note of the Conference of Ambassadors on the subject of the ex-Crown Prince of Germany is as follows:

In a note addressed by Herr von Hösch on November 10, 1923, the German Government notified the conference, in reply to the question raised on November 9, that it had authorized its representative in Holland to give the ex-Crown Prince a passport to return to Germany. The Allied governments take cognizance of this statement.

They also take cognizance of the letter addressed on November 18, 1918, by the German chargé d'affaires to the Director of Political Affairs at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs for communication to the French premier (a copy of which is annexed to this letter). The Allied governments take note of the declarations contained in the above-mentioned document, both as regards the renunciation by the ex-Crown Prince of his rights to the crown of Prussia and the imperial crown and the formal undertaking by the German Government not to authorize the return to Germany of the ex-Emperor.

They point out that the German Government, by communicating to the French Government the text of the renunciation of the Crown Prince, has thus shown that it considers the renunciation to be valid, and that it does not admit of its annulment. At the same time the Allied governments point out that the German Government, which in order to evade the obligations of the Peace Treaty in the matter of military control, cited the difficulties of the internal situation in Germany and the state of unrest there, has, in full knowledge of the facts, authorized the return of the ex-Crown Prince, whose presence in German territory they cannot fail to know is likely to provoke serious complications for Germany, both at home and abroad.

In these circumstances the Allied powers feel obliged to inform the German Government that they hold it fully responsible for the consequences which may result from its having granted permission to the ex-Crown Prince to reside in Germany. They also feel it necessary to warn the German Government of the danger which might result from this situation, and which might compel the Allied powers to consult together upon the necessary measures to deal with the situation.

(Signed)

POINCARÉ.

THE HOHENZOLLERN RENUNCIATION

In the letter of Herr von Hösch, referred to above, it is stated:

First, the ex-Crown Prince renounced by an act, which he signed on December 1, 1918, his rights to the Crown of Prussia and the imperial crown. The substance of the document in question is as follows [according to the translation from the German text]:

"By this document I expressly and finally renounce all rights to the Prussian and im-

perial crowns to which I might be entitled either by virtue of the renunciation of the throne by His Majesty the Emperor and King or by virtue of any other title. Signed by my hand at Wieringen on December 1, 1918.

"WILHELM."

Secondly, the ex-Kaiser has made no request to the German Government in which he expressed his desire to return to Germany.

Thirdly, the German Government can only once more formally confirm its declaration, which I made known to you the day before yesterday, that it will not permit the return of the ex-Kaiser to Germany.

SENATOR BORAH'S RESOLUTION

DECEMBER 20, Senator Borah introduced in the Senate what is known as Senate Resolution 101.

The resolution was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas war is the greatest existing menace to society, and has become so expensive and destructive that it not only causes the stupendous burdens of taxation now afflicting our people but threatens to engulf and destroy civilization; and

Whereas civilization has been marked in its upward trend out of barbarism into its present condition by the development of law and courts to supplant methods of violence and force; and

Whereas the genius of civilization has discovered but two methods of compelling the settlement of human disputes, namely, law and war, and therefore, in any plan for the compulsory settlement of international controversies, we must choose between war on the one hand and the process of law on the other; and

Whereas war between nations has always been and still is a lawful institution, so that any nation may, with or without cause, declare war against any other nation and be strictly within its legal rights; and

Whereas revolutionary war or wars of liberation are illegal and criminal, to wit, high treason, whereas under existing international law wars of aggression between nations are perfectly lawful; and

Whereas the overwhelming moral sentiment of civilized people everywhere is against the cruel and destructive institution of war; and

Whereas all alliances, leagues, or plans which rely upon force as the ultimate power for the enforcement of peace carry the seeds

either of their own destruction or of military dominancy to the utter subversion of liberty and justice; and

Whereas we must recognize the fact that resolutions or treaties outlawing certain methods of killing will not be effective so long as war itself remains lawful; and that in international relations we must have, not rules and regulations of war, but organic laws against war; and

Whereas in our Constitutional Convention in 1787 it was successfully contended by Madison and Hamilton that the use of force when applied to people collectively—that is, to States or nations—was unsound in principle and would be tantamount to a declaration of war; and

Whereas we have in our Federal Supreme Court a practical and effective model for a real international court, as it has specific jurisdiction to hear and decide controversies between our sovereign States; and

Whereas our Supreme Court has exercised this jurisdiction, without resort to force, for 135 years, during which time scores of controversies have been judicially and peaceably settled that might otherwise have led to war between the States, and thus furnishes a practical exemplar for the compulsory and pacific settlement of international controversies; and

Whereas an international arrangement of such judicial character would not shackle the independence or impair the sovereignty of any nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the view of the Senate of the United States that war between nations should be outlawed as an institution or means for the settlement of international controversies, by making it a public crime under the law of nations, and that every nation should be encouraged by solemn agreement or treaty to bind itself to indict and punish its own international war breeders or instigators and war profiteers under powers similar to those conferred upon our Congress under Article I, section 8, of our Federal Constitution, which clothes the Congress with the power "to define and punish offenses against the law of nations"; and be it

Resolved further, That a code of international law of peace based upon equality and justice between nations, amplified and expanded and adapted and brought down to date, should be created and adopted;

Second, That a judicial substitute for war should be created (or, if existing in part,

adapted and adjusted) in the form or nature of an international court, modeled on our Federal Supreme Court in its jurisdiction over controversies between our sovereign States, such court to possess affirmative jurisdiction to hear and decide all purely international controversies, as defined by the code, or arising under treaties, and to have the same power for the enforcement of its decrees as our Federal Supreme Court, namely, the respect of all enlightened nations for judgments resting upon open and fair investigations and impartial decisions and the compelling power of enlightened public opinion.

International Notes

PERSIA ADDS A HOPEFUL NOTE to the New Year orchestra of the world. Hussein Alai, Persian minister to the United States, has recently pointed out that, being let alone, at last Persia is "getting along famously." The American commission headed by Dr. A. C. Millspaugh, formerly of our State Department, and Prof. E. L. Bogart, of the University of Illinois, together with a staff of twelve Americans, has upon invitation been in Persia since September last. Under the supervision of this commission, there has been a balancing of the budget, a centralization of finances, the beginning of a Persian national bank, and a survey for a complete reassessment of taxes. Oil there is in Persia—possibly in north Persia and certainly in south Persia. The oil in south Persia is being exploited by British interests. When the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey was about to take over a concession for the oil rights in northern Persia, British interests objected on the ground that they had acquired these northern rights from the Russians. The Persian Parliament has objected to the extension of British operations to the north; and there the matter stands.

THE CONGRESS OF WOMEN of the Little Entente, which was recently held at Bucharest, has an interesting story behind it.

The Women's Little Entente was founded at Rome during the summer international feminist congress, and was joined by Poland,

Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, and Rumania; but since the delegates of these countries had received no authority from their organizations to form such a feminist federation, the Women's Little Entente has been, up to the present, of a provisional character, and has only just now been formally established at the Bucharest Congress.

At the congress, the rules of the Women's Little Entente received full sanction, and the aim of the work is as follows: The political enfranchisement of women, with the desire for the ultimate legal recognition of all feminist ideals; the protection of the socially weak; work for permanent peace, and the protection of national minorities. Special attention was paid to the last question. The feminist organizations will collect data on the subject of national minorities independently, and will work for their protection according to their numbers.

For the better acquaintance and rapprochement of the peoples forming the Little Entente, a complete plan has been worked out, which includes exchange of university students, organization of scientific excursions, sending of journalists from one country to another, small investigations of the most important problems, holding of conferences, etc.

At the Bucharest Congress, Bulgaria was excluded from the Women's Little Entente because at the Women's Congress at Podjedrad, near Prague, the Bulgarian delegates had unjustly accused Serbia of the oppression of national minorities in Macedonia. But at the same time, Bulgaria was given to understand that it will be received again into the entente if Bulgarian feminist organizations show in the future that they really wish for pacifism and will apologize for the incident at Podjedrad.

Next year the congress of the Women's Little Entente will be held at Belgrade.

AN OFFICE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY is created by an Italian decree effective September 29, which introduces certain changes in the Italian patent laws, principally with reference to the duration of the patent and the fees payable and the organization of the patent office. All matters relating to patents, trade-marks, designs, models, and copyrights will fall under the jurisdiction of the Office of Intellectual Property, which is under the Ministry of Industry, Commerce, and Labor. Patent rights will run for a period of 15 years from the date of application. Formerly

patents were granted from 1 to 15 years, at the election of the patentee. The application and description of the discovery or the invention must be drawn up in the Italian language. Applications for rights in connection with additions to or modifications of already existing patents, if filed by the owner within the six months following the date of the original patent, will have priority over similar applications which may be presented by third parties within the stated period. The following fees are charged in connection with obtaining and maintaining patent rights: Application, 100 lire; an annual tax beginning with 50 lire for the first year and increasing by 50 lire for each succeeding year; a special tax of 100 lire, in addition to the application fee, for additions to or modifications of already-existing patents. The application tax, the first annual tax, and the tax on modifications or additions will be payable at the time the applications are filed. The application fee will not be refunded on withdrawal or rejection of the application for patent. Subsequent annual fees are payable in advance each year, during the month corresponding to that in which the application was originally filed. If taxes are not paid when due, they will be accepted within the three months following, on payment of an extra charge of 25 lire. The terms of the present decree will apply to patent rights already obtained, but taxes previously paid in accordance with the laws and rules then established will stand good and valid. Those taxes which are unpaid will have to be settled in conformity with the terms of this decree. Patentees holding patents which have been granted for a period of less than 15 years may continue to enjoy their privileges until the expiration of a total period of 15 years, taxes to be paid in accordance with the provisions of this decree.

MAHJONGG SETS VALUED AT \$849,833 figure in imports of merchandise into the United States from Shanghai, China, for the first nine months of this year, which show an increase of almost 33 per cent, compared with the corresponding period of 1922. Shipments to the United States were valued at \$47,582,423 in 1923, compared with \$38,709,080 during the same period of last year, but gold bars and coin were valued at \$6,062,712 that year, while they only amounted to \$4,249,034 in 1923, resulting in a net increase of exports

aggregating \$10,687,021 over the preceding year. Based on these returns, it is estimated that the total declared exports from China to the United States for the full year will increase about 23 per cent over the exports of 1922.

PROTESTS AGAINST THE RATIFICATION of the treaty with Turkey are making their appearance. Senate Resolution 54, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, reads:

Whereas the United States on the 23d day of April, 1920, recognized Armenia as an independent State and the Senate by resolution of May 14, 1920, extended congratulations to Armenia upon the attainment of her independence; and

Whereas the President of the United States on November 20, 1920, pursuant to the stipulations of the treaty of Sevres and at the instance of the powers signatory to said treaty, defined the southwestern boundaries of Armenia, and the President of the United States on November 10, 1922, declared that "everything which may be done will be done to protect the Armenian people and reserve to them the rights which the Sevres treaty undertook to bestow"; and

Whereas Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Turkey on the 10th day of August, 1920, formally recognized Armenia as a free and independent State and solemnly pledged themselves to protect the national rights and liberties of the Armenian people; and

Whereas the people of the United States view with misgiving and disappointment the failure of the powers to protect the independence of Armenia, to bring to an end the reign of violence and terrorism to which the Armenians had been subjected at the hands of the Turks, and to remove impediments to the maintenance of an independent Armenian State and to the peaceable settlement of Armenians within the territories ascribed to said State in the treaty of Sevres and delimited by the President of the United States in accordance with said treaty: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States do not resume diplomatic relations with Turkey, or permit its nationals to advance any financial aid to Turkey, until the Turkish Government shall have withdrawn all its military forces and occupation from the territories allocated to Armenia in the treaty of Sevres and delimited by the President of the United States in conformity with said treaty, and shall have removed all impediments to the peaceable settlement of Armenians within said territory, and shall have consented to the setting up of an independent Armenian State therein, free from any claim of sovereignty thereover by the Turkish Government.

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS reports that, of late, increasing numbers of German workers are leaving Germany in order to escape the distressing conditions in their own country. All the countries bordering on Germany announce a growing stream of German immigration. In most of these countries it is necessary to have a special permit for entry, but many Germans manage to cross the frontiers secretly. Jugoslavia, Rumania, and Portugal also report an increase in the number of immigrant Germans.

Emigration overseas has also increased. Every one who can by any possibility amass the necessary amount of money emigrates. The number of German emigrants leaving German and Dutch ports during the first half year of 1923 was 40,872, of whom 23,910 were males and 16,962 females. In June of this year, the emigration reached higher figures than any since the beginning of the nineties of last century. Most German emigrants go to South America, but emigration to the United States has also increased recently. American newspapers note the growing numbers of German immigrants, who are often helped to defray the costs of the journey by relatives living in the States. In many cases, also, German families send over some young member of the family in order that he may help to maintain the rest of the family and pay for their subsequent removal to the States. The quota of German immigrants to the United States is now exhausted and no new immigrants will be admitted before the end of June, 1924.

THE HUGE SUBMERSIBLE STEEL DOCK for testing submarines, one of the engineering wonders of the war, is to be broken up. It was designed by a Hamburg engineer, first submitted to the Russian Government and rejected, and, in 1916, ordered for the German navy. It was not completed until 1918, coming into the possession of Great Britain on the cessation of hostilities. The dock contains a great cylinder for the reception of the U-boat to be tested, and berth space for two other submarines on either side of the cylinder. This dock is to be broken up at Queensborough by British iron and steel merchants.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN GOODS may be transported again to France via Germany, according to a published statement of German rail-

ways. Since the beginning of 1923 the exchange of goods between Czechoslovakia and France has had to go by a round-about route over Austrian and Swiss roads.

THE FIFTH ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING of the International Confederation of Students was held last September in England. Two outstanding results of the meeting are: First, an international students' magazine, to be published six times a year, in French and English; second, the commissioning of the national unions in those countries which were neutral during the war to act as intermediaries to approach the students' unions not now in the Federation. It is the wish of the Confederation to include representatives from every country that has its own students' organization.

THE BALTIC REPUBLICS OF ESTHONIA, Latvia, and Lithuania are showing a trend toward more stable business conditions. The purchasing power of the people has risen, which means larger imports. Exports also show an increase. Agricultural industry is nearly at pre-war level, reducing the importation of foodstuffs. Government finances have improved, showing a close balance between revenue and expense, and the inflation of paper currency in these republics has stopped.

AN AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, with a charter membership of 32, has been organized in the Dominican Republic. Though the majority of the executive committee are to be citizens of the United States, honorary membership is to be extended to presidents of other chambers of commerce in Santo Domingo. It is intended to make clear to these organizations that the American chamber is in no sense a rival, but a body of men ready to co-operate in the promotion of trade between the Dominican Republic and the United States for the benefit of both countries.

THE ZR3, CONSTRUCTED IN GERMANY for the United States Navy, will be employed on a mail service between New York and London, according to a statement by Admiral Moffett, chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The Zeppelin is expected to fly to the United States over France, Spain, and the South Atlantic. She will be able to carry a crew of 24 men and 30 passengers, with their baggage. The

seating and sleeping arrangements compare favorably with the finest American Pullman cars. The cooking compartment is to be equipped with electric appliances. Large windows give the passengers an excellent view of the world as they skim above it. The maximum speed of the ZR3 will be about 80 miles an hour, with a cruising radius of 8,600 miles. Midway in the Atlantic a ship will be stationed to direct or otherwise aid the great air vessel.

SHIPPING THROUGH THE KIEL CANAL for the first half of 1923 aggregated 6,639,023 registered net tons. This amount was more than half the tonnage for the year 1922, though the first six months are invariably poorer for shipping in the canal than are the later months. The heaviest traffic is always during the summer. Since German ships carried only 40 per cent of this tonnage, it is evident that foreign companies are discovering the saving of time, coal, and insurance to be made by using, whenever possible, the Kiel Canal.

THE SUKKUR BARRAGE IN INDIA is the largest irrigation scheme of its kind in the world. Two bridges, each more than five times the length of London Bridge, will cross the Indus. Seven canals will be constructed, three of which will be wider than the Suez Canal, and the largest 305 miles long. One canal will have a discharge equal to that of the Thames. It is estimated that this system will irrigate 500,000 acres, which is more than the total cultivated area of Egypt. The irrigated lands will produce annually about 2,000,000 tons of grain and cotton. To Sir George Lloyd, retiring governor of Bombay, is ascribed the credit of forcing the solution of a problem involving the future prosperity of Sind, a problem which has baffled two generations. The system will, therefore, bear Sir George Lloyd's name.

RECOVERY OF NORMAL ACTIVITY in the Ruhr will be a slow process, says *Commerce Reports*, issued by the U. S. Department of Commerce. This paper voices the opinion that there cannot be an early solution to the problem of shortage of supplies with which the French market has been laboring. Not only must the Ruhr equipment be put in satisfactory condition for operation, but it will be some time before the labor yield can be brought back to normal, and, what is quite as important, the transportation system must

be re-established. These developments may easily take so long that available stocks of coke and coal may become exhausted. Moreover, so much of the first yield will be needed to rehabilitate the Ruhr industries themselves that for some time little will be free for export. Only by such rehabilitation can the local population become again self-supporting. So, if the greatest yield from the Ruhr is finally to be attained, the French market will probably have short supplies from that source until, at least, well into 1924. To increase the difficulties of France, Belgium has recently restricted her own coal exports 50 per cent. All this points to a continued, possibly an increasing dependence of France upon coal supplies from British and other foreign sources, where purchases must be made with the franc at a low rate of exchange.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA IS NOW a self-governing colony of the British Empire. The British South African Company has, since the beginning of this State, over thirty years ago, been responsible to the Crown for its administration. On October 1, 1923, that responsibility terminated. The first governor is Sir John Chancellor.

GREAT BRITAIN AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA have recently concluded provisional negotiations for the opening of a new air-line between London and Prague. The agreement expires March 31, 1924, when it will be superseded by a definitive treaty for ten years. The reason for the provisional nature of this agreement lies in the fact that the English Government now aids aviation undertakings by direct subvention. Before March 31, 1924, however, a private national air company is to be formed which will absorb all air service to foreign countries. The government will then put its subvention in the hands of the national company in one lump sum. The importance of Prague as a junction of international communication, it is believed, will be greatly enhanced by the opening of this air-line to England.

CHILE IS REPORTED to have made great efforts to establish a non-aggression pact between herself, Argentina, and Brazil, with the view of reducing armaments. It is, however, reported from Santiago that Chile will have to look to her own interests in case Brazil and Argentina continue their naval

and military expenditures as now contemplated.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF SPAIN is still difficult, in spite of increased revenues. The first six months of the current fiscal year show an increase in collections of 47,000,000 pesetas above the budget, but with expenditures 120,000,000 pesetas higher than the budget. Compared with last year, there was an increase in collections during the six months' period, exclusive of loans, of 89,000,000 pesetas. There was a reduction of 75,000,000 pesetas in the same period in Moroccan war expenses, compared with last year. In November total revenue collections exceeded last November's by 20,250,000 pesetas. A large volume of domestic business is reported, especially in textiles; but consumption of raw cotton and activity of the Barcelona textile mills has been reduced 50 per cent from last year because of the competition of imported British goods. The metal and mining situation has improved of late. Ore exports have been resumed from Bilbao, and there is a prospect of an additional market for steel, iron, and coal in Italy. This improvement of trade is expected to follow the commercial treaty recently concluded with Italy, which gives Spain most-favored-nation treatment on metallurgical products. In agriculture, the cereal crop is in excellent condition because of recent abundant rains. It is estimated that there will be a slight surplus over the country's needs in wheat production for the coming year, as final statistics show the crop to have been considerably over the average for the past ten years. In order to aid Spanish agriculture, it is now proposed, according to advices to the Department of Commerce, to appropriate one hundred million pesetas for agricultural development, part of this money to be used for the purchase of agricultural machinery, fertilizers, seeds, and any other materials necessary to modern intensified farming. In addition to this amount, 20,000,000 pesetas that have hitherto been used in connection with expenditures on public granaries will now be turned over to this new fund. The conditions regarding the disposition of the appropriation will be decided upon within the next few months by the directorate.

CHARLES G. DAWES AND OWEN D. YOUNG, the American representatives on the more important of the two Reparation Commission committees of experts that will study Germany's condition with a view to a solu-

tion of the reparations problem, sailed from New York for Paris December 29. Before sailing they held long conferences with President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes. General Dawes was accompanied by one of his brothers, Rufus C. Dawes, of Chicago, while Stuart M. Crocker accompanied Mr. Young. It is reported that Secretary Hughes is aiding in the formation of a technical staff of assistants to aid the American experts. It is understood that Henry M. Robinson, president of the First National Bank of Los Angeles, selected as American member on the second committee of experts which will study the means of returning Germany capital which has been sent to the United States and other countries, will come to Washington to confer with President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes before sailing for Paris in the near future. The first committee of experts is scheduled to meet in Paris on January 14, while the second committee will not meet until January 21.

A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT of the *New York Times*, writing from Paris under date of December 27, announces that when Foreign Minister Benes left Paris that day for Prague he took with him the draft of a treaty of alliance between France and Czechoslovakia. The correspondent is of the opinion that this political treaty will almost surely be followed by a military treaty which will tie together the fortunes of the two republics. In connection with this alliance, which is quite open, it is interesting to recall that the French parliament has just consented to a credit of 300,000,000 francs to Czechoslovakia.

IT IS REPORTED that prices in Germany have dropped appreciably since the first of December, and that the effort to create a stable currency appears to have succeeded beyond hopes. A correspondent of the *Baltimore Sun*, writing from Berlin under date of December 11, says: "Prices have dropped nearly or quite fifty per cent in the last ten days."

THE COST OF THE WORLD WAR to the American people in cash, according to final calculations made by officials of the United States Treasury, has been \$40,000,000,000. This, it is believed, exceeds in dollars and cents the outlay of any other belligerent, with the possible exception of Great Britain and Germany, and probably exceeds the total of the Allied Powers during the period this country was at war.

ELEUTHERIOS VENIZELOS, who represented Greece at the Paris Peace Conference and whom President Wilson considered the strongest man at the conference, has accepted the invitation to return to Athens and to take his part in the reconstruction of Greece. Mr. Venizelos had not been in Greece since 1920. The influence of his personality upon the highly disturbed situation is being watched with keenest interest. He has already announced his aim to be to bring his country back into a normal path. He does not intend to form a government, neither does he intend to remain active indefinitely. In placing his services at the disposal of his country, it is the rôle of arbitrator and counselor that he wishes to fill. He has no hankering for party strife. Whether he will pronounce for a republic or a monarchy has not yet been disclosed. Whatever his decision, it will undoubtedly be the decision of his country. He may suggest a plebiscite upon this question. It is reported that the republicans are not altogether pleased with the prospects, especially since the régime is unsolved. The report of his return created an unfavorable influence upon the market and upon exchange rates. Part of the Greek press, discussing the possibilities of foreign intervention in favor of the Glückburg dynasty, announces a forthcoming demarche on the part of the Balkan powers. Following King George's departure from Athens, the Rumanian representative, a confidential friend of the Greek royal family, suddenly left. The Rumanian legation, however, denies that it is trying to interfere with the internal affairs of Greece.

THE RUSSIAN QUESTION has precipitated a lively tilt between certain sections of the Senate and the Department of State. The temper of the Russian reaction to Mr. Hughes' recent note is illustrated by an accusation by the editor of *Izvestia*, the Soviet organ, edited by Mr. Stekloff. This organ accused Mr. Hughes of changing the sense of the article from which he quoted. Mr. Stekloff writes: "Mr. Hughes, having extracted a few lines out of the general context of the article, added several lines of his own, thus changing the sense. Despite the external coincidence of the separate words, I still categorically declare that, by citing my words in the manner Mr. Hughes did, he consciously committed forgery."

LETTER BOX

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF
TRADE UNIONS, AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND.

To the Editor of the Advocate of Peace.

DEAR SIR: In the November number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, page 370, it is stated that Professor Sir Gilbert Murray, President of the League of Nations Union of Great Britain and League delegate from South Africa, tactlessly presented to the Assembly at Geneva, on September 22 last, "a petition from the International Federation of Trade Unions, asking for some settlement of the reparations problem and its attendant difficulties, with a view to European peace," and you add that "the Federation represents some twenty million workers, who, as Sir Professor Gilbert Murray all too truthfully remarked, had never before shown any sign of confidence in the League."

Although we have not yet received the official report of the Fourth Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, we venture to suggest that there is something slightly misleading in this statement, due no doubt to the separation of a few words from their context. We have every reason to believe that Professor Murray, when he used these words, was far from casting any aspersion upon the International Federation of Trade Unions for apparent lack of confidence in the League of Nations; he was merely regretting the fact that the workers in general have not yet the full confidence in the League which he would like them to have. Moreover, when he used them, he was quite possibly unaware of certain facts to which we should like to call your attention, and which will, we think, entirely dispose of the suggestion that the International Federation of Trade Unions has never shown any confidence in the League of Nations. These facts are the following:

(1) On March 5, 1920, we wrote to the Supreme Council of the League of Nations on the subject of the economic condition of Central Europe, begging the League of Nations to take steps to save these countries from economic ruin.

(2) At the Peace Congress, which we held at The Hague in December, 1922, we adopted a resolution on Imperialism, Militarism and the Transformation of the League of Nations, demanding public control over the armaments industry by means of the League of Nations. This resolution also called for "the transformation of the League of Nations into an all-embracing society of peoples."

(3) Certain of the leaders of the International Federation of Trade Unions, namely, Oudegeest and Jouhau, have for some time past been members of the Mixed Temporary Commission, appointed by the League of Nations to discuss the possibilities of disarmament.

The International Federation of Trade Unions, of course, does not regard the League of Nations in its present form as the ideal of a world alliance for the maintenance of peace, but no doubt you are aware that there are not many pacifist organizations which take that view. That is, however, a very different thing from an assertion that we have never shown "any sign of confidence" in the League of Nations.

Yours faithfully,

ON BEHALF OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS:

J. OUDEGEEST,
Secretary.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

SIR:

We are thankful—

That there has not been signed away with the pen that which our forefathers were only able to get with the sword.

That the Monroe Doctrine—"Friendship for all; entangling alliances with none"—still lives.

That, under the leadership of Washington, Lincoln, and Roosevelt, America is to be preserved and protected as "the home of Americans."

OBED CALVIN BILLMAN.

BOOK REVIEWS

A SON AT THE FRONT. By *Edith Wharton*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 426. Price, \$2.00.

Mrs. Wharton has been for many years a resident of Paris. She has in this book made use of her personal knowledge of the war period in France, and against that dark background she has painted a character novel of universal truth.

There is no trace of peace propaganda in the book, not even sugar-coated medication. Yet, because it is true to life and to history, and because it has the truth of art, the peace lessons to be drawn from this war book are many and various. It is an odd fact that the one professed pacifist among the characters

in the story is so nearly a caricature that he almost cheapens the whole group; almost, but not quite. The author's real artistry refused to let her play up the foibles of this pompous pacifist, whom the touch of a personal grievance changed overnight to a no less pompous compiler of "atrocities."

The book severely arraigns war from the first shadow of its approach. In the beginning war is unthinkable. "It's too stupidly uneconomic, to begin with," says George. "That's the way we all feel. Think of everything that counts—art and science and poetry and all the rest—going to smash at the nod of some doddering old diplomatists! . . . People are too healthy and well fed now. They are not going off to die in a ditch to oblige anybody." And "George, so fresh and cool and unafraid, seemed to prove to his father that a world that could produce such youths would never again settle its differences by the bloody madness of war." Nevertheless, like one who carries his umbrella lest it may rain, the American artist, Crampton, set about trying to keep his French-born son, George, out of any chance of service. Yet the war comes, and one by one the youth of the book fling themselves into its fiery furnace.

The hero of the story is the artist, Crampton. It is through his eyes that we see the whole action as truly as if it were written in the first person. His complex nature, helpless in dealing with practical affairs, has led him over a rough path. At the beginning of the story, which coincides with the beginning of the war, he is a lionized painter of portraits—eccentric, bitter, impractical, but, for his son's sake, rapidly accumulating money. The bright star of his existence is that son, George, whom he is about to enjoy, as they live and journey together. The dark shadow is his scornful jealousy of the boy's wealthy stepfather, Brant, who, after marrying the materialistic woman who has divorced Crampton, has cared for the boy and loved him generously and dumbly. The jealousy is all on account of the boy, not the woman; for Crampton and his former wife have a "fundamental lack of things to say to each other."

The two men are admirable foils to each other: the irascible father, great in his art, but temperamentally unsuccessful in everything else; the little, stiff, conventional banker, practical, but inarticulate. Julia Brant, the wife, superficial, fashionable, and,

except in her real love for her son, trivial, contrasts strongly with Adele Anthony, the true friend of them all—"good old Adele," with her antiquated dress, her face "haloed with tumbling hairpins," her untidiness and incongruities making "a loose mosaic over the solid crystal block of her character."

Other contrasting characters are clearly drawn. There is Madge Talkett, shallow, but lovely in her nurse's uniform; her face "wistful, haggard with the perpetual hurry of the aimless." There is Boylston, the quiet, efficient relief worker, the "perfect listener," who knows and helps everybody. All are drawn with naturalness; but we do not quite experience the emotions of any of them as we do those of Crampton. We see them, as it were, through the keen visual sense of the artist; yet nothing matters quite so much as the upheaving emotions in Crampton's own soul. Even George, the son, is perceived through a dazzling mist. As his father lost the distinct visual image of him at times, so do we. The death of George we are prepared for. It is the tragedy of Crampton which we feel.

The theme of the novel is an old one in a new guise—the struggle of love with jealousy. The love motive is that of the artist for his son, the jealousy that of the thwarted father for the successful stepfather. During a nightmare-ridden and war-torn period the son is snatched away from both. Meanwhile we watch the two motives struggling in the complex nature of Crampton. The two men are compelled to work together for the boy. Crampton hates it, puts up with it, forgets it, until at last the simplicity and inarticulate goodness of Brant disarms the jealousy. The realization of the artist that at the last his son was completely at one with himself as with no one else gratifies his love; he sees the Brants suffering a loss more overwhelming than his own, because they have had less than he, and, aided by the good offices of Boylston and Adele Anthony, the kindlier impulses of his heart triumph. The real monument to George is a father at peace with himself and just to those who are unlike himself.

MEMORIES OF THE RUSSIAN COURT. By *Anna Viroubova*. The Macmillan Co., New York. Pp. 400. Price, \$—.

In an age when it is not entirely fashionable to be nice about the great, a volume such

as *Anna Viroubova's*, breathing loyalty and devotion to dead and fallen royalty, necessarily excites a certain sympathetic interest. As a record of the intimate, and somewhat humdrum, life of the doomed imperial family of Russia, these memoirs have, on the face of them, a convincing air. One feels very clearly both the charm and the weakness of the Emperor and Empress; their mentalities, governed by the rigid principles of an almost medieval idealism, simply could not cope with the actual situation, even if, in the first place, it had been realized by them.

Anna Viroubova's account of Rasputin is one of the most interesting things in the book, more especially when it is completed by the story of Rasputin's death as related by Purlshkevitch, who took an active part in the murder. From these two relations it would seem obvious that the hostile court displayed hardly less superstition touching Rasputin than the Emperor and Empress themselves. The man must have been possessed of an extraordinary vital magnetism, which, under other circumstances, might have made him one of the great constructive figures in history. With nothing else, it gave us the blindly tragic pawn of destiny which did much to precipitate the fall of the Russian Empire.

The whole effect of the book is one of inevitability. In all the imperial entourage, there was not one great or selfless figure. An almost Oriental atmosphere of petty intrigue seems unredeemed by the slightest vision or vigor of mind, and it is a little sad to reflect that not even the representatives of foreign owners appear to have been entirely unaffected by their miasmatic surroundings.

AS THEY ARE. FRENCH POLITICAL PORTRAITS BY ——. Translated by *Winifred Katzin*. Alfred Knopf Company, New York. Pp. 217. Price, \$2.50.

This excellently translated book might also have been entitled "What Raymond Poincaré Thinks of His Opponents"; for, with admirable consistency, every political figure in France which the present Premier might have reason to fear is described in terms all too closely approaching the language of a Poincaré Sunday sermon dealing with Germany or Great Britain.

Caillaux, Herriot, Painlevé, Briand, each receive their measure, pressed down and flowing over, of contempt, anger, and hinted

accusation; but it must be conceded that the chapter concerning André Berthelot is a masterpiece of its kind. Nothing could equal the mind that conceived it, including the allusion to Philippe Berthelot as the tool of his wicked and designing brother, except the mind that finds a satisfaction in suppressing the very office once held by the victim of its enmity.

French political life, however, has always been notorious for its personal venom. What is, perhaps, a little pathetic about this particular political squib is that the author is almost as clumsy in his efforts at praise as he is in his efforts at detraction. It is possible to be amused by the condescending patronage extended to Monsieur Clemenceau, or by the would-be adulatory description of Monsieur Poincaré himself as a "national statesman of a new type"; but surely the chapter on René Viviani should not have been written. If it is meant as a very subtle deprecation of Monsieur Viviani, it seems hardly kind or loyal on the part of M. Poincaré's admirers; if, on the other hand, it is intended as a somewhat defensive attempt at praise, the incidents selected to illustrate Monsieur Viviani's personal character are ill-chosen, though a certain joy cannot but be derived from the idea of M. Viviani as "un peu brusque—mais de si bon cœur." On the whole, nevertheless, it is always better to pass over M. Viviani's social achievements in silence.

In France, of course a publication of this kind is accepted as one of the amenities of political life, and read or discarded in proportion to its wit, however cruel or malicious that may be. Placed before the American public, however, even without its preface, such a book is not calculated to enhance our understanding of that unhappy country whose purely intellectual achievements have been the glory of our civilization.

THE BURNING SPEAR. By *John Galsworthy*. Scribner's, New York. Pp. 251. Price, \$1.50.

This book was anonymously published just after the war, and met, Mr. Galsworthy says, with "the coolness, not to say disfavor, that one would expect." He assumes that the reason for this disfavor rested with the public psychology of the period. The time has now come, he thinks, to reissue his book.

But, however good the purpose underlying it, the book does not, we think, justify itself

as a work of art. It does not, in our opinion, enhance the literary reputation of Mr. Galsworthy. The comparison with Don Quixote is a bit unfortunate, since Dr. Lavendar, the knight-errant of this book, does not at all measure up to his Spanish prototype. As a caricature it is dull and bears about the same relation to Don Quixote as the comic strip in the newspaper bears to the inimitable drawings of Cruikshank or of Max Beerbohm.

The really worth-while part of the book lies in the preface, which does express clearly a truth which we should think upon. This truth relates to war propaganda. "The war had its desperate verities," he says, "and please let no one think that this writer ever budged an inch from his conviction that his country had to fight, and to a finish. But the fighting that was done *with words* often seemed to drag our cause down, and to blur, rather than to sharpen, its reality. . . . I do not believe it was necessary to 'dope' and 'gas' in my country. I believe the management underrated the qualities of the public, as it almost always does."

Mr. Lavendar was, therefore, intended to be farcically idiotic. If only the author could have given his character enough verisimilitude to point the wit and make us laugh, we could have better remembered the story and its moral.

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED

SOCIAL CHANGE. By *William Field Ogden*. 365 p. B. W. Huebsch, New York.

A HISTORY OF ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE. By *H. N. Fowler, Ph. D.* 467 p. Appendices and index. Macmillan Co., New York. \$3.00.

WHEN THERE IS NO PEACE. By *the author of The Pomp of Power*. 308 p. and index. George H. Doran Co., New York. \$3.00.

THE STORY OF UTOPIAS. By *Lewis Mumford*. 315 p. Bibliography. Boni & Liveright, New York. \$3.00.

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE. By *Raymond Leslie Buell*. 461 p. Appendices and index. D. Appleton & Co., New York. \$3.00.

THE RUSSIAN IMMIGRANT. By *Jerome Davis, Ph. D.* 210 p. Bibliography. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$1.50.

REVOLUTION. By *J. D. Beresford*. 357 p. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

- GERMAN OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE WORLD WAR. Translated under the supervision of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Two volumes. Oxford Press, New York.
- AS WE SEE IT. By *René Viviani*. 314 p. Harper & Brothers, New York. \$3.50.
- ECONOMIC EFFECT OF THE WAR UPON WOMEN AND CHILDREN. By *Irene Osgood Andrews*. 190 p. Oxford Press, New York.
- NEGRO MIGRATION DURING THE WAR. By *Emmett J. Scott*. 189 p. Bibliography and index. Oxford Press, New York.
- PRIZE CASES DECIDED IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. Prepared under the supervision of *James Brown Scott*. Two volumes. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS, DECEMBER 10-15, 1922. 210 p. International Federation of Trade Unions, Amsterdam.
- JUDICIAL REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. By *Robert von Moschzisker*. 139 p., addenda and index. The National Association for Constitutional Government, Washington, D. C.
- ROBERT BACON, LIFE AND LETTERS. By *James Brown Scott*. 448 p. and index. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, \$5.00.
- THE EQUALITY OF STATES. By *Julius Goebel*. 89 p. Columbia University Press, New York.
- WOODROW WILSON'S CASE FOR THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. Compiled by *Hamilton Foley*. 208 p. and appendices. Princeton University Press, \$1.75.
- PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN
PEACE SOCIETY**
- 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
- Limited numbers of the following pamphlets are available at the headquarters of the American Peace Society, the price quoted being for the cost of printing and postage only:
- PAMPHLETS**
- | | | | |
|---|------------|--------|--|
| Ethical and General Peace Literature : | Published. | | |
| Butler, Nicholas Murray : | | | |
| The International Mind..... | 1912 | \$0.05 | |
| Call, Arthur D. : | | | |
| Cumber and Entanglements..... | 1917 | .10 | |
| Carnegie, Andrew : | | | |
| A League of Peace..... | 1905 | .10 | |
| Crosby, Ernest H. : | | | |
| War From the Christian Point of View | 1905 | .05 | |
| Franklin on War and Peace..... | | .10 | |
| Gladden, Washington : | | | |
| Is War a Moral Necessity?..... | 1915 | .10 | |
| Green, Thomas E. : | | | |
| The Burden of the Nations..... | 1914 | .10 | |
| The Forces that Failed..... | | .10 | |
| Stanfield, Theodore : | | | |
| The Divided States of Europe and the United States of America... .. | 1921 | .10 | |
| Tolstol, Count Leon : | | | |
| The Beginning of the End..... | 1898 | .10 | |
| Wales, Julia G. : | | | |
| "The Conscientious Objector"..... | 1918 | .10 | |
| Christ of the Andes (illustration) 7th edition | 1914 | .05 | |
| Palace of Peace at the Hague (illustrated) | 1914 | .05 | |
| Peace and Children : | | | |
| Darby, W. Evans : | | | |
| Military Drill in Schools..... | 1911 | .05 | |
| Military Training for Schoolboys : Symposium from educators..... | 1916 | .05 | |
| Walsh, Rev. Walter : | | | |
| Moral Damage of War to the School Child | 1911 | .05 | |
| Von Oordt, Bleuland : | | | |
| Children Building Peace Palace, post-card (sepla)..... | | .05 | |
| Historical Peace Literature : | | | |
| Kant, Immanuel : | | | |
| Perpetual Peace. First published in 1795, republished in..... | 1897 | .25 | |
| Call, Arthur D. : | | | |
| The Will to End War..... | 1920 | .15 | |
| Levermore, Charles H. : | | | |
| Synopsis of Plans for International Organization | 1919 | .05 | |
| Penn, William : | | | |
| Peace of Europe. First published in 1693, republished in..... | 1912 | .10 | |
| Trueblood, Lyra : | | | |
| 18th of May, History of its Observance | | .05 | |
| Scott, James Brown : | | | |
| The Development of Modern Diplomacy | 1921 | .10 | |
| Trueblood, Benjamin F. : | | | |
| International Arbitration at the Opening of the 20th Century.... | | .10 | |
| William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government..... | | .10 | |
| Tryon, James L. : | | | |
| A Century of Anglo-American Peace | 1914 | .05 | |
| New England a Factor in the Peace Movement | 1914 | .05 | |
| Washington's Anti-Militarism | | .05 | |
| Worcester, Noah : | | | |
| Solemn Review of the Custom of War. First published, Christmas, 1914, republished in..... | 1904 | .10 | |

* A number of these books will be reviewed later.

Biographical:		Problems of the War, The Peace (paper). 99 pages..... 1914-18 .15	
Beals, Charles E.:		Bacon, Corinne:	
Benjamin F. Trueblood, Prophet of Peace	1916 .10	Selected Articles on National De- fense. 243 pages.....	1916 .90
Call, Arthur D.:		Balou, Adin:	
James Brown Scott. Sketch of his services to the cause of inter- national justice	1918 .10	Christian Non-resistance. 278 pages. First published 1846, and republished	1910 .50
Hemmenway, John:		Choate, Joseph H.:	
William Ladd, The Apostle of Peace	1891 .10	The Two Hague Conferences. 109 pages	1912 .50
Japan and the Orient:		Crane, William Leighton:	
Deforest, J. H.:		The Passing of War. 298 pages. January	1914 .50
Conditions of Peace Between the East and the West.....	1908 .05	Crosby, Ernest:	
Is Japan a Menace to the United States?	1908 .05	Garrison, the Non-resistant. 141 pages	1905 .40
Green, Thomas:		Dymond, Jonathan:	
War with Japan?.....	1916 .10	Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with Christianity (paper). 182 pages. (1892 edition).....	1834 .50
Kawakami, Isamu:		Estournelle de Constant:	
Disarmament, The Voice of the Japanese People	1921 .10	Report on International Commission to Inquire into the Causes of the Balkan Wars. 419 pages.....	1914 .90
Sakatani, Baron:		Graham, John William:	
Why War Between Japan and the United States is Impossible....	1921 .10	Evolution and Empire (paper). 230 pages. April.....	1914 .40
Tolstol, Count Leon:		Gulick, Sydney L.:	
Letter on the Russo-Japanese War	1904 .10	The Fight for Peace. 192 pages..	1915 .30
International Law:		Hull, William I.:	
Call, Arthur D.:		The Two Hague Conferences. 516 pages	1908 .90
Coercion of States	1920 .05	Janson, Gustaf.:	
Three Facts in American Foreign Policy	1921 .10	The Pride of War (novel). 350 pages	1912 .90
Governed World, A. Three Docu- ments	1921 .10	Jordan, David Starr:	
Pepper, George Wharton:		The Human Harvest. 122 pages..	1907 .50
America and the League of Nations	1921 .10	Unseen Empire. 209 pages.....	1912 .50
Ralston, Jackson H.:		Ladd, William:	
Should any National Dispute be Reserved from Arbitration?....	1908 .05	Essay on a Congress of Nations. Introduction by James Brown Scott. 162 pages. First pub- lished in 1840, republished in..	1916 1.00
Root, Elihu:		La Fontaine, Henri:	
"The Great War" and International Law	1921 .10	The Great Solution. 177 pages...	1916 .70
Scott, James Brown:		Lynch, Frederick:	
Organization of International Law	1917 .10	The Peace Problem, 127 pages....	1911 .75
Public Opinion <i>versus</i> Force.....	1915 .05	Through Europe on the Eve of War. 152 pages.....	1914 .25
Snow, Alpheus:		Moritzen, Julius:	
International Legislation and Ad- ministration	1917 .10	The Peace Movement of America. 419 pages	1912 .90
BOOKS			
A limited number of the following books are on hand and can be had at the follow- ing reduced prices plus postage:			
		Published.	
American Foreign Policy. State- ments of Presidents and Secre- taries of State. Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. 132 pages	1920	\$0.90	
Angell, Norman:			
America and the New World State. 305 pages	1915	.90	
Arms and Industry. 248 pages...	1914	.90	
Great Illusion, The. 416 pages...	1910	.90	
Scott, James Brown:			
Grotius on the Freedom of the Seas. (Grotius, first published in 1608). 83 pages.....	1916	.90	
Peace Through Justice. 102 pages	1917	.70	
Second Pan-American Congress. The Final Act. Commentary by James Brown Scott. 516 pages.....	1916	1.00	
Von Suttner, Berthe:			
Lay Down Your Arms (a novel). 435 pages	1914	1.00	
White, Andrew D.:			
The First Hague Conference. 123 pages	1005	.50	

ADVOCATE OF
PEACE
THROUGH JUSTICE

Advocate of Peace, published regularly since 1834—the oldest, largest, and most widely circulated peace magazine in the world—celebrates its ninetieth birthday today by appearing in this its new dress. Until now, the general form of this well-known periodical has not been changed since 1869.

Advocate of Peace assumes thus a shape more conformable with such standard monthly magazines as the National Geographic and the Atlantic Monthly. The amount of printed matter has been increased over that of any previous year by 20 per cent.

Advocate of Peace is the peace magazine which, when America entered the war, placed upon its cover these words: "The clarion, unmistakable call to every one of us now is that we must end this war by winning it."

Advocate of Peace is the official organ of the American Peace Society, with headquarters in Washington, founded by William Ladd in 1828. Its purpose—the magazine is in no sense a money-making enterprise—is to promote a better international understanding.

American Peace Society

612, 13, 14 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	67
EDITORIALS	
Propaganda—Pro and Con, the American Peace Award—French Imperialism—The Health of Germany—Mexican Problem—Russia's Difficulty—Editorial Notes.....	69-80
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
Internal Conditions in France—The German Situation—German Activities in Holland—Italian-Spanish Trade Treaty—Another Peace Prize	81-85
GENERAL ARTICLES	
The Winning Plan (including the full text).....	86
By Edward W. Bok	
War (address before the American Peace Society, 1838).....	92
By Ralph Waldo Emerson	
Centenary of the Monroe Doctrine.....	100
By the Secretary of State	
The Last Cost of War.....	110
By David Starr Jordan	
Relief of German Children.....	114
By Ernest Lyman Mills	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
The Committee of Experts.....	116
French Economics and Finance.....	117
The Danish Finance Act.....	118
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	119
LETTER BOX.....	123
BOOK REVIEWS.....	126

Vol. 86

FEBRUARY, 1924

No. 2

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It is ninety-five years old. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right think-

ing in the United States for nearly a century; which has done more for the men, women, and youth of America by the reaction upon them of the spirit of justice and fair play than it has done even for the peace workers themselves, who have been the special object of its effort; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.
All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

OFFICERS

President:

HON. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, Miami, Florida.

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON, former President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

HON. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Lawyer, Washington, D. C.

HON. JAMES L. SLAYDEN, Member Council Interparliamentary Union, San Antonio, Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

HON. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, *ex officio*.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *ex officio*.

GEORGE W. WHITE, *ex officio*.

HON. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, University, Alabama.

DR. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

WALTER A. MORGAN, D. D., 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., 808 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

HON. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, President Fairmont Seminary, Washington, D. C.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 West 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

HON. HENRY TEMPLE, House of Representatives Washington, D. C.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., 30 Koun Machi, Mita Shiba, Tokyo, Japan.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

Pres. WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, Bloomington, Ind.

GEORGE BURNHAM, JR., Philadelphia, Pa.

DR. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. H. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

DR. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Esq., Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

DR. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

Mrs. PHILIP N. MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

HON. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

HON. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salda, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective: and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

FEBRUARY, 1924

NUMBER
2

EDITORIALS

PROPAGANDA

PROPAGANDA is a word with a perfectly good parentage, but its reputation has suffered of late. It has been rather loosely employed. It is viewed as covering a multitude of sins.

Propaganda is simply a scheme or plan for propagating or promoting ideas or doctrines. It ought to be legitimate to promote ideas or doctrines. The church is doing that thing without serious criticism. Schools and missions and political parties do that. A great deal of money is spent every day in advertising tenets or opinions. It ought to be proper to use propaganda in a democracy. There is no reason for eliminating the word from the upper levels of word society.

A distinguished Senator submitted in the United States Senate December 20, 1923, a resolution calling for a special committee of five to investigate and report to the Senate "whether there is any organized effort being made to control public opinion and the action of Congress upon legislative matters through propaganda or by the use of money, by advertising or by the control of publicity, and especially to inquire what, if any, such methods are being employed to control the action of Congress . . . and what, if any, such influences are being employed, either by American citizens or the representatives of foreign governments or foreign institutions, to control or affect the foreign or domestic policies of the United States." From later developments, it appears that

this resolution was aimed at the American Peace Award, of which Mr. Bok is the leader. Other aims of the resolution will appear later.

There surely is a difference between legitimate and illegitimate propaganda. Societies such as the American Peace Society are carrying on propaganda. They are not ashamed of it; on the contrary, they are proud of it and wish they could carry it on more effectively. There is nothing underground in the promotion of propaganda by such bodies. Names of their officers are printed from time to time. All moneys received by them for the promotion of their work are carefully accounted for, and all but small sums are accredited personally in their annual reports and elsewhere. It never has occurred to them that they could do otherwise. They wish the world to know not only what they stand for, but the people and organizations who stand for them. This, we suspect, is an essential characteristic of legitimate propaganda.

Where the sources of revenue are unknown or are obscure, propaganda is probably illegitimate. Honest propaganda advertises, while dishonest propaganda hides, its support. That is the essential difference.

It would be perfectly proper—indeed, desirable—for the States to require, through legislative action, that every organization engaged in propaganda should make public the sources and the amounts of its revenue.

PRO AND CON—THE AMERICAN PEACE AWARD

WE FIND no reason for criticizing the origin or purpose of the American Peace Award. It originated, we have no doubt, in worthy motives. It all seems to have been wholly above-board. Its purpose as set forth by Mr. Bok is, we have no reason to doubt, as he describes it. Since in a democracy progress can be achieved, seemingly, only through clash of opinion and attrition of ideas, Mr. Bok is not only within his rights; he is, we believe, pursuing his duty as he sees it. He has already achieved results. In consequence of his award, men and women everywhere are thinking in terms of international peace. He has dramatized the peace movement. He has, as he says, "stimulated idealism by the golden spur of self-interest." Whether or not the result will mean "a united national mind within definable terms" remains to be seen. We are not sure that his referendum will end in "an expression of the national will." But it is an encouragement to peace workers to have a man of affairs thinking peace, paying for it, and saying "that world peace can be attained if enough people think of it, and desire it, and say they desire it." So much for Mr. Bok. With him we have no quarrel.

The Judges

The people whom Mr. Bok called to help in the promotion of his purpose are above reproach. As is generally known, practically all of them were, before their appointment, predisposed to favor the League of Nations; but we are perfectly confident that they have selected the plan, printed elsewhere in these columns, in perfect good faith.

Merits of Plan

As for the plan, there are things to be said in its favor. Its author is probably

interested "to achieve and preserve the peace of the world." He seems to be opposed to a policy "of isolation and aloofness in the world." He has discovered that an international organization for the promotion of international peace based upon a force of arms has been found to be unworkable in practice. Indeed, he grants that the present League of Nations cannot operate under its covenant. While admiring the League, he condemns its covenant. He thinks he sees that the League is moving to "the foundations so well laid by the world's leaders between 1899 and 1907 in the great international councils of that period." He—of course, it may be a she—realizes that the people of the United States are "favorable to international conferences for the common welfare, and to the establishment of conciliative, arbitral, and judicial means for settling international disputes." He realizes that moral judgment and public opinion are the ultimate sanctions of any hopeful agency for the control of international policies. He knows that the United States Government will accept no responsibility and assume no obligation in connection with any duties imposed upon the League by the peace treaties, "unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action." Perhaps most worthy of all, he realizes the importance of resuming the lawmaking processes in the realm of international affairs. He also grants without seeming to realize that it offsets the major part of his argument, that "anything else than a world conference, especially when great powers are excluded, must incur, in proportion to the exclusion, the suspicion of being an alliance rather than a family of nations." These, in our opinion, represent all that can be said favorable to the views as set forth by the author of this plan. Since we submitted no "plan," we write with no prejudice natural to a disappointed competitor.

The Method

There are objections to the method adopted by the American Peace Award. We cannot see how plural voting can be entirely avoided. Only one plan has been submitted to the public. A simple affirmative and negative vote under these circumstances cannot be very illuminating. Those prejudiced in favor of the plan will vote for it in a larger proportion than those who are opposed. It is wholly unlikely that the ballot will give anything like an accurate picture of public sentiment. It all savors of an organized propaganda in favor of the League of Nations.

Misrepresentations of Fact

The plan as a whole is surprisingly filled with misrepresentations of fact. It seems incredible that any one can say seriously that "there is not room for more than one organization to promote international co-operation." There are at least one thousand such organizations now working at that very business.

The author tells us that the members of the League "cannot and will not abandon this system," while the very substance of his proposal is that we co-operate and participate in the work of the League with the hope that the League will abandon its system.

He says that the United States maintains theoretically a policy of isolation, which according to his own statement of facts is not true.

Contrary to his implication, the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments had nothing, directly or indirectly, to do with the League of Nations.

He says that the settlement of the Aaland Islands dispute by the League of Nations "averted a war," which is a mere assumption and probably untrue.

He says that it is "immediately practicable" for the United States to extend co-operation with the international labor organizations. Whether or not it be "im-

mediately practicable" would seem to depend upon the question whether or not the United States considers such co-operation desirable. The same thing is true of the author's remarks about our adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice. It certainly is not true that these last suggestions "are in harmony with policies already adopted by our government," because thus far the United States has not considered them "practicable."

The author tells us that these suggestions of his "do not involve a question of membership in the League of Nations as now constituted, but it cannot be denied that they lead to the threshold of that question." His metaphor is a bit subtle, and we miss any reference to the good manners, taste, and dignity of the United States.

He tells us about "important modifications" in the Covenant of the League of Nations "foreshadowed" by its "practical experience." As a matter of fact, there have been no such "modifications."

The author agrees that Articles X and XVI of the covenant "suggest the action of a world State." Here we believe the author is right. But, since the League exists still under this same unmodified covenant, how can he announce that such a world State "does not now exist"? The author unfortunately neglects to tell us that leaders of the League tried to get the League to act as a super-State in the contest between Greece and Italy over Corfu.

He goes too far when he says that "no one now expects the League Council to try to summon armies and fleets," for Lord Robert Cecil, "Savonarola of the League," has from time to time expressed directly a contrary view. Many of the French supporters of the League still believe in armies and fleets for that body.

The author grants that Article X gives to the League "a protective power . . . on paper." Since the League still exists

under this "paper" and under no other "paper," Article X does not seem to have disappeared in any sense.

Certainly it is an extravagance to say that the small States are faced with the alternative of preserving "a form of words in the covenant" or of making it possible for the United States to sit in the League of Nations.

His reference to attempts to change Article X and XVI has no bearing upon his argument. They have not been changed. Indeed, as he shows, "a small group of weak States, like Persia and Panama," have successfully blocked the last attempts at such changes. So long as these articles remain as parts of the covenant, it is difficult to see how in any sense they have been reduced "to something like innocuous desuetude." They are alive until repealed.

It is not true that the Council of the League has been unwilling "to intervene in any American controversy." As pointed out by Philip Marshall Brown in an interview published in the *New York Times* under date of January 8, "the Secretary General of the League did actually proffer the mediation of the League in the controversy between Panama and Costa Rica in 1921, concerning an award by Chief Justice White, of the United States Supreme Court." The League interested itself actively in the dispute between Chile and Peru over the provinces of Tacna and Arica. It is also true that representatives of Latin America have been chosen as presidents of the League, and that the League has maintained a special Bureau on Latin-American affairs. The author will find it difficult to convince the United States of the importance of his statement that there is "an unwritten law limiting the powers and duties of the League Council, defined in Article XI of the covenant, to questions that seem to threaten the peace of the Old World."

It is wholly an unwarranted assump-

tion, quite contrary to the facts, that under the Monroe Doctrine the United States claim leadership in the Western Hemisphere; it certainly is not true that the Pan American Union is "already a potential regional league."

When he tells us that the world of business and finance is already unified, he directly contradicts his other statement, that "there is not room for more than one organization to promote international co-operation."

Since the Covenant of the League of Nations has not been changed, and since he grants that the covenant provides for a world State, there is no justification for his conclusion that the League has no "actual powers" except "to confer and advise, to create commissions, to exercise inquisitive, conciliatory, and arbitral functions and to help elect judges of the Permanent Court."

Since the covenant has not been changed in any of these particulars, it is improper to say that "the League has moved to the foundations laid by The Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907." The organs of the League are in no sense "successors to The Hague conferences." The Hague conferences did not lack "the resources" to create a "secretariat"; they created one.

These are some of the misstatements of fact which face one as one reads through this interesting document.

The New Thing

The plan submits two proposals: (1) that the United States Government should be authorized to propose co-operation with the League and participate in the work of its Assembly and Council without becoming a member of the League and with a variety of reservations; (2) that the United States adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice, according to the proposals of Secretary Hughes and President Harding in February, 1923.

The only new thing in these proposals is that the author is to receive \$50,000 at once, and, if his plan meets with the approval of the United States Senate or with an adequate degree of popular support on or before March 4, 1925, he is to receive \$50,000 more. That is new.

The Proposals

The proposals themselves are not altogether happy.

It is difficult to see how the United States could participate in the work of the Assembly and Council without being a member of the League. To suggest that the United States should do so if it could is not particularly inspiring.

How the United States can accept the League as an instrument of mutual counsel, participate in its work, without interfering "with political questions of policy or international administration of any foreign State" does not readily appear.

Unwittingly, evidently, the author has submitted a plan which, taken as a whole, is a thorough-going condemnation of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Yet this covenant is still the written law of the League. It has not been changed. So far, it has been found impossible to amend it, none of the proposed amendments having been ratified under Article 26, which requires a unanimous vote of the States represented on the Council and of a majority of the States represented in the Assembly. And yet the author proposes that we of the United States should participate in the work of the Assembly and Council operating under a covenant condemned not only by the author, but by the League itself.

Under the terms of his own definition, the League of Nations is open "to the suspicion of being an alliance rather than a family of nations."

If the League as organized is incapable of amending its own statute, what reason is there for believing that the United States can help "to reconstitute" it?

It Would Have Been Better

Had Mr. Bok chosen for his committee of award, say, three persons known to be intelligently opposed to the League of Nations, three known to favor it, and one outstanding neutral—if such there be—and if a number of plans had been selected for the referendum, then something might have been developed likely to meet with support in the United States Senate. That would have been better.

Another observation: The whole proceeding is simply another illustration of our modern and not altogether happy drift away from the moorings fixed by the builders of our Republic. Under the first amendment to our Constitution it is provided that Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. This referendum of the American Peace Award comes under the terms of this amendment only by a most liberal interpretation. Anyhow, the amendment added nothing to the powers of the United States and subtracted nothing from the authority of the States. Mr. Justice Marshall, speaking the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the well-known case of *McCulloch v. Maryland*, said: "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass. Of consequence, when they act, they act in their States."

A Worthier Precedent

Eighty-four years ago the American Peace Society offered an award for the best essay on a Congress of Nations. The prize offered at that time was only \$1,000. Some forty plans were submitted. The American Peace Society, according to the record, "concluded to accept the advice of the first committee of award—the Hon. Messrs. Story, Wirt, and Calhoun—to

publish the five best essays, as the second committee, consisting of ex-President Adams, Chancellor Kent, and the Hon. Daniel Webster, did not agree on the successful competitor. The Peace Society appointed a committee of their own body to select five of the best dissertations for publication, "having an eye to the awards of the above-named committees." The society directed its secretary, William Ladd, to add a sixth essay. This Mr. Ladd did. He noted down the points of the various essays submitted and presented them in his essay, "with such reflections, additions, and historical facts" as occurred to him during his labor. His own comment upon his work reads: "so that my claim to originality, in this production, rests much on the thought of separating the subject into two distinct parts, viz: 1st. A congress of ambassadors from all those Christian and civilized nations who should choose to send them, for the purpose of settling the principles of international law by compact and agreement, of the nature of a mutual treaty, and also of devising and promoting plans for the preservation of peace and meliorating the condition of man. 2. A court of nations, composed of the most able civilians in the world, to arbitrate or judge such cases as should be brought before it, by the mutual consent of two or more contending nations, thus dividing entirely the diplomatic from the judicial functions, which require such different, not to say opposite, characters in the exercise of their functions. I consider the Congress as the legislature and the court as the judiciary, in the government of nations, leaving the functions of the executive with public opinion, 'the queen of the world.' This division I have never seen in any essay or plan for a congress or diet of independent nations, either ancient or modern, and I believe it will obviate all the objections which have been heretofore made to such a plan."

This essay by William Ladd, written in

1840, according to a leading international authority of our day, "contains every worthy thing that has been said or can be said upon the problem of international peace." The Hague system, toward which the author of the Bok plan tells us the League of Nations is rapidly drifting, developed out of the principles set forth in this essay. Should Mr. Bok be minded to publish a number of the plans submitted in competition for his award, possibly another William Ladd may arise in this century to advance the methods of peace. The author of this plan is not he.

AS TO FRENCH IMPERIALISM

FRANCE does not consider that she is bent upon a policy of imperialism, if by imperialism is meant a policy of extending control, dominion, or empire over another nation. She entertains no such purpose. She insists that she is as democratic as any other nation. Her occupation of the Ruhr started in no plan to dismember Germany, to destroy Germany, or to dominate Europe. As pointed out by M. Poincaré, had France desired to dismember Germany, France would have taken Frankfort, occupied the valley of the Main, separated Bavaria from Prussia, and broken Germany in two. She did nothing of the sort.

France entered the Ruhr because Germany had defaulted her obligations for three years. Germany became, France believes, deliberately an insolvent debtor. As is the practice in such cases, France applied economic pressure. M. Poincaré explained the motives of France as follows: "We have not the slightest wish to appropriate the property of others or to do violence to the conscience of men. We have no intention of annexing any portion of German territory, and we dismiss with the contempt they deserve the accusations of imperialism brought against France."

The Treaty of Versailles is a fact. As

such it ranks among the supreme laws for the nations that ratified that instrument. France cannot change that treaty. It is the duty of all parties to the treaty to maintain it until it has been changed according to methods mutually accepted for such a proceeding. In defending the treaty, the French believe they are defending the cause of peace. "And, what is more," says the Prime Minister of France, "they are defending the future of the German Republic against the consequences of its aberrations. They will complete their work of justice and once again will have deserved well of their country."

France has no designs of occupying German territory permanently. Nothing is further from her aims. In the language of W. D. Guthrie, of the New York Bar:

"The French are too intelligent and fair-minded not to appreciate that their permanent welfare and prosperity as well as the welfare and prosperity of their allies demand that normal economic conditions should be restored in Europe as soon as possible, and I am confident that they are sincerely desirous of co-operating to that end and ready to make any additional sacrifices that may be found to be equitable and reasonably within their power to make. But, while willing to cooperate, they are not willing further to handicap their future and security. They profoundly apprehend that if Germany, intact, undevastated, and unimpaired in productive resources and national wealth, be rehabilitated economically, while France is left drained of capital resources by the unreimbursed cost of reconstruction and pensions and the burden of her war debts and taxation, it will only be a few years before an impoverished and economically weak France—impoverished and weakened through no fault of her own—will lie at the mercy of a restored and strong Germany, with the probability, in the light of the experiences of the past, that France will be again invaded and devastated."

France believes that she is safeguarding civilization. She believes that she is do-

ing this by carrying out her pledges. She believes also that she is carrying out the pledges of her allies. She has not forgotten what she and all her allies believed in 1914, that Germany's offense was an offense against civilization. She believes by all the laws of war and by all the laws of morality that Germany has not been asked to pay too much. She has seen the amount assessed against Germany whittled down from 800 billion gold marks to 480 billion, proposed by the British at Paris, to 132 billion, named by the Committee on Reparations, to 50 billion under the terms of the London settlement, notwithstanding that the figure approved by the Americans in Paris was 120 billion and by Bonar Law in December, 1922, 60 billion.

France knows that Germany's wealth in natural resources, in the number of her people, and in the ability of those people is greater than her own. France knows that Germany produces per acre more wheat, rye, barley, oats, and potatoes than France, Austria, Hungary, or the United States. France remembers the great increase in German wealth during the decade preceding 1913. She knows that Germany has four-fifths of the coal on the continent of Europe and iron a plenty. She knows that water power, potash, mineral salts, zinc, copper, lead, and tin are found in abundance in Germany.

The Haber process of nitrogen fixation by direct synthesis is one of the world's most colossal sources of wealth. There are two plants in Germany manufacturing nitrogen under this process with a capacity of 300,000 tons annually. This constitutes an annual supply of nitrogen exceeding that of all the rest of the world put together. It means 15,000,000 tons of fertilizer for Germany—an amount twice that ever used by the United States in one year. Furthermore, every one knows that this same nitrogen can be turned into explosives at a moment's notice.

Taxes per capita in Germany for the year 1920 found her tenth in the list of the larger powers.

Germany's wealth is intact, while French wealth has been largely ruined.

France believes that Germany had the means to pay; that she only lacked the will.

France believes that the logic of her policy is irrefutable. France was attacked. She bore the brunt of the war. She was all but destroyed. With the aid of her friends, she defeated Germany. She has made no claim save that the destructions wrought by Germany should be made good. She was deceived by Mr. Wilson and by Lloyd George. She waited four years without results. The methods which she finally employed were not as brutal as were the methods adopted by Bismarck in 1871. She entered the Ruhr with the purpose of creating in Germany the will to pay. She met resistance. She saw Germany counting on a split between France and England. She saw the German mark follow the curve of German prodigality and the willful sequestration of German money. She saw Germany pursue deliberately the policy of self-ruin. France ended the resistance. She is now evacuating German territory in proportion as she is receiving payments. She is standing by the treaty. She denies, therefore, the charge of imperialism and war-baiting. She believes that she is safeguarding civilization by carrying out her pledges and ours, by applying her mind to the facts and by pursuing the logic of the situation.

French policy in the Ruhr is not M. Poincaré's policy; it is French policy. The support of the Prime Minister throughout France is more nearly unanimous than is the support of any other statesman in Britain or the United States. He was recently re-elected to the Senate in his own Department by almost a unanimous vote. In the recent election France

assumed a solid front in the face of the British political contest.

France was not imperialistic when she gave up large parts of Canada, following the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, nor when she retired from India a few years later. She was not imperialistic when she signed a treaty of alliance with our forefathers February 6, 1778. So generous was France in that treaty that the Prime Minister of Spain called her "a glaring instance of Quixotism." These same forefathers of ours did not consider France imperialistic when, following our Revolutionary War, she asked for no advantage under the treaty or for any reimbursement because of the costs which had been imposed upon her because of our war for liberation. France was not considered imperialistic when she was the inspiration of democracy everywhere before and after Napoleon. It was France who liberated Greece at Navarino in 1827; who did the same for Belgium before the walls of Antwerp in 1832; who later helped toward the establishment of independence in Rumania, and who made possible the unity of Italy when she stood at Magenta and Solferino, without which there could have been no peace of Villafranca. Reviewing these last contributions of France, Charles Downer Hazen, professor of history in Columbia University, does not call France imperialistic. He calls her the "liberator of nations."

The very existence of the third Republic is the supreme answer to the charge that France is imperialistic.

"La duce France." "There is no culture but the French," said Nietzsche. "The most beautiful kingdom after the Kingdom of Heaven," wrote Grotius. And our own Benjamin Franklin, after years of residence in France, expressed the sentiment that "every man has two mother countries, his own and then France." Surely there are no people more socially developed, more gracious, more

artistic, more "infinitely civilized," than the French. No people ever become more exalted in crises than the French. No race has a greater hatred for cant, sentimentality, insincerity, brag, and bombast than the French.

It is natural and inevitable that France should indignantly deny the charge of imperialism. She believes that she is safeguarding civilization by carrying out her pledges, by defending her treaty obligations, by helping the rest of us to fulfill our pledges, by carrying on in the name of all those high purposes with which she is thrilled when she utters these, her most sacred of words, *La Patrie*.

THE HEALTH OF GERMANY

THE expert committee on reparations is evidently to look after Germany's health. That is encouraging news. General Charles G. Dawes has discovered already that Germany is ill. Her capacity to pay is weak; so the General has decided that the economic processes of Germany will have to revive under a stable currency and under a balanced budget before the doctors can go further. The basic and controlling lesions being brought to light, the treatment can be administered.

In his address to the expert committee January 14 he said: "Any common-sense individual can estimate the distance a well man can run. Fifty medical experts gathered around the bedside of a dying patient will give fifty estimates of how far he can run if he gets well. The Reparations Commission and the world, upon the question of Germany's capacity to pay, have been listening thus far to the medical experts. Let us first help Germany to get well."

That sounds like common sense; it also sounds like sympathy. That is an encouraging note.

We do not realize the barriers erected by national pride and selfish interest. The

General is right. During his short sojourn in France the General has seen things. He tells us "of those foul and carrion-loving vultures—the nationalistic demagogues of all countries—who would exploit their pitiful personalities out of a common misfortune." So far, nobody seems to have arisen to ask to whom the General referred. The General feels that since there was a complete allied co-operation when the nations were faced with an overwhelming emergency in 1914, there should be now a complete allied co-operation and for the same reason. That is a general proposition, but it sounds good.

The economists who have written books recently on the economic situation in Europe get little comfort from General Dawes' speech. The General tells them that they have stirred up "an impenetrable and colossal fog bank of economic opinion" based upon rapidly shifting premises. So in his attempt to crown common sense as king he begins by recognizing that the foundations of economic Germany have well-nigh crumbled away, and with them the productivity of the German people. Having lost their capacity for work, Germany has lost her capacity to pay. The remedies offered have, in the main, been surcharged with political poisons. Evidently the expert committee on reparations propose to apply their business minds uninfluenced by political ambitions or thought of personal consequences. They are going at once about the business of stabilizing Germany and balancing the German budget. Every right-thinking person wishes them success. The German people may well be encouraged, for out of this new and disinterested examination of the facts there ought to come the beginnings of the new day for the stricken German people.

There is in Germany an abiding belief in this great new day for that people. There is every historical reason for believing that those highly intelligent folk will

come again to the principles of self-government, take up their industrial, social and educational work, and become respected once more by their neighbors.

AGAIN, THE MEXICAN PROBLEM

MEXICO has become again a cloud on the Pan-American sky. At a time when we had begun to breathe easily over this situation because of the resumption of normal diplomatic relations with Mexico, De la Huerta, until recently a member of the Obregon Cabinet, now a candidate for the high office of President of the Republic, has been able to finance and to carry on a revolutionary movement of no mean proportions. Our Executive Department, wishing to aid the Mexican Government, which we have recently recognized, decided to furnish military supplies to President Obregon. Public opinion of the United States hoped that this would mean the speedy termination of the revolution. To date such has not been the result.

The situation is highly complicated. Rebels have had a way of winning out in Mexico. Madero was successful against Diaz; Huerta was successful against Madero; Carranza was successful against Huerta. Is the present Huerta to be successful against Obregon?

Huerta has attempted to blockade Tampico. He may be able to shut off commerce with that city, including United States commerce. As a belligerent he claims to be within his rights. But the United States has not recognized the Huertistas as belligerents. So far as the United States is concerned, Huerta is therefore without status in international law. President Obregon has asked the privilege of transferring his troops across United States territory. From a military point of view, Obregon's request should be granted. Texas has agreed. In the meantime Huerta has succeeded in getting war

supplies from England. Obregon, with no fighting ships in the Gulf of Mexico, has been unable to stop Huerta from landing these supplies at Vera Cruz. Thus the United States furnishes military supplies to Obregon, while English manufacturers supply the revolutionists. In the meantime our commerce, to say nothing of the rights of our nationalists in Mexico, is threatened.

The United States has sent battleships to Mexico. Shall we have to send troops to the aid of Obregon? We have started out to help Obregon defeat Huerta. Where shall we draw the line?

Of course, what we are to do in Mexico will depend largely upon the state of public opinion in our country. At the moment there is no demand that American forces be used against Huerta. Our policy of establishing an embargo on shipments of arms to Mexico has not been effective in similar situations heretofore. It may not prove effective now.

The issue, of course, is clear. General Obregon wishes his successor in office to be his friend Calles. De la Huerta, wishing the presidency himself, has started the revolution to thwart the will of Obregon. The only hopeful solution of a situation like this would seem to lie in the good sense and patriotism of the Mexican people themselves.

RUSSIA'S DIFFICULTY

RUSSIA has had a hard time convincing the nations of the world that she is a fit companion. Her governmental experiment does not appeal either to the common sense or the imagination of other governments. The agencies in control of that country are a Soviet Government, a Russian Communist Party, and the Third International. Collectively they represent a united and energetic opposition to capitalistic forms of government, to capitalistic society wherever organized. True,

the Russian Communists have found that their theories do not work in their own country. So far as they have been able to bring anything like order out of their chaos, they have found it necessary to adopt the methods of the capitalists. In the main, their movement seems to have been the evolution of an adolescent enthusiasm coming slowly at last to the sense of an approaching maturity.

Under date of December 22 we wrote to Senator William E. Borah as follows:

"Please tell me if I am wrong in the following assumptions relative to the position of Russia in our modern world. I understand the facts to be—

"First, that there are three agencies in control of affairs in Russia: a Soviet Government, controlled by the Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party, which Communist Party is theoretically under the control of the Central Executive Committee of the Third International. In practice, however, I understand that the Executive Committee of the Communist Party controls at present the Third International.

"Second, that the Third International is organized under the constitution of the Second World Congress, held in 1920, which constitution has not been changed.

"Third, that under this constitution the scheme for the organization of the world is that there shall be one Communist Party in each country, which Communist Party shall control the Soviet Government in each country, and which shall itself be under the control of the Central Executive Committee of the Third International, as a world organization.

"Fourth, that a number of the important members of the Soviet Government in Russia are also members of the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party, and in turn they are also members of the Central Executive Committee of the Third International. For, example, Lenin, Trotsky, and Kamenev are members of all three organizations. Zinoviev, the president of the Central Executive Committee of the Third International, is a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

"Do not these facts make Zinoviev fully as responsible for the policies and actions of the Soviet Government as Lenin, Trotsky, and Kamenev for the policies and actions of the Third International? And do not these facts establish beyond any doubt the insoluble connection between the Soviet Government, the Russian Communist Party, and the Third International? Under this system of interlocking directorates, is it not difficult to distinguish between the responsibilities of the three agencies as proposed by the Third International? Does not Mr. Tchitcherin hide behind a mere technicality when he says that the Soviet Government has sent no instructions to the American Workers' Party?"

To date the Senator has been too busy to reply.

OUR objections to the winning plan of the American Peace Award arise from no criticism of its origin or purpose. We grant that there are merits in the plan. While there are objections to the methods employed, we do not object to the plan on that ground. We are opposed to the plan because it contains nearly a score of misstatements or misrepresentations of fact; because it proposes that we work under a covenant which the author himself condemns and which he shows the League itself condemns; and, more important, because we believe there is a much better plan. Readers of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* know what that plan is.

WHEN radicals come into power, then responsibility gradually makes them over into conservatives. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, just beginning his job as Prime Minister of Great Britain, will prove no exception to this rule. With the duties of office almost upon him, he complained of Britain's indecisive and ineffective foreign policies. He moaned over the conditions of Central Europe. He pleaded for new policies and new machinery and

for the day when diplomacy will be handled more skillfully, more sympathetically for the susceptibility of other peoples; but he was quick to add that what England wants at the same time is "a friendly but firm assertion" of her "own interests." He went on to add: "We must have a new beginning. We cannot be disregarded; our interests will not allow us to be disregarded, and I am perfectly certain that no nation in Europe wishes to disregard us if we show enough self-respect to impress it upon them." Of such is radical idealism faced with the responsibilities for action in government.

THE Permanent Court of International Justice, organized by the League of Nations, has occupied a large place in public discussion. Numbers of inquiries come to this office asking for material relative to this project. We call attention to the little book reviewed elsewhere in these columns, entitled the "Permanent Court of International Justice." This book, which can be obtained from this Society, will be particularly serviceable for persons interested in working up debates for or against the court.

THE Treaty of Versailles may be characterized as the curse of Europe; yet this treaty is a fact. It is the supreme law of Europe, now as upon the day of its ratification, five years ago. There will come a day when the treaty will be altered; but any modification will have to follow the usual processes of the conference, redraft, and ratification. At the moment it is the foundation upon which rest the new States of Europe and the law-abiding behavior of all parties to the treaty. Mr. Louis Barthou, President of the Reparations Commission, in his address of welcome to the committee of experts, of which our General Dawes is now the chairman, said: "The Treaty of Versailles is our charter.

It shall be yours. It is within its scope that in conformity with article 234 you will pursue your work in full independence and high impartiality." Mr. Barthou here expresses the French will. France is determined that the Treaty of Versailles shall not be considered as a mere scrap of paper. This is a fundamental fact, the starting point for any reconstruction of Europe.

A REPORTER who has devoted a number of years to interviewing travelers just returned from Europe has come to the conclusion that opinions on conditions in Europe can be easily classified for the convenience of the press. This he believes to be a very simple matter. He finds that practically every person returning from Europe has adopted one of seven theories. These theories he summarizes as follows: (1) The Tory theory—Hurrah for Mussolini! (2) The Liberal theory—Hurrah for England! (3) The Radical theory—Hurrah for Russia! (4) The Professional World War Veteran theory—Hurrah for France! (5) The Isolationists' theory—Hurrah for Us! (6) The Pro-League theory—Hurrah for Everybody! (7) The Average Man theory—Well, well, well! We gather the impression from the tenor of his remarks that there should be added an eighth, the Reporter's theory—Oh, —!—

IS France proceeding from worthy motives, safeguarding civilization by carrying out the provisions of the treaty? Frederick Bausman, a former member of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, has written a book—"Let France Explain"—published in England, in which he develops the thesis that "France is a spoiled child, and a dangerously spoiled child." In the next number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* we shall print a review of this book by a well-known publicist.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN FRANCE

THE pronounced decline of the franc has increased living costs in France and adversely affected government finances, according to a cable to the Department of Commerce from Commercial Attaché Chester Lloyd Jones at Paris. Manufacturers, especially metallurgists, are profiting temporarily from the export demand created by the declining franc.

Exports in November were valued at 2,942,000,000 francs, compared with 2,814,000,000 francs in October, and imports at 3,161,000,000 francs, compared with 3,068,000,000 francs. Eleven months' exports totaled 27,318,000,000 francs, of which foodstuffs constituted 2,885,000,000 francs; raw materials, 8,295,000,000; manufactured goods, 14,685,000,000, and parcel post packages, 1,452,000,000 francs. Imports for the period were valued at 28,781,000,000 francs, of which foodstuffs constituted 6,672,000,000 francs; raw material, 18,210,000,000 francs, and manufactured articles, 3,898,000,000 francs. The tonnage of exports in the eleven months' period was 22,126,000 metric tons and of imports 49,756,000 metric tons, of which coal formed 28,000,000 tons.

Weather Unfavorable to Crops

Continued rains, low temperatures, and insects are retarding the progress of the spring crops. The serious overflow of the Seine has caused the shutdown of many suburban factories. Preventive measures have been expensive to the Paris municipality.

Wholesale prices in France in November showed a considerable increase from the prices in the preceding month, according to statistics issued by the *Statistique Générale*. The basis for the figures for both months has been changed from average 1913 prices to average prices in July, 1914. The following table shows the advances:

Commodities.	October, 1923.	November, 1923.
General index, all commodities	429	452
Vegetables	343	358
Animal foodstuffs.....	402	414
Item including sugar.....	448	487
All foodstuffs.....	386	404
Textiles	539	592
Metals and minerals.....	438	461
Miscellaneous	441	456
All industrials.....	467	494

The Paris retail foodstuffs price index for November, also based on July, 1914, prices, was 355, compared with 349 for October.

THE GERMAN SITUATION

THE response to the invitations extended in December by the Reparations Commission to the Allied and Associated Powers to suggest experts for the two committees decided upon resulted in further invitations being sent to the following nominees, the first two to sit upon the committee for inquiry into the German budgetary situation and German currency, and the third upon the committee to investigate the problem of German holdings abroad:

United States: General Charles G. Dawes, Mr. Owen D. Young, and Mr. H. M. Robinson.

Great Britain: Sir Robert Kindersley, Sir Josiah Stamp, and Mr. Reginald McKenna.

France: Georges Parmentier and Professor Allix.

Italy: Dr. Alberto Pirelli, Professor Frederico Flora, and Signor Mario Alberti.

Belgium: Baron Houtart, M. Emile Francqui, and M. Albert Edouard Jansen.

The first committee opened its sessions on January 14, the second on January 21.

The Reparations Inquiry

The keynote of the experts' deliberations was given by General Dawes in a speech,

at the opening of the first committee, in a phrase, namely: "Strictly business and no politics." Germany's productivity was the key to the restoration of Europe, he declared, and went on to censure the nationalistic tendencies of various European statesmen, which, in his opinion, had obstructed the world's recovery. Disaster, he predicted, faced the Allies and Europe unless common sense were crowned king. While unable to speak officially either for the American Government or for the American people, General Dawes nevertheless, as an individual, deplored demagogic exploitation of the European situation by Americans anxious to make political capital out of it. He said he did not know whether a common-sense reparations conception existed, but added: "We shall know. To the knowledge of whether this conception exists the result of our work and the action of the Reparations Commission thereon will, perhaps, be the final contribution."

M. Louis Barthou promised French cooperation and expressed French desires for its success, upon which, in his opinion, the pacific equilibrium of the entire world depended.

The first witness invited to appear before the committee headed by General Dawes was Dr. Schacht, President of the Reichsbank and German Currency Commissioner, in order to avail itself of Dr. Schacht's knowledge of the present currency situation in Germany and to receive his suggestions as to measures which could be quickly applied to improve the status of the mark and stabilize it.

The Food Loan

The German Government's attempt to secure a seventy-million-dollar loan, principally from the United States, for the purchase of foodstuffs, came to nothing for the time being, owing to the action of the Reparations Commission, which refused to accede to a request for permission to make the credit a first lien upon reparations. The French Government, supported by the Belgian Government, determined to delay action by the Reparations Commission until the Dawes Commission, so called, completed its inquiry and made its report. Arrangements with banking interests in America for handling the load had been completed.

According to information received by the United States Government, Germany has devised a temporary method of obtaining fats and other foods it needs from abroad by collecting a tax on exports from the country to be used for this purpose, but professes itself unable to cope with the situation much longer.

The Internal Situation in Germany

The continued stability of the Rentenmark currency and the resumption of production in the Ruhr caused some slight industrial improvement in Germany, but the financial situation remained precarious and the unoccupied regions noted an increase of business stagnation and unemployment. The operation of measures to insure deflation, which at the time of writing were in the first stages, caused a serious depression to be felt among manufacturers. Subsidies from the government were stopped, and railway rates and taxes fixed on a gold basis, making them substantially higher than the pre-war level. Cheap credits became no longer available, since the Reichsbank initiated a policy under which loans could only be granted under a guarantee of full indemnity for the bank in case of depreciation before maturity.

Some favorable elements in the situation were created by the reintroduction of a longer working day and the prevalence of low wages, which, reckoned on a gold basis, were at the time of writing only two-thirds of pre-war scales.

By the middle of January the note circulation of the Reichsbank had reached some five hundred quintillions, equivalent at the then current official parity to five hundred million gold marks. Treasury bills and discounts were said to have been wholly redeemed. The gold reserve was 467,000,000.

Estimates by the Labor Ministry showed between two and three million totally unemployed in unoccupied Germany, though the rapid increase of earlier months was said to have ceased.

German Concessions in Russia

The German Volga Bank is reported to have obtained from the Supreme Concession Committee a concession of 270,000 acres of free land in the autonomous reservation of the Volga Germans. The aims

of the concessionaires are said to be the restoration of agriculture by giving out-subconcessions. Following the approval of this concession by the Council of Commissioners, the bank began negotiations abroad which resulted in the signing of a preliminary project of a subconcession agreement in Berlin, according to which 67,000 acres were to be leased to the German Russian Agrarian Association. This agreement was confirmed by the Council of Commissioners on October 23. The subconcession is for 36 years. During the first year the concessionaires are bound to cultivate at least 10 per cent of the territory; on the second, 30 per cent; on the third, 80 per cent, and on the fourth, 100 per cent. The plan of exploitation must be confirmed by the Commissariat of Agriculture and mineral rights are retained by the government.

GERMAN ACTIVITIES IN HOLLAND

CONDITIONS of doing business in Germany during recent months have been so difficult that both industry and finance have sought to transfer a certain amount of their activities to a country where business could be done without the restrictions placed on it at home. Holland, geographically convenient, politically neutral, and for years a favorite stamping ground for German capital and business, was the logical place for such an escape, and it is estimated by a Dutch banker that since the armistice several milliards of gold marks of German capital have been sent to Holland to be employed in various ways. A large part of this sum has been transferred during the last few months, when business in Germany was at a standstill, according to recent reports of Consul General George E. Anderson, of the State Department.

The greatest investment of this German capital has been in banking, since this means merely the transfer of money and no purchase of factories. The Deutsche Bank, through a branch; the Disconto-Gesellschaft, through A. de Barg & Co., and the Dresdner Bank, through Proehl & Gutman, have long been represented in Holland, and lately the Commerz und Privatbank of Berlin have secured direct

representation through Hugo Kauffmann & Co.'s bank; the Darmstaedter und National Bank have obtained control of Hamburger & Co., while the Barmer Bankverein, a Stinnes organ, and part of the powerful Provincial Bank Verein, and the Thyssen group, through the Disconto Effectenbank, are preparing to extend their operations considerably.

Financing Export Trade

With the financing of export trade facilitated through provision of the necessary banking facilities, the next step has been to found or acquire distinct export concerns, with the intention of handling German exports through Holland and of securing concessions in various countries, notably South America and the Dutch East Indies. The large rolling mills, the Linke - Hofmann Werke - Lauchhammer, have established in Amsterdam the Maatschappij voor Yzer-Staal-en Spoorwegindustrie, which co-operates with the Dutch rolling-mill industry and is financed in its operations by a Dutch bank. The Scheidemandel chemical works are represented in the same way, and also a large Berlin glass manufactory. Directly or indirectly, the Stinnes, Siemens, and Allgemeine Elektrizitaets Gesellschaft have all established connections of this character, while the German wool trade has made special arrangements for the handling of their supply of raw material, with the possible diversion to Amsterdam of a large part of the wool imports into Germany. In this latter move Dutch bankers are closely concerned. The Bergmann Elektrizitaetswerke are also represented in Amsterdam. Large export firms, as Heckt, Pfeiffer & Co., have their own branches in Holland.

It is estimated that there are some \$400,000,000 of German money now on deposit in Dutch banks, and it is known that a large part of the stocks and bonds floated during the last year on the Amsterdam stock exchange, including some American issues, has been acquired for German account.

The primary purpose of the German investments described above is said not to be "economic penetration" or an intention to compete with Dutch manufacture, but merely to provide facilities, unobtainable in Germany at present, for necessary ex-

port business. Nevertheless Dutch industries have taken alarm and are pressing for certain protective measures.

THE ITALIAN-SPANISH TRADE TREATY

BY THE commercial treaty between Italy and Spain, effective December 10, 1923, Italy accords Spain conventional duties (rates below the general tariff) on articles included in 43 items of the Italian tariff and most-favored-nation treatment on articles included in 234 items. All other articles are subject to the general rates. In exchange, Spain accords Italy conventional duties (rates below the second column) on articles included in 96 items of the Spanish tariff and most-favored-nation treatment on articles included in 809 items.

The list of Spanish products accorded conventional rates in the Italian tariff, as reported to the Department of Commerce by Commercial Attaché C. M. Cunningham, consists in large part of foodstuffs and raw materials useful in Italian industry, and includes fish, fresh and salted; sardines, anchovies, fresh and preserved fruits, preserved vegetables, fresh and preserved olives, mineral ores, pig-iron and steel billets, cork, licorice root, crude tartar, goat, sheep, and calf skins, tanned without the hair; dried and fresh orange and lemon peeling.

In many instances the conventional rates granted Spain are merely those already granted other nations by treaty, and therefore do not represent any new rates. On a few items, including sardines and anchovies, almonds, preserved olives, casks, cork products, and tanned skins, the conventional duties granted by Italy to Spain by this treaty are lower than previously existing conventional rates, but the reductions are slight. Most other special products are accorded most-favored-nation treatment in Italy.

The list of Italian goods accorded conventional rates in the Spanish tariff includes furniture, hand tools, locomotives and locomotive tenders and spare parts, hydraulic and electric motors, pumping machinery and other machinery, dynamos, magnetos, transformers, and similar electrical equipment, automobiles and auto-

motive products, unmanufactured rubber, rubber tires, sanitary supplies, wearing apparel of all kinds, raw and refined sulphur, pharmaceutical products, hemp and sisal thread, binder twine.

On the majority of these articles the conventional rates granted to Italy are the same as those previously granted by treaty to other nations. Most of the products on which new concessions in the Spanish duties are established are distinctive Italian specialties, in which there is little competitive interest from the United States. The list chiefly comprises marble, glass beads, crude sulphur, citric and tartaric acid, hemp, sheets of unvulcanized rubber, and hats and caps of straw or of wool or hair felt.

The list of Italian goods accorded most-favored-nation treatment upon importation into Spain is extensive, including a large number of manufactures and foodstuffs. All Italian goods not entitled to conventional rates in the Spanish tariff are subject to the rates of the second column.

Other provisions of the treaty relate to import restrictions, transit trade, sanitary measures, certificates of origin, and certificates of analysis. Most-favored-nation and national treatment is reciprocally accorded to the ships of the two countries, with the exception of ships engaged in coastwise trade. Most-favored-nation treatment is also reciprocally accorded to the commercial travelers and to commercial, industrial, and financial organizations. Spain reserves the right to withhold from Italy such special benefits as it may in the future grant to colonies, Portugal, and the Spanish-American republics. A most important provision of the treaty is the elimination of Italian goods from the customs surcharge levied on goods from countries with depreciated currencies.

The new rates established by this treaty in the conventional tariff of Italy are extended to the United States by virtue of its most-favored-nation status in Italy. The few new rates established in the conventional tariff of Spain are not, however, extended to the United States.

Further detailed information regarding the treaty will be furnished by the Division of Foreign Tariffs of the Department of Commerce upon request.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH EDUCATION

THE World Federation of Education Associations has announced a new contest for a peace plan. This contest differs materially from the American Peace Award inaugurated by Mr. Edward Bok.

\$25,000 Award for Peace Plan

A gentleman whose name is withheld has given the Federation twenty-five thousand dollars, to be used as an award for the best plan which will bring to the world the greatest security from war. The donor of this gift watched the proceedings of the World Conference on Education which met in San Francisco in June, 1923, and, believing that lasting peace can come only through education, he desires to encourage a movement calculated to promote friendliness among the nations.

The World Federation has acknowledged the gift to be used in furthering the world's greatest cause, and has accepted the offer. The Federation joins the donor in the belief that such a reformation as the award is to promote must await the longer processes of education. It also accepts the belief that textbook materials and teaching attitudes are all essential, and any plan proposed must have as its principal object the bringing about of a better understanding between nations, with the elimination of hatreds, both racial and national.

The Peace Plan

A plan of education calculated to produce world amity is desired. The contest calls for a world-wide program of education which will promote the peace of the world. The contest is likewise world-wide and open to interested persons of all countries. The plan does not call for legislative action unless necessary to back up new and fundamental processes. It is the conviction of the giver and of the Federation that universal peace must have universal application and must begin with unprejudiced childhood. It is rather desired to create a world-wide thinking on the subject of the Golden Rule as applied to international contacts, and to produce a psychology or "world mindedness" such as will support any system of diplomacy or any functioning of the State.

Rules of the Contest

The rules of the World Federation contest are as follows:

1. All manuscripts must be in typewritten form, with sufficient margin for the notes of examiners.

2. The Commission on Award reserves the right to reject such manuscripts as it may desire.

3. The plan should contain a clear, concise set-up of not to exceed 2,500 words, with not more than an equal number of words in argument or clarifying statements.

4. Manuscripts will not be returned. The Federation reserves the right to retain, for such use as it may see fit, all plans submitted.

5. Only one plan may be submitted by one person or organization, and no person who is a member of an organization which submits a plan shall be allowed to participate further in the contest.

6. In order to secure impartial decision manuscripts should be unmarked, but should be accompanied by a plain, sealed envelope, unmarked, in which shall be given the author's name and address, so that in case of acceptance the award may be mailed to the proper person. Any identifying marks on the manuscript will render the sender ineligible to compete.

7. Plans must be submitted to Augustus O. Thomas, president of the World Federation of Education Associations, Augusta, Maine, U. S. A., bearing postmark not later than July 1, 1924.

8. Twelve thousand five hundred dollars of the award will be given when the plan is accepted and \$12,500 when the plan is inaugurated.

Commission on Award

The commission which will examine the manuscripts submitted and will decide on the award will consist of the following persons: Henry M. Robinson, president, First National Bank, Los Angeles, Calif., and member of Board of International Arbitration; Henry Noble McCracken, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Percival P. Baxter, Governor of Maine, Augusta, Maine; Herbert S. Houston, publisher of *Our World*, New York, N. Y.; P. W. Henry, Scarborough-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.; Olive M. Jones, president,

National Education Association, Public School 120, New York, N. Y.; Henry E. Dunnack, State Librarian, Augusta, Maine; J. W. Crabtree, secretary, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.; Cora Wilson Stewart, chairman, Illiteracy Commission, Frankfort, Ky.; George T. Moody, Bound Brook, N. J.; Carleton E.

Ladd, Buffalo, N. Y.; William Gibbs McAdoo, Los Angeles, Calif.; Milton A. McRea, Script-McRea Newspaper Bureau, Detroit, Mich., and San Diego, Calif.; Alfred Lucking, Ford Building, Detroit, Mich.; R. A. Milliken, president, Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

THE WINNING PLAN

No. 1469 Selected by Jury of American Peace Award

Mr. Bok's Statement

WITH deep satisfaction I present for the consideration and vote of the American people the plan selected by the jury as entitled to the American Peace Award under the conditions.

The award brought forth 22,165 plans. Since many of them were the composite work of organizations, universities, etc., a single plan often represented the views of hundreds or thousands of individuals. There were also received several hundred thousand of letters which, while they did not submit plans, suggested in almost each instance a solution of the peace problem.

The jury had, therefore, before it an index of the true feeling and judgment of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. The plans came from every group in American life. Some were obviously from life-long students of history and international law. Some were from persons who have studied little, but who have themselves seen and felt the horror of war, or who are even now living out its tragedy.

However unlike, they almost all express or imply the same conviction: That this is the time for the nations of the earth to admit frankly that war is a crime, and thus withdraw the legal and moral sanction too long permitted to it as a method of settling international disputes. Thousands of plans show a deep aspiration to have the United States take the lead in a common agreement to brand war in very truth an "outlaw."

The plans show a realization that no adequate defense against this situation has thus far been devised, and that no international law has been developed to control it. They point out that security of life and property is dependent upon the

abolition of war and the cessation of the manufacture of munitions of war.

Some of the plans labor with the problem of changing the hearts of men and disposing them toward peace and goodwill; some labor to find a practicable means of dealing with the economic causes of war; some labor with adjusting racial animosities, with producing a finer conception of nationalism, etc., etc.

Through the plans as a whole run these dominant currents:

That, if war is honestly to be prevented, there must be a right-about-face on the part of the nations in their attitude toward it, and that by some progressive agreement the manufacture and purchase of the munitions of war must be limited or stopped.

That, while no political mechanism alone will insure co-operation among the nations, *there must be some machinery of co-operation* if the will to co-operate is to be made effective; that mutual counsel among the nations is the real hope for bringing about the disavowal of war by the open avowal of its real causes and open discussion of them.

Finally, that there must be some means of defining, recording, interpreting and developing the law of nations.

The jury of award unanimously selected the plan given below as the one which most closely reflected several of these currents.

The Honorable Elihu Root, chairman of the jury of award, then prepared the following forward-looking statement indicating that the mutual counsel and co-operation among the nations provided in the selected plan may lead to the realization of another, and not the least important, of the dominant desires of the American public as expressed in the plans:

"It is the unanimous hope of the jury that the first fruit of the mutual counsel and co-operation among the nations which will result from the adoption of the plan selected will be a general prohibition of the manufacture and sale of all materials of war."

The purpose of the American Peace Award is thus fulfilled: To reflect in a practicable plan the dominating national sentiment as expressed by the large cross-section of the American public taking part in the award.

I therefore commend the winning plan as unanimously selected by the jury of award, and, Mr. Root's statement of the first object to be attained by the counsel and co-operation provided in the plan, to the interest and the widest possible vote of the American people.

JANUARY, 1924. EDWARD W. BOK.

Statement of Jury of Award

The jury of award realizes that there is no one approach to world peace, and that it is necessary to recognize not merely political, but also psychological and economic factors. The only possible pathway to international agreement with reference to these complicated and difficult factors is through mutual counsel and co-operation, which the plan selected contemplates. It is therefore the unanimous opinion of the jury that of the 22,165 plans submitted, Plan Number 1469 is "the best practicable plan by which the United States may co-operate with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world."

It is the unanimous hope of the jury that the first fruit of the mutual counsel and co-operation among the nations which will result from the adoption of the plan selected will be a general prohibition of the manufacture and sale of all materials of war.

ELIHU ROOT, *Chairman.*
 JAMES GUTHRIE HARBORD.
 EDWARD M. HOUSE.
 ELLEN FITZ PENDLETON.
 ROSCOE POUND.
 WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE.
 BRAND WHITLOCK.

Author's Name Not to Be Revealed until
 After Referendum

In order that the vote may be taken solely upon the merits of the plan, the

policy committee, with the acquiescence of Mr. Bok, has decided not to disclose the authorship of the plan until after the referendum, or early in February. The identity of the author is unknown to the members of the jury of award and the policy committee, except one delegated member.

The Policy Committee: John W. Davis, Learned Hand, William H. Johnston, Esther Everett Lape, member in charge; Nathan L. Miller, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Mrs. Ogden Reid, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Henry L. Stimson, Melville E. Stone, Mrs. Frank A. Vanderlip, Cornelius N. Bliss, Jr., treasurer.

The Plan in Brief

Proposes—

I. That the United States shall immediately enter the Permanent Court of International Justice, under the conditions stated by Secretary Hughes and President Harding in February, 1923.

II. That, without becoming a member of the League of Nations as at present constituted, the United States shall offer to extend its present co-operation with the League and participate in the work of the League *as a body of mutual counsel* under conditions which

1. Substitute moral force and public opinion for the military and economic force originally implied in Articles X and XVI.
2. Safeguard the Monroe Doctrine.
3. Accept the fact that the United States will assume no obligations under the Treaty of Versailles except by act of Congress.
4. Propose that membership in the League should be opened to all nations.
5. Provide for the continuing development of international law.

Full Text of Plan

The complete manuscript of Plan No. 1469, providing for co-operation between the United States and other nations "to achieve and preserve the peace of the world," is given below, including the author's reasoning:

Plan Number 1469

There Is Not Room for More Than One Organization to Promote International Co-operation

Five-sixths of all nations, including about four-fifths of mankind, have already created

a world organization, the purpose of which is "to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security."

Those nations cannot and will not abandon this system, which has now been actively operating for three and a half years. If leading members of the United States Government ever had serious hopes that another association of nations could be formed, such hopes were dispelled during the Washington Conference by plain intimations from other powers that there is not room for more than one organization like the League of Nations.

The States outside the organized world are not of such a character that the United States could hopefully co-operate with them for the purpose named.

Therefore, the only possible path to co-operation in which the United States can take an increasing share is that which leads toward some form of agreement with the world as now organized, called the League of Nations.

By sheer force of social international gravitation, such co-operation becomes inevitable.

The United States Has Already Gone Far in Co-operation with the League of Nations

The United States Government, theoretically maintaining a policy of isolation, has actually gone far, since March 4, 1921, toward "co-operation with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world."

The most familiar part of the story is the work of the Washington Conference, wherein President Harding's administration made a beginning of naval disarmament, opened to China a prospect of rehabilitation, and joined with Great Britain, Japan, and France to make the Pacific Ocean worthy of its name.

Later came the recommendation that the United States should adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Not long after that action President Harding wrote to Bishop Gallor:

"I do not believe any man can confront the responsibility of a President of the United States and yet adhere to the idea that it is possible for our country to maintain an attitude of isolation and aloofness in the world."

But since the proposed adhesion to the Permanent Court would bring this country into close contact at one time and point with the League of Nations, and since such action is strenuously opposed for exactly that reason, it is pertinent to inquire not only how much co-operation with the League and its organs

has been proposed during the life of the present administration, but also how much has been actually begun.

Officially or Unofficially, the United States Is Represented on Many League Commissions

The United States Government has accredited its representatives to sit as members "in an unofficial and consulting capacity" upon four of the most important social welfare commissions of the League, viz: Health, Opium, Traffic in Women and Children, and Anthrax (Industrial Hygiene).

Our government is a full member of the International Hydrographic Bureau, an organ of the League. Our government was represented by an "unofficial observer" in the Brussels Conference (Finance and Economic Commission) in 1920. It sent Hon. Stephen G. Porter and Bishop Brent to represent it at the meeting of the Opium Commission last May.

Our Public Health Service has taken part in the serological congresses of the Epidemics Commission and has helped in the experimental work for the standardization of serums.

Our government collaborates with the League Health Organization through the International Office of Public Health at Paris, and with the Agriculture Committee of the League Labor Organization through the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome.

In February, 1923, Secretary Hughes and President Harding formally recommended that the Senate approve our adhesion to the Permanent Court under four conditions or reservations, one of which was that the United States should officially participate in the election of judges by the Assembly and Council of the League, sitting as electoral colleges for that purpose.

Unofficial co-operation from the United States with the work of the League includes membership in five of the social welfare commissions or committees of the League, in one on economic reconstruction, and in one (Aaland Islands) which averted a war. American women serve as expert assessors upon the Opium and Traffic in Women Commissions.

Two philanthropic agencies in the United States have between them pledged more than \$400,000 to support either the work of the Epidemics Commission or the League inquiry into conditions of the traffic in women and children.

How Can Increasing Co-operation Between the United States and the Organized World Be Secured?

The United States being already so far committed to united counsels with League agencies for the common social welfare, all of which have some bearing upon the preservation of world peace, the question before us may take this form:

How can increasing co-operation between the United States and the organized world for the promotion of peace and security be assured, in forms acceptable to the people of the United States and hopefully practicable?

The United States Can Extend Its Present Co-operation with the League's Social Welfare Activities

Without any change in its present policy, already described, the United States Government could, first, show its willingness to co-operate similarly with the other humane and reconstructive agencies of the League. To four of these agencies that government has already sent delegates with advisory powers. It could as properly accept invitations to accredit members with like powers to each one of the other welfare commissions. It has already received invitations from two of the latter.

It is, secondly, immediately practicable to extend the same kind of co-operation, whenever asked to do it, so as to include participation in the work of the commissions and technical committees of the Labor Organization. The record shows that such co-operation is already begun.

The single common purpose of all these committees is the collection and study of information on which may be based subsequent recommendations for national legislation.

All conventions and resolutions recommended by the first three congresses of the International Labor Organization have already been laid before the Senate of the United States and without objection, referred to the appropriate committee. No different procedure would have been followed if the United States were a member of the Labor Organization of the League.

An Immediate Step Is Adherence to the Permanent Court

A third immediately practicable step is the Senate's approval of the proposal that the United States adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice for the reasons and

under the conditions stated by Secretary Hughes and President Harding in February, 1923.

These three suggestions for increasing co-operation with the family of nations are in harmony with policies already adopted by our government, and in the last case with a policy so old and well recognized that it may now be called traditional.

They do not involve a question of membership in the League of Nations as now constituted, but it cannot be denied that they lead to the threshold of that question. Any further step toward co-operation must confront the problem of direct relations between the United States and the Assembly and Council of fifty-four nations in the League.*

In Actual Operation the League Employs No Force

The practical experience of the League during its first three and a half years of life has not only wrought out, in a group of precedents, the beginnings of what might be called the constitutional law of the League, but it has also shifted the emphasis in activities of the League and foreshadowed important modifications in its constitution, the covenant.

At its birth the Covenant of the League bore, vaguely in Article X and more clearly in Article XVI, the impression of a general agreement to enforce and coerce. Both of those articles suggest the action of a world State which never existed and does not now exist. How far the present League is actually removed from functioning as such a State is sufficiently exhibited in its dealings with Lithuania and Poland over Vilna and their common boundary and with Greece and Italy over Corfu.

Experience in the last three years has demonstrated probably insuperable difficulties in the way of fulfilling in all parts of the world the large promise of Article X, in respect to either its letter or its spirit. No one now expects the League Council to try to summon armies and fleets, since it utterly failed to obtain even an international police force for the Vilna district.

Each assembly of the League has witnessed vigorous efforts to interpret and modify Article X. In the Fourth Assembly an attempt to adopt an interpretation of that

*Fifty-seven States, including Germany, are members of the International Labor Organization of the League. There are about sixty-five independent States in the world.

article is essential agreement with the senatorial reservation on the same subject in 1920 was blocked only by a small group of weak States like Persia and Panama, which evidently attributed to Article X a protective power that it possesses only on paper.

Such States, in possible fear of unfriendly neighbors, must decide whether the preservation of a form of words in the Covenant is more vital to their peace and security and to the peace and security of the world than the presence of the United States at the council table of the family of nations.

As to Article XVI, the Council of the League created a Blockade Commission which worked for two years to determine how the "economic weapon" of the League could be efficiently used and uniformly applied. The commission failed to discover any obligatory procedure that weaker powers would dare to accept. It was finally agreed that each State must decide for itself whether a breach of the covenant has been committed.

The Second Assembly adopted a radically amended form of Article XVI, from which was removed all reference to the possibility of employing military force and in which the abandonment of uniform obligation was directly provided for. The British Government has since proposed to weaken the form of requirement still further.

Articles X and XVI, in their original forms, have therefore been practically condemned by the principal organs of the League and are today reduced to something like innocuous desuetude. The only kind of compulsion which nations can freely engage to apply to each other in the name of peace is that which arises from conference, from moral judgment, from full publicity, and from the power of public opinion.

The Leadership of the United States in the New World Is Obviously Recognized by the League

Another significant development in the constitutional practice of the League is the unwillingness of the League Council to intervene in any American controversy, even though all States in the New World except three are members of the League.

This refusal became evident in the Panama-Costa Rica dispute in 1921 and in the quarrel between Chile, Peru, and Bolivia—a quarrel which impelled the last two States to absent themselves from the Third Assembly, wherein a Chilean was chosen to preside.

Obviously the League intends to recognize the leadership of the United States in the New World precisely as the United States claims it. This is nothing less than the observance of an unwritten law limiting the powers and duties of the League Council, defined in Article XI of the Covenant, to questions that seem to threaten the peace of the Old World. When the United States is willing to bring the two halves of the world together for friendly consideration of common dangers, duties, and needs, it will be possible to secure, if it is desired, closer co-operation between the League organizations and the Pan-American Union, already a potential regional league. It is conceivable that the family of nations may eventually clearly define certain powers and duties of relatively local significance which may be developed upon local associations or unions. But the world of business and finance is already unified. The worlds of scientific knowledge and humane effort are nearly so. Isolation of any kind is increasingly impossible, and world organization, already centralized, is no more likely to return to disconnected effort than the United States is likely to revert to the Calhoun theory of States' Rights and Secession.

In Actual Operation, if Not in Original Conception, the League Realizes the Principle and the Hopes of The Hague Conferences

The operation of the League has therefore evolved a council widely different from the body imagined by the makers of the covenant. It can employ no force but that of persuasion and moral influence. Its only actual powers are to confer and advise, to create commissions, to exercise inquisitive, conciliative and arbitral functions, and to help elect judges of the Permanent Court.

In other words, the force of circumstances is gradually moving the League into position upon the foundations so well laid by the world's leaders between 1899 and 1907 in the great international councils of that period. The assemblies of the League and the congresses of the international labor organizations are successors to The Hague conferences.

The Permanent Court has at least begun to realize the highest hope and purpose of the Second League Conference.

The Secretariat and the Labor Office have become continuation committees for the administrative work of the organized world,

such as The Hague Conference lacked resources to create but would have rejoiced to see.

The Council, resolving loose and large theories into clean-cut and modest practice, has been gradually reconciling the League, as an organized world, with the ideals of international interdependence, temporarily obscured since 1914 by the shadows of the World War.

No one can deny that the organs of the League have brought to the service of the forces behind those ideals an efficiency, scope, and variety of appeal that in 1914 would have seemed incredible.

It is common knowledge that public opinion and official policy in the United States have for a long time, without distinction of party, been favorable to international conferences for the common welfare, and to the establishment of conciliative, arbitral and judicial means for settling international disputes.

There is no reason to believe that the judgment and policy have been changed. Along these same lines the League is now plainly crystallizing, as has been shown, and at the touch of the United States the process can be expedited.

In no other way can the organized world, from which the United States cannot be economically and spiritually separated, belt the power of public opinion to the new machinery, devised for the pacific settlement of controversies between nations and standing always ready for use.

The United States Should Participate in the League's Work under Stated Conditions

The United States Government should be authorized to propose co-operation with the League and participation in the work of its Assembly and Council under the following conditions and reservations:

I. The United States accepts the League of Nations as an instrument of mutual counsel, but it will assume no obligation to interfere with political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign State.

The United States Will Maintain the Monroe Doctrine

In uniting its efforts with those of other States for the preservation of peace and the promotion of the common welfare, the United States does not abandon its traditional attitude concerning American independence of

the Old World and does not consent to submit its long-established policy concerning questions regarded by it as purely American to the recommendation or decision of other powers.

The United States Proposes that Moral Judgment and Public Opinion Be Substituted for Force

II. The United States will assume no obligations under Article X, in its present form in the covenant, unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

The United States will assume no obligations under Article XVI, in its present form in the covenant or in its amended form as now proposed, unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

The United States proposes that Articles X and XVI be either dropped altogether or so amended and changed as to eliminate any suggestion of a general agreement to use coercion for obtaining conformity to the pledges of the covenant.

The United States Will Assume No Obligations under the Versailles Treaty Except as Congress Approves

III. The United States will accept no responsibility and assume no obligation in connection with any duties imposed upon the League by the peace treaties, unless in any particular case Congress has authorized such action.

The United States Proposes That Membership Be Opened to Any Self-governing State

IV. The United States proposes that Article I of the Covenant be construed and applied, or, if necessary, redrafted, so that admission to the League shall be assured by any self-governing State that wishes to join and that receives the favorable vote of two-thirds of the Assembly.

The Continuing Development of International Law Must Be Provided for

V. As a further condition of its participation in the work and counsels of the League, the United States asks that the Assembly and Council consent—or obtain authority—to begin collaboration for the revision and development of international law, employing for this purpose the aid of a commission of jurists. This commission would be directed to formulate anew existing rules of the law of nations, to reconcile divergent opinions, to consider points hitherto inadequately provided for but vital to the maintenance of in-

ternational justice, and in general to define the social rights and duties of States. The recommendations of the commission would be presented from time to time, in proper form for consideration, to the Assembly as to a recommending if not a lawmaking body.

Among these conditions Numbers I and II have already been discussed. Number III is a logical consequence of the refusal of the United States Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, and of the settled policy of the United States which is characterized in the first reservation. Concerning Numbers IV and V this may be said:

Anything less than a world conference, especially when great powers are excluded, must incur, in proportion to the exclusions, the suspicion of being an alliance rather than a family of nations. The United States can render service in emphasizing this lesson, learned in The Hague Conference, and in thus helping to reconstitute the family of nations as it really is. Such a conference or assembly must obviously bear the chief responsibility for the development of new parts of the law of nations, devised to fit changed and changing conditions, to extend the sway of justice, and to help in preserving peace and security.

WAR

By RALPH WALDO EMERSON

NOTE.—In the winter and early spring of 1838 the American Peace Society held a course of lectures in Boston. This lecture was the seventh in the course. Mr. Alcott wrote in his diary at the time:

"I heard Emerson's lecture on *Peace*, as the closing discourse of a series delivered at the Odeon before the American Peace Society. . . . After the lecture I saw Mr. Garrison, who is at this time deeply interested in the question of peace, as are many of the meekest and noblest souls among us. He expressed his great pleasure in the stand taken by Mr. Emerson and his hopes in him as a man of the new age. This great topic has been brought before the general mind as a direct consequence of the agitation of the abolition of slavery."

The lecture was printed in 1849 in *Æsthetic Papers*, edited by Miss Elizabeth P. Peabody.

This reprint, including the "Notes," is taken from the Centenary edition of the complete works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Volume XI, edited by Edward Waldo Emerson, and reprinted by permission of and by arrangement with Houghton Mifflin Company, the authorized publishers.

The archangel Hope

Looks to the azure cope,

Waits through dark ages for the morn

Defeated, day by day, but unto Victory born.

IT HAS been a favorite study of modern philosophy to indicate the steps of human progress, to watch the rising of a thought in one man's mind, the communication of it to a few, to a small minority, its expansion and general reception, until it publishes itself to the world by destroying the existing laws and institutions, and

the generation of new. Looked at in this general and historical way, many things wear a very different face from that they show near by, and one at a time—and particularly war. War, which to sane men at the present day begins to look like an epidemic insanity, breaking out here and there like the cholera or influenza, infecting men's brains instead of their bowels, when seen in the remote past, in the infancy of society, appears a part of the connection of events, and, in its place, necessary.

As far as history has preserved to us the slow unfoldings of any savage tribe, it is not easy to see how war could be avoided by such wild, passionate, needy, ungoverned, strong-bodied creatures. For in the infancy of society, when a thin population and improvidence make the supply of food and of shelter insufficient and very precarious, and when hunger, thirst, ague, and frozen limbs universally take precedence of the wants of the mind and the heart, the necessities of the strong will certainly be satisfied at the cost of the weak, at whatever peril of future revenge. It is plain, too, that in the first dawns of the religious sentiment, *that* blends itself with their passions and is oil to the fire. Not only every tribe has war-gods, religious festivals in victory, but *religious wars*.

The student of history acquiesces the more readily in this copious bloodshed of the early annals, bloodshed in God's name.

too, when he learns that it is a temporary and preparatory state, and does actively forward the culture of man. War educates the senses, calls into action the will, perfects the physical constitution, brings men into such swift and close collision in critical moments that man measures man. On its own scale, on the virtues it loves, it endures no counterfeit, but shakes the whole society until every atom falls into the place its specific gravity assigns it.¹ It presently finds the value of good sense and of foresight, and Ulysses takes rank next to Achilles. The leaders, picked men of a courage and vigor, tried and augmented in fifty battles, are emulous to distinguish themselves above each other by new merits, as clemency, hospitality, splendor of living. The people imitate the chiefs. The strong tribes, in which war has become an art, attack and conquer their neighbors and teach them their arts and virtues. New territory, augmented numbers, and extended interests call out new virtues and abilities, and the tribe makes long strides. And, finally, when much progress has been made, all its secrets of wisdom and art are disseminated by its invasions.

Plutarch, in his essay "On the Fortune of Alexander," considers the invasion and conquest of the East by Alexander as one of the most bright and pleasing pages in history; and, it must be owned, he gives sound reason for his opinion. It had the effect of uniting into one great interest the divided commonwealths of Greece, and infusing a new and more enlarged public spirit into the councils of their statesmen. It carried the arts and language and philosophy of the Greeks into the sluggish and barbarous nations of Persia, Assyria, and India. It introduced the arts of husbandry among tribes of hunters and shepherds. It weaned the Scythians and Persians from some cruel and licentious practices to a more civil way of life. It introduced the sacredness of marriage among them. It built seventy cities, and sowed the Greek customs and humane laws over Asia, and united hostile nations under one code. It brought different families of the human race together—to blows at first, but afterwards to truce, to trade, and to intermarriage. It would be very easy to show analogous benefits that have

resulted from military movements of later ages.

Considerations of this kind lead us to a true view of the nature and office of war. We see it is the subject of all history; that it has been the principal employment of the most conspicuous men; that it is at this moment the delight of half the world, of almost all young and ignorant persons; that it is exhibited to us continually in the dumb show of brute nature, where war between tribes, and between individuals of the same tribe, perpetually rages. The microscope reveals miniature butchery in atomies and infinitely small biters that swim and fight in an illuminated drop of water; and the little globe is but a too faithful miniature of the large.

What does all this war, beginning from the lowest races and reaching up to man, signify? Is it not manifest that it covers a great and beneficent principle, which nature had deeply at heart? What is that principle? It is self-help. Nature implants with life the instinct of self-help, perpetual struggle to be, to resist opposition, to attain to freedom, to attain to a mastery and the security of a permanent, self-defended being; and to each creature these objects are made so dear that it risks its life continually in the struggle for these ends.

But while this principle, necessarily, is inwrought into the fabric of every creature, yet it is but *one* instinct; and though a primary one, or we may say the very first, yet the appearance of the other instincts immediately modifies and controls this; turns its energies into harmless, useful and high courses, showing thereby what was its ultimate design; and, finally, takes out its fangs. The instinct of self-help is very early unfolded in the coarse and merely brute form of war, only in the childhood and imbecility of the other instincts, and remains in that form only until their development. It is the ignorant and childish part of mankind that is the fighting part. Idle and vacant minds want excitement, as all boys kill cats. Bull-baiting, cockpits, and the boxer's ring are the enjoyment of the part of society whose animal nature alone has been developed. In some parts of this country, where the intellectual and moral faculties have as yet scarcely any culture, the ab-

sorbing topic of all conversation is whipping; who fought, and which whipped? Of man, boy, or beast, the only trait that much interests the speakers is the pugnacity.² And why? Because the speaker has as yet no other image of manly activity and virtue, none of endurance, none of perseverance, none of charity, none of the attainment of truth. Put him into a circle of cultivated men, where the conversation broaches the great questions that besiege the human reason, and he would be dumb and unhappy, as an Indian in church.

To men of a sedate and mature spirit, in whom is any knowledge or mental activity, the detail of battle becomes insupportably tedious and revolting. It is like the talk of one of those monomaniacs whom we sometimes meet in society, who converse on horses; and Fontenelle expressed a volume of meaning when he said, "I hate war, for it spoils conversation."

Nothing is plainer than that the sympathy with war is a juvenile and temporary state. Not only the moral sentiment, but trade, learning, and whatever makes intercourse, conspire to put it down. Trade, as all men know, is the antagonist of war. Wherever there is no property, the people will put on the knapsack for bread; but trade is instantly endangered and destroyed. And, moreover, trade brings men to look each other in the face, and gives the parties the knowledge that these enemies over sea or over the mountain are such men as we; who laugh and grieve, who love and fear, as we do. And learning and art, and especially religion, weave ties that make war look like fratricide, as it is. And as all history is the picture of war, as we have said, so it is no less true that it is the record of the mitigation and decline of war. Early in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Italian cities had grown so populous and strong that they forced the rural nobility to dismantle their castles, which were dens of cruelty, and come and reside in the towns. The Popes, to their eternal honor, declared religious jubilees, during which all hostilities were suspended throughout Christendom, and man had a breathing space. The increase of civility has abolished the use of poison and of torture, once supposed as necessary as navies now. And, finally, the art of war, what with

gunpowder and tactics, has made, as all men know, battles less frequent and less murderous.

By all these means war has been steadily on the decline; and we read with astonishment of the beastly fighting of the old times. Only in Elizabeth's time, out of the European waters, piracy was all but universal. The proverb was, "No peace beyond the line"; and the seamen shipped on the buccaneer's bargain, "No prey, no pay." The celebrated Cavendish, who was thought in his times a good Christian man, wrote thus to Lord Hunsdon, on his return from a voyage round the world: "Sept. 1588. It has pleased Almighty God to suffer me to circumpass the whole globe of the world, entering in at the Strait of Magellan, and returning by the Cape of Buena Esperança; in which voyage, I have either discovered or brought certain intelligence of all the rich places of the world, which were ever discovered by any Christian. I navigated along the coast of Chili, Peru, and New Spain, *where I made great spoils. I burnt and sunk nineteen sail of ships, small and great. All the villages and towns that ever I landed at, I burned and spoiled.* And had I not been discovered upon the coast, I had taken great quantity of treasure. The matter of most profit to me was a great ship of the kings, which I took at California," &c. And the good Cavendish piously begins this statement, "It hath pleased Almighty God."

Indeed, our American annals have preserved the vestiges of barbarous warfare down to the more recent times. I read in Williams's History of Maine that "Assa-combit, the Sagamore of the Anagunticook tribe, was remarkable for his turpitude and ferocity above all other known Indians; that, in 1705, Vaudreuil sent him to France, where he was introduced to the king. When he appeared at court, he lifted up his hand and said, 'This hand has slain a hundred and fifty of your majesty's enemies within the territories of New England.' This so pleased the king that he knighted him, and ordered a pension of eight livres a day to be paid him during life." This valuable person, on his return to America, took to killing his own neighbors and kindred with such appetite that his tribe combined against him, and

would have killed him had he not fled his country forever.

The scandal which we feel in such facts certainly shows that we have got on a little. All history is the decline of war, though the slow decline. All that society has yet gained is mitigation: the doctrine of the right of war still remains.

For ages (for ideas work in ages, and animate vast societies of men) the human race has gone on under the tyranny—shall I so call it?—of this first brutish form of their effort to be men; that is, for ages they have shared so much of the nature of the lower animals, the tiger and the shark, and the savages of the water-drop. They have nearly exhausted all the good and all the evil of this form: they have held as fast to this degradation as their worst enemy could desire; but all things have an end, and so has this.³ The eternal germination of the better has unfolded new powers, new instincts, which were really concealed under this rough and base rind. The sublime question has startled one and another happy soul in different quarters of the globe, Cannot love be, as well as hate? Would not love answer the same end, or even a better? Cannot peace be, as well as war?

This thought is no man's invention, neither St. Pierre's nor Rousseau's, but the rising of the general tide in the human soul, and rising highest and first made visible in the most simple and pure souls, who have therefore announced it to us beforehand; but presently we all see it. It has now become so distinct as to be a social thought: societies can be formed on it. It is expounded, illustrated, defined, with different degrees of clearness; and its actualization, or the measures it should inspire, predicted according to the light of each seer.

The idea itself is the epoch; the fact that it has become so distinct to any small number of persons as to become a subject of prayer and hope, of concert and discussion—that is the commanding fact. This having come, much more will follow. Revolutions go not backward. The star once risen, though only one man in the hemisphere has yet seen its upper limb in the horizon, will mount and mount, until it becomes visible to other men, to multitudes, and climbs the zenith of all eyes. And so it is not a great matter how long

men refuse to believe the advent of peace: war is on its last legs; and a universal peace is as sure as is the prevalence of civilization over barbarism, of liberal governments over feudal forms. The question for us is only *How soon?*

That the project of peace should appear visionary to great numbers of sensible men; should appear laughable even to numbers; should appear to the grave and good-natured to be embarrassed with extreme practical difficulties is very natural. "This is a poor, tedious society of yours," they say; "we do not see what good can come of it. Peace! why, we are all at peace now. But if a foreign nation should wantonly insult or plunder our commerce, or, worse yet, should land on our shores to rob and kill, you would not have us sit and be robbed and killed? You mistake the times; you overestimate the virtue of men. You forget that the quiet which now sleeps in cities and in farms, which lets the wagon go unguarded and the farm-house unbolted, rests on the perfect understanding of all men that the musket, the halter, and the jail stand behind there, ready to punish any disturber of it. All admit that this would be the best policy if the world were all a church, if all men were the best men, if all would agree to accept this rule. But it is absurd for one nation to attempt it alone."⁴

In the first place, we answer that we never make much account of objections which merely respect the actual state of the world at this moment, but which admit the general expediency and permanent excellence of the project. What is the best must be the true; and what is true—that is, what is at bottom fit and agreeable to the constitution of man—must at last prevail over all obstruction and all opposition. There is no good now enjoyed by society that was not once as problematical and visionary as this. It is the tendency of the true interest of man to become his desire and steadfast aim.

But, further, it is a lesson which all history teaches wise men, to put trust in ideas and not in circumstances. We have all grown up in the sight of frigates and navy yards, of armed forts and islands, of arsenals and militia. The reference to any foreign register will inform us of the number of thousand or million men that are now under arms in the vast colonial

system of the British Empire, of Russia, Austria, and France; and one is scared to find at what a cost the peace of the globe is kept. This vast apparatus of artillery, of fleets, of stone bastions and trenches and embankments; this incessant patrolling of sentinels; this waving of national flags; this reveille and evening gun; this martial music and endless playing of marches and singing of military and naval songs seem to us to constitute an imposing actual, which will not yield in centuries to the feeble, deprecatory voices of a handful of friends of peace.

Thus always we are daunted by the appearances, not seeing that their whole value lies at bottom in the state of mind. It is really a thought that built this portentous war establishment, and a thought shall also melt it away.⁵ Every nation and every man instantly surround themselves with a material apparatus which exactly corresponds to their moral state or their state of thought. Observe how every truth and every error, each a *thought* of some man's mind, clothes itself with societies, houses, cities, language, ceremonies, newspapers. Observe the ideas of the present day — orthodoxy, skepticism, missions, popular education, temperance, anti-masonry, anti-slavery; see how each of these abstractions has embodied itself in an imposing apparatus in the community; and how timber, brick, lime, and stone have flown into convenient shape, obedient to the master idea reigning in the minds of many persons.⁶

You shall hear some day of a wild fancy which some man has in his brain, of the mischief of secret oaths. Come again one or two years afterwards, and you shall see it has built great houses of solid wood and brick and mortar. You shall see a hundred presses printing a million sheets; you shall see men and horses and wheels made to walk, run, and roll for it: this great body of matter thus executing that one man's wild thought. This happens daily, yearly about us, with half thoughts, often with flimsy lies, pieces of policy and speculation. With good nursing they will last three or four years before they will come to nothing. But when a truth appears—as, for instance, a perception in the wit of one Columbus that there is land in the Western Sea, though he alone of all men has that thought, and they all jeer—

it will build ships; it will build fleets; it will carry over half Spain and half England; it will plant a colony, a State, nations, and half a globe full of men.

We surround ourselves always, according to our freedom and ability, with true images of ourselves in things, whether it be ships or books or cannons or churches. The standing army, the arsenal, the camp and the gibbet do not appertain to man. They only serve as an index to show where man is now; what a bad, ungoverned temper he has; what an ugly neighbor he is; how his affections halt; how low his hope lies. He who loves the bristle of bayonets only sees in their glitter what beforehand he feels in his heart. It is avarice and hatred; it is that quivering lip, that cold, hating eye, which built magazines and powder-houses.

It follows, of course, that the least change in the man will change his circumstances; the least enlargement of his ideas, the least mitigation of his feelings in respect to other men; if, for example, he could be inspired with a tender kindness to the souls of men, and should come to feel that every man was another self with whom he might come to join, as left hand works with right. Every degree of the ascendancy of this feeling would cause the most striking changes of external things: the tents would be struck; the man-of-war would rot ashore; the arms rust; the cannon would become street-posts; the pikes a fisher's harpoon; the marching regiment would be a caravan of emigrants, *peaceful* pioneers at the fountains of the Wabash and the Missouri. And so it must and will be: bayonet and sword must first retreat a little from their ostentatious prominence; then quite hide themselves, as the sheriff's halter does now, inviting the attendance only of relations and friends; and then, lastly, will be transferred to the museums of the curious, as poisoning and torturing tools are at this day.

War and peace thus resolve themselves into a mercury of the state of cultivation. At a certain stage of his progress the man fights, if he be of a sound body and mind. At a certain higher stage he makes no offensive demonstration, but is alert to repel injury and of an unconquerable heart.⁷ At a still higher stage he comes into the region of holiness; passion has

passed away from him; his warlike nature is all converted into an active medicinal principle; he sacrifices himself, and accepts with alacrity wearisome tasks of denial and charity; but, being attacked, he bears it and turns the other cheek, as one engaged, throughout his being, no longer to the service of an individual, but to the common soul of all men.

Since the peace question has been before the public mind, those who affirm its right and expediency have naturally been met with objections more or less weighty. There are cases frequently put by the curious—moral problems, like those problems in arithmetic which in long winter evenings the rustics try the hardness of their heads in ciphering out. And chiefly it is said, Either accept this principle for better, for worse, carry it out to the end, and meet its absurd consequences; or else, if you pretend to set an arbitrary limit, a "Thus far, no farther," then give up the principle, and take that limit which the common sense of all mankind has set, and which distinguishes offensive war as criminal, defensive war as just. Otherwise, if you go for no war, then be consistent and give up self-defense in the highway, in your own house. Will you push it thus far? Will you stick to your principle of non-resistance when your strong box is broken open, when your wife and babes are insulted and slaughtered in your sight? If you say yes, you only invite the robber and assassin; and a few bloody-minded desperadoes would soon butcher the good.

In reply to this charge of absurdity on the extreme peace doctrine, as shown in the supposed consequences, I wish to say that such deductions consider only one-half of the fact. They look only at the passive side of the friend of peace; only at his passivity; they quite omit to consider his activity. But no man, it may be presumed, ever embraced the cause of peace and philanthropy for the sole end and satisfaction of being plundered and slain. A man does not come the length of the spirit of martyrdom without some active purpose, some equal motive, some flaming love. If you have a nation of men who have risen to that height of moral cultivation that they will not declare war or carry arms, for they have not so much madness left in their brains, you have a

nation of lovers, of benefactors, of true, great and able men. Let me know more of that nation; I shall not find them defenseless, with idle hands swinging at their sides. I shall find them men of love, honor, and truth; men of an immense industry; men whose influence is felt to the end of the earth; men whose very look and voice carry the sentence of honor and shame; and all forces yield to their energy and persuasion. Whenever we see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, we may be assured it will not be one that invites injury; but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the bottom of the heart of every man, even of the violent and the base; one against which no weapon can prosper; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race and has the tears and the blessings of mankind.

In the second place, as far as it respects individual action in difficult and extreme cases, I will say, such cases seldom or never occur to the good and just man; nor are we careful to say, or even to know, what in such crises is to be done. A wise man will never impawn his future being and action, and decide beforehand what he shall do in a given extreme event. Nature and God will instruct him in that hour.

The question naturally arises, How is this new aspiration of the human mind to be made visible and real? How is it to pass out of thoughts into things?

Not, certainly, in the first place, *in the way of routine and mere forms*, the universal specific of modern politics; not by organizing a society, and going through a course of resolutions and public manifestoes, and being thus formally accredited to the public and to the civility of the newspapers. We have played this game to tediousness. In some of our cities they choose noted duelists as presidents and officers of anti-duelling societies. Men who love that bloated vanity called public opinion think all is well if they have once got their bantling through a sufficient course of speeches and cheerings, of one, two, or three public meetings; as if *they* could do anything: they vote and vote, cry hurrah on both sides, no man responsible, no man caring a pin. The next season, an Indian war, or an aggression on our commerce by Malays; or the party this man votes with have an appropriation to carry through Congress: instantly he wags his

head the other way and cries, Havoc and war!

This is not to be carried by public opinion, but by private opinion, by private conviction, by private, dear and earnest love. For the only hope of this cause is in the increased insight, and it is to be accomplished by the spontaneous teaching, of the cultivated soul, in its secret experience and meditation, that it is now time that it should pass out of the state of beast into the state of man; it is to hear the voice of God, which bids the devils that have rended and torn him come out of him and let him now be clothed and walk forth in his right mind.

Nor, in the next place, is the peace principle to be carried into effect by fear. It can never be defended, it can never be executed, by cowards. Everything great must be done in the spirit of greatness. The manhood that has been in war must be transferred to the cause of peace before war can lose its charm and peace be venerable to men.

The attractiveness of war shows one thing through all the throats of artillery, the thunders of so many sieges, the sack of towns, the jousts of chivalry, the shock of hosts—this, namely, the conviction of man universally, that a man should be himself responsible, with goods, health and life, for his behavior; that he should not ask of the State protection; should ask nothing of the State; should be himself a kingdom and a State; fearing no man; quite willing to use the opportunities and advantages that good government throw in his way, but nothing daunted, and not really the poorer if government, law, and order went by the board; because in himself reside infinite resources; because he is sure of himself, and never needs to ask another what in any crisis it behooves him to do.⁸

What makes to us the attractiveness of the Greek heroes? of the Roman? What makes the attractiveness of that romantic style of living which is the material of ten thousand plays and romances, from Shakspeare to Scott; the feudal baron, the French, the English nobility, the Warwicks, Plantagenets? It is their absolute self-dependence. I do not wonder at the dislike some of the friends of peace have expressed at Shakspeare. The veriest churl and Jacobin cannot resist the influ-

ence of the style and manners of these haughty lords. We are affected, as boys and barbarians are, by the appearance of a few rich and wilful gentlemen who take their honor into their own keeping, defy the world, so confident are they of their courage and strength, and whose appearance is the arrival of so much life and virtue. In dangerous times they are presently tried, and therefore their name is a flourish of trumpets. They, at least, affect us as a reality. They are not shams, but the substance of which that age and world is made. They are true heroes for their time. They make what is in their minds the greatest sacrifice. They will, for an injurious word, peril all their state and wealth and go to the field. Take away that principle of responsibility, and they become pirates and ruffians.⁹

This self-subsistency is the charm of war; for this self-subsistency is essential to our idea of man. But another age comes, a truer religion and ethics open, and a man puts himself under the dominion of principles. I see him to be the servant of truth, of love and of freedom, and immovable in the waves of the crowd. The man of principle, that is, the man who, without any flourish of trumpets, titles of lordship or train of guards, without any notice of his action abroad, expecting none, takes in solitude the right step uniformly, on his private choice and disdaining consequences—does not yield, in my imagination, to any man. He is willing to be hanged at his own gate, rather than consent to any compromise of his freedom or the suppression of his conviction. I regard no longer those names that so tingled in my ear. This is a baron of a better nobility and a stouter stomach.

The cause of peace is not the cause of cowardice. If peace is sought to be defended or preserved for the safety of the luxurious and the timid, it is a sham, and the peace will be base. War is better, and the peace will be broken. If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero, namely, the will to carry their life in their hand, and stake it at any instant for their principle, but who have gone one step beyond the hero, and will not seek another man's life; men who have, by their intellectual insight or else by their moral elevation, attained such a

perception of their own intrinsic worth, that they do not think property or their own body a sufficient good to be saved by such dereliction of principle as treating a man like a sheep.

If the universal cry for reform of so many inveterate abuses, with which society rings, if the desire of a large class of young men for a faith and hope, intellectual and religious, such as they have not yet found, be an omen to be trusted; if the disposition to rely more in study and in action on the unexplored riches of the human constitution, if the search of the sublime laws of morals and the sources of hope and trust, in man, and not in books, in the present, and not in the past, proceed; if the rising generation can be provoked to think it unworthy to nestle into every abomination of the past, and shall feel the generous darings of austerity and virtue, then war has a short day, and human blood will cease to flow.

It is of little consequence in what manner, through what organs, this purpose of mercy and holiness is effected. The proposition of the Congress of Nations is undoubtedly that at which the present fabric of our society and the present course of events do point. But the mind, once prepared for the reign of principles, will easily find modes of expressing its will. There is the highest fitness in the place and time in which this enterprise is begun. Not in an obscure corner, not in a feudal Europe, not in an antiquated appanage where no onward step can be taken without rebellion, is this seed of benevolence laid in the furrow, with tears of hope; but in this broad America of God and man, where the forest is only now falling, or yet to fall, and the green earth opened to the inundation of emigrant men from all quarters of oppression and guilt; here, where not a family, not a few men, but mankind, shall say what shall be; here, we ask, Shall it be War, or shall it be Peace?

Notes

1. With regard to schooling a man's courage for whatever may befall, Mr. Emerson said: "Our culture, therefore, must not omit the arming of the man. Let him hear in season that he is born into the state of war, and that the commonwealth and his own well-being require that he should not go dancing

in the weeds of peace, but warned, self-collected and neither defying nor dreading the thunder, let him take both reputation and life in his hand, and with perfect urbanity dare the gibbet and the mob by the absolute truth of his speech and the rectitude of his behavior." ("Heroism," *Essays, First series.*)

"A state of war or anarchy, in which law has little force, is so far valuable that it puts every man on trial." ("The Conservative," *Nature, Addresses and Lectures.*)

2. Mr. Emerson used to take pleasure in a story illustrating this common foible of mankind. A returned Arctic explorer, in a lecture, said, "In this wilderness among the ice-floes, I had the fortune to see a terrible conflict between two Polar bears—" "Which beat?" cried an excited voice from the audience.

3. In his description of the Tower of London in the journal of 1834, it appears that the suits of armor there set up affected Mr. Emerson unpleasantly, suggesting half human destructive lobsters and crabs. It is, I believe, said that Benvenuto Cellini learned to make the cunning joints in armor for men from those of these marine warriors.

In the opening paragraphs of the essay on Inspiration, Mr. Emerson congratulates himself that the doleful experiences of the aboriginal man were got through with long ago. "They combed his mane, they pared his nails, cut off his tail, set him on end, sent him to school, and made him pay taxes, before he could begin to write his sad story for the compassion or the repudiation of his descendants, who are all but unanimous to disown him. We must take him as we find him," etc.

4. In *English Traits*, at the end of the chapter on Stonehenge, Mr. Emerson gave a humorous account of his setting forth the faith or hope of the non-resistants and idealists in New England, to the amazed and shocked ears of Carlyle and Arthur Helps.

5. "As the solidest rocks are made up of invincible gases, as the world is made up of thickened light and arrested electricity, so men know that ideas are the parents of men and things; there was never anything that did not proceed from a thought." ("The Scholar," *Lectures and Biographical Sketches.*)

6. In the *Problem* he says of the Parthenon and England's abbeys, that

Out of thought's interior sphere
These wonders rose to upper air.

7. Mr. Emerson in his conversation frankly showed that he was not yet quite prepared to be a non-resistant. He would have surely followed his own counsel where he says, "Go face the burglar in your own house," and he seemed to feel instinctive sympathy with what Mr. Dexter, the counsel, said in the speech which he used to read me from the Selfridge trial: "And may my arm drop powerless when it fails to defend my honor!"

He exactly stated his own position in a later passage, where he says that "in a given extreme event Nature and God will instruct him in that hour."

8. Thoreau lived frankly and fearlessly up to this standard.

9. This same view is even more attractively set forth in "Aristocracy." (*Lectures and Biographical Sketches*, pp. 36-40.)

THE CENTENARY OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE*

By HONORABLE CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Secretary of State of the United States

FOREIGN policies are not built upon abstractions. They are the result of practical conceptions of national interest arising from some immediate exigency or standing out vividly in historical perspective. When long maintained, they express the hopes and fears, the aims of security or aggrandizement, which have become dominant in the national consciousness and thus transcend party divisions and make negligible such opposition as may come from particular groups. They inevitably control the machinery of international accord which works only within the narrow field not closed by divergent national ambitions or as interest yields to apprehension or obtains compensation through give and take. Statesmen who carry the burdens of empire do not for a moment lose sight of imperial purposes and requirements. When a balance of power is deemed essential to national security you cannot conjure it away by any form of words. The best of diplomatic instruments, the conference, has no magical potency to dispose of these strongly held national convictions.

A Bright Page in History

We are fortunate in our detachment from many difficulties and dangers which oppress the imagination of other peoples, but we should resist the tendency to in-

dulge in self-praise. When we have a clear sense of our own interests, we are just as inflexible as others. The great advantage we have had is that, coming to independence in a world afflicted with the long rivalries of military powers, the traditions of conquest, and the dreams of empire, we sought simply the assurance of freedom, and our national instinct has been opposed to aggression and intervention. The Monroe Doctrine was the embodiment of this sentiment. Through the one hundred years since its announcement, despite the strife of parties and opposing convictions as to domestic issues, it has been a unifying principle, contributing not only to our security and peace but to our dignity and prestige as a power capable of thus asserting and maintaining a vigorous independent policy. The attitude of American statesmen toward this Doctrine, with few exceptions, has been that expressed in the familiar words of Daniel Webster: "I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it or tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted."

Maintaining Independence

The anxiety to escape the toils of European politics and intrigues was early manifested. John Adams in 1782 wrote in his diary, "'You are afraid,' says Mr. Oswald today, 'of being made the tools of the powers of Europe.' 'Indeed I am,' says I. 'What powers?' said he. 'All of them,' said I. 'It is obvious that all the powers of Europe will be continuously

* An address at the meeting held under the auspices of the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Philadelphia Forum, at Philadelphia, on the evening of Friday, November 30, 1923, to celebrate the centenary of the Monroe Doctrine.

maneuvering with us to work us into their real or imaginary balances of power. . . . Indeed it is not surprising; for we shall very often, if not always, be able to turn the scale. But I think it ought to be our rule not to meddle." We were not isolated and could not be. The European powers were at our doors; their conflicts had embroiled the New World from the beginning. There was no thought of escaping constant dealings with these powers, whose rivalries menaced our peace, but upon what basis should these dealings be had? We had the choice of seeking the protection of alliances, or the more difficult course of maintaining independence. With splendid courage no less than with profound wisdom the fathers chose the latter course, at once conserving our safety and enhancing our influence. It was the choice of an infant nation, but of a nation conscious of the promise of its influence as a world power.

This was the admonition of the Farewell Address: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. . . . The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, and have with them as little *political* connexion as possible. . . . Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concern. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships, or enmities. . . . Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humour, or caprice?"

Our Doctrine

As our paramount interest dictated abstention from participation in European politics, so it also required that the machinations of foreign powers should not have increased opportunity here, and when the independence achieved by the Spanish colonies in this hemisphere was threatened by the imposing combination of European sovereigns, styled the Holy Alliance, this correlative policy found emphatic expres-

sion in Monroe's message: "We should consider," said he, "any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." And on the same occasion, in response to Russian pretensions, it was announced with equal emphasis "that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

These are the two points of the Monroe Doctrine. The most significant circumstance connected with the form of the declaration of the non-intervention principle was that it was made by the United States alone. The British Foreign Secretary, George Canning, had proposed a joint declaration with Great Britain, and this was favored by both Jefferson and Madison. But, with the advice of John Quincy Adams and in view of the fact that Great Britain had not recognized the new republics, Monroe decided upon a separate declaration on our sole responsibility and joined with it the statement of the non-colonization principle, which not only had not been suggested by Canning, but was wholly opposed to his views.

It is not my intention to repeat what I have said in a recent address with respect to the Doctrine, but rather, restating its true content, to inquire as to its place in the scheme of the foreign policies of the United States as a world power in the twentieth century with respect to the region of the Pacific Ocean and the Far East, to Europe, and to this hemisphere.

Two Modifications

Certainly, after one hundred years, there should be no hesitancy in defining

what we mean by the Monroe Doctrine and this, despite those critics who seek to disparage it by professing to be unable to understand it, and those prophets of a new era who would thrust it aside, and those zealots who would use it as a convenient warrant for any sort of action they may favor in this part of the world, is, after all, not a very difficult task. In the original declaration there were, as I have said, two points stating the opposition of this government, first, to any action by European powers to extend their system to this hemisphere, or to any interposition by them for the purpose of oppressing or controlling the destiny of the new American republics, and, second, to the future colonization by European powers of the American continents. In all that has been said or done since the declaration of Monroe, it can be regarded as modified in only two particulars. What was said with Europe exclusively in view must be deemed equally applicable to all non-American powers; and the opposition to the extension of colonization was not dependent upon the particular method of securing territorial control and, at least since Polk's time, may be deemed to embrace opposition to acquisition of additional territory through transfer of dominion or sovereignty. Neither of these modifications change the Doctrine in its essentials, and it may thus be summarized, as I have elsewhere stated, as being opposed (1) to any non-American action encroaching upon the political independence of American States under any guise, and (2) to the acquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in this hemisphere by any non-American power. How does the Doctrine thus defined stand in the present scheme of American policy? And by policy I do not mean the proposals of any party or group, but those principles and aims which have been supported either by definite action of the Executive within his authority or of the treaty-making power, or by a sentiment so preponderant and long cherished that it may be called the opinion of the country. The changes of one hundred years in population, extent of territory and developed resources, and our military potency are obvious enough and need no recital. But have the changes altered our policy or has it become inconsistent with the Doctrine?

The Pacific and the Far East

In relation to the Pacific Ocean and the Far East we have developed the policies of (1) the open door, (2) the maintenance of the integrity of China, (3) co-operation with other powers in the declaration of common principles, (4) co-operation with other powers by conference and consultation in the interests of peace, (5) limitation of naval armament, and (6) the limitation of fortifications and naval bases.

The *Empress of China*, fitted out by Robert Morris and others, sailed to Canton in 1784, and by the year 1805 thirty-seven American vessels cleared for that port. In 1843 Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, instructing Caleb Cushing as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to China, said: "You will signify, in decided terms and a positive manner, that the Government of the United States would find it impossible to remain on terms of friendship and regard with the Emperor if greater privileges or commercial facilities should be allowed to the subjects of any other government than should be granted to citizens of the United States." Most-favored-nation treatment was secured in the Treaty of 1844, with respect to which Caleb Cushing said: "Thus, whatever progress either government makes in opening this vast empire to the influence of foreign commerce is for the common good of each other and of all Christendom." Thus was laid the foundation for the policy of the open door, or equality of opportunity. When the great powers took advantage of the weakness of China to obtain spheres of interest in order to facilitate exploitation and to restrict free commercial intercourse, this government, through Secretary Hay, sought to establish by international accord the principle of the open door, and with this to obtain the recognition and preservation of the territorial and administrative integrity of China. Despite many obstacles, caused by the disregard of professions and the desire to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the progressive disintegration of China, this government continued earnestly to press these principles, and at the recent Washington Conference the postulates of American policy were taken out

of the unsatisfactory form of diplomatic notes and, with a more adequate and explicit statement, were incorporated into a solemn international engagement, signed by the nine powers especially interested in the Far East. This treaty has been ratified by all but one of these powers, and it is hoped that ratification by that power will not be long deferred.

While the diplomatic exchanges between the powers, in which the open-door policy was fully accepted, were not, of course, satisfactory and later became largely ineffective, they were so strongly supported by public opinion in this country as to make it clear that while we eschewed alliances we were ready to join in declarations of common principles where this method of co-operation would supply the best means of attaining the desired object. This was again illustrated by the resolutions adopted at the Washington Conference.

Again, through the Four-Power Treaty between the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan, which is to continue for 10 years and thereafter subject to termination on 12 months' notice, we have established another form of co-operation with regard to insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean. It is provided that if any controversy arises between any of the parties out of any Pacific question which cannot be settled by diplomacy, with regard to their rights in relation to these possessions and dominions, they shall invite the other parties to the treaty to a joint conference, to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment. Also, if the rights sought to be safeguarded by the treaty are threatened by the aggressive action of any other power, the parties shall communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to arrive at an understanding as to the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or separately, to meet the exigencies of the particular situation. In giving assent to this treaty the United States Senate made the reservation, which in no sense departed from the intent of the treaty, that it should not be regarded as a commitment to armed force, or alliance, or obligation to join in any defense. Thus we have definitely adopted the policy for the protection of our insular possessions, and for

the preservation of peace in the Pacific region, of conference and consultation with other powers.

Limitation of naval armament has manifest relation to our policies in the region of the Pacific Ocean and the Far East, but it has, of course, a much wider scope and expresses our strong desire to avoid extravagant outlays and the competition in armament which is provocative of war. In the proposals which our government made to this end we were carrying forward an American principle which as early as 1794 Alexander Hamilton recommended for application to the Great Lakes and which was so applied in the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817. It had been the desire of our government that the project of reduction or limitation of armament which failed in the First Conference at The Hague in 1899 should be taken up in the Second Conference in 1907. And we then considered this matter, and we still consider it, so far as land armament is concerned, as "unfinished business," to use the phrase found in the instructions to our delegates at the Second Hague Conference.

Further, in support of this policy, we were willing to agree to certain defined limitations as to fortifications and naval bases in the Pacific Ocean, maintaining for 15 years, or until the end of the year 1936, and thereafter subject to termination on two years' notice, the status quo with respect to fortifications or naval bases in the Philippines and Guam. This was sufficiently emphatic with respect to our non-aggressive and peaceful intentions in the East, and yet it merely confirmed the policy of Congress, which has never had the intention of fortifying either the Philippines or Guam. As indicative of this phase of our policy with respect to these possessions, which we acquired as the result of the Spanish War, let me repeat what Senator Lodge said in the course of the debate in the Senate on the recent naval treaty. With respect to Guam, he said: "We took that island in the Spanish-American War. . . . We have had so little interest in the island that we have never passed a line of legislation in regard to it or to provide for its government or to make any provision about it at all. . . . We have never fortified it, and nobody would vote to spend money in forti-

ying it." With respect to the Philippines, he said: "The Philippines will be in exactly the condition in which they now are and have been ever since they were taken. . . . We shall never fortify them. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to fortify them. . . . We are not going to do it."

How do these policies in the region of the Pacific Ocean square with the Monroe Doctrine? Is there any inconsistency? Has our entrance into this region as a world power of first rank led us to violate our traditions? Manifestly not. We fought the Spanish War to put an end to an intolerable nuisance at our very door, and to establish and make secure the independence of Cuba, not to override it. And as a consequence of victory in that war we acquired distant possessions, but not with the purpose of making these a basis for encroaching upon the territory or interfering with the political independence of the peoples of the eastern nations. In safeguarding the integrity of China, in securing equality of commercial opportunity, in endeavoring to forestall efforts at exploitation and aggression, in seeking to remove suspicion and allay apprehensions, and in enlarging through assured tranquillity the opportunities of peaceful commerce, we have been pursuing under different conditions the same aims of independence, security, and peace which determined the declaration of Monroe.

Europe

With respect to Europe, our policy has continued to be, in the phrase of Jefferson: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." We entered the Great War, not violating our tradition, for the cause of liberty itself was at stake. We have emerged from the war with the same general aims that we had before we went in. Though victors, we have sought neither territory nor general reparations. Our people have borne their own burdens, and in large part we are bearing the burdens of others. We are not seeking to dictate to Europe or to deprive any one of rights. But we do desire peace and economic recuperation in Europe. We contributed our arms in the interest of liberty and to destroy the menace of an autocratic power, but not to secure the economic prostra-

tion of a vanquished people. We have the deepest sympathy with the people of France; we warmly cherish their ancient friendship. We desire to see France prosperous and secure, with her wounds healed and her just demands satisfied. We desire to see a united and prosperous Germany, with a will to peace, making amends to the full extent of her power and obtaining the appropriate rewards of her labor and skill. We wish to see an end to the waste of military efforts and the easing of the burdens of unproductive expenditures. We wish to see the fires of hatred quenched. It is because of these earnest desires that we have hoped, as was stated in the recent communication to the British Government, that the solution of the present grave problems would be sought in fair and comprehensive inquiry in which all interested might participate and which would be inspired by the determination to find means to restore the productive activities through which alone reparations can be paid, and to give opportunity for the reasonable contentment and amicable relations of industrious peoples through which alone peace and security can be assured.

The bitter controversy which followed the war showed with what tenacity we still hold to the principle of not meddling in the political strife of Europe. It is true that the spread of democratic ideas and the resulting change in governments have removed the danger of organized effort to extend to this continent the European "political system" of 100 years ago. But Europe still has "a set of primary interests" which are not ours. As Washington said: "She must be engaged in political controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concern." Unity in war did not avail to change the divergent national aims and policies in peace. It is not that our interests may not be affected injuriously by such controversies. That was true in the days of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe; indeed the effect of changes and developments is that we are far better able to bear such injuries today than we were then, as is sufficiently illustrated by our sufferings during the Napoleonic wars. But it was, despite such injuries, the abiding conviction that we had better bear these ills than suffer the greater evils which would follow the

sacrifice of our independent position. We still hold to that view. The preponderant thought among us undoubtedly is that our influence would not be increased by pooling it. The influence that is due to our detachment and impartiality could not long be maintained if we should substitute the rôle of a partisan in European quarrels and the constant efforts of propagandists have brought vividly before us the fact that where the direct American interest is not clearly perceived foreign controversies afford abundant opportunity for the play among us of intense racial feeling. What was true in Monroe's day is even more true today in view of our vast population drawn from many countries and reproducing here the conflicts of European interests. It is not to our interest to adopt a policy by which we would create or intensify divisions at home without healing divisions abroad. And it must be always remembered that the moral force of our expressions depends upon the degree of the preponderance of the sentiment behind them. Each group intent upon the assertion of its own demands forgets the equal insistence of others. But when all is said there is still no doubt of our desire to be helpful in every practicable way consistent with our independence and general aims. We have poured out our wealth without stint both in charity and investment and the important productive enterprises undertaken abroad since the war have been supported by American capital. The difficulties which beset Europe have their causes within Europe and not in any act or policy of ours.

Generally our policies toward Europe may thus be summarized: We are still opposed to alliances. We refuse to commit ourselves in advance with respect to the employment of the power of the United States in unknown contingencies. We reserve our judgment to act upon occasions as our sense of duty permits. We are opposed to discriminations against our nationals. We ask fair and equal opportunities in mandated territories as they were acquired by the Allies through our aid. We desire to co-operate according to our historic policy in the peaceful settlement of international disputes which embraces the policy of judicial settlement of such questions as are justiciable. It is our purpose to co-operate in those varied human-

itarian efforts which aim to minimize or prevent those evils which can be met adequately only by community of action. For example, we are at this moment leading in the effort to put a stop to the abuse of narcotic drugs. We strongly support, as our recent action has shown, international conferences where the conditions are such that they afford an instrumentality for the adjustment of differences and the formulation of useful conventions. We seek to aid in the re-establishment of sound economic conditions. In short, our co-operation as an independent State in the furtherance of the aims of peace and justice has always been and still is a distinctive feature of our policy.

An American Policy in This Hemisphere

There is plainly no inconsistency between these policies and the Monroe Doctrine. Our position as a world power has not affected it. The question is whether that Doctrine is still important under changed conditions. The answer must be in the affirmative. The fact that the intervention of non-American powers in this hemisphere is not threatened at this moment cannot be deemed to be controlling. The future holds infinite possibilities, and the Doctrine remains as an essential policy to be applied wherever any exigency may arise requiring its application. To withdraw it, or to weaken it, would aid no just interest, support no worthy cause, but would simply invite trouble by removing an established safeguard of the peace of the American continents.

While retaining the Doctrine, we should make every effort to avoid its being misunderstood. If its import has been obscure, it is largely because it has often been treated as though it were our sole policy in this hemisphere, and as though every action bearing upon our relations to our sister republics must be referred to it. Attempts to stretch the Doctrine have made it in some quarters a mystery and in others a cause of offense. Treating the Doctrine as a catch-all has not only given rise to much unnecessary debate, but has been harmful to our just influence by arousing fears of latent possibilities of mischief and affording opportunities to those few but busy persons who are constantly seeking to foster a sentiment hostile to this country.

By correct definition of the Doctrine, I do not mean a statement in advance of every application of it. That, of course, as in the case of any principle, would be quite impossible. The important thing is the understanding of the principle itself. It should be recognized that the Doctrine is only a phase of American policy in this hemisphere, and the other phases of that policy should be made clear. It would not be entirely correct to say that the Doctrine is merely negative, for it is a positive declaration that certain action on the part of non-American powers in relation to this hemisphere will be regarded as dangerous to our peace and safety and as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition. But the Doctrine is a principle of exclusion. Both with reference to the declaration as to non-intervention and to that as to extension of territorial control, it aims directly at the exclusion of interposition by non-American powers. In recognizing these limitations of the Doctrine, we do not detract from its importance; it gains rather than loses by such clarification. The principle of exclusion embodies a policy of self-defense on the part of the United States; it is a policy set up and applied by the United States. While the Monroe Doctrine is thus distinctively a policy of the United States maintained for its own security, it is a policy which has rendered an inestimable service to the American republics by keeping them free from the intrigues and rivalries of European powers. The same, or similar, principles might, of course, be set up and applied by any or all of our sister republics, and it is believed that each of them would be benefited by having such principles as a definite part of her foreign policy. We have always welcomed declarations by other American States as to their determination thus to safeguard their independence. We have also been gratified at the acquiescence in these principles by European powers.

But fully recognizing the value of the Doctrine, it still remains true that it simply states a principle of opposition to action by non-American powers. It aims to leave the American continents free from the described interposition, but it does not attempt to define in other respects our policies within this hemisphere. Our affirmative policies relating to our own

conduct in relation to other American States, and not merely our policy with respect to the conduct of non-American powers, should be clearly envisaged. Those affirmative policies, while distinct from the mere principle of exclusion set forth in the Monroe Doctrine, are not inconsistent with that Doctrine but rather constitute its fitting complement.

First. We recognize the equality of the American republics, their equal rights under the law of nations. Said Chief Justice Marshall: "No principle of general law is more universally acknowledged than the perfect equality of nations. . . . It results from this equality that no one can rightfully impose a rule upon another."

At the first session of the American Institute of International Law, held in Washington in the early part of 1916, the jurists representing the American republics adopted a declaration of the rights and duties of nations. This declaration stated these rights and duties "not in terms of philosophy or of ethics but in terms of law," supported by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. The declaration set forth the following principles:

I. Every nation has the right to exist, and to protect and to conserve its existence; but this right neither implies the right nor justifies the act of the State to protect itself or to conserve its existence by the commission of unlawful acts against innocent and unoffending States.

II. Every nation has the right to independence in the sense that it has a right to the pursuit of happiness and is free to develop itself without interference or control from other States, provided that in so doing it does not interfere with or violate the rights of other States.

III. Every nation is in law and before law the equal of every other nation belonging to the society of nations, and all nations have the right to claim and, according to the Declaration of Independence of the United States, "to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

IV. Every nation has the right to territory within defined boundaries and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over its territory, and

all persons whether native or foreign found therein.

V. Every nation entitled to a right by the law of nations is entitled to have that right respected and protected by all other nations, for right and duty are correlative, and the right of one is the duty of all to observe.

It cannot be doubted that this declaration embodies the fundamental principles of the policy of the United States in relation to the republics of Latin America. When we recognized these republics as members of the family of nations we recognized their rights and obligations as repeatedly defined by our statesmen and jurists and by our highest court. We have not sought by opposing the intervention of non-American powers to establish a protectorate or overlordship of our own with respect to these republics. Such a pretension not only is not found in the Monroe Doctrine, but would be in opposition to our fundamental affirmative policy.

Second. It follows that it is a part of our policy to respect the territorial integrity of the Latin American republics. We have no policy of aggression; we do not support aggression by others; we are opposed to aggression by any one of the Latin American republics upon any other.

Fortunately, however, under present conditions, there is no reason to apprehend such aggression. History shows that boundary disputes not infrequently give rise to action which in reality is of an aggressive character, but is sought to be justified by territorial claims. There are but few of these controversies still open in Latin America. Argentina and Chile resolved their boundary dispute by arbitration. The boundary controversy between Argentina and Brazil was also submitted to arbitration and the decision has been loyally carried out. Chile and Peru have found it possible, and we were privileged to give the aid of our good offices in the matter, to provide for the submission to arbitration of the questions which have long vexed their relation growing out of the Tacna-Arica controversy and the Treaty of Ancon. There are a few minor boundary questions in Latin America, but there is no reason to doubt that they will be disposed of peacefully. It is believed that no aggression is threatened in Latin America.

Third. States have duties as well as rights. Every State on being received into the family of nations accepts the obligations which are the essential conditions of international intercourse. Among these obligations is the duty of each State to respect the rights of citizens of other States which have been acquired within its jurisdiction in accordance with its laws. A confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interests of particular individuals but at the foundations of international intercourse, for it is only on the basis of the security of property validly possessed under the laws existing at the time of its acquisition that the conduct of activities in helpful co-operation is possible. Each State may have its code of laws in accordance with its conception of domestic policy, but rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another State it is under an international obligation appropriately to recognize. It is the policy of the United States to support these fundamental principles.

Fourth. It is the policy of this government to make available its friendly assistance to promote stability in those of our sister republics which are especially afflicted with disturbed conditions involving their own peace and that of their neighbors. It is the desire of the United States to render this assistance by methods that are welcomed and which are consistent with the general policies above stated. For example, in the case of the Central American republics, it has been our constant endeavor, in the interest of the maintenance of their integrity and sovereignty, to facilitate by our good offices such agreements between themselves and such measures of security and progress as will favor stable and prosperous conditions. This has been the object of the conferences of Central American republics, and at the last conference, held in Washington in December, 1922, an important advance was made. It is not too much to say that if the treaties and conventions then formulated and signed are ratified and carried into effect there will be no probability of further serious disturbances in Central America, and these republics, favored with vast natural resources, will enter upon an era of tranquillity and will enjoy opportunities of almost unlimited prosperity.

In promoting stability we do not threaten independence but seek to conserve it. We are not aiming at control but endeavoring to establish self-control. We are not seeking to add to our territory or to impose our rule upon other peoples.

Fifth. The United States aims to facilitate the peaceful settlement of difficulties between the governments in this hemisphere. This policy has had notable illustration in our own relation to our neighbor on the north, the Dominion of Canada, which is justly proud of its position in "the community of nations known as the British Empire." We have a boundary with Canada, including that of Alaska, of about 5,500 miles unfortified. Through arbitration we have disposed of such serious controversies as those relating to the Behring Sea fisheries rights, the Alaska boundary, and the North Atlantic coast fisheries. We have an International Joint Commission for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon questions relating to boundary waters and other questions arising along the boundary between Canada and the United States. Our 100 years of peace furnish a shining example of the way in which peoples having an inheritance of bitterness and strife have been able to live in friendship and settle all their differences by peaceable methods.

With respect to the Latin American republics, it is our policy not only to seek to adjust any differences that may arise in our own intercourse, but, as I have said, to extend our good offices to the end that any controversy they may have with each other may be amicably composed. We are seeking to establish a *Pax Americana* maintained not by arms but by mutual respect and good will and the tranquilizing processes of reason. We have no desire to arrogate to ourselves any special virtue, but it should constantly be recognized that the most influential and helpful position of the United States in this hemisphere will not be that of the possessor of physical power but that of the exemplar of justice.

In connection with this aim, it is gratifying to note that the treaties between the United States and other countries providing for commissions of inquiry, in the interest of full investigation and consideration of causes of difference before resort to hostilities, and the similar treaty con-

cluded in February, 1923, between the United States and the republics of Central America, formed the basis of the conclusion at the Santiago conference for a general treaty for the submission to commissions of inquiry of controversies arising between the American republics.

Sixth. In seeking to promote peace, as well as to aid in the reduction of unproductive expenditures, this government has sought to encourage the making of agreements for the limitation of armament. Through our treaty with the great naval powers we have limited our capital ships, and we have voluntarily reduced our land forces. One of the treaties negotiated at the Central American conference provides for the limitation of armament on the part of the Central American republics. At the recent Santiago conference it was not possible to reach an agreement between the other Latin American States upon this subject, but undue importance should not be attached to this failure. I have recently pointed out that whether we have regard to the total active armies in the world, or to the total organized forces in the world, we have in this hemisphere, including the United States and Canada, but 6 per cent of the whole. Moreover, the discussion at Santiago did not reveal points of view that must be considered to be utterly irreconcilable. On the contrary, it may be hoped that in the fortunate absence of all causes of serious controversy, and for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary outlays, a basis of agreement to limit armament may yet be reached.

Seventh. The policies which have been described are not to secure peace as an end in itself, but to make available the opportunities of peace; that is, to open the way to a mutually helpful co-operation. This is the object of the Pan American conferences. These will be increasingly helpful as they become more and more practical. The object is to create the opportunity for friendly contact, to develop a better appreciation of mutual interests and to find particular methods by which beneficial intercourse can be aided. This bears directly upon the facilitation of exchanges, the protection of health, the promotion of education and commerce, and the developing of all the necessary agencies for disseminating information and for improving means of communication.

With peace assured and apprehensions allayed, it will inevitably be found that there is less diversity of interest than had been supposed, and that there is an ever-widening opportunity for working together for the common good.

Eighth. It should also be observed that in our commercial relations the United States is seeking unconditional most-favored-nation treatment in customs matters. Prior to the beginning of the present year preferential tariff rates had for about 20 years been conceded by Brazil to certain imports from the United States. This had been an anomalous feature of our tariff relations, since the general policy of this government has been neither to give or to seek customs preferences. In view of the adoption of the tariff act of 1922, section 317 of which authorizes the President to declare additional duties upon the products of any country that may discriminate against the commerce of the United States, it was felt that this government could not longer with consistency ask the Brazilian Government to grant to goods of the United States rates which were lower than those which were accorded to similar imports from other countries. In making known, in January last, its determination no longer to seek the renewal of preferential treatment, this government explained to the Government of Brazil that its policy henceforth would be to seek from Brazil, as well as from other countries, treatment for goods from the United States as favorable as might be accorded to the products of any third country. Notes have been exchanged with Brazil embodying this policy. The government is contemplating the negotiation of new commercial treaties with Latin American countries or the modification of existing treaties in harmony with the most-favored-nation principle, excepting, however, as in the case of the exchange of notes with Brazil, the special treatment which the United States accords or hereafter may accord to Cuba, in view of our special relations with that republic, and to the commerce between the United States and its dependencies and the Panama Canal Zone. Not only does the Monroe Doctrine not mean that the United States has a policy of seeking in the Latin American republics economic advantages

denied to other countries, but it is not the general policy of the United States to seek preferential rights. The commercial treaties which it is proposed by this government to negotiate with the Latin American countries are, with respect to the principles involved, substantially like those which it is sought to negotiate with European governments.

Ninth. We have certain special policies of the highest importance to the United States.

We have established a waterway between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—the Panama Canal. Apart from obvious commercial considerations, the adequate protection of this canal—its complete immunity from any adverse control—is essential to our peace and security. We intend in all circumstances to safeguard the Panama Canal. We could not afford to take any different position with respect to any other waterway that may be built between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans. Disturbances in the Caribbean region are therefore of special interest to us, not for the purpose of seeking control over others, but of being assured that our own safety is free from menace.

With respect to Cuba, we have the special interests arising from our treaty and our part in the securing of her independence. It is our desire to see her independence not weakened but safeguarded and her stability and prosperity assured. Our friendly advice and aid are always available to that end.

I have sketched briefly these affirmative policies of the United States in this hemisphere. We rejoice in the progress of our sister republics and at the enhanced prosperity which is at their call. The Monroe Doctrine stands, as it has always stood, as an essential part of our defensive policy, but we are no less but rather more interested in the use of the opportunity which it created and has conserved. We desire no less than they themselves the independence, the peace and progress of all the American republics, and we seek to enjoy to the fullest extent possible the blessings bestowed by the spirit of confraternity, those mutual benefits which should result from our intimate association and our common political ideals.

THE LAST COST OF WAR

By DR. DAVID STARR JORDAN

THE first cost of war consists mainly in its wastage of human life and of the products of man's achievements, its degradation of morals and ideals. The last cost, not to be repaired for many generations, is found in the extermination of superior human strains. The killing off of so many of the best (a process inseparable from warfare) results in the inevitable lowering of the level of racial vigor through the partial limitation of male parenthood to the less efficient, whom war leaves behind.

The general effect of war on human virility is stated by Charles Darwin in the fewest possible words. In the *Descent of Man* (1871) he writes:

In every country in which a standing army is kept up, the fairest young men are taken to the conscription camp or are enlisted. They are thus exposed to early death during war or are often tempted into vice, and are prevented from marrying during the prime of life. On the other hand, the shorter and feebler men, with poor constitutions, are left at home, and consequently have a much better chance of marrying and propagating their kind.

Killing Off the Race at "The Top"

It is obvious, first, that armies demand men above the average physical efficiency, and further evident that the most energetic and intelligent among these make the best soldiers; it is also recognized that those who fight most efficiently are most likely to be killed. At the same time, also, both warfare and barrack life alike tend to restrict men in their prime from normal parenthood. Thus those excluded from military service for one reason or another, certainly weaker on the average, become in general the fathers of the next generation. By the law of heredity, "Like the seed is the harvest," and the future of the race repeats the qualities of its actual parentage.

This thesis is logically without flaw, but to demonstrate historically its actual validity through the experience of nations is a task of the most complex character; for society does not miss that which it has

never known, and all considerations of the relative values of strains of inheritance are mingled inextricably with the results of education, organization, commerce, industrialism, opportunity, and emigration—influences which may seem to transform a nation in a manner quite independent of the innate virility of its people.

"Blood Will Tell"

Historians in general have ignored the facts of personal heredity within the race, and the significance of these facts in the rise and fall of nations. They have usually assumed that outside events or conditions, such as food or climate, have molded races as they have helped to mold individuals, and that the original human material passes from generation to generation in otherwise unchanging series; but the continuity is broken and the character of the life-stream altered whenever any particular type is subject to extirpation. To kill off the strongest or the best, or those in any way superior, is to reduce the relative number of the type in generations to come in direct proportion to the extent of elimination. Killing in any form is not a source of progress. Race advancement results from the propagation of exuberant life. Direct effects of racial environment are potent only within certain limits. It is undoubtedly true that climate affects the activities of men as individuals or in the mass; education may intensify their powers or mellow their prejudices; oppression may make them servile, or dominion arrogant; but these traits and their resultants due to external influences do not "run in the blood," they are not "bred in the bone." So far as experiment shows, they do not color the stream of heredity. Older, deeper set, more permanent than climate or training or experience, are hereditary traits, and in the long run it is always "blood that tells."

Perpetuating Defectives by War

But even hereditary traits are not immutable. War and conquest, with other influences of reversed selection, may modify even these. It is *the man who is left* who determines the future trend. His

inborn qualities the next generation will inherit.

The facts of war selection are recognized by Dr. Nicolai as follows:

Every victory of the wise over the foolish is a step forward; every victory of the stupid is a step backward. Victory in war precludes victory of wisdom. War gives no other selection than this: it is a factor of degeneration where strong men are exterminated and dullards survive. War propagates unfitness because it destroys healthy humanity, leaving those of inferior worth. The blind, the dumb, the idiotic, the deformed, the scrofulous, the white-blooded, the impotent, the paralytic, the dwarf, all these can rest secure in wartime. For them no bugle calls.

. . . The selective influence of war is such that, if it lasts long enough, it will follow quite automatically that of warlike people only the weakest elements will be left. . . . The dogma that peace enfeebles a people while war gives the strength of steel is only a vulgar error. The opposite is the truth. . . . In the longest peace not so much folly is spoken nor so many lies told as in the shortest war. (*Die Biologie des Krieges*, 1915.)

The law of human heredity is expressed in common parlance by the phrase "Blood will tell." This means that ancestral traits will persistently reappear. And it must be noted that these traits are those of actual ancestors, not merely the general qualities prevailing in the environments of one's birthplace. The close resemblance existing between members of the same race is due to the fact that they are largely descended from identical forebears, as is clearly shown by genealogical studies. Traits shared in common have become ingrained by repeated interlocking marriages within the group.

In every race-group, no matter how small, some families or family strains will be superior to others. The most gifted of every group constitute the basis of its race progress. There are very many types of excellence, numberless elements being involved in racial advance; but the disproportionate loss of any superior factor is a step in race deterioration.

The Greeks gave to the most precious of human products, the fine strains of heredity, the name of "aristoi," "the best." Aristocracy, "rule of the best,"

was indicated as a political ideal. But it soon became evident that the "aristoi" and the aristocrats belong to very different categories. The aristocrat inherited his father's title and control, but not necessarily his superiority of mind or body. Admitting that born leaders of earlier times were the ancestors of modern aristocracy, we must not forget that the original blood has suffered great dilution through marriage for money or for "convenience." Marriage for love, the only condition by which personal initiative can be maintained in the stock, is a privilege of the commoner, seldom of the nobleman, almost never of royalty.

Pampering Weakness in Peace

The marks which distinguish the aristocracies of today, love of display, titles, finery, and the sports of leisure, are not indicative of any real excellence. They are features of the sheltered life, in which whims and trivialities take the place of settled purpose. In the aristocratic castes, as with royalty, the law of primogeniture obtains, an excellent thing according to Dr. Samuel Johnson, "because it ensures that there will be but one fool in the family."

The current aristocracy of Europe (whose social position depends on inheritance) is largely identical with the "leisure class." But the "leisure class" is never, as a whole, made up of men of racial value. No man of force and initiative is content to remain "at leisure." Strong men do not bask in idleness from lack of economic compulsion. Dilletantism is, of course, an "acquired character," but every such trait must have a basis of inheritance, else it cannot be acquired. "Moreover, of all the criteria for the selection of a ruling class, careful dressing, correct dancing, and mastery of etiquette are by far the most preposterous." (Gué-*rard*.)

One of the most important advantages of democracy is that it allows those really "best" to rise to their highest possibilities—not necessarily as officials. In a democracy, there are always men in the rank and file as good as those distinguished by office-holding. Only in equality before the law can latent force be adequately utilized.

Variety in Perfection

It is, of course, by no means true that all races of men have equal potential values. It is also not certain that all genetic advantages are the privilege of any one race, even were there such a thing as "race purity" among civilized peoples. The best examples of the lowest races offer more hope, so far as their line of descent is concerned, than the feeble-minded or feeble-willed of the highest. Not long since, in Adelaide, the writer met a full-blooded Australian "Black-fellow" named David Unaipon, broad-minded and competent, a mechanical engineer by profession, who would be respected in any community. The chief test of racial rank is this—that race is lowest which possesses fewest men capable of self-elevation. Opportunity and education come to no race as gifts. Powerful strains create their own opportunity; there can be no other leverage.

"There is for races or nations more than one way to be superior. One race may be superior to the other by the simple process of getting on top and holding the other down. It may become superior by learning to do some one thing better than any one else in the world. And this may be a very simple thing; it may be raising cotton, or it may be writing a book." (Booker T. Washington.)

There is No "Self-made Man"

There exists, of course, in the mass a certain number of individuals of superior potentiality who have not yet found themselves or found means of self-extrication. There are others yet to be brought forth through happy combinations of ancestral traits, drawn from varied lines. But high endowments never spring from all-round nonentity. "Ability is never careless of its ancestry. . . . There are no 'self-made men.'" For each man has within him, derived from his intertangled ancestry, the potentiality of whatever he becomes. Where an individual seems to overtop his parentage, it was because his forebears were of actually superior material, very likely misjudged by indiscriminating society. The genuine upper classes are those who in any race possess brains and character and can "steadily will."

Many writers have loosely assumed that

education operates to raise the level of heredity; but it is amply proved that education of the individual does not train his progeny, except as it may provide for them a favorable environment. In each generation, intellect must be disciplined anew.

The word "progress" is commonly used with a double meaning, including "nurture" as well as "nature"—that is, improvement through education as well as race-development. The two are entirely distinct. Race-improvement is very slow, depending mainly on survivals of the fittest. Results of education may be immediate and impressive.

But education is effective only if imposed "on the solid ground of Nature." By training we may increase the range of the individual man; education gives him access to the accumulated stores of the ages. Civilization has been defined as "the sum total of those agencies and conditions by which a race may advance independently of heredity."

In various essays, the present writer has tried to gather the facts concerning the downfall of nations as a resultant of reversed selection by war. It is easy to show that the decay of Greece was of the nature of suicide. Her never-ending wars, internal and external, exhausted the race. The fall of Rome was plainly due to similar causes—ruinous struggles at home, far-flung campaigns abroad. "The Empire perished for want of men" at a time when Rome was crowded with people. But the "human harvest was bad." The "men about town" were unfit for warfare. Toward the end, "only cowards remained, and from their brood sprang the new generations."

The Fate of Other Nations

In the history of every warring nation appears more or less clearly the same relation of cause and effect. Some recent observations in England may help to illustrate. "Scotland," say D. James A. Macdonald, "speaks from long and sad experience. Every heathery hill looks down on a glen that generation after generation sent, in answer to the fiery cross and pipes of war, the best its home had bred. . . . The weaklings died in infancy. By the law of the survival of the fittest, there was bred a race of giants, whole kilted regi-

ments, every man six feet or more, were the pride of their race and the glory of British arms. . . . Tell me, have the fittest survived? Go through their cities and over their moors and down their glens. More than 800 kilted soldiers of the giant mold went out of my ancestral glen at Cul-loden Mor."

To London at the opening of the war came up from the English and Scotch universities one group after another of young volunteers, the very cream of the race, to be drilled for service across the channel. In sharp contrast to those splendid boys we remarked the crowds of youths from the East End (said to be over 100,000 in number), undersized, undervitalized, saturated with liquor and shot through with vice, who lay about on the grass watching the companies drill. Great Britain has no use for them today; their fathers were rejected in the Boer War, their grandfathers from the war in India—three generations of inefficient kept at home to build up the London slums.

From the *'Varsity* for October 28, 1916, containing names and records of 1,320 Oxford men killed and missing, I quote, almost at random, the following typical entries from Balliol College:

- Ashton, E. D. 1908. Second lieutenant, Lancashire Fusiliers; aged 26; B. A.
- Asquith, R. 1897. Aged 38; eldest son of the Prime Minister; a brilliant scholar; won an open scholarship; 1st class honorable Mods.; 1st Class Lit. Hum. prox. access-Hertford Scholarship, Ireland; Craven and Derby scholarships; Fellow of All Souls 1902-1919; M. A.
- Buch, C. J. 1900. Lieutenant, Bedfordshire Regiment, aged 36; history lecturer, Minister of Education, Cairo; B. A.
- Darbishire, A. D. 1897. 14th Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders; a well-known research student; professor elect in the University of British Columbia.
- Dickenson, H. N. 1900. Lieutenant, Royal West Kent Regiment; died of wounds; aged 34; B. A.; had gained some distinction as a novelist.
- Wallace, A. 1912. Sergeant, New Zealand Fusiliers; died of wounds at Gallipoli, aged 24; Rhodes scholar; mentioned in dispatches.

And so on through the whole long roster. The records of Cambridge University read

in the same fashion. In the first two years 14,450 Cambridge men had entered the service. Of these, 1,872 were reported killed, 2,622 wounded or missing. Such irredeemable losses point toward a relatively emasculated Britain a quarter century hence. A like fate awaits France, Germany, and Austria as well. But this, the last and most enduring cost of war, will then as now pass unnoticed by the statesman, the diplomatist, and "the man on the street."

Salvaging Human Waste

We do not yet know how many men, women, and children were killed, maimed, or wounded in the World War. The number runs very high, far into the millions—thirty, forty, or more—according to the completeness of our statistics. To replace these incalculable losses is a problem beyond statesmanship. *Restoration of numbers*, however slow, is, of course, a matter relatively simple; *renewal in quality* is well-nigh hopeless.

As has been abundantly pointed out, war first devours the young, selected for strength and endurance, "the best that the nation can bring." But the devastation, immeasurable as it is, by no means stops there. For with each man who falls, perishes also the great widening wedge, reaching forward through time, of those who by rights should be his descendants. "Giving his life for his country," a man gives far more than that—he yields up his proportion of the "slain unnumbered" who are never to be.

Again, in addition to the million fallen in battle, war takes its quota of civilians. Refugees of every description, men and women, children often lost or abandoned, trampled or starved in the rush, perish along the road, or are slain through "military necessity." Furthermore, everywhere behind the lines, far or near, war takes a corresponding toll—high-minded men and women breaking under the strain of a topsy-turvy world, the feeble and aged dying from want and neglect. It is often estimated that for each soldier who falls two or three noncombatants also perish.

As an accompaniment of all this, the shadow of enforced celibacy has spread over the womanhood of Europe. A world in which women hopelessly outnumber the men is sadly unnatural. It means that

thousands fitted for love and motherhood are to be debarred from the richest joys of life.

To recapitulate: Restoration in quantity is a matter of time; restoration in quality—in values, moral, mental, and physical—will be a much longer and more difficult process. Still for a century to come,

the history of Europe will disclose its failure adequately to conserve the most forceful elements of its population. But as, in the long run, the strong and intelligent tend to outlast the futile, the dissipated, and the lawless, we may expect after this, as after every war, an ultimate, though very tardy, recovery.

WHY RELIEF FOR GERMAN CHILDREN

By ERNEST LYMAN MILLS

The author, resident of Geneva, Switzerland, has spent months studying conditions in Germany.—EDITOR.

ON THE face of it, the appeal of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America for German relief would seem an impertinence. But is it? Is it not true that the basis of all reform rests upon a vital change in human character, something akin to what the old-time revivalists call conversion? There is not the slightest difficulty in writing a Plato's "Republic," a Moore's "Utopia," or any of the dreams of the Marxists or others of a world where strife has changed to co-operation. Even Soviet Russia looks good on paper.

One can easily card-catalogue all of the features of such an ideal society and put it up in pictures of "Spotless towns." The League of Nations is not a new dream, but is the embodiment of the ideals and ideas of a thousand dreamers of all lands and ages. Any well-balanced economist or religious visionist could write the constitution and most of the by-laws of a model earthly government. Our Declaration of Independence is almost a perfect document of this sort. The only obstacle to the acceptance of these programs is to be found in human nature itself. The innate desires of the various units making up our distressed and divided humanity to fight for individual rights and prerogatives tips over the set-up plans. A radical change in the moral sentiments of the bulk of mankind is essential to the adopting of any program of peace. We have not gone beyond or even yet reached the program of the Nazarene, who said, "Peace among men of good-will." Unless

we can somehow change human nature into a nature charged with good-will, we shall not get very far with our moral programs.

Now, any move which aims to develop the spirit of good-will is contributing toward a change in human nature which will help banish wars. It is with this conviction that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America plans to initiate a campaign of German relief, stressing particularly the undergirding of the agencies of relief, especially the church agencies, which are now at work in that distressed land. By personal first-hand contact of trusted leaders, it has ascertained that the need constitutes a real emergency. General Allen is responsible for the statement that "the mortality rate of babies during the last three months was 21 per cent higher than last year, although the birth rate in Berlin declined by 30 per cent. Half of the newly born children have been transferred to orphan asylums, since the parents cannot provide for them. The shortage of clothing for children during the coming winter will affect their state of health very much. Approximately 3,000,000 people are without underclothing and shoes. Babies are without swaddling clothes, and in many instances bed-clothing is entirely missing.

"These figures are consistent with the estimates given in a recent report from the representative in Berlin of the United States Department of Agriculture. According to this report, meat consumption, not including imports, was 123 pounds per capita in 1912 and 84 in 1922, but the estimates for the first six months in 1923 show a consumption of 34 pounds per capita."

The Federal Council proposes to show to the German people an expression of good-will which can rise above war-time hatred. If the American public does rise above its deep-seated distrust and extend a brotherly and helpful hand, we shall go a long way toward developing in Germany and America that good-will which alone is fundamental for world peace. Will the American people be as large and as generous in creating and revealing good-will as it was in propagating war to a successful conclusion? We venture to hope that American generosity will be more potent for world peace than even its armies were in their courageous and wholly idealistic prosecution of the war.

The Federal Council realizes that many Americans are apt to look with suspicion on any such move. There are those among us who will detect the subtle hand of German propaganda and see in it an effort to annul our interest in the Allied cause. There are people who are still fighting the War of the Revolution and cannot see any reason for a close understanding with Great Britain. Probably some can yet be found who do not yet accept the verdict of our Civil War, and there will always be those who can never be satisfied because America did not blast her way through ruined German cities to Berlin. For some small souls and misguided patriots, no war ever ends. A part of their plan seems to be to perpetuate war-time hatreds. From such the Federal Council will only receive damnation. But most of those who recognize the spirit of good-will which prompts the action will rejoice that the Federal Council has the courage to help in an emergency which confronts a former enemy.

I was waiting for my train at a Berlin station and engaged in conversation, as is my custom, with a German baggage-master, and in the course of our remarks we mentioned the fighting ability of the American soldiers. He appreciated the situation, probably saw a generous American tip in the distance, and said, "The French grenade? Poof, and that was about all; we were not much afraid of them; but when the Americans came and began to throw their grenades! Ach, Gott! Bang! they left only a hole. They were terrible!" We laughed together, as I

slipped him a couple of billion marks for the children.

But he started me to thinking.

Our grenades cleared out the old German imperialism—with the help of half of the world. We did the job thoroughly. Now, we are Anglo-Saxon, with the exception of a few million Slavs, Latins, etc., but in the main we have the Anglo-Saxon fighting spirit—we aim to finish the job when we start. When the foe falls, we count him out to make sure that he knows he is beaten. Then we take hold, lift him to his feet, tell him what a fine fight he put up, lead him to the cloak-room, clean him up, give him pocket money, hire a taxi, and send him home. Later in the day we call or send in our cards to inquire how he does. Remember the quarrel? Hold the grudge? Not for more than ten seconds! This is about the finest thing one knows of the Anglo-Saxon and the mixed American. This is why I believe in the truly American, Anglo-Saxon call of the Federal Council for the starving German children. Of course, it means a change of heart; but who cares? It is the American way!

DAYS

NOTE.—This poem appeared in the first number of the *Atlantic Monthly*. Mr. Emerson, often ranked as America's greatest poet, once referred to it as perhaps his best poem.

Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,
Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,
And marching single in an endless file,
Bring diadems and fagots in their hands.
To each they offer gifts after his will,
Bread, kingdoms, stars, and sky that holds
them all.
I, in my pleaded garden, watched the
pomp,
Forgot my morning wishes, hastily
Took a few herbs and apples, and the Day
Turned and departed silent. I, too late,
Under her solemn fillet saw the scorn.

—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

THE SCOPE OF THE COMMITTEES OF EXPERTS

Correspondence between M. Barthou, French
Delegate, Reparation Commission, and Mr.
Logan, Unofficial American Representative,
Reparation Commission

M. Barthou to Mr. Logan

Delegation Francaise a la Commission des
Reparations

PARIS, December 5, 1923.

MY DEAR MR. LOGAN :

I have just had a conversation with our
colleague, Monsieur Delacroix, upon the ob-
servations which you have exchanged with
us. In order to give you more definite infor-
mation and to clear up points which might
leave doubts in your mind, we desire to fur-
nish you with more precise details.

The first committee of experts will en-
deavor to find—

(a) The means of balancing the budget ;

(b) The measures to be taken to stabilize
the currency.

Concerning the stabilization of the cur-
rency, the experts would be invited first of all
to determine the conditions to be realized in
order that a currency may be stabilized, and
then the measures to be progressively taken
so as to realize all of these conditions.

As the stabilization of the currency neces-
sitates budget equilibrium, the experts would
similarly be invited to study in detail the
receipts and the expenditures of the Reich
and also of the different States.

The Reparation Commission would ask the
experts to give it, in all sincerity, their pro-
fessional opinion on the questions submitted
to them.

Monsieur Delacroix and I greatly hope that
this further information may lead your gov-
ernment to acquiesce in the acceptance by
American experts of the invitations which
will be sent to them to participate in the
labors of the committees. Furthermore, if
you accept this suggestion, I am quite pre-

pared to submit it to the Reparation Com-
mission.

(Signed)

LOUIS BARTHOU.

Mr. Logan's Reply to M. Barthou

United States Unofficial Delegation
Reparation Commission

18 RUE DE TILSITT,

PARIS, December 12, 1923.

MY DEAR M. BARTHOU :

I have not failed to inform my government
of your letter of December 5. My govern-
ment is deeply interested in the economic
recuperation of Europe and is gratified to
learn of the proposal for the establishment
by the Reparation Commission of two com-
mittees of experts for the purposes stated.
My government notes the statement in your
letter, that the first committee of experts will
endeavor to find—

(a) The means of balancing the budget of
Germany, and

(b) The measures to be taken to stabilize
its currency ;

and that to this end the experts will be in-
vited to determine the conditions to be real-
ized in order that a currency can be stabilized
and the measures to be progressively taken
so as to realize all of the conditions, and also
that they will be invited to study in detail
the receipts and expenditures of the Reich,
as well as of the different States.

It has been made clear in our interviews
that the Government of the United States is
not in a position to be represented on these
committees, but my government believes the
proposed inquiries will be of great value, and
it views with favor the acceptance by Ameri-
can experts of invitations to participate in
the work of the committees.

It is hoped that through these committees
a practicable and just solution of the pend-
ing problems may be found.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) JAMES A. LOGAN, JR.

THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL SITUATION OF FRANCE

Complete Text of the Speech of the Minister of Finance, Delivered on December 26, Before the French Senate

Pessimism in certain quarters concerning the economic situation of France is absolutely unjustified. Every indication about our economic and financial situation shows, on the contrary, a real improvement. The alarmist feeling which is being shown originates from foreign countries and not from France. Foreigners, who have invested considerable sums in German marks, are afraid Germany's bankruptcy will cause Europe's bankruptcy and, first of all, France's.

It is not to be denied that the French "franc," after a rise at the beginning of 1922, has since then depreciated in an exaggerated way. Is the lowering of the international value of the franc due to our financial or to our economic situation? An analysis of those two factors allows up to answer that question: From a financial point of view, France has made during the last few years a considerable effort for restoration without having received one cent from Germany. The balancing of our "ordinary budget" has been obtained, and even more—an annuity of about 3,500 millions has been included in that budget, in order to meet the charge of loans issued to make good for Germany's default, while this annuity might have been included in the budget of "recoverable expenditures." This result has been obtained, thanks to an increase in tax collections.

In 1922 the government collected 2,464 millions more in taxes than in 1921. In 1923, during the first eleven months of the fiscal year, we collected 2,900 millions more than during the preceding year, and the surplus for the whole year will probably reach 3,200 millions; this means that in the course of those two years the French taxpayer will have paid 5,650 millions more than in 1921; and it is to be noted that one-third of the surplus is not of a transitory character, but represents a permanent increase from permanent causes, among which is the coming back to economic life of the devastated regions. Three years ago the taxes collected in the liberated regions amounted to 1,250 millions; this year they will reach 2,500 millions; next year the treasury will receive 700 or 800 millions more; perhaps even one billion.

The income tax on personal property yielded, in 1920, 567 millions and it will yield this year 1,300 millions, which represents ten times the yield of 1913, which amounted to only 136 millions. The income tax in 1919 yielded 190 millions, and for the ten first months of this year it yielded 2,194 millions. These are proofs that the important surplus in tax collections is sufficient to solve the problem of the "ordinary budget," and the result is that every loan issued by the French Government is exclusively applied to the "budget of recoverable expenditure." In 1920 the total amount of our loans was 38,686 millions; in 1921 it was 26,540 millions; in 1922 it was 17,947 millions, and on November 30, 1923, it reached only 15,356 millions. This decrease in our loans will be more and more important in the future. Next year the amount to be put at the disposal of the "budget of recoverable expenditure" will be reduced by three billions.

It is remarkable, moreover, that some repayments were made to foreign countries: 1,100 millions of francs (or 204 million pesetas) to Spain, 13 million dollars to the United States and 50 million yen to Japan.

The economic and financial situation for the first eleven months of 1923 is even much more favorable. Our commercial balance shows a deficit of 1,475 million francs, which is not far from the figures for 1913, which were 1,360 million francs. If one takes into account not merely the trade balance, but also the balance of payments, it will be seen that the commercial balance is favorable. A few figures will show clearly the main points of this economic revival: Statistics concerning our seaports showed in 1921, for outgoing ships, 19,684,000 tons; in 1922, 24,368,000 tons; in 1923, 28,083,000 tons. The coal output amounted in 1919 to 22 million tons; in 1921, to 20 million; in 1922, to 31 million; in 1923, to 36 million, and in 1913, to 40 million tons. So that, in spite of the destruction of the coal mines of northern France, we are now nearly back to the pre-war situation. On the other hand, while in 1921 we had 91,000 unemployed, we had only 2,674 on January 1, 1922, and on December 20, 1923, statistics give the number of men unemployed as 441 only.

There is, then, a complete contradiction between the *real* situation of France and the exchange rate of her "franc," and this contradiction is not justified by any financial or economic reason.

Some people think that the cause of the depreciation of the franc should be found in a policy of exaggerated expenditure, and they speak of the liberated regions as of a bottomless abyss. It is a mistake, as is well proved by the reconstruction of those regions. Of 3,300,000 hectares (8,151,000 acres) of land which has been devastated, 2,930,000 hectares (7,237,100 acres) have been put again into cultivation. Of 22,900 destroyed factories, 20,175 have been put again in operation; of 741,983 destroyed dwellings, 599,000 have already been rebuilt. In three years from now the main part of the reconstruction work in the liberated regions will be completed.

The real cause of the deterioration of our exchange is the non-execution by Germany of the Versailles Treaty. As long as the reparations question has not been settled, there will remain in the world many elements of uncertainty and of trouble which will prevent that peace for which we have paid so dearly from becoming the durable order of things, to which we all aspire. The exchange crisis in France and Belgium, as well as the unemployment problem in Great Britain, are the result of a lack of solidarity among the victorious nations, which enabled Germany to evade her obligations.

DANISH PLAN FOR CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Bill for the Establishment of a Currency Equalization Fund

(As Approved by the Folketing at the Third Reading, November 15, 1923)

SECTION 1. By agreement between the State, the Danish National Bank, and the four leading private banks, a Currency Equalization Fund is established for the purpose of preventing large fluctuations of the daily quotations through continued intervention on the currency market, and of co-operating in the improvement of the value of the Danish crown to the extent to which conditions necessary for this may be brought about.

SEC. 2. The State participates in the fund with two-fifths, the Danish National Bank with two-fifths, the four leading private banks with one-fifth together. The responsibility of the four leading private banks in case of loss (cf. section 7) is, however, not to exceed three and one-quarter million crowns.

SEC. 3. For the promotion of its purpose as described in section 1, the fund shall procure a supply of foreign currency equivalent to a sum of five million pounds sterling. This supply shall be provided by foreign credit, for which the State and the National Bank are guarantors, jointly and separately, having recourse to the four leading private banks for one-fifth thereof within the limit mentioned in section 2.

SEC. 4. The fund shall be administered by a board of eight members: two representatives of the State, two of the directors of the National Bank, and one director of each of the leading private banks. The representatives of the State and of the National Bank shall have three votes each, the representatives of the leading banks one vote each. The board elects a chairman, who shall be in charge of the administration of the affairs of the fund. In case of a tie of vote, the vote of the chairman shall be decisive. The mandate as a member of the board of the fund shall be unpaid. The fund may engage salaried assistance to such extent as the chairman deems necessary.

SEC. 5. The board of the fund shall hold meetings as often as decided by the chairman or desired by one of the representatives of the State or one of the representatives of the National Bank or by two of the representatives of the leading private banks. The board decides the maximum rate of exchange at which the fund may be willing to sell, and whether the fund shall buy, and, if so, at which rate of exchange; otherwise the board itself adopts the methods of procedure.

SEC. 6. The agreement shall be valid for two years. The credit mentioned in section 3 shall be sought for the same period. After the expiration of the two years the activity of the fund shall be liquidated, provided that the continuation be not adopted by a new law and agreed to by all the members.

SEC. 7. At the expiration of this agreement, or if the activity of the fund ceases before, because its resources have been exhausted, in which case the cessation of the activity can be resolved by the board by simple majority, account shall be rendered and distribution of loss, respectively profit, shall take place in the proportion in which the participants, in accordance with section 2, are partners in the fund, in case of the four leading banks with due regard to the maximum amount for which they may be held liable according to section 2.

SEC. 8. Should the final liquidation of the fund result in loss, and the National Bank, in order to cover foreign obligations, use any part of its gold reserve, the excess rate of exchange, compared to the par value, which may be obtained by the realization hereof shall be used to cover the loss resulting from the activity of the fund.

SEC. 9. With regard to covering the foreign debt which may exist at the time of the liquidation of the fund, the State assumes one-half of the obligations and receives in return one-half of the assets augmented by the quota of the loss, for which the four leading private banks are liable. The National Bank assumes the other half of the obligations and receives in return the other half of the assets.

SEC. 10. The quotations at the Exchange of Copenhagen on the day of liquidation shall be used as basis for the account of loss, respectively profit.

SEC. 11. Should the National Bank, in order to cover its quota, dispose of so much of its gold reserve that the said reserve is reduced to less than 50 per cent of the bank notes in circulation, the reduction of the bank-note guarantee caused thereby shall not have any influence on the tax due to the State from the National Bank, according to the amendment to the Octroi of August 30, 1919.

SEC. 12. All expeditions pursuant to this law are exempt from stamp duty to the Danish State.

SEC. 13. The act becomes effective at once.

News in Brief

THE WOMEN'S PEACE UNION announced January 13 that it invites all contestants for the Bok Prize who are not satisfied with the award to send copies of their plan to its headquarters, 244 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

"The Union," says Miss Raden, "will organize a committee, made up of people known to have widely different points of view, to read the plans and select the three which seem the most valuable. No member of the

committee will be a member of the Women's Peace Union. The Union has no money for a prize, but we expect to secure through the press wide publicity for the plans selected. Access to all plans received as well as to the three plans selected will be given to all representatives of the press, since our object is to give wide circulation to all the original and valuable ideas which the Bok Prize has drawn forth from the public. Plans must be received by February 15."

THE PRINCE OF WALES, as Earl of Chester, made a semi-official public appearance in Paris for a few days in January. Like his grandfather, who created the necessary atmosphere for founding the Entente, the Prince is considered "sympathetique" by the French. However great the coolness between the Quai d'Orsay and Downing Street, this unofficial ambassador is regarded with affectionate interest in Paris.

FRENCH BIRTHS INCREASED for the first nine months of 1923, according to official statistics. In the ninety departments of France, there was an excess of 78,451 births over deaths in that period.

ROME IS BEING CONSIDERED by the Council of the League of Nations as the place for holding a conference, probably about February 14, on the question of the universal application of the principles of the Washington Naval Conference. Before any official announcement is made, however, the Swiss Government will be discreetly sounded on its feelings with regard to taking the conference outside of Switzerland. The League of Nations is not willing to offend Swiss susceptibility by having the conferees meet elsewhere than in Switzerland, in order to secure the attendance of delegates from Russia, which country has declined to be represented at the meeting if it is held in Switzerland.

THE GHANDI NON-CONFORMISTS and the ultra radicals in India are losing ground, says Dr. Westel W. Willoughby, professor of political science in Johns Hopkins University. Dr. Willoughby has recently returned from India. He thinks that the diarchic form of government now in effect eventually will solve the political problems of India and give that State a form of government similar to other British dominions, such as Canada and Australia.

FRANCE HAS RATIFIED two of the four sets of treaties drawn up by the Washington Conference. These are the Naval Limitations Treaty and the Four-Power Pact. Of the other two, one makes new rules for submarine warfare, the other binds the signatories to the policy of the open door and equal opportunity in China. It seems improbable that either of these last two sets of treaties will be ratified by the present chamber, whose mandate continues to the April elections. On the one hand the Italo-Spanish agreement is considered as a threat to French communications with the North African colonies in time of war and has re-emphasized France's need of naval power. As under present conditions the chief strength of the French navy in adjacent waters is submarines, it is felt that France can ill afford to tie her hands in advance regarding the use she might be obliged to make of this form of weapon. On the other hand, France at present is making strenuous efforts to increase her activities in what has long been regarded as its sphere of influence in China, namely, the populous province of Yunnan, adjoining the French colony in Indo-China, just as the British are reported to be making similar efforts in Tibet and Turkestan.

AN EXPEDITION SENT OUT by the University of Pennsylvania recently shipped to Philadelphia some 85 tons of ancient relics from Egypt and Palestine. Some of the articles in the consignment weighed five tons each, notably the doorways and columns from the Palace of Pharaoh Menepthah, at Memphis, Egypt. A number of complete mosaic floors are part of the Egyptian collection. From ruins in Palestine numerous historical monuments are in the consignment, together with notable examples of ancient sculpture.

KING GEORGE AND QUEEN ELIZABETH of Greece, traveling like ordinary citizens, went to Italy early in January to attend the services commemorating the death of the exiled Greek King Constantine, who is buried in Naples. It was rumored that the Greek royal family hoped, during their stay of several weeks in Naples, to keep in close touch with affairs in Greece.

THE PORTO RICAN LEGISLATURE sent ten of its members, accompanied by Horace M. Towner, Governor of Porto Rico, to the United States in January. The commission had for its object an attempt to secure from

Congress the modification of the organic law of the island. The joint resolution passed by the last legislature, creating the commission, requests legislation covering six points, designed to give the insular government and people substantially the same rights in their own country as are now enjoyed by the States; also, that all national measures that tend to benefit education, agriculture, and other sources of knowledge or of wealth in the island be extended to Porto Rico in the same proportion that they are extended to all the States in the Union.

THE DANISH SECTION of the Woman's National League for Liberty and Peace held recently an all-country meeting in Denmark. After some revision, the object of the league now stands as follows: To promote the work for a just peace between nations, races, and classes; to make war illegal and instead adopt a state of affairs which insures conflicts being settled by mediation, arbitration, or other peaceful means; to work for the above theories being made the foundation for the bringing up and education of the young both at school and in the home; to co-operate with women in other countries working for the same aims.

HUNGARIAN WAR LOANS QUOTATIONS have recently improved. The rise is attributed to hopes placed in the impending reform of State finances.

THE CZECHOSLOVAK COMMITTEE for Educational and Cultural Relations with Great Britain and the United States of America held a meeting on December 5, 1923, in the English seminar of Charles University, Czechoslovakia. Dr. Mathesius, professor of English language and literature at the university, is chairman of the committee. The initiative for the founding of such a committee is largely to be attributed to President McCracken, of Vassar College, who paid a visit to Prague a year ago in connection with the proposed American Institute there. Exchange of professors, students, and books between Czechoslovakia, on the one hand, and Great Britain and the United States, on the other, are among the methods proposed to promote cultural relations. In the United States Dr. S. P. Duggan, Director of the Institute for International Education, is working with the Czechoslovakian committee.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of the Women's Engineering Society is to be

held in Manchester, England, in the spring of 1924. There are now about 200 working members of this society, besides a number of honorary members who give some support. Though a new organization, the Woman's Engineering Society was invited to participate, on an equality with other engineering institutions, in an exhibit recently held in England.

THE FIRST VOCATIONAL SCHOOL ever operated in Albania was organized two years ago by the American Junior Red Cross. The students in this institution represent, it is said, the brightest boys in the new Balkan Republic.

YUGOSLAVIAN PRODUCTION OF SUGAR was said, in a recent meeting of beet-growers and sugar manufacturers in Belgrade, to be unsatisfactory. Only 30,000 tons of sugar were turned out last year, although the factories had a capacity of 120,000 tons. The conference proposed the raising of customs duty on imported sugar 2 dinars per kilogram.

THE DUTCH FOREIGN OFFICE announces a temporary commercial and shipping treaty between the Netherlands and Finland. It came into force on November 20, 1923, and will remain in force until a definite trade and navigation treaty can be concluded, unless upon a three months' notice it be abrogated by either contracting parties after January 1, 1925. The two countries are giving each other most-favored-nation treatment as far as commerce, customs duties, shipping, and various dues and taxes are concerned. Certain exceptions have been made with regard to border and coasting traffic. This treaty will not alter the commercial relations between the Netherlands and the United States, but will give the Netherlands decided advantages over the United States in trade with Finland, pending the conclusion of a treaty between this government and Finland.

CUBA HAS MADE A GOVERNMENT appropriation of \$40,000, which will be used for an athletic field and stadium at Habana University, and another of \$200,000, for the construction of new buildings at the asylum and school for nurses at Mazorra.

THE CHILEAN MINISTER AT LONDON has procured a loan from England of 500,000 pounds for the completion of a breakwater and for pier construction at Antofagasta,

Chile. The first quota of the loan, amounting to 100,000 pounds, is available immediately. The Chilean Government plans to make Antofagasta one of the best ports on the Pacific coast of South America.

INFORMATION FROM BERGEN, NORWAY, states that, because of the lack of ice-breakers, the harbor authorities at Archangel have announced that the White Sea will be closed to navigation this winter.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE HAS ACCEPTED the honorary presidency of the Pan-Pacific Union. This union is in no sense an agency of any government, though it enjoys the good-will of all the countries bordering the Pacific Ocean. Invitations to attend its conferences are forwarded through Federal and other sources. Affiliated or working with the union are educational and scientific bodies, chambers of commerce, and like organizations striving for the advancement of Pacific communities. Its central office is at Honolulu, at the ocean cross-roads. In accepting the presidency of the Pan-Pacific Union, President Coolidge says: "My services will always be enlisted in behalf of the cause of peace and good neighborhood, to which the union is devoted."

A NEW LINEN FACTORY has been established at Ribierinha, in the Azores. Flax has been grown in these islands for many years and the new enterprise is seeking to capitalize the possibilities of the industry. At the present time the mill is treating about one ton of flax daily, but it is intended to increase this amount. Coarse linen cloth, sheetings, toweling, and handkerchiefs are being made, and the plant is able to produce thread of a fineness of Nos. 35 to 40.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING SERVICE of the Siamese Red Cross has been recently inaugurated. The first nursing center was formally opened in Bangkok, Siam, with religious ceremonies, and inspection by Prince Nagara Svarga. The center is purely for consultation, advice, and instruction. Miss Wan Piroshaw, who heads this public health nursing center, received her training in Manila, through the friendly hospitality of the Philippines Red Cross chapter there.

A GREAT DEMONSTRATION AGAINST WAR and armaments has been determined upon by the management committee of the International

Federation of Trade Unions, with headquarters in Amsterdam, Holland. The demonstration is planned to take place in all countries on September 21, 1924.

SIXTY MILLION DOUGLAS FIR seeds were sent as a New Year's gift to Great Britain by the American Tree Association. The president of the Association, Charles Lathrop Pack, presented the seeds to Henry G. Chilton, the British charge, at the embassy in Washington. The seeds are to be used by the British Forestry Commission to reforest areas that were cut over in that country for war purposes.

THE NEW PEACE HOUSE IN NEW YORK has been recently opened with a pageant. It has a large auditorium, where a forum will be organized and where other meetings can be held. The Women's Peace Society headquarters have been moved to Peace House.

THE ONLY WOMAN REPRESENTATIVE of any nation to a foreign government is the Russian Soviet Minister to Norway, Anna Kolontay.

A REPORT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE states that the new Turkish Republic is attempting to replace the half of the Turkish commercial fleet lost in the war. At the time of her entry into the war Turkey's merchant marine amounted to about 110,000 tons. Of this tonnage it is estimated that less than 50,000 tons remain, and that the greater portion of this is in bad condition or obsolete. The comparatively small tonnage of the merchant fleet at the outbreak of the war was primarily due to the inability of the Ottoman Empire to reserve Turkish coastal trade to ships under Turkish registry. Now that Turkey has limited its coastal shipping exclusively to vessels under Turkish registry, where heretofore Greece and Italy figured most prominently, a new impetus has been given to the development of a national merchant marine, says Vice-Consul E. A. Plitt, of the State Department. This effort to build up a purely Turkish domestic carrying trade appears to have been without other discrimination against foreign shipping hitherto, except in the matter of a sanitary tax of 5 piasters per ton on foreign vessels, where Turkish vessels pay only 2 piasters. The Seir Sefaine has inaugurated a service between Black Sea, Aegean, and Mediterranean ports, and is trying to augment its ton-

nage through the purchase of additional units and to improve its methods of operation. At present a great need is felt for large-sized vessels to handle the passenger traffic, but this is only temporary, the future of the country's merchant fleet being dependent largely upon the demand created by the development of Turkey's resources and industries.

INTERNATIONAL ART IS A FEATURE of the midwinter exhibition of the Chicago Art Institute this year. There are a worthy number of sketches and paintings by contemporary artists on exhibition. These come from Russia, Finland, Italy, and France, as well as the United States. Handicrafts also, both old and modern, form a feature of the exhibition.

FORTY-EIGHT AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS are co-operating in archeological research in the Near East. A wonderful civilization is believed to be fully preserved beneath the desert sands from southern Mesopotamia to Mosul, where the present survey is being made.

THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY of the founding of this Republic is already attracting attention. A joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to celebrate the anniversary was recently laid before the United States Senate. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas in three years a century and a half have elapsed since the signing on July 4, 1776, of that memorable assertion of freedom and human rights, the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the Declaration of Independence was followed by seven years of struggle—fraught with suffering, hunger, and defeat—in which three and one-half million frontiersmen wrested their freedom from the tyranny of Great Britain and made real upon this continent their ideals of self-government; and

Whereas the nation which was founded through the sacrifices of these patriots has grown into the greatest and richest nation on the earth and is now not only the most powerful but, with a single exception, also the oldest of republics; and

Whereas the ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for all upon which this nation was founded, can only be preserved by recurring again and again to these foundation principles in which it was conceived, and the struggles and suffering of the brave men and women who believed in them with passionate faith: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the Assembly concurring), That Congress be, and is hereby, memorialized to pass the necessary legisla-

tion to fittingly celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of this Republic, and to give prominence in such celebration to an exposition of the documents and relics related to the heroic struggle for freedom of this nation; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the presiding officers of both houses of Congress and to each member thereof from Wisconsin.

ACCORDING TO THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, import and export statistics have just been published in France for the first ten months of the year 1923. Both imports and exports have risen considerably and the figures for October, 1923, are higher than any of the other months. This prosperity is mainly attributed to the disappearance of German competition in both the foreign and home markets. Even now, however, France's trade balance cannot be regarded as entirely satisfactory, since it still shows an excess of imports over exports. *La Journée Industrielle*, an employers' journal, had this fact in view when it declared some ten days ago that France's foreign sales and purchases would have balanced had it not been for the milliards of additional expenditure necessitated during the year for the purchase of coal and coke. Since then agreements have been concluded with the German industrialists, and Poincaré has made skillful use of this news to strengthen his position in the Chamber. The event is greeted with joy by the French employers' press. *La Journée Industrielle* is already chuckling with glee over the advantages to be reaped from the agreements, which "were proposed to the German industrialists weeks ago with great patience." If all goes well, the French will get 17 or 18 million tons of fuel from the Ruhr next year. The article concludes with the words: "This will be ample to meet our requirements in coal."

WITH THE INTENTION OF COUNTERACTING by statistics the impression that France is exceptionally militaristic, the Foreign Office has made public the budgetary estimates for military expenditures for the United States, England, and France. The figures are compared as follows: The United States estimates 3,544,853,270 francs, or \$708,970,654; British Isles, 3,212,500,000 francs, or £128,500,000, or \$642,500,000; British Empire, 4,726,694,475 francs, or £189,067,779, or \$945,338,890, while the figures for France are 4,595,002,335 francs, or \$919,000,467.

LETTER BOX

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Jan. 12, 1924.

DEAR SIR:

I congratulate you and the Society on the great change of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. It is much more convenient in size, more comely in color, easier to read on account of the soft paper, attractive from the variety of print, and most promising in power, in view of the distinguished men mentioned among its officers, directors, and committees. The title is not quite pleasing. "*ADVOCATE OF PEACE Through Justice*" sounds to me a bit cold, unsympathetic, rigid, frigid, unappealing. "Use every man after his desert, and who would 'scape whipping." Justice must have consideration; but will men want to do justice unless they love? Isn't love necessary for a right approach to justice?

"And earthly power doth then show likest God's
When mercy seasons justice."

It was Shylock who asked his pound of flesh in the name of justice resting on agreement. "In the course of justice (alone) none of us should see salvation." "God is love." The Christmas message of peace rests upon and springs out of love. The Cross speaks of love. I wonder if a better title would not be "*The ADVOCATE OF PEACE Through Love and Justice*." The Good Book says, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace." I wish you and the other officers might think this over and see if spiritually such an amended title of the *ADVOCATE* might not seem warmer, more instinct with life, more attractive as an advocate of peace. Our Lord, the Saviour of the world, is our "Advocate." Looking at His life and death and church, would we conclude that through the centuries the appeal has been simply for peace through justice? What do *you* think as you look over human life? In the main the "*ADVOCATE*" is much bettered. It is so good I should like to see it made best. With all good wishes and among them one wish for a happy New Year,

Sincerely yours,

(REV.) EMELIUS W. SMITH.

SOPIA, BULGARIA, December 24, 1923.

To the Editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

DEAR SIR: I am in the receipt, regularly, of your valuable paper, I believe, on the recommendation of Chancellor David Starr Jordan. Your paper is above all an organ working for universal peace. This can be attained only by good, sincere relations between nations. Falsehood is ruinous to such relations; truth alone will contribute to that end. My statement, as enclosed, is the truth, and the publishing of it can do only good; it may serve to prevent a repetition of incidents as the one in question. I have no objection to your toning down any harsh word I may have used.

Last year you very kindly published a reply of mine to Mr. Gordon Gordon-Smith's unseemly attack upon Bulgaria. It was not the first time I had an exchange of words with him.

In the international notes of your issue of December you give a version of the incident that occurred between Jugoslavia and Bulgaria—the attempt to assassinate the Serbian military attaché in Sofia, as reported from Belgrade, and you add: "The Belgrade press was unanimous in its praise of the government for having shown the necessary firmness with a view to obtaining complete reparations and also the safeguarding of the country's dignity."

I do regret to have to say that every word of the account of the incident as given to you is false, and trust that, for the sake of the advocacy of peace and better relations among nations, you will give me the opportunity to place the real facts of the case before the public.

The incontrovertible facts of the incident are as follows: Two men obtained admittance to Colonel Kristich's (the Yugoslav military attaché in Sofia) apartment at an hour when he was habitually out, and at once attacked the servant. The Colonel, by chance at home, rushed to the assistance of his servant, and in the scuffle received two scratches in the head. No alarm was given in the house or the street. The servant, with a dagger sticking in his shoulder, runs off to the Yugoslav legation, some two hundred yards away, reports what has happened, and thus only are the authorities informed. The police and ministers crowd to the scene and receive the Colonel's account: "One man fled on my appearance; the other I knocked down and se-

cured his revolver, with which he made two attempts to fire at me, but he succeeded in getting off." He showed the two wounds in his head, the wound in the servant's shoulder, a flesh wound, and the captured dagger. The revolver turned out impossible to fire off; it was rusted and the cartridges were in the same condition. There was no reason to doubt the Colonel's account or his belief that an attempt had been made on his life.

A Yugoslav-Bulgarian commission was sitting in Sofia to adjust outstanding questions. The incident was put down to some desperate Communists or Agrarians intent upon frustrating the good results promised by the negotiations.

The police authorities, the Minister President, and the Minister of the Interior there and then expressed their sorrow and presented their apologies to the Colonel. The man, the police more than suspected, had meanwhile taken refuge in the Yugoslav legation, which refused to deliver him up.

The next day the Yugoslav minister presented to the Bulgarian Government an ultimatum: Within 24 hours the Minister of the Interior and the prefect of police to make apologies; a company of 250 men to salute the Yugoslav flag; a strict inquiry to be made and a payment of indemnity to be fixed by The Hague Court. There was no time to protest or discuss, and the Bulgarian Government, fearing immediate occupation of Bulgarian territory, a coveted object, considered it wiser to comply with the ultimatum, which it did on the following morning. The Bulgarian Government looked forward to right itself before The Hague Court. The Yugoslav Government, however, has taken the precaution to deprive Bulgaria of such a possibility. The Yugoslav minister has waited upon the Bulgarian Minister of Foreign Affairs and has declared that his government withdrew the last two points of the ultimatum; that they should be considered as null and void; that the incident was closed.

I repeat, such are the real facts.

If Italy bullied Greece, why should not Jugoslavia improve the lesson upon Bulgaria. Where is the power to stop such ruinous conduct for any hope of peaceful conditions among nations? And neither Italy nor Jugoslavia appear to regret having been drawn into such a false, dishonorable situation, as regards respect due to others, to international relations. Both are proud of the exercise of power to humiliate a smaller nation

in one case and a defenseless one in another—defenseless by treaty.

On the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of the Fascisti revolution Signor Mussolini, addressing the massed demonstration, said: "For the first time in Italian political life, Italy has accomplished an act of absolute independence, having the courage to deny the competence of the Areopagus at Geneva. . . . If tomorrow's sacrifices should be graver than yesterday's, would you undertake them?" And answer came: "Yes, we swear it!"

If there was ever an attempt to raise a home scandalous incident to one of virtue it is this one, cynically invented, attempt on the life of the Yugoslav military attaché.

There is little else to add.

P. M. MATTHÉEFF.

THE CHÂTEAU THIERRY APARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 17, 1924.

To the Editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

SIR: It is difficult to see in what way the action of the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (popularly known as Yugoslavia), in the matter of the attempt to assassinate Colonel Kristich, its military attaché in Sofia, can be criticised. Taking the facts as stated by M. Matthéeff himself, what do we find? Two Bulgarians, armed with daggers and revolvers, entered the residence of Colonel Kristich at Sofia with the evident intention of murdering him. As his servant barred their entrance, they stabbed him. On Colonel Kristich coming to his servant's assistance, he was attacked in his turn. One man attempted to shoot him, but his revolver missed fire. The other struck him on the head, inflicting two wounds. Colonel Kristich knocked one of his assailants down; whereupon both fled.

Colonel Kristich, as military attaché, belonged to the diplomatic corps of Sofia. International law knows no greater crime than an attempt on the life of any one accredited to a country in a diplomatic capacity. If such a crime was allowed to go unpunished, a very bad precedent would be created. All that the Belgrade Government demanded was that the Bulgarian Government should officially express its regrets to the Yugoslav minister at Sofia, and that (Colonel Kristich, the victim of the outrage being a military officer) a company of Bulgarian infantry, with the colors, should render military honors

to the legation that had thus been attacked in the person of one of its members by Bulgarian criminals. There was, further, a demand that the matter should be referred to the International Tribunal at The Hague, which was to be asked to fix what indemnity, if any, was due for this outrage.

In view, however, of the fact that the Bulgarian Government promptly accorded the satisfaction demanded, the Belgrade Government later waived all question of an indemnity and declared the incident closed. In doing so it considered that it was showing a friendly spirit. M. Matthéeff, for some mysterious reason, seems to think that this is not so. He surely does not think that before the International Tribunal Bulgaria hoped to *justify* the crime committed?

That there is only too much reason to fear such acts of violence in Bulgaria is proved by recent events. Since the Tsankoff Government came into power M. Stambulisky, the Agrarian leader and former premier; M. Dashkaloff, the former Bulgarian minister to Prague, and M. Gennadieff, a former prime minister, have been assassinated, while M. Guechoff, also a former premier, was severely wounded in the streets of Sofia. All this, taken with the political activities of Todor Alexandroff, the leader of the Bulgarian Comitadjis, whose armed bands have repeatedly raided the territory of Serbian Macedonia, burning the villages and massacring the inhabitants, has inspired considerable anxiety in Yugoslavia, as these incidents do not make for good neighborly relations. This is regrettable, but as long as such conditions prevail it is difficult to foresee any improvement. The late Alexander Stambulisky was sincerely desirous of establishing friendly relations with Yugoslavia and did much to promote these. Many people believe that this was the reason for the reactionary party driving him from power and murdering him.

Yours very sincerely,

G. GORDON-SMITH.

INTERNATION INSTITUTE OF CHINA,
PEKING, CHINA.

SIR: I derive much benefit from the ADVOCATE OF PEACE. Some of its articles are translated into my *Chinese Weekly*, the international journal. I am working all the time for peace, especially in China.

China is without a head. For twelve years China has had no emperor; and yet the young emperor, at the close of the Tsing, or Manchu, Dynasty, still lives in the imperial

palace and holds court for his Manchu subjects. He also draws revenue from the Chinese Republic, though not as much as was originally stipulated.

Adjoining the imperial palace is the presidential palace, or mansion, but for a second time in two years it is left vacant, without a president. President Hsu Shih-chang, who was forced out of office in the summer of last year, and fled to his sumptuous residence in Tientsin, was the first to go. President Li Yuan-hung, who was forced out of office in June of this year, and fled to another sumptuous residence in Tientsin, has been the second one to go.

No emperor can satisfy the Chinese of today. And it seems as if no president can succeed any better. There are, however, plenty of aspirants, not for the throne, but for the seat. Whether emperor or president, there is supposed to be glory and honor, and what is more, money, in being the head of a great and vast country like China.

When President Li fled to Tientsin, and later on wandered forth to Shanghai to dabble further in politics, it was supposed that his departure was to make room for another aspirant, Marshal Tsao Kun, who is military governor of three provinces, wherein lies the national capital. This ambition has not been crowned with success, and no one knows whether a legal election is to take place or not. There are many fears and even premonitions that even if an election takes place and Tsao Kun is the man, there will at once begin another civil war.

Should Tsao Kun not be elected by legal methods, and the dozen provinces which now favor him insist on a dictatorial procedure, there will also result civil war. The mass of the people, however, without caring whether there is a head to the government or not, are sincerely anxious to avert war. Hence a peace movement is the countercurrent to confusion and strife.

As a matter of fact, China not only has no emperor and no president, and gets along very well without either, but has no monarchy and no real republic. It also seems to some that China has no government. This is not so. China has always had local self-government, and in addition there are provincial governments, with both civil and military rulers, and also various competitors. There is also a kind of central government, with which foreign diplomats can still hold concourse. This is called a cabinet or dubbed a regency or administrative council. Dr. Wellington Koo is the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

This system of ruling a nation is unlike all others. It is not the Soviet system, for workmen and peasants are far from ruling in China. It is not the Swiss system, for in the first place these administrators have not been chosen by the people or by Parliament (how they got in need not be stated), and in the second place these men have chosen no one as chairman or president.

Thus it is that China is without a head. This would not matter if there were only a strong central government. Under the present divisive condition of the country, the revenue coming to the Peking Government is insufficient for meeting obligations, and, what is worse, there is no recognized authority for the whole country. There is a government recognized by foreign powers, but not by the Chinese people.

There are many Chinese who recommend that each province concern itself with its own affairs and not bother about the national government at Peking or anywhere else. This policy, if carried out, would be a form of dismembering China by her own hands and not by foreign powers. There is good sense in the proposal for greater provincial autonomy and for federalism in democracy, but a country which persists in continuing to have no government will destroy its own existence.

Thus politics in China are fascinating. We all wonder what is going to happen next. We are all perforce becoming prophets.

GILBERT REID.

BOOK REVIEWS

UNDERSTANDING ITALY. By *Clayton Sedgwick Cooper*. New York, The Century Co. Pp. 306. Price, \$3.00.

Mr. Cooper is an American who has already written books of appreciation on South American countries; he has also written books dealing with foreign trade and markets. In this volume he attempts, quite successfully, to make modern Italy, the young Italy of enterprise and liberty, understood by his own countrymen.

He finds that individualism is the key to the Italian character, and that Italy gives unique freedom for the expression of individuality. In fact, he suspects that country is freer today than the United States, Great Britain, or Switzerland.

A chapter on Fascismo and the new Italian nationalism is perhaps the most interesting and interpretive of the book. He gives in full the "Rules of discipline for the black-shirted princes of Italy." Mussolini, of course, threatened force in capturing the government for the people, but he really had so large a majority of the public enrolled under his banner that it amounted to a pub-

lic endorsement. Mr. Cooper thinks that Mussolini is the first premier who has truly represented United Italy, who has drawn his adherents from every section. That the Fascismo used such vigorous methods merely illustrates the fact that they are Italians and not Anglo-Saxons; that they have not the same attitude toward parliamentary and constitutional law as have the Anglo-Saxons.

This is a fact which he does not see fit to mention again when, later, he appreciatively outlines the Italian objections to our limitation of immigration by the law of 1922. The American reader, however, will remember the fact that the Italian does not feel toward constitutional law as we do. It will influence his attitude toward Italian immigration.

Further chapters give, in readable fashion, the strength of Italy in agriculture, industry, and trade; in man-power and in water-power, with which she is planning to run her railroads and most of her industries.

Opportunities for American investment are enumerated in somewhat the same fashion in which Mr. Malcolm Davis, a few years ago, pointed out similar opportunities in Russia, in his book, "Open Gates to Russia."

Numerous photographic illustrations are sprinkled through the book, but with no particular relation to the chapters in which they occur.

Mr. Cooper sums up the present European situation, defending, by the way, the position of France in respect to reparations. He sees the new Italy as a strong power for reconstruction in Europe. Her spiritual and national development is, he thinks, working toward the building up of good-will, tolerance, and ideals of national patriotism and international brotherhood.

THE IRRESISTIBLE MOVEMENT OF DEMOCRACY.

By *John Simpson Penman*. Macmillan, New York. Pp. 729. Price, \$5.00.

Mr. Penman was led to undertake the present study of democracy by the famous sentence which President Wilson used in his war address to Congress, April 2, 1917: "The world must be made safe for democracy." Taking the word democracy in its usual meaning, as a form of popular government, he asked himself what it meant and if it was worth saving.

This scholarly but charmingly written book aims to answer these questions.

Democracy, as it sprang up in the latter quarter of the 18th century, went through somewhat parallel lines of development in America, France, and England. These movements are traced separately in the three main divisions of the book. Due recognition, however, is given in each to the interaction of the democratic impulse among the three countries.

The main thesis of the book is that the onward movement of democratic liberty is really irresistible; that, as a form of government, its growth and expansion is the epic history of the modern world; and that it maintains, by its own inherent strength, a steady and irresistible advance in spite of the opposition of individuals, governments, or classes.

In the face of the many depressing and critical books on democracy now coming from the press, it is indeed heartening to read a convincing statement that we have come to a point in development when class interest must ultimately be "broken against the movement of popular government which expresses the rule of all the people for the general welfare."

One of the very best features of the book, however, according to our way of thinking, is the sympathetic spirit in which we are led to follow the adventures of our sister democracies, France and England, in their quest for popular liberty. We of America may well recall from time to time that we are not the only liberty-loving people in the world. It is wholesome business to follow the process through which two other nations have asserted the same irresistible principle of freedom.

PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

The Reference Shelf. Vol. 11, No. 12. Compiled by *Julia E. Johnsen*. Pp. 117. H. W. Wilson Co., New York. Price, 90 cents.

This little handbook, primarily designed for debaters, presents in compact form most of the arguments heretofore given for and against the World Court. They are first presented in a brief, or outline, at the beginning of the book. It seems to us that some of the arguments, at least on the negative side, are contradictory. This means that debaters will need to choose carefully statements that are not mutually exclusive of each other. It is true, however, that the out-

lines do group together arguments, all of which are sometimes used, if not always by the same person.

A valuable bibliography follows the brief, and this, in turn, is followed by reprints, 19 in number, of all or parts of speeches and articles on the subject, by representative persons. No official documents are given, since these are readily obtainable elsewhere.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES; ITS SOURCES AND ITS APPLICATION. By *Thomas James Norton*. Little, Brown and Co., Boston. Pp. 298. Price, \$2.00.

If the people of the United States are to discuss intelligently the various proposals for international association that are now before them, they must understand the principles involved in an association of States. They must know where we stand now and why we are here. They should know what has been found workable in policies and what has already been discarded as useless or dangerous.

To this end, few better means of obtaining a clear view can be imagined, at least for us common run of folk, than this well-planned and simply written book of Mr. Norton's.

His plan is to "explain the Constitution by a note to every line or clause that has a historical story or drama back of it, or that has contributed during the one hundred and thirty-three years of our life under this instrument to the national or the international welfare of mankind." Not only does the author frequently give the arguments originally made in framing the Constitution as it stands, but, also he often shows by example or contrast wherein its provisions have proved salutary. For instance, under the phrase "to declare war," he reviews the declaration of war on Serbia by the government of Austria-Hungary in 1914, and shows how it could not have happened under our Constitution, since by its provisions no one man or coterie can declare war.

As in most books, there are some slips of interpretation and in statements of fact. In his interpretation of "We, the people of the United States," the author does a little violence to Mr. Chief Justice Marshall's objection to compounding our people "into one common mass." The author ignores throughout his book the fact that it was the "Federal Convention," not "Constitutional Convention," which met in Philadelphia in 1787.

A separate table of cases for the special use of lawyers, a good index and two well-printed and well-arranged charts, complete the usefulness of this excellent text.

OF WHAT USE ARE THE COMMON PEOPLE? By *Heinrich Buchholz*. Warwick and York, Baltimore. Pp. 25.

The author of this defense of democracy speaks from the standpoint of the common people. He is disturbed by the disintegrating effect of the criticism of the people which he continually reads. Many criticisms are true, not because of the inherent defects of the rank and file, but because of unjust usurpations of authority by politicians on the one hand and by "Intelligencia" on the other. His special quarrel seems to be with the latter.

Mr. Buchholz is perhaps unduly acid in speaking of clergymen, educators, and other "uplifters." He seems to have a certain fog-giness as to the difference between intelligence tests and school examinations. Of course, it is not true that the term "common schools" is any more a contemptuous term than are the phrases "common laws" or "the common good."

But his comparison, all the way through the book, of the body politic to an ideal family, where the balance is kept between the interests of the group and of the individual, is a good one. His plea for the common man is eloquent. On the whole, the book offsets wholesomely the sarcastic essays appearing elsewhere nowadays, as well as those other scholarly, but text-book-like, volumes which aim to defend democracy.

DEUTSCHLAND UND DER GENFER VÖLKERBUND. By *Dr. Hans Wehberg*. Ernst Oldenberg, Leipzig. Pp. 112.

This little paper-covered book on the League of Nations contains, in well organized form, much that will interest a German reading public.

Beginning with Hugo Grotius, Dr. Wehberg runs rapidly through the history of international law, as well as other methods of war prevention. An eloquent chapter on the reasonableness of Germany's admission to the League finishes the body of the booklet.

An appendix follows, containing the Covenant of the League and a brief bibliography of German books on the subject.

For Debaters

Permanent Court of International Justice

JULIA E. JOHNSEN, Compiler

AFFIRMATIVE

— and —

NEGATIVE

ARGUMENTS

— and —

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Price 90 Cents

Any Book on
International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD..... 131

EDITORIALS

Woodrow Wilson—Legitimate Self-interest—Not Wholly Selfish—
Peace as an American Ideal—The Hope for an International
Peace—What of the Franc?—Another Worthy Contest—Editorial
Notes 133-142

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

American Trade with Europe—The New British Government—De-
velopments in American Cable Facilities—Aviation in Europe—
Reconstruction Work in Japan..... 143-151

GENERAL ARTICLES

Academy of International Law at The Hague..... 151
Announcement by the Bureau of the Curatorium
The Maintenance of Peace..... 157
By Colonel S. C. Vestal
Great Preaching in England and America..... 165
By Walter A. Morgan
A Misleading Book..... 171
By Gordon Gordon-Smith

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

British Note to Russia..... 179
Soviet Congress's Response..... 180
Britain and France, Premiers' Letters..... 180
Chicherin on Mr. MacDonald's Decision..... 181
Treaty between Italy and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and
Slovenes 182

NEWS IN BRIEF..... 183

LETTER BOX..... 188

BOOK REVIEWS, *Good Reading for Children*..... 189

Vol. 86

MARCH, 1924

No. 3

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It is ninety-five years old. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right think-

ing in the United States for nearly a century; which has done more for the men, women, and youth of America by the reaction upon them of the spirit of justice and fair play than it has done even for the peace workers themselves, who have been the special object of its effort; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, Miami, Florida.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, former President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Lawyer, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES L. SLAYDEN**, Member Council Inter-parliamentary Union, San Antonio, Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, *ex officio*.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *ex officio*.

GEORGE W. WHITE, *ex officio*.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, University, Alabama.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

WALTER A. MORGAN, D. D., 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., 808 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, President Fairmont Seminary, Washington, D. C.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 West 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, House of Representatives Washington, D. C.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., 30 Koun Machi, Mita Shiba, Tokyo, Japan.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

Pres. WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, Bloomington, Ind.

GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. H. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Esq., Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

Mrs. PHILIP N. MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

* Emeritus. ** Died February 24, 1924.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective; and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

MARCH, 1924

NUMBER
3

EDITORIALS

WOODROW WILSON*

WOODROW WILSON is with us in the flesh no more. The mortal body of him rests in the bosom of an ecclesiastical shrine on a hill in the capital of the nation. Only record and memory remain to mark for the oncoming generations the kind of man he was, the pith in the work he did. But we know now that on the firmament of his day he shone greatly. Surely at no time in our modern world has any man arisen to occupy the place in the thoughts and emotions of mankind everywhere as did he. In the forenoon of Saturday, December 14, 1918, he arrived in the city of Paris. Beside the President of France he rode down the Champs Elysée, across the Pont Alexandre III, by the French Foreign Office and the Chamber of Deputies, again across the Seine, through the Place de la Concorde and the Rue Royal to the palace that had been especially prepared for his reception and entertainment. The streets, the buildings, the trees, the statuary, all elevated places along the route were crowded with enthusiastic thousands bent upon doing him honor, heralding him, indeed, as the hope of humanity. Limitations in his views, his methods, his personality, are of no interest in this hour. A world luminary has passed. Born of America, one of us, for a time he spoke the voice of his nation and of peoples. With millions of the earth we would pay our tribute to the greatness that was Woodrow Wilson.

LEGITIMATE SELF-INTEREST

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE is not in sympathy with the current criticism that the United States of America is pursuing a policy of selfish isolation. True, we are not unmindful of our own interests. It is of no little importance that we should be mindful of those interests. Our Secretary of State has recently pointed out that "foreign policies are not built upon abstractions. They are the result of practical conceptions of national interests." This seems to be the historical fact.

Our United States represents a reaction against the governmental systems of the Old World. Our growth has been a national development in the pursuit of our own interests. Distance from the old home land, long generations of time, problems peculiar to a pioneer people, the pursuit of self-interest—these developed on this hemisphere, perhaps as nowhere else, the spirit of individualism and self-reliance, the notion of liberty, of freedom from imposed control. Out of this kind of self-interest grew our emancipation from the political systems of Europe.

School children know the history of this growth. A grouping in colonies, the attempts to unite the groups beginning

* Woodrow Wilson, twenty-eighth President of the United States, 1913-1921, born in Staunton, Virginia, December 28, 1856; died at his home, 2300 S Street, Washington, D. C., Sunday, February 3, 1924, at 11:15 o'clock a. m.

with "The United Colonies of New England," as early as September 7, 1643; William Penn's plan for a union of the English colonies in 1698; Benjamin Franklin's plan for a union, presented at Albany in 1754, and his later plan of 1775—here are some of the steps which led to the Declaration of Independence, an act of separation, itself an expression of self-interest.

When John Adams, as early as September, 1776, pleaded for "an entire neutrality in all future European wars," and when later he noted in his diary of 1782 he thought that "it ought to be our rule not to meddle" in the politics of Europe, he was giving expression to an American principle of self-interest. The treaty of 1783, which closed our revolutionary period, was a very practical expression of American self-interest. That same year the Congress passed a resolution, under date of June 12, which contained these words: "The true interest of the States requires that they should be as little as possible entangled in the political controversies of European nations." It is out of such documents that our familiar principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of or controversies between other States arose. Because of this principle we maintained the policy of neutrality in 1790, when war threatened between England and Spain, and again in 1793, when Citizen Gênet tried to line up this country in a war against England. Out of that background Washington pleaded in his farewell address that we have with other nations "as little political connection as possible." With such a background it was easy for Thomas Jefferson to warn us of entangling alliances in Europe. The Monroe Doctrine, with its notice to the nations of the Old World that they must not extend their systems or colonies in this hemisphere, was an expression of the popular will—indeed, of

self-interest. "We should consider," runs the message, "any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

If we examine this history we find our American people pursuing their self-interests, not wholly in a spirit of isolation. In 1778 we were borrowing money from France. We were trying to borrow money in 1860 from various parts of the world. We have lent money lavishly through the World War. We have given generously throughout the years in money. We have been doing business with the world from the beginning of our history. Our social and diplomatic relations with all nations have been intimate and are increasingly so. We have isolated ourselves from other nations only in a political sense. Our policy has been based upon self-interest. The wisdom of this policy has further expression in the utterances of practically all of our statesmen. Indeed, Richard Cobden, an English statesman of great ability, pointed out that peace is brought about by "as much intercourse as possible betwixt peoples and as little as possible betwixt governments." We have no right to claim perfection for America. On the other hand, we are not called upon to hang our heads "in shame" because of our political relations with foreign States. We as a people have worked according to our "practical conceptions of national interests."

NOT WHOLLY SELFISH

IF THE United States has pursued a policy of self-interest, it has not been wholly because of selfishness. It is an extravagance to say that we have sought to live alone. We have always had an international mind on this continent. The *Mayflower* Compact of 1620 begins: "In the name of God, Amen." That is not a

selfish utterance. When the drafters of that document went on to recognize their allegiance to King James and to promise to set up for themselves a "civil body politic," for their "better ordering and preservation . . . just and equal laws," under which they promised "all due submission and obedience," they were neither isolationists nor mere self-seekers.

And there was a long international training in the after years. The trading companies, the colonial charters, the maritime and commercial disputes, were expressions of international adjustments. In 1776 they were working for reciprocal concessions in treaties under acts of Congress. The plea of our fathers for a freedom of the seas was an international plea. Our forebears carried on a war with a State in northern Africa in defense of their faith in the freedom of the seas. They fought two wars to overcome the right of belligerents to visit and search our neutral vessels in time of war, and won; albeit not finally until 1862. When they were insisting upon the freedom of commerce in time of war, they were thinking in international terms.

Our Declaration of Independence is not only an international document, it is replete with phrases indicating the international mind. The author of that document was not thinking of America alone. He did not confine himself to the "laws" of Virginia or Massachusetts. He did not appeal to the "opinions" of New York and Pennsylvania simply. He was thinking of "human events," of "the powers of the earth," of "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God," and of "the opinions of mankind," for which he had "a decent respect." It is "all men" who are created equal. It is "among men" that governments are instituted. The "Supreme Judge," in his view, was "of the world." War, -peace, alliances, commerce, are mentioned in this document; and, further, there is this international sentence: "Let

facts be submitted to a candid world." If there be selfishness in this record, it is a noble selfishness, calculated not to harm, but to serve.

PEACE AS AN AMERICAN IDEAL

IT WAS Edward Everett Hale who used to refer to the United States as a great peace society. One of the objects of every Power is to maintain peace. But throughout the history of white civilization on our North American continent, peace has been peculiarly the end sought. During the colonial period the various plans of union proposed were for the peace and safety of the colonies. The commercial policies were founded upon the principle that enlightened self-interest requires a condition of peace for profitable trade. The Declaration of Independence was not only an international document; it sprang from a common will to promote peace in this western world. From the beginning, Congress, even when carrying on war, was struggling to extend the boundaries of peace. The Confederation following the Declaration of Independence grew out of a desire for peace. The Federal Convention of 1787, itself an international conference made up of duly instructed delegates, organized with officers, committees, and plenary sessions, satisfied the small and large States, provided for the settlement of disputes between the States, and substituted the coercion of law for the coercion of arms—all to the end that there might be peace between the States of the Union. In pursuing their self-interests, they were pursuing the cause of peace, just as by pursuing the cause of peace they were pursuing their interests.

Thus, if we have been isolationists, it has not been wholly selfish. We have been mindful of the cause of peace. While George Washington felt that we should avoid as much as possible political con-

nections with the Old World, he was keenly aware of the necessity of observing good faith and justice toward all nations, of cultivating peace and harmony with all. Jefferson, who counseled us to avoid entangling alliances, on more than one occasion gave voice to his opposition to war and to his belief in the possibility of overcoming it. The Monroe Doctrine was frankly an attempt to avoid certain things "dangerous to our peace and safety." This doctrine grew out of a popular faith in free institutions. It has maintained peace. We believe in it and support it as an agency for peace.

The United States has always shown a lively interest and sympathy for popular government movements, wherever they might spring up. It was so when Greece was struggling for her independence from the Turk, when the reform movements were on in Spain and Portugal, when the colonies of Central and South America were evolving into statehood. We showed this interest and sympathy not only in words but in deeds. We were quick to send an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Frankfort, even before the government of the German Confederation had been established. President Zachary Taylor stood keenly ready to recognize Hungary should she be successful in her struggle against the dynasty of the Hapsburgs. When she failed, the United States Congress passed a resolution March 3, 1851, approved by President Fillmore, sympathizing with the Hungarians who had lost and were living in exile in Turkey, and our government sent a ship to Turkey for those exiles and brought them to this country. Indeed, probably no foreigner was ever received with greater consideration than was Kossuth. It was no accident that the United States Government was the first to recognize the French Republic in 1848, and, again, the Third Republic of 1870. It was instinctive, genuine, and enthusiastic. The peo-

ples of this Union had from the beginning an ingrained interest in the cause of peace. They were opposed to the systems of armed camps, because they were aflame with a love for the institutions of free government. The United States has pursued with consecration the principle of arbitration, with the result that we are today bound by more treaties of arbitration than any other great power. The history of Pan American co-operation, of the conferences of 1899, 1901, 1906, 1910, 1923, is a history of a will to peace. This will appeared again in our co-operation with the Hague conferences. It found expression in our frequent attempts to establish the principle of equality of American republics, to respect the territorial integrity of Cuba, to extend our friendly assistance, officially and unofficially, wherever that assistance was needed.

If we have seemed to be selfish, it has been because on occasion we were; but, on the whole and in the long run, our country, maintaining its true interests as it saw them, has conspicuously sought to cooperate with other nations and to extend to them the opportunities of peace.

THE HOPE FOR AN INTERNATIONAL PEACE

THERE is a hope that the nations will yet be able to settle all their disputes without resort to war. This hope need not wait overlong upon education, religion, or the changing of human nature. It need not linger for some new plan or panacea, some new organization. It does not require that we give up our two fundamental principles, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that only that government can endure which is a government of laws and not of men. It does not call upon us to forsake free institutions, or to join in an organization of a few men with power to

control, to wage war, to dwell, themselves, above the law. It contemplates no league to enforce peace, a contradiction in terms and wholly discredited because of its inherent inconsistencies. It does not require us to believe that nations unwilling to abide by their contracts can be expected to fare forth to war in the interests of other nations; in other words, that a compact to enforce peace has any more value from the point of view of honor than a compact to keep the peace.

The hope of an international peace requires only a slight extension of ideas. When nations announce themselves willing voluntarily to accept just laws, uniform principles of justice mutually agreed upon, show by their actions that they consider themselves governed by such laws, then, and not until then, can there be any abiding peace between the powers.

As with persons, so with States; they must abide by the eternal verities. This may sound like an abstraction, but it has a tangible content. States, like persons, have rights and duties. In the case of persons, a superior, called the State, adopts rules of action called laws, and as a superior imposes them on individuals. In the case of persons, law is a rule of action imposed by a superior, called the State, upon an inferior. International law is not so. As Dr. David Jayne Hill says, in itself international law is "but a system of freely accepted rules, to which justice requires a pledge of obedience." Thus the hope of an international peace lies in a world made up of States equal before the law which they themselves have freely fashioned and agreed to accept.

An independent court of international justice accessible to all on equal terms, where rights may be defended against an aggressor, is an inevitable consequence of such a system. Faith in the growth of public opinion for the enforcement of the court's decisions is warranted by the his-

tory of the Supreme Court of the United States, of the Privy Council of Great Britain, of the prize courts of the various nations.

Thus the hope for an international peace lies in international conferences made up of duly accredited delegates, which delegates draft laws, return these laws to their various governments for ratification, all with the understanding that when thus passed and thus ratified, they become laws for the nations that ratify, all supported by a free and wholly independent court for the settlement of questions of interpretation.

World peace is thought to be man's most difficult problem. It is widely believed to be insoluble. Believers in its solution bury it in equations of relativity that befog and baffle. The hope of an international peace may be a far simpler thing than we are in the habit of supposing.

WHAT OF THE FRANC?

WHAT are the prospects for the French franc? At the moment it is at its lowest point in history. True, other exchanges are being jolted—the Japanese yen, the Danish krone. The Hungarian crown has collapsed. Even the pound sterling has not escaped. But the French franc is more of an international barometer just now than, perhaps, any of these, for it reflects not only the relations existing between France and Germany, but, in its way, the prospects of peace and war for Europe.

In a sense, the picture is far from bright. The French have been meeting their deficit by issuing short-term treasury bonds. This has compounded the difficulties for the French people, because it has meant more and more interest and sinking-fund charges. And now, with the fall of the franc, even the ability to float these treasury bonds becomes weaker and weaker.

One result is that the Poincaré Government was threatened again with defeat. This government is opposed by the Royalists, by the extreme right, by the followers of Clemenceau, by the Communists within the government, and now by an increasing number of the people, who are feeling the increased cost of living. Then, too, there is a Teapot Dome scandal over the charges of graft in the rehabilitated areas, a failure to get help out of the Ruhr, and a developing lack of confidence. Yet the government has withstood many a storm. No one seems anxious for Poincaré's job.

In the absence of payments from Germany, France knows that she must do one of three things: She must increase her taxes; she must create emergency property taxes in the nature of a capital levy; or she must follow the example of Russia and Germany and extend the processes of paper inflation.

This is the picture of France at a time when the Associated Press, under date of February 19, announces that Germany's revenues during January showed an unexpected and encouraging growth, amounting to 191,000,000 gold marks over the government's revenues for December. The December revenues already have shown a growth of approximately ten times those of November.

And yet there are factors offsetting the gloom in the French situation. The deficit in the French commercial balance has steadily decreased during the last three years, the deficit in her trade balance decreasing by 21 per cent since 1922. There has been no paper inflation in France since 1920; on the contrary, since that time nearly 2,000,000 paper francs have been withdrawn from circulation. The general budget for expenditures is now considerably less than one-half the budget of 1920. During the last three years the treasury receipts have steadily increased.

The French will to weather the storm is manifest. In spite of the devastations

due to the war, France is producing now more wheat than in 1913. There is no unemployment in France. Trade between France and her overseas possessions is ten billions larger than before the war. The devastated regions, which could pay only 600,000,000 francs in taxes in 1919, paid during the year 1923 more than 2,000,000,000. We are advised that the general budget for 1924 is to be balanced without resort to new loans. As to the budget of "recoverable expenditure," the French Government is recommending drastic economies and raising also additional fiscal resources in the nature of additional taxes. In the main the financial and economic situation in France on January 1, 1924, represented a decided improvement over that of any other time since the war.

If the franc continues to fall, it will be because of speculation and a lack of confidence, not because of any inherent disease. French opinion is that German bankers, helped by financial allies in other countries, are the cause of the present flight from the franc. The steadying factor is the popular opposition throughout France to any renewed paper inflation. To avoid this the people are not only willing to stand a 20 per cent increase in the taxes, but, if we understand the French aright, they will go to any limit.

ANOTHER WORTHY CONTEST

DISCUSSION is the hope of a democracy, especially if the discussion be for the purpose of promoting truth. To labor for a prize is not the most dignified expression of the human spirit, but it is better to have labored for a prize than not to have labored at all. All contests for prizes which start people to work accomplish good, at least for the contestants. There are higher merits to be achieved in other ways, but to struggle honestly for a prize in a worthy field is not all to the bad.

Over 200 American newspapers have just announced an unusual series of prizes. These newspapers are interested to discover among the public, private, and parochial high schools of America the three students with the highest capacity for interpreting and popularizing the American governmental system. The quest is to take the form of a nation-wide oratorical contest. The purpose is to increase interest in and respect for the United States Constitution. All young men and women attending high schools and not over nineteen years of age are entitled to compete. The orations, which must be original, must not require more than twelve minutes for delivery. A contestant may choose one of the following subjects: the Constitution; Washington and the Constitution; Hamilton and the Constitution; Jefferson and the Constitution; Madison and the Constitution; Marshall and the Constitution; Webster and the Constitution; Lincoln and the Constitution. The only restriction as to the development of these themes is that the orations must be of such a character as to increase interest in and respect for the Constitution of the United States. Here is worthy business.

The system to be employed is simple. The low-point total system of judging will be used. The country is to be divided into seven zones, as follows: the District of Columbia, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Kansas City, and Los Angeles. By the familiar processes of elimination, classes in various schools will compete, bringing to the front the student with an oration best in literary merit and delivery and, second, calculated most to increase interest in and respect for the Constitution of the United States. Then schools within a given area will compete. The eliminations will then proceed by groups of schools and major newspaper territories until the winner in each of the seven major zones is determined. These

seven winners, having won substantial local awards along the way, will compete in Washington, D. C., on June 6 for the three national prizes of \$3,500, \$1,000, and \$500 respectively. It is announced that President Coolidge will make an address at that meeting. It is estimated that more money will be distributed in this way throughout the United States than is expended by the fund of the Rhodes scholarships. Once again idealism is to be promoted by the golden spur of self-interest.

The project, under the terms of which nothing is offered for sale, is endorsed by publicists and educators throughout the nation. The contestants are not asked to subscribe to anything, to clip coupons, or to obligate themselves in any way. The newspapers announce that the contest is to be a clean-cut effort in behalf of better citizenship.

It would be difficult to devise a happier series of prizes, for at no time in our history have we needed more to know our America than now.

CHARLES HERBERT LEVERMORE has been awarded the first \$50,000 of the American Peace Award. If his plan is sufficiently acceptable to the American people or to the United States Senate, Dr. Levermore will receive another \$50,000. It gives us pleasure to congratulate him. For years Dr. Levermore has been an honored laborer in the fields of education and of international studies. Born in this country, son of a clergyman, he graduated from Yale and received the degree of Ph. D. from Johns Hopkins University, where later he became a University fellow in history. For a number of years he was professor of history in Massachusetts Institute of Technology. For six years he was President of the Adelphi College. His work as an author has extended from historical

works to the editorship of song books. Since 1917 he has been secretary of the New York Peace Society. Since 1919 he has also been secretary of the League of Nations Union in New York City. He is the author of a series of year books of the League of Nations, the third of which has just appeared from the press of the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*.

THREE treaties of friendship have recently been announced in Europe. It may be believed that these, together with the report of the special committees on the German financial conditions, are most important international events. France now has a treaty of friendship with Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia has a similar treaty with Jugoslavia. And now Italy also has a similar treaty with Jugoslavia. Under the circumstances, it is difficult to imagine either Hungary or Bulgaria attacking any member of the Little Entente, or *vice versa*. This would seem to clear the air, so far as any possibility of an early war in the Balkans is concerned.

THE signing of the treaty of friendship between Italy and Jugoslavia puts an end to one of the most dangerous situations in Europe, one which any time in the last four years might have led to a war between Italy and Jugoslavia. During that time the trade of Fiume has been at a complete standstill. Grass a foot long was growing on the quays and railways. Not a ship has entered her port for over three years; her commerce has been destroyed and the population reduced to starvation.

By the treaty Italy is given the town of Fiume proper—that is to say, the part of the city on the right bank of the River Reshina. The other part of the city, known as the town of Shusak, on the left bank of the Reshina, together with the

portion of the harbor known as Porto Barros and the delta of the River Reshina, over which the railway passes, is given to Jugoslavia. Italy further agrees to lease for fifty years, at a rental of one lira a year, two of the principal basins of the port of Fiume. Italy in return, for a nominal rental of one dinar per year, is given the right to use the canalized branch of the River Reshina.

It is clear from the terms of the treaty that Jugoslavia has been given the oyster, while Italy gets the shell. Signor Mussolini realized that Fiume can only live from its Jugoslav hinterland, and he has contented himself with the admission of Italian sovereignty over Fiume proper, but leaves the working of the port and the future development of the city in the hands of the Jugoslavs. The fact that a majority of the population of Fiume proper is Italian-speaking makes the agreement a just one from an ethnographical point of view, though politically its entire future depends on Jugoslavia. With time, the city will surely lose such Italianness as it now possesses. Mussolini, however, was forced to reckon in Italian politics with the Irredentissimi of the D'Annunzio type and could not altogether abandon Italian claims. The presence of a few Italian gendarmes in the streets will probably be in the future the only outward signs of Italian sovereignty.

THE course of peace, like the course of true love, never did run smooth. At a time when the United States, under date of January 29, resumed diplomatic relations with Greece, troubles were brewing in the Republic of Honduras which made it necessary for our government, under date of February 13, to sever relations with that State. The reason why our State Department found it impossible to recognize the Government of Honduras lay in the fact that there was no govern-

ment in Honduras to recognize. At the moment there are three political factions in this Central American State. With the end of the year 1923 constitutional government ceased to exist. The reason was that there was no majority for any of the three candidates for the presidency, either at the polls or in the Congress. The constitution of Honduras provides no means of continuing the constitutional power in such an emergency. The result was the end of government. In this situation each of the parties proclaimed its candidate as president. Thus there was nothing in the form of a government to recognize. Our American minister, Mr. Morales, remains at Tegucigalpa, trying to help in his unofficial capacity to bring order out of the chaos.

THE Mediterranean Sea has not ceased to be a bone of contention among the great powers. The objections not only on the part of Spain, but on the part of Britain, and perhaps in a lesser measure upon the part of Italy, to the position of France in Tangier has brought the whole Mediterranean problem again to the fore. The new Spanish dictator has recently called attention to the ancient Spanish objection to the British occupation of Gibraltar. The Marquis de Estella calls Gibraltar "a permanent national insult." So strong is this feeling just now in Spain that certain writers of Britain are suggesting that Gibraltar be returned to Spain, and that Britain be given Ceuta, including both the fortress and the bay. There is no doubt that the Italian gesture against Corfu was an expression of the Italian will to control the Adriatic.

Italy has delimited Albania for the purpose of preventing Jugoslavia and Greece from challenging her supremacy in the Adriatic.

Of course, an Italian control of the Adriatic constitutes something of a threat

to the control of the Mediterranean. Naturally Britain is concerned, because of her desire to keep an open route to India. The demilitarization of the Straits at the second Lausanne conference may or may not prove to be effective in time of war, but the interest in the Straits, with the great Russian hinterland, is a part of the world's worries over the Mediterranean. The British interest in Egypt and in Palestine is due primarily to the Suez Canal.

If it be true that all nations are pursuing what they conceive to be their legitimate national interests, and if we grant further that no nation holds that war is a desirable end in itself, it remains that one of the most important factors in the whole problem of peace and war is the Mediterranean.

THE problem of national immigration continues to attract attention. At a time when the proceedings of the national immigration conference, held in the city of New York during the month of December, are just appearing, Congress continues its labors with impending immigration legislation. Secretary Hughes has written to the chairman of the Senate Immigration Committee, urging that the proposed legislation should avoid any "discrimination of which just complaint can be made." He calls attention to the fact that the plan of the Johnson bill to substitute 1890 census figures as the basis for future quota restrictions had already "evoked representations from Italy and Rumania." There is no doubt that there is considerable feeling in the Congress over this problem of immigration. Representative Cable, a member of the Immigration Committee of the House, remarked recently that an "American bloc" should be organized to combat the "foreign bloc" in Congress. It is true that the Congress is within its rights in passing any restric-

tions upon immigration it sees fit. But it is sound moral sense that we should not pass any legislation involving any "discrimination of which just complaint can be made."

PREMIER MACDONALD, under date of January 26, made a friendly gesture to France in the form of a note to M. Poincaré. It was a kindly touch, extending greetings and good wishes. Expressing grief at the unsettled points causing trouble and concern, he assured the French Premier that it would be his "daily endeavor" to help to settle them to the mutual benefit of both countries. He said:

"I am sure by the strenuous action of good will these conflicts can be settled and policies devised in the pursuit of which France and Great Britain can remain in hearty co-operation. We can be frank without being hostile, and defend our country's interests without being at enmity. Thus the Entente will be much more than a normal thing, and France and Great Britain can advance together to establish peace and security in Europe."

Mr. Poincaré's reply appears elsewhere in these columns. We find no reason for believing that these gentlemen are simply sparring preliminary to a real set-to. In any event, we sense a softening of the asperities between France and England.

COLONEL VESTAL'S article, "The Maintenance of Peace," appearing elsewhere in these columns, is the point of view of a distinguished authority of our Army War College. He speaks for a large section of the intelligent men of our army and navy. His views are of importance for all who are concerned to advance the cause of peace between nations. Colonel Vestal's writings have appeared not only in magazines such as the *Atlantic Monthly*, but he is the author of a carefully written book entitled *The Maintenance of Peace*.

THE British Government, under date of February 1, recognized the Union of Soviet Republics as the *de jure* rulers of those territories of the old Russian Empire which acknowledge their authority. There remain, however, details relating to existing treaties, the settlement of claims, the adjustment of propaganda, and the establishment of a treaty to settle all questions outstanding between the two countries. The Moscow Government welcomed this proposal, noting with satisfaction that the historic step was one of the first acts of the first government of Great Britain chosen by the working classes.

THE last revolution in Mexico seems to be dying out. How far the policy of the United States has aided in this process is difficult to determine. Measured by the results, we may be warranted in believing that that policy has not been harmful.

JAMES L. SLAYDEN, of San Antonio, Texas, for many years a member of the Executive Committee of the American Peace Society, and its President from 1917 to 1920, died at his home in San Antonio, Texas, Sunday morning, February 24, at 3:30 o'clock. Throughout his career, Mr. Slayden's chief interest was in a better understanding between the nations, a fact which marked his labors as a member of the United States House of Representatives from 1897 to 1919.

In 1888 he married Ellen Maury, of Charlottesville, Virginia, who survives him. Mr. Slayden's life and work as a member of the United States Congress won for him an enviable place in the affections of both the Senate and the House. His princely bearing, intelligence, his unselfish devotion to the best things of life stamped him not only as a gentleman, but as a noble product of our American civilization.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

AMERICAN TRADE WITH EUROPE

TRADe statistics of the Department of Commerce covering 1923, according to Douglas Miller, of the Western European Division, Department of Commerce, show that Europe absorbed slightly more than half of American exports and shipped 30 per cent of our imports. During the year, sales of American wheat, corn, and other cereal products fell off, while exports of lard and bacon reached increased levels. The drop in shipments of cotton to some European markets, such as Spain, was offset by increased takings by Germany. American imports of crude rubber, wool, hides, and skins reflect increased prosperity in this country. Sales of American specialty products, such as automobiles, tires, typewriters, and adding machines show important increases. Exports to Europe for the year register a gain of one-half of 1 per cent of previous year's figures, with a 17 per cent increase in imports from Europe.

Steady Exports and Increased Imports

Exports from the United States to the continent of Europe in 1923 amounted to \$2,093,000,000, an increase of one-half of 1 per cent over the previous year's figures, which were \$2,083,000,000. Imports from Europe amounted to \$1,157,000,000, an increase of 17 per cent over 1922 imports, which were \$911,000,000. Our favorable balance of trade with Europe amounted to \$936,000,000, compared with \$1,092,000,000 in the previous year. Europe took slightly more than 50 per cent of American exports in 1923, a drop from 54 per cent the year before. We took 30½ per cent of our total merchandise imports from Europe last year, compared with 31½ per cent in 1922. Thus Europe became slightly less important as a market for American goods and a source of imports.

These figures show merchandise imports and exports only and take no account of the large movement of invisible

items in our foreign balance. Some of these items bulk very largely in our European accounts. During the year large sums of money were spent by American tourists abroad and of these sums Europe received the greater share. At the same time emigrant remittances from this country maintained the high figure of recent years and tend to offset the merchandise purchases which Europe is making in our markets. Other invisible items include shipping, insurance, and the interest on invested foreign capital. In merchandise trading alone, our increase of one-half of 1 per cent in exports to Europe is less than the increase of 9 per cent in exports to the entire world, and while imports from Europe increased 17 per cent, imports from all countries showed a gain of 22 per cent.

Exports Rise in Closing Months of 1923

During 1923 exports to Europe remained below the 1922 level from March to August, but the heavy shipments of agricultural products in the last half of the year brought the 1923 figures above those of the previous year, ending with record shipments to Europe of \$246,000,000 in December, the highest monthly figure for some time.

Imports from Europe were relatively more important during the early half of the year and showed increases in raw materials for use in American manufacture. During the latter half of 1923 our imports from Europe remained practically the same as the previous year.

Exports of American products to Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, and Denmark, in the order named, showed a marked percentage increase, while our shipments to the United Kingdom, our largest single customer, France, Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Belgium showed only a very slight change from the preceding year. Shipments to the Netherlands, Norway, and Spain declined.

Our imports from the following coun-

tries, in the order named, showed large percentage increases over 1922: Denmark, Austria, Italy, Germany, Norway, Belgium, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. More moderate increases were recorded from Sweden, Spain, France, while no substantial change occurred in imports from Czechoslovakia, and Switzerland shipped us less goods than in the preceding year.

Important Increases in Exports to Great Britain

The United Kingdom was again in 1923 the largest single purchaser of American export commodities. Exports to the United Kingdom amounted to \$882,000,000, an increase of \$27,000,000 over the year before, or 3 per cent, according to figures compiled by the Western European Division of the Department of Commerce. Imports were \$404,000,000, an increase of \$47,000,000, or 14 per cent. Important increases in exports were copper, ingots and rods, which rose from \$13,000,000 to \$25,000,000; automobiles, from \$3,500,000 to \$6,000,000; zinc from \$1,100,000 to \$5,500,000; mineral oils, from \$62,000,000 to \$66,000,000; wood and manufactures, from \$5,500,000 to \$8,000,000; naval stores, from \$7,500,000 to \$10,000,000; lard, from \$28,000,000 to \$29,000,000; salmon, from \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000. Decreases in exports occurred in the following commodities: Pork, from \$82,000,000 to \$78,000,000; leather, from \$13,000,000 to \$11,000,000; corn, from \$21,000,000 to \$10,000,000; wheat, from \$47,000,000 to \$21,000,000; wheat flour, from \$12,000,000 to \$9,000,000; sugar, from \$23,000,000 to \$15,000,000; tobacco, from \$86,000,000 to \$76,000,000; cotton, from \$204,000,000 to \$190,000,000. It is thus evident that the United Kingdom bought smaller quantities of cotton and foodstuffs, but increasing amounts of metals and manufactured products.

Increases in imports from the United Kingdom occurred in the following commodities: Rubber, from \$9,000,000 to \$22,000,000; wool and manufactures, from \$23,000,000 to \$33,000,000; tea, from \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000; hides and skins, from \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000; tin, from \$6,000,000 to \$10,000,000; cotton cloth, from \$27,000,000 to \$37,000,000. Im-

ports of coal decreased from \$17,000,000 to \$4,000,000, and pearls from \$3,000,000 to \$2,500,000. The falling off in the imports of coal is, of course, accounted for in the fact that in 1922 strike in the American bituminous industry caused temporary shipments of British fuel to the American market. The marked increase in rubber imported is especially striking and reflects the general increased level of prosperity in the United States.

Exports to France Twice as Valuable as Imports from France

American imports from France in 1923 showed a slight increase from the previous year, according to an analysis of trade with France by the Western European Division of the Department of Commerce. The only important declines in the major articles were calfskins, gloves, and walnuts. Early in the year the French glove industry was suffering from severe depression and the export demand was weak, but general improvement in the industry occurred in later months, accompanied by increased demand for French gloves from the United States. The number of pairs of gloves received from France increased, the whole of the fairly important decline being due to lower values. The decline in value of walnut imports shows the same feature of reduced value, with quantity unchanged. The decrease in our imports of calfskins from France is offset by increase in cattle hides, sheepskins, and kidskins. Among increased imports, the most noteworthy was raw silk, which was four times as great as in 1922. Imports of spun silk, silk fabrics, and silk wearing apparel also showed material increases. Cotton laces also were imported in great quantities. Pearls, always an important item of the trade, advanced slightly over the previous year. Total imports increased 5 per cent.

Our exports to France, which are nearly twice as valuable as our imports from France, increased about 2 per cent, despite a decline in vegetable foodstuffs, accounted for by increased European production and heavy stocking in previous years. Wheat, corn, and barley exports to France showed a total decline of upward of \$11,000,000, or more than 58 per cent. Exports of dried and canned fruits

declined similarly, while sugar exports reached only one-third of their 1922 value. Less important declines occurred in shipments of lead and zinc, leaf tobacco, automobiles and automobile tires, and leather. Exports of American shoes, though still of minor importance, increased considerably.

Although value figures show an increase in our raw cotton exports to France in 1923, quantity figures reveal a slight decline, probably due to supplies obtained from other sources rather than to reduction of total requirements. In contrast with vegetable food products, exports of animal foodstuffs to France increased considerably, including pork products and condensed milk.

Petroleum products showed little change in value on account of reduced prices, but the quantity statistics show a considerable increase. Refined copper, one of the leading factors in the trade, increased by one-third.

Exports to Germany Show Large Increases

Exports of United States goods to Germany gained only three-tenths of 1 per cent in 1923, while imports showed an increase of 38 per cent. Important increases in exports were bacon, from \$6,000,000 to \$10,000,000; lard, from \$26,000,000 to \$40,000,000; cotton and manufactures, from \$131,000,000 to \$144,000,000; naval stores, from \$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000; leaf tobacco, from \$4,000,000 to \$5,500,000; sulphur, from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000; adding and calculating machines, from \$150,000 to \$400,000; typewriters, from \$60,000 to \$178,000. Decreases in exports to Germany occurred in corn, from \$22,000,000 to \$5,000,000; rice, from \$13,000,000 to \$12,000,000; wheat, from \$13,000,000 to \$3,000,000; wheat flour, from \$10,000,000 to \$2,000,000; lubricating oils, from \$10,000,000 to \$5,000,000; copper, from \$27,000,000 to \$22,000,000; lead, from \$700,000 to \$600,000.

The following imports from Germany showed significant increases: Laces and embroideries, from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000; china, from \$1,000,000 to \$3,600,000; cotton wearing apparel from \$7,500,000 to \$9,000,000; toys, from \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000. Imports of colors and dyes decreased from \$2,500,000 to \$2,000,000,

while shipments of muriate of potash dropped from \$3,500,000 to \$2,000,000.

Diamonds Largest Item of Imports from Belgium

Two items stand out in the American statistical tables covering imports from Belgium, namely, diamonds and flax. The former article, which reached a total value of nearly \$30,000,000 in 1923, an advance of 25 per cent from the previous year, had a value only a little less than one-third of the total trade. The latter, which was valued at less than a half million dollars, declined slightly from 1922. Of the remaining important articles, for which separate statistics are not available, glass, a large proportion of our imports of which proceed from Belgium, was imported at a greatly increased rate in 1923, and the amount received from Belgium doubtless shared in this advance; muriate of potash dropped considerably, and fabrics of flax and hemp were also imported in smaller quantities. Imports showed an average increase of 23 per cent.

The decline of \$1,000,000 in total exports to Belgium is accounted for by important reductions in all cereal exports, which occurred because of increased production and the previous accumulation of large stocks, aggregating more than \$10,000,000. There were also large decreases in our exports of sugar, for the same reason as that of cereals. Cotton, probably because of increased Belgian imports from other countries rather than a decline in total cotton requirements; linseed cake, canned salmon, and southern yellow pine, which experienced a serious slump. In spite of the general increase in other items of our exports to Belgium, there are few outstanding instances of higher values. Refined copper experienced the most important rise, amounting to \$3,000,000, or about 50 per cent, indicating the activity of those Belgian industries requiring copper as one of the raw materials. American automobiles, both trucks and passenger cars, were shipped in greater numbers, and petroleum products showed a corresponding increase, especially in quantity, the prices of gasoline being considerably lower. In contrast with other foodstuffs, our exports of pork products showed a striking improvement, while condensed

and other prepared milk advanced considerably in value. Total exports dropped 1 per cent.

Imports from Italy Increased 44 Per Cent

American imports from Italy, which increased 44 per cent in 1923, cover a wide variety, only a few of which are outstanding. In first rank among these in 1923 was raw silk, which increased nearly 400 per cent from the previous year, partly because of our higher total imports of this commodity, but primarily to the improved Italian crop. Although cheese was relegated to second place by the advance in silk imports, it also showed an important increase, amounting to about 50 per cent. These two commodities comprised nearly one-third of our total imports from Italy in 1923. Other commodities for which statistics are available, such as gloves, carpet wool, hats, and walnuts, declined in value, but hat materials, which form a fairly important item, held their own, and silk manufactures increased slightly.

In spite of a reduction of more than \$16,000,000 in exports of American wheat to Italy in 1923, there was an increase of \$17,000,000 in the total trade. Most of the other commodities, as might be expected, showed increases, the only other important decreases being in imports of corn, which dropped to insignificance from a fairly important figure. Leading all in value was cotton, which increased about 15 per cent, because of heightened prices, despite of moderate decline in quantity. Exports of lard and bacon, which were insignificant in 1922, became an important part of the trade. Refined copper exports rose nearly 50 per cent, forming the third article in point of value. The increase in exports of bituminous coal, owing to increased Italian industrial requirements and the curtailment of receipts from Germany, was almost equally great, but coal shipments to Italy in 1922 had been very light. Important advances were registered in exports of all kinds of petroleum products except lubricating oil. Leaf tobacco, always an important export to Italy, increased considerably in 1923, due apparently to improved demand from Italian tobacco manufacturers to supply their market. Among minor items which

increased to a greater or less extent are automobile tires, southern yellow pine, tin plate, typewriters, and cotton textile machinery. Total exports gained 12 per cent.

Slump in Exports to Spain

Spain is one of the very few countries to which the United States exported less in 1923 than in 1922. The decline amounted to about \$9,000,000, or 12 per cent. This is completely accounted for by the slump in exports of cotton to Spain, due to the depression of the Spanish textile industry, which has been at a low ebb all year and was almost at a standstill during the strike at Barcelona last summer. The other outstanding declines in exports to Spain were sugar, due to increased production; corn and wheat, owing to Spanish import prohibitions on these grains, that on corn being only partial; refined copper, and sulphate of ammonia. Many other commodities registered considerable gains, the most notable being automobiles and motor trucks, with an increase of \$3,000,000, and leaf tobacco, with over \$1,500,000. An increase corresponding to that in automobile exports occurred in gasoline, which advanced more than a half million dollars in spite of lower prices. It appears that, notwithstanding the depression in Spanish industries, the market for American cars is by no means saturated. Lumber exports to Spain also increased appreciably, especially staves required for wine and olive exports. Exports of harvesters and reapers, which were almost nil in 1922, increased to a fair value in 1923.

American imports from Spain are largely raw materials and foodstuffs. They are of much smaller value than our exports to Spain and are also considerably lower than our imports from other European countries of equal importance. Imports of hides and skins increased by about 25 per cent; imports of iron ore, which is a less important item, rose by nearly 50 per cent, and imports of the minor commodities, carpet wool and walnuts, also showed small advances. These increases, however, were more than counterbalanced by a decline of over \$1,000,000 in imports of unrefined copper. A slight drop is also shown in imports of copper ore. The net percentage gain was 7 per cent.

THE NEW BRITISH GOVERNMENT

AS HAD been somewhat dolorously anticipated by the Conservative Party, after its smashing losses in the tariff election, the reassembly of Parliament saw the immediate defeat of Mr. Baldwin's government by a vote of no confidence moved by Mr. Clynes, representing the Labor Party, as an amendment to the address in reply to the King's speech. The majority against the late government was 72.

Mr. Baldwin's resignation was followed by a royal summons to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the Labor leader, who had just previously been sworn in as a privy councillor at the palace. Mr. MacDonald accepted, and received his appointment as Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury. In the meantime Parliament assembled, heard the announcement of Mr. Baldwin's resignation, and adjourned until February 12.

Composition of the First British Labor Cabinet

The official list of Mr. MacDonald's government is as follows: Premier and Foreign Secretary, Mr. MacDonald; Lord Privy Seal and Leader in the Commons, Mr. Clynes; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Snowden; Lord Chancellor, Lord Haldane; Lord President of the Council, Lord Parmoor; Home Secretary, Mr. Arthur Henderson; First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Chelmsford; Colonial Secretary, Mr. J. H. Thomas; Secretary for War, Mr. Stephen Walsh; Secretary for Air, Brigadier-General Thomson; President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Sidney Webb; Secretary for India; Sir Sydney Olivier; Secretary for Scotland, Mr. W. Adamson; Minister of Health, Mr. Wheatley; Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Noel Buxton; Minister of Labor, Mr. Tom Shaw; Minister of Pensions, Mr. F. O. Roberts; Minister of Education, Mr. C. P. Trevelyan; Postmaster General, Mr. Vernon Hartshorn; Chancellor of the Duchy, Colonel Wedgwood; First Commissioner of Works, Mr. F. W. Jowett; Attorney General, Mr. Patrick Hastings, K. C.; Solicitor General, Mr. Henry H. Slessor, K. C.; Financial Secretary to Treasury, Mr. William Graham; Financial Secretary to War Office, Mr. J. J. Lawson; Parliamentary Secretary to Treasury and Chief Whip, Mr. Ben C. Spoor.

All the above are members of Parliament with the exception of Mr. Arthur Henderson, Sir Sydney Olivier, Brigadier-General Thomson, Mr. Slessor, and Mr. Sydney Arnold.

It will be noted that the list of appointments contains many names which have long been familiar in English political life. Mr. Clynes (Lord Privy Seal) was Food Controller during the late war; Lord Parmoor was formerly a Conservative M. P.; Lord Haldane was Secretary of State for War from 1905 to 1912 and subsequently Lord Chancellor until 1915; Mr. Henderson was Paymaster General and Labor Adviser to Mr. Asquith's Liberal Government and afterwards a member of the War Cabinet; Mr. S. Walsh held office between 1917 and 1919 as Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of National Service; Sir Sydney Olivier was formerly Governor of Jamaica and afterwards Permanent Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, then Assistant Comptroller and Auditor of the Exchequer; Mr. C. P. Trevelyan was Liberal member for Yorkshire in 1899 and Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education in 1908; Lord Chelmsford was Governor of Queensland, then of New South Wales, and subsequently Viceroy of India; Mr. Noel Buxton was formerly Liberal member for Whithy; Mr. Arthur Ponsonby was private secretary to Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman and succeeded him as Liberal member for Stirling Burghs.

First Steps of the New Government

Prior to the reassembly of Parliament, after the adjournment, Mr. MacDonald opened preliminary negotiations with Soviet Russia on the question of recognition and appointed a provisional chargé d'affaires to Moscow. At the same time an exchange of courtesies took place between the British Prime Minister and M. Poincaré, the former announcing his accession to power by a personal letter, to which the latter replied in kind. A conference to settle the boundary question between North and South Ireland was also initiated, and after expressing the confidence placed in the League of Nations by the Labor Party, the hope for an equitable arrangement concerning Germany, and various similar optimisms, the new government may be said to have settled into its collar.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AMERICAN CABLE FACILITIES

The past few months have seen developments in American cable facilities that will have far-reaching results on international communication in the United States. The completion of the Commercial Cable Company's new cable from New York via Canso, Nova Scotia, and the Azores to Ireland and France provides an additional modern cable of much greater capacity than any previously in existence in the Atlantic. Although negotiations are not yet completed, there seems to be good reason to believe that some of the restrictions now imposed on the operation of American cables to the continent of Europe will shortly be removed, and that cable companies will be as free to develop their business on the continent as they are now in the United States, Canada, and England.

Following hard on the announcement of the completion of the commercial cable comes the statement of the Western Union Telegraph Company that a satisfactory solution of its difficulties in securing landing rights in the Azores and Portugal is now in sight. With the final adjustment of this dispute the last obstacle in the way of the direct cable connection to Spain and the Mediterranean is removed. The plans of the Italian company to extend this service eastward in the Mediterranean to Greece and Constantinople will make available an additional route to the Near East that has long been necessary for American business.

Cable communication to San Domingo, Haiti, and a number of the Lesser Antilles has long been uncertain, due to the many interruptions that occur. Up to the present time, two cable systems have operated generally throughout the West Indies—the West India and Panama Telegraph Company and the Compagnie Française des Cables Télégraphiques.

The Compagnie Française des Cables Télégraphiques, usually called the French Cable Company, has exclusive rights to the telegraph business in every island of the West Indies and in Venezuela. These exclusive possessions have made it impossible for many years for any competitors to enter these particular points in the territory of the French company.

All America Cables, Inc., recently announced a general meeting of the stockholders for the purpose of considering the purchase, by that company, of the United States and Haiti Company and the West Indian System of the French Cable Company. The acquisition of these systems by All America Cables will mean direct cable service from the United States, over the lines of American companies, to practically every point of commercial importance in the West Indies, Central and South America.

The total effect of the changes produced by these three great developments would make the American cable system dominant in this hemisphere, and it can hardly fail to have a direct effect on all of our international business and our relations with the countries of Europe and of South America.

AVIATION IN EUROPE

The year 1923 was an experimental year for European aviation, especially for Germany. Basic lines of an international flying system were planned and carried through, giving Germany contact by air service with all neighboring countries. During the summer of 1923 daily flights were made on the following 19 lines:

1. London-Paris.
2. London-Brussels-Cologne.
3. Manchester-London-Rotterdam-Amsterdam-Bremen-Hamburg-Berlin.
4. Paris-Brussels - Rotterdam - Amsterdam.
5. Paris-Strassburg-Prague-Warsaw.
6. Paris-Prague-Vienna-Budapest-Belgrade - Bukharest - Constantinople (1,600 kilometers).
7. Toulouse- Barcelona -Alicante- Malaga-Rabat-Casablanca (1,600 kilometers).
8. Antibes-Ajaccio.
9. Seville-Larache.
10. Hamburg-Copenhagen.
11. Berlin-Dessau-Leipzig- Fuerth- Munich.
12. Munich-Zurich-Geneva.
13. Munich-Vienna-Budapest.
14. Berlin-Danzig-Koenigsberg.
15. Koenigsberg-Memel-Riga-Reval.
16. Reval-Helsingfors.
17. Koenigsberg-Smolensk-Moscow.
18. Danzig-Warsaw-Lemberg.

19. The long stretch of 2,800 kilometers—Moscow-Kharkow-Rostow-Mineralnuye-Wodu-Grosniy-Baku-Tiflis (Junkers Air Service, Russian).

The Junkers Werke and Aëro-Lloyd participated in eleven of the above lines. These two firms now largely control German commercial aviation.

The former concern accomplished 1,070,000 flight kilometers, carried 17,750 passengers and 85,776 kilograms of mail and freight, while the latter covered 274,465 kilometers, carried 2,528 passengers and 1,415,600 kilograms of mail and freight (including newspapers to and from England).

Flights to China Contemplated

It is planned through international agreement to extend activities during 1924. The Junkers-Werke proposes to establish the following lines: A through line, London-Berlin-Lemberg-Odessa-Baku-Teheran; a through line, London-Rotterdam-Cologne-Strassburg-Zurich-Genoa-Naples (with branches to Tripoli and North Africa) - Brindisi - Athens (and branch to Smyrna) - Crete-Port Said-Cairo; and a line from Lisbon to Madrid, Barcelona, Marseille, Genoa, Trieste, Vienna, Warsaw and over Nizhni-Novgorod to Siberia and China.

It is also planned to utilize the night for travel by a combination train and airplane service, using the train for the night portion of the journey. Where routes include a considerable journey over or along the edge of water, such as the Genoa-Naples-Brindisi-Athens-Smyrna line, the night trip will be by seaplane.

RECONSTRUCTION WORK IN JAPAN

THE special session of the diet, which was called on December 10 for the purpose of considering the recommendations of the Restoration Board, according to the United States Department of Commerce, was able, in spite of the short period of the session, to pass upon the major points at issue, and in so doing pave the way toward permanent reconstruction activities. Outstanding accomplishments of this session were the settlement of the amount to be expended upon restoration

of public work during the next five years and the authorization of municipal foreign loans, if found necessary, backed by the security of the central government.

Foreign Loans Authorized

According to bills passed by the diet at the special session, which were subsequently sanctioned by the Emperor and promulgated on December 24, 1923, the total amount to be expended for restoration of public works, both in Tokyo and Yokohama and in surrounding prefectures, as well as for fire prevention zones, during the next five years—that is, up to March 31, 1929—will aggregate 468,438,849 yen, which the central government is authorized to borrow. At the same time an edict was published authorizing the central government to guarantee principal and interest of retraction loans floated by the cities of Tokyo and Yokohama to the extent of 140,000,000 yen “in case such loans were floated in the foreign market.”

It is understood that Japanese agents are already in London and New York negotiating municipal loans authorized by this edict.

The total amount authorized for restoration of public works during each of the next five fiscal years (each fiscal year begins on April 1 of the corresponding year and ends on March 31 of the following year) aggregates 342,192,600 yen, and is split up as follows: 1923, 6,291,800; 1924, 87,607,000; 1925, 86,855,400; 1926, 66,190,800; 1927, 56,235,934; 1928, 39,011,866.

It is apparent from the foregoing figures that little may be expected in the way of permanent reconstruction until after March 31, 1924. The recommendation of the Capitol Restoration Board as submitted to the diet called for an expenditure during the remainder of the fiscal year 1923 (ending March 31, 1924) for restoration works amounting to 8,850,000 yen. The diet, however, cut this down to 6,291,800 yen. The item receiving the greatest cut seems to have been that for street improvement. This estimate was cut 20 per cent with the understanding that the central government would assume the cost of improving all streets over 72 feet wide and also any necessary expense arising out of land condemned for such purposes. No other expenses, however,

are to be borne by the central government. Of the total to be expended for restoration works, 306,678,400 yen are earmarked for Tokyo and the remainder 35,514,400 yen for Yokohama.

In addition to restoration works expenditures the plan calls for loans amounting to 15,325,402 yen during the period 1923-1928 for the restoration of the prefectures in which Tokyo and Yokohama are located. Tokyo prefectures will receive 12,729,698 yen of this amount and the remainder will go to Kanagawa (Yokohama) prefecture.

Construction of Fire-Prevention Zones

In the rebuilding plan an item of 89,225,917 yen was inserted to take care of construction of fire-prevention zones, in order that future fires may be more easily controlled and to prevent a recurrence of the recent conflagration. Much of this amount will be expended in the building of city parks, as it is realized that such open spaces are very effective as fire-breaks and constitute practically the only means of checking such fires as that which followed the recent earthquake. These fire-prevention zones will be distributed over the whole devastated area and used in such places as required. Of the total amount allotted for this purpose the city of Tokyo will receive 50,156,707 yen and the city of Yokohama 10,743,333 yen.

A subsidy of 21,694,730 was also provided for the purpose of assisting the municipalities in making interest payments on their restoration loans. Tokyo will receive 17,408,274 yen of this amount, the remainder going to Yokohama.

The government is authorized to float loans in the open market in excess of the 468,438,849 yen authorized, in order to make up the difference between the face value of the issues and the net proceeds from their sale. Another important edict promulgated on December 24 authorized the government to issue 5 per cent treasury notes in payment for land condemned in the process of carrying out the reconstruction work.

A bill authorizing the government to make loans to the insurance companies amounting to 180,000,000 yen, in order that they might pay 10 per cent on their outstanding policies, failed to pass and was held over for the regular session. It

is understood that its failure to pass in the special session was not due to any serious objection being raised by that body, but because of the lack of time. The session ended with the bill still in the House of Representatives.

Freight Congestion on Japanese Railways

Congested freight on Japanese railroads has been rapidly increasing in recent weeks. Most of the goods delayed are destined for the regions devastated by the recent earthquake, and as a result of the failure to deliver goods needed in Tokyo prices for a number of commodities are rising daily. After investigation, the Tokyo Chamber of Commerce has offered the following suggestions to alleviate the situation:

1. The general clearing away of debris and other impediments still on highways and waterways in order to permit greater utilization of motor trucks and barges.

2. The construction of sheds and warehouses at freight-concentration points in order that goods may be unloaded with celerity.

3. The taking over by the railways of the management and supervision of existing warehouses.

4. A better distribution of freight cars by railway officials.

The railway authorities assert, however, that the present congestion is inevitable and they do not believe that efficient measures for clearing up the situation can be taken at this time. Nevertheless, they admit that, unless a remedy is found, a general breakdown of transportation facilities will probably occur.

Tokyo Not Yet Repopulated

Temporary structures are still being built in Tokyo at a rapid rate, and from present indications such work will continue through the winter and well into the summer months, since refugees are returning in great numbers, for which shelters must be provided. In spite of the great number that has returned to Tokyo since the earthquake, close to half a million refugees are still living with their friends and relatives in the country and in other cities of Japan to which they fled.

According to an investigation made by the Metropolitan Police Board, refugees who are yet to return to Tokyo number

about 467,000. A great many are also quartered with friends in Tokyo and some 86,000 are living in public barracks. Those still living in temporary shacks built by themselves during the earthquake period are said to number 5,200.

A total of 110,223 structures of various kinds had been erected in Tokyo up to November 23, at which time work was said to be going ahead at a rapid rate. Of this number 52,908 were residences, 49,722 stores with living quarters, 5,039 stores

and offices, and 2,555 factories. Many of these temporary structures, it is reported, are as good, and better in some instances, than the buildings which were destroyed, especially in the poorer sections of the city.

No permanent buildings have been erected to date, due to the issuance of an imperial decree prohibiting such operations until the Capitol Restoration Board has completed its plans for such building.

ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AT THE HAGUE

Founded with the Support of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

AN ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE BUREAU OF THE CURATORIUM

Inauguration of the Academy

CREATED in the early part of 1914, but delayed in the beginning of its actual work, the Academy was solemnly inaugurated on July 14, 1923, at the Palace of Peace, at The Hague, under the auspices of the Dutch Government and in the presence of the diplomatic body, the representatives of the League of Nations, various international institutions, and the press of all countries.

The speeches delivered on this occasion have been collected in a special pamphlet.*

Work and Life of Academy in 1923

The Academy started its work immediately. For the first year, the term was exceptionally limited to six weeks, divided into two periods from July 16 to August 3, and from August 13 to September 1, respectively.

The syllabus included 71 courses or lectures for the former period and 64 for the latter, bearing on various questions of public international law in time of peace. They were delivered by 28 specialists, professors, magistrates of high rank, diplomatists or statesmen belonging to fifteen different nations, eleven of which are in Europe and four in America.

The courses were attended by 351 persons of 31 different nationalities and truly

representing an élite; three-fourths were university graduates already belonging to the professions.

While on the one hand most of these students had come to The Hague at their own expense, a good number of them, on the other hand, who discharge official duties in their own countries, as members of diplomatic, consular, or administrative departments, had been sent by their governments and entrusted with the mission of following the courses and reporting on the advantages to be derived from the teaching of the Academy.

For reasons of expediency, the Academy did not deem it advisable, for the present at least, to undertake the publication of the lessons. It left it to the members of its teaching staff to do as they thought fit. Several courses and lectures have thus been or will be published later—some under the auspices of various institutions, others by the editors of special reviews or in separate form.

Results Obtained

The results obtained in the first year fully answered the expectations of the promoters.

It has been shown that combined endeavors with a view to spreading and developing international law are within practical possibilities, and that it is by no means chimerical to hope that people may thus be led to think "internationally."

* Séance solennelle d'inauguration. Paris, Imprimerie Chaix, 1923.

In an atmosphere so remarkable for the diversity of race, thought, and language, it has been possible, thanks to the common objects aimed at by all, thanks to the single language used for teaching purposes, and also by the co-operation of every goodwill, to establish a cordial scientific intercourse between the teachers and links between the students allowing of lasting work in common.

The members of the Academy know that they can henceforth rely on the confidence of governments, on the help of all experts, and on the attendance of audiences that will grow more and more numerous.

The success obtained in 1923 encourages them to pursue their work in 1924, while profiting by the lessons of experience.

General Organization of Academy

The Academy keeps to the same organization. It is administered by a managing board, composed of the members of the Carnegie Endowment Directing Committee for the Palace of Peace,¹ and assisted by a financial committee.²

From the scientific standpoint it is placed under a curatorium of twelve members belonging to different countries.³

¹The managing board of the Academy is composed in the following manner: S. E. Cort van der Linden, ancien Président du Conseil des Ministres des Pays-Bas, président; MM. le baron J. A. H. van Zuylen van Nyevelt; W. I. Doude van Troostwyk, envoyé extraordinaire et ministre plénipotentiaire en disponibilité; le Jonkheer A. M. Snouck Hurgronje, Secrétaire général au Ministère des Affaires étrangères à La Haye; J. P. A. François, chef de division au Ministère des Affaires étrangères à La Haye, professeur de droit international à l'École des Hautes études commerciales de Rotterdam, membres; E. N. van Kleffens, chef de division au Ministère des Affaires étrangères à La Haye, secrétaire; M. J. E. Boddart, secrétaire du Curatorium de l'Université de Leyde, trésorier.

²The members of the Financial Committee are: MM. B. C. J. Loder, Président de la Cour permanente de justice internationale; J. Oppenheim, membre du Conseil d'État des Pays-Bas; D. A. P. N. Koolen, président de la Seconde Chambre des États généraux.

³The Curatorium of the Academy includes: Président, M. Ch. Lyon-Caen, Doyen honoraire de la Faculté de Droit de Paris, Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques de l'Institut de France; Vice-Président, M. N. Politis, ancien ministre

Organization of Teaching

According to its statute, the Academy "is constituted as a center of higher studies in international law (public and private) and cognate sciences, in order to facilitate a thorough and impartial examination of questions bearing on international juridical relations" (Art. 2).

Teaching Staff

"To this end, the most competent men of the various States will be invited to teach, through regular courses and lectures or in seminaries, the most important questions, from the point of view of theory and practice, of international legislation and jurisprudence, as they arise, *inter alia*, from deliberations of the conferences and arbitral awards" (Art. 3).

Periods of Teaching

In order to insure the co-operation of all competent persons and give facilities to future students from every country, the courses of the Academy will be held in summer, from July to October (Art. 3, § 2), during the period which coincides with the long vacation in universities and holidays in general.

des Affaires étrangères de Grèce, professeur honoraire à la Faculté de Droit de Paris; Membres: M. A. Alvarez, Conseiller du Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Chili, membre de la Cour permanente d'arbitrage de La Haye; M. Catellani, Sénateur du Royaume d'Italie, professeur à l'Université de Padoue; M. le Baron Descamps, Ministre d'État, Sénateur du Royaume de Belgique, professeur à l'Université de Louvain; M. L. de Hammarskjöld, Gouverneur de la province d'Upsal, ancien Président du Conseil des ministres de Suède; M. Heemskerck, ministre de la Justice des Pays-Bas; lord Phillimore, ancien lord Justice d'appel, membre du Conseil Privé, Président au Tribunal des Prises, membre de la Chambre des Lords; Dr. W. Schucking, professeur à l'École supérieure de commerce de Berlin, membre du Reichstag et de la Cour permanente d'arbitrage de La Haye; M. James Brown Scott, Secrétaire général de la Dotation Carnegie pour la paix internationale; Dr. Strisower, Président de l'Institut de Droit international, professeur à l'Université de Vienne; M. le Baron de Taube, ancien professeur à l'Université de Pétersbourg; Secrétaire général, M. le Baron Albéric Rolin, professeur émérite à l'Université de Gand, président d'honneur de l'Institut de Droit international; Secrétaire de la Présidence, M. G. Gidel, professeur à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris et à l'École des Sciences politiques.

In 1924 the term will consist of nine weeks, divided into two periods, from July 14 to August 12, and from August 13 to September 12, respectively. Each period will include the same number of courses and lectures, which, while not bearing on the same matters, will, however, be of equal importance.

Syllabus

The main subject is to be international law, taught only in relation to peace, excluding the laws of war, which, owing to the still recent memories of the world conflagration, can hardly, it seems, be studied in the objective and impartial spirit that the Academy intends to follow.

Private international law will also find a place in the syllabus.

During each of the two periods main courses will be given on the historical development and general principles of international law, both public and private, while a certain number of special lectures will be devoted to carefully defined subjects, selected according to the special competence of professors and as far as possible among the juridical problems of the present time.

The regulations issued by the curatorium will mention the courses considered as compulsory and those that may be freely chosen by the students in order to deserve the certificate of regular attendance.

Nature of Teaching

The teaching is given in French exclusively. Free from any national bias, conceived in a spirit that aims at being both very practical and highly scientific, it differs essentially from the similar teaching given in universities or great national establishments. It seeks greater variety, more definite specialization, and, above all, greater thoroughness. Each subject is studied in all its bearings.

In order to make their lessons more accessible to the students for whom they are intended, the professors circulate abstracts of their lectures before delivery, with all necessary references, and at the end of the course there is also distributed a substantial summary of the conclusions to be drawn from it.

Admission

This form of teaching is offered to all those who, already possessing some ele-

ments of international law, are prompted by a wish to improve their knowledge of that science, whether from a professional point of view or a desire for information.

"Admittance to the Academy will be liberally granted, with the only reservation of the indispensable supervision to be exercised by the Board, which grants leave to attend the courses, conferences, or seminaries and which can withdraw such leave for reasons of discipline."

Every person, therefore, wishing to follow the courses of the Academy has only to send to the secretary of the managing board at The Hague an application for admission, mentioning names and surname, nationality, occupation, and address.

Fees

"The Board may demand, on admission, the payment of fees that shall not exceed 12 florins" (Art. 9). But in 1924, as in 1923, the teaching will be entirely free. No fees will be charged either for attendance at courses, lectures and seminaries or for access to the great library of the Palace of Peace.

Scholarships

For the time being, there will be no scholarships such as the board is empowered to award with the assent of the financial committee and after consultation with the curatorium (Art. 10). Subsidies may be given or scholarships granted by governments or universities, as has been the case in 1923 in several countries. The Academy hopes this example will be largely followed in 1924.

Certificates of Attendance

Certificates of regular attendance will be delivered to students deserving the same. The curatorium will regulate the conditions under which they may be obtained.

Facilities for Students' Accommodation at The Hague

Special facilities will be offered to the students for staying at The Hague, thanks to the association founded by their predecessors of 1923. Arrangements concluded with several hotels and boarding-houses will make it possible to reduce their expenses to the average cost of living in the other towns of Europe. All necessary in-

formation in this respect will be supplied on application to the secretary of students and former Students' Association, The Academy, Palace of Peace, at The Hague.

PROGRAMME

Et Horaire des Cours et Conférences Pour l'Année 1924 (14 Juillet-12 Septembre)

L'enseignement commencera le lundi 14 juillet 1924 : il est divisé en deux périodes d'égale durée et comprenant chacune un même nombre de cours et conférences sur des matières différentes, mais de même importance. Les auditeurs peuvent ainsi, selon leurs convenances et le temps dont ils disposent, suivre l'une ou l'autre des deux séries, ou bien les deux, sans s'exposer, en ce dernier cas, à des doubles emplois.

L'enseignement s'adresse à tous ceux qui, possédant déjà quelques notions de droit international, ont, par intérêt professionnel ou curiosité d'esprit, le désir de se perfectionner dans l'étude de cette science.

Donné en langue française, destiné à une élite intellectuelle d'auditeurs de différentes nationalités, conçu dans un esprit à la fois très pratique et hautement scientifique, il se différencie essentiellement, sous le rapport de la méthode et de la spécialité, des enseignements similaires des universités et des grandes écoles nationales, dont il est le naturel complément.

L'enseignement est absolument gratuit. Toute personne désirant le suivre n'a qu'à faire parvenir au Secrétariat du Conseil d'administration de l'Académie, au Palais de la Paix, à La Haye, une demande d'admission indiquant ses noms, prénoms, nationalité, profession et adresse.

Première Période: 14 Juillet-12 Aout, 1924

Le développement historique du droit international jusqu'au XVII^e siècle.—M. le Baron Taube, ancien Professeur à l'Université de Saint-Petersbourg. Les 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30 et 31 juillet et le 1^{er} août, à 9 h. 15 m.

Principes du droit international public.—La structure de la communauté internationale.—M. Jesse S. Reeves, Professeur à l'Université de Michigan. Les 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29 et 31 juillet et le 1^{er} août, à 10 h. 45 m.

Principes du droit international privé.—La théorie anglo-saxonne des conflits de

lois.—M. Hugh H. L. Bellot, Secrétaire général de l'International Law Association, ancien Professeur à l'Université de Londres. Les 14, 15, 17, 18, 21 et 22 juillet, à 4 h. 30 m.

Matières spéciales de droit international privé.—La nationalité.—M. Ernst Isay, Professeur à l'Université de Bonn. Les 24, 25, 28, 29 et 31 juillet et le 1^{er} août, à 4 h. 30 m.

Droit administratif international.—Les Unions internationales de nature économique.—M. W. Kaufmann, Professeur à l'Université de Berlin. Les 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 et 12 août, à 9 h. 15 m.

Droit commercial et économique international.—Théorie et technique des traités de commerce.—M. le Baron Nolde, ancien Professeur à l'Université de Saint-Petersbourg. Les 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 et 12 août, à 10 h. 45 m.

Organisation internationale.—La Société des Nations.—M. G. Scelle, Professeur à l'Université de Dijon. Les 4, 6, 7, 8, 11 et 12 août, à 4 h. 30 m.

Jurisprudence internationale.—Les méthodes de travail de la diplomatie.—M. N——. Les 15 et 22 juillet, à 9 h. 15 m., les 16 et 23 juillet, à 10 h. 45 m., et les 17 et 24 juillet, à 3 heures.

Règlement des conflits internationaux.—L'arbitrage et la justice internationale.—M. N——. Les 14, 15, 16, 21, 22 et 23 juillet, à 3 heures.

Droit pénal international.—Le domaine d'application des lois pénales.—M. André Mercier, Président du Tribunal arbitral mixte franco-allemand, Professeur à l'Université de Lausanne. Les 4, 5 et 6 août, à 3 heures.

Droit financier international.—Les contrôles financiers internationaux.—M. André Andréadès, Doyen de la Faculté de Droit de l'Université d'Athènes. Les 28, 29 et 30 juillet, à 3 heures.

Organisation internationale des voies de communication.—M. Bourquin, Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles. Le 6 août, à 9 h. 15 m., et les 7 et 8 août, à 3 heures.

Problèmes américains.—L'extension de la doctrine de Monroë en Amérique du Sud.—M. de Planas Suarez, Ministre de Vénézuéla à Lisbonne. Le 29 juillet, à 9 h. 15 m., le 30 juillet, à 10 h. 45 m., et le 31 juillet, à 3 heures.

Deuxième Période: 13 Aout-12 Septembre, 1924

Le développement historique du droit international depuis le XVII^e siècle.—M. O. Nippold, ancien Professeur à l'Université de Berne, Président de la Cour Suprême de la Sarre. Les 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28 et 29 août, les 1^{er} et 2 septembre, à 9 h. 15 m.

Principes du droit international public.—Les règles fondamentales de la vie internationale.—M. Ch. Dupuis, Membre de l'Institut de France, Professeur à l'École libre des Sciences politiques de Paris. Les 25, 26, 28, 29 août, les 1^{er}, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 et 12 septembre, à 10 h. 45 m.

Principes du droit international privé.—La théorie continentale des conflits de lois.—M. A. Pillet, Professeur à l'Université de Paris. Les 21, 22, 25, 26, 28 et 29 août, à 4 h. 30 m.

Matières spéciales de droit international privé.—La propriété industrielle.—M. G. Maillard, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Paris. Les 1^{er}, 2, 4, 5, 8 septembre, à 4 h. 30 m., et le 10 septembre, à 10 h. 45 m.

Droit administratif international.—Théorie générale des Unions internationales.—M. E. Catellani, Sénateur du Royaume d'Italie, Professeur à l'Université de Padoue. Les 3, 5, 9, 10, 11 et 12 septembre, à 9 h. 15 m.

Droit commercial et économique international.—Les Sociétés de Commerce.—M. Th. Niemeyer, Professeur à l'Université de Kiel. Les 3, 4, 8, 9, 11 et 12 septembre, à 3 heures.

Organisation internationale.—Le Bureau international du Travail.—M. Mahaim, Professeur à l'Université de Liège. Les 18, 20, 22, 25, 27 août et 2 septembre, à 3 heures.

Jurisprudence internationale. — Les gouvernements de fait.—M. Gemma, Professeur à l'Université de Bologne. Les 13, 14, 18, 19, 21 et 22 août, à 10 h. 45 m.

Règlement des conflits internationaux.—Les bons offices, la médiation et la conciliation.—M. Ph. Marshall Brown, Professeur à l'Université de Princeton. Les 13, 14, 19, 21 et 26 août, à 3 heures, et le 27 août, à 10 h. 45 m.

Droit pénal international.—Les effets des jugements répressifs dans les rapports internationaux.—M. Maurice Travers, Docteur en Droit, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Paris. Les 10, 11 et 12 septembre, à 4 h. 30 m.

Droit financier international.—L'entraide financière internationale.—Sir John Fischer Williams, K. C., Conseiller juridique britannique à la Commission des Réparations. Le 18 août, à 4 h. 30 m., le 19 août, à 9 h. 15 m., et le 20 août, à 10 h. 45 m.

Droit colonial international.—Les mandats internationaux.—M. G. Diena, Professeur à l'Université de Turin. Les 1^{er} et 2 septembre, à 3 heures, et le 3 septembre, à 4 h. 30 m.

Questions de droit international concernant les religions.—M. Hobza, Professeur à l'Université de Prague. Le 3 septembre, à 10 h. 45 m., le 4 septembre, à 9 h. 15 m., et le 5 septembre, à 3 heures.

CH. LYON-CAEN,

Secrétaire Perpétuel de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques de l'Institut de France, Doyen Honoraire de la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris, Président du Curatorium.

N. POLITIS,

Ancien Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de Grèce, Professeur Honoraire à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris, Vice-Président du Curatorium.

BARON ALBÉRIC ROLIN,

Président d'Honneur de l'Institut de Droit International, Professeur Émérite à l'Université de Gand, Secrétaire Général de l'Académie.

G. GIDEL,

Professeur à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris et à l'École des Sciences Politiques, Secrétaire de la Présidence.

TABLEAU DES JOURS ET HEURES DES COURS ET CONFÉRENCES

Première Période 14 Juillet-12 Aout

		à 9 h. 15 m.	à 10 h. 45 m.	à 3 heures.	à 4 h. 30 m.
Lundi	14 juillet.....	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. N. —	M. Bellot.
Mardi	15 —	M. N. —	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. N. —	M. Bellot.
Mercredi	16 —	Baron Taube.	M. N. —	M. N. —	
Jeudi	17 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. N. —	M. Bellot.
Vendredi	18 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.		M. Bellot.
Lundi	21 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. N. —	M. Bellot.
Mardi	22 —	M. N. —	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. N. —	M. Bellot.
Mercredi	23 —	Baron Taube.	M. N. —	M. N. —	
Jeudi	24 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. N. —	M. Isay.
Vendredi	25 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.		M. Isay.
Lundi	28 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. Andréadès.	M. Isay.
Mardi	29 —	M. Planas Suarez.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. Andréadès.	M. Isay.
Mercredi	30 —	Baron Taube.	M. Planas Suarez.	M. Andréadès.	
Jeudi	31 —	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.	M. Planas Suarez.	M. Isay.
Vendredi	1er août.....	Baron Taube.	M. Jesse S. Reeves.		M. Isay.
Lundi	4 —	M. Kaufmann.	Baron Nolde.	M. Mercier.	M. Scelle.
Mardi	5 —	M. Kaufmann.	Baron Nolde.	M. Mercier.	
Mercredi	6 —	M. Bourquin.		M. Mercier.	M. Scelle.
Jeudi	7 —	M. Kaufmann.	Baron Nolde.	M. Bourquin.	M. Scelle.
Vendredi	8 —	M. Kaufmann.	Baron Nolde.	M. Bourquin.	M. Scelle.
Lundi	11 —	M. Kaufmann.	Baron Nolde.		M. Scelle.
Mardi	12 —	M. Kaufmann.	Baron Nolde.		M. Scelle.

Deuxième Période: 13 Aout-12 Septembre

		à 9 h. 15 m.	à 10 h. 45 m.	à 3 heures.	à 4 h. 30 m.
Mercredi	13 août	M. Nippold.	M. Gemma.	M. Marshall Brown.	
Jeudi	14 —	M. Nippold.	M. Gemma.	M. Marshall Brown.	
Lundi	18 —	M. Nippold.	M. Gemma.	M. Mahalm.	Sir J. Flscher Williams.
Mardi	19 —	Sir J. Flscher Williams.	M. Gemma.	M. Marshall Brown.	
Mercredi	20 —	M. Nippold.	Sir J. Flscher Williams.	M. Mahalm.	
Jeudi	21 —	M. Nippold.	M. Gemma.	M. Marshall Brown.	M. Pillet.
Vendredi	22 —	M. Nippold.	M. Gemma.	M. Mahalm.	M. Pillet.
Lundi	25 —	M. Nippold.	M. Dupuis.	M. Mahalm.	M. Pillet.
Mardi	26 —		M. Dupuis.	M. Marshall Brown.	M. Pillet.
Mercredi	27 —	M. Nippold.	M. Marshall Brown.	M. Mahalm.	
Jeudi	28 —	M. Nippold.	M. Dupuis.		M. Pillet.
Vendredi	29 —	M. Nippold.	M. Dupuis.	M. Mahalm.	M. Pillet.
Lundi	1er sept	M. Nippold.	M. Dupuis.	M. Diena.	M. Maillard.
Mardi	2 —	M. Nippold.	M. Dupuis.	M. Diena.	M. Maillard.
Mercredi	3 —	M. Catellani.	M. Hobza.	M. Niemeyer.	M. Diena.
Jeudi	4 —	M. Hobza.	M. Dupuis.	M. Niemeyer.	M. Maillard.
Vendredi	5 —	M. Catellani.	M. Dupuis.	M. Hobza.	M. Maillard.
Lundi	8 —		M. Dupuis.	M. Niemeyer.	M. Maillard.
Mardi	9 —	M. Catellani.	M. Dupuis.	M. Niemeyer.	
Mercredi	10 —	M. Catellani.	M. Maillard.		M. Travers.
Jeudi	11 —	M. Catellani.	M. Dupuis.	M. Niemeyer.	M. Travers.
Vendredi	12 —	M. Catellani.	M. Dupuis.	M. Niemeyer.	M. Travers.

Le Bureau du Curatorium de l'Académie.

THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE

By COLONEL S. C. VESTAL
Of the Army College

A NUMBER of years ago, when Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States and Mr. Taft was Secretary of War, a letter was received by the War Department from a minister of the Gospel asking the department to express an opinion as to when the United States could disband its army and navy. The department was reminded that these desirable ends could be brought about by the general acceptance of arbitration as a means of settling disputes between nations and by the general evolution of brotherly love among men of all nations and races. It was my good fortune at that time to be on duty in the Military Information Division of the War Department, and I was detailed to prepare an answer in the form of a letter. I wish to bring out the main points which I tried to establish in that old letter.

Five Propositions

The subject of my talk is "The Maintenance of Peace." The first point I wish to bring out is that I do not use this expression as synonymous with the "Coming of the Millennium." I use it in an entirely different sense, as will presently appear.

The second proposition which I wish to establish is that there are two kinds of wars, from the political point of view, namely, civil wars and international wars. It is very important to make this distinction and to keep it clearly in mind. Civil wars take place within a State or nation. Our own civil war was rightly named. The Boer War and the American Revolution were civil wars within the British Empire, and not international wars, as we ordinarily think of them. The innumerable wars in Latin America and China are, for the most part, civil wars. International wars take place between States or nations. The World War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Spanish-American War, the Mexican War of 1846, and the War of 1812 were of this type. Strange as it may appear today, after the events of the World War, more blood and

treasure are spent in civil wars, in every epoch of history than are spent in international wars. Until we entered the World War, our expenditures and our loss of life in international war were insignificant as compared to the cost of money and lives in our civil war. All of the panaceas recommended to abolish and prevent armed conflict refer only to international wars. No one has ever proposed a cure-all to prevent civil wars, except, of course, good government; but it often fails. The preamble of the Constitution of the United States makes a very clear distinction of the duty of the general government in the matter of civil and international wars. "We, the people of the United States," says the preamble, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, *insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*"

I wish to discuss the maintenance of international peace rather than the maintenance of domestic peace; but much light may be thrown upon the international peace problem by a study of the principles involved in the maintenance of domestic peace. Darwin found that he could explain many of the phenomena of natural selection as Nature applies it to wild species by man's selection as applied to domestic species. In the same way we may learn the basic principles of the maintenance of international peace by a study of our problems of domestic peace. I would like to point out right here, that if international wars should ever be eliminated by the establishment of a single government over all the races of mankind, the problem of domestic peace would still remain; and we would undoubtedly find that the maintenance of domestic peace throughout the world would be a much more difficult question than our present mixed problem of maintaining domestic peace at home and international

peace with our warlike neighbors. The Romans found this to be true when they established a single government over all the civilized races of antiquity.

The third point which I wish to establish is that political questions, both within States and between States, are settled by war or by a moral equivalent of war. In all well-governed countries the ballot is now the moral equivalent of war. We settle domestic political questions by means of votes. From the decision of the ballot there is only one appeal, and that is to the bullet. In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson laid down, as one of the essential principles of our government, "absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism." The might of the majority makes right. No court of justice can reverse the decisions of the ballot-box. Courts may be called upon to render decisions in the process of counting the ballots; but when the decision of the majority is once determined, no court can set it aside. To do so at the behest of a militant minority would be to acquiesce in the dictum that the might of the minority makes right. The accepted principle in all countries of unstable government is that the might of the minority does make right. In all such countries great political questions are settled directly by the use of arms, as, for instance, in Mexico. The fundamental principle of government in Anglo-Saxon countries is that the might of the majority makes right. We all subscribe to this doctrine and assert it every time that we go to the ballot-box. It is amusing to hear men, whose happiness, peace, and contentment in life rest upon the sacredness of the rights of majorities, madly exclaiming against the idea that might makes right. What they really mean to condemn is the idea that the might of the minority makes right. If they would be a little more careful in their use of language, we would all agree with them.

There are always, in every country, aggressive minority parties, which can never expect to secure a majority of votes at the polls and which place their hopes upon the direct use of force. Russia has fallen into

the hands of such a party. The I. W. W., the Bolsheviki, the militant Socialists, and all who attempt to bring about political action by the general strike assert, in its most odious form, the principal that the might of the minority makes right.

In the United States, as I have said before, we have in the ballot a moral equivalent of war for the settlement of domestic political questions; and the use of force comes in only to prevent extreme radicals from imposing their will upon the nation. We adhere to the principle that the might of the majority makes right. I wish to point out here that our primary duty as soldiers of the greatest republic of all times is to uphold the decisions of the ballot-box.

The fourth proposition which I wish to bring out is that our courts can never settle a political question.* The Supreme Court of the United States, from the time of Chief Justice Marshall, has said over and over again that political questions cannot be settled by that court, and has pointed out the fact that political questions are settled by the President and Congress. We must, however, make a sharp distinction between political and legal questions. Our courts settle legal questions; they interpret and apply the laws; they do not make the laws. The making of the laws is always a political question. The framers of the Constitution took particular pains to confer the power of settling political questions upon the Congress and the President of the United States, who are, directly or indirectly, elected by the votes of the people. The framers were particularly anxious that political questions should not arise between the States of the Union; and such questions ordinarily do not arise between the States. When they do, as in 1861, the Supreme Court has no remedy. The disputes between the States, which are settled by the Supreme Court, involve purely legal questions, and these are easily decided by the court.

The fifth point which I wish to estab-

* It is true that if States in a controversy agree to submit their dispute to a court of law or equity, from the time of such submission the question ceases to be a political one and the court acquires jurisdiction.

lish is that there is no simple moral equivalent of war for the settlement of political questions between States. Man has been searching for this thing throughout historic times, and undoubtedly far back in prehistory. The relations of nations not actually in a state of war are regulated by diplomacy; but diplomacy, as we all know, rests upon force. To those who may regard this as a horrid admission, I would call attention to the fact that political questions within national boundaries are settled by force—*i. e.*, by majority rule.

Force Behind the Ballot

In Anglo-Saxon countries we first try to settle political questions by the ballot-box. Force comes into evidence and play, only in case that the minority refuses to abide by the decision of the ballot-box. But in many countries political questions are settled by a direct appeal to arms. What I want to bring out is this: that while the machinery for settling political questions between nations is different from that used to settle domestic political questions, both rest upon the same basic foundation, namely, force.

And Behind Arbitration

But how about arbitration? Cannot arbitration settle international political questions and prevent wars? The answer is, "No." The question has been asked since remote antiquity and the answer has always been "No." But some will say: Was not the danger of war with Great Britain in the Venezuela controversy averted by arbitration? "No" is the answer. The question between Great Britain and the United States was this: Shall the boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela be settled by arbitration? The main question was settled by force when Grover Cleveland stamped his foot and served an ultimatum on Great Britain that she must settle the boundary question by arbitration. Arbitration was forced upon Great Britain by what amounted to a threat of war. To say that arbitration averted war is very misleading. A great advocate of international arbitration was asked by some newspaper men about three years ago whether arbitration had ever prevented war, and he had to

admit that it had not yet done so; but he still had hopes that it might do so at some time in the future.

Legal vs. Political Questions

It is well to note that both legal and political questions arise between nations just as they both arise within national boundaries. Purely legal questions are never the real causes of war; though, of course, they may be put forward as a pretext to cover political questions which are the real causes of war. Purely legal questions between nations may be and are settled by courts—sometimes by the courts of one nation and sometimes by the courts of another, and sometimes by arbitration. They are the so-called justiciable questions which we have heard so much about. They are constantly arising and constantly being settled without the general public, in most cases, ever being aware of the fact.

But no court can settle a political question which may arise between two nations, any more than our Supreme Court can settle political questions which may arise between States of the American Union. There is a fixed unwillingness in the minds of men against settling political questions by judicial decisions. We do not do it in the United States. We never have done it and we never will do it. If our Supreme Court settled the political questions which arise in the United States the judges would become the autocratic rulers of the State, and we would cease to have a republican form of government. Why, then, should we expect to be able to settle the great political questions which arise between nations by a means which we utterly reject for the settlement of domestic political questions?

We have seen that political questions are the causes of international wars. There is, as a matter of fact, only one species of political question which brings on international wars. The pretexts are many and belong to many species, but the causes are few and belong to a single species. The real causes of the international wars of history have been the desire of conquest on one hand and the fear of it on the other. I use the term conquest in a very wide sense. In 1914 Germany and Austria went to war to conquer a privi-

leged position in the world. The nations which rallied against them were prompted for the most part by the fear of seeing an aggrandized Germany laying down laws for the guidance of a subject world. How futile arbitration showed itself to be in the presence of Germany's determination to overrun and conquer her neighbors.

Thus far I have been discussing the political relations of nations and I have tried to establish the fact that political questions between nations are settled by force, in some form. I wish now to discuss this interplay of force purely from the military and naval point of view.

Force from Military Point of View

I desire to introduce this phase of the subject by asking and trying to answer a question. The question is this: Why has not the modern world fallen under the domination of a single nation, as the ancient world came under the rule of the Roman Republic? The answer to this question will explain the real reason we sent two millions of men to France to fight against a country that we had always admired and considered as a good friend, and why we will, if similar conditions arise the future, do the same thing over and over again. To answer the question I will say that the modern world owes its liberties to the fact that the strongest military power has never been, at the same time, the strongest naval power; or, putting it the other way, that the strongest naval power has never been the strongest military power.

The ancient world fell under the dominion of the Roman Republic within sixty years after Rome, the strongest military power in the world, secured command of the sea. If Carthage had been able to defeat the Romans at sea, as England has been able to defeat the Spanish, French, and Germans in modern times, Rome would have never been able to make her world-wide conquests.

Twofold Character of a Developing Menace

Likewise the extensive conquests of Alexander the Great were made possible by the fact that his father, Philip of Macedon, conquered Athens and destroyed her sea power. The conclusion which I wish to bring out by these ancient exam-

ples is that the liberties of the free nations can really be in danger only when the strongest military power in the world becomes also the strongest naval power. If Carthage had been the strongest military power in the days when she was the strongest naval power, she would have conquered the ancient world, as Rome conquered it. I have always believed that if Hannibal had had command of the sea he would have conquered Rome and subjugated the other independent nations of the Mediterranean world.

The first objective in a war between two nations separated by the sea, or in a war between two great coalitions, is to gain control of the sea; for the side that obtains such control secures immunity from invasion from its sea fronts and, at the same time, power to invade the enemy's territory, and opens for itself and closes to the enemy the resources of the neutral world. He that hath command of the sea fights with the weight of the terrestrial universe behind him. When Rome became the dominant naval power in the Mediterranean she could isolate her weaker enemies, prevent them from assisting one another, and conquer them separately by means of her invincible army, which was superior as a fighting force to any other army in the Mediterranean world. If Germany had defeated the British fleet at Jutland, she would soon have made a victorious peace. She would have conquered and overrun all the nations of Europe and Asia, sparing only those that became her subservient allies, and the United States would have stood opposed to Europe and Asia united under the nation that went to war for world empire. It goes without saying that we would have been at war with Germany before she had completed her European-Asiatic conquests, and that we would not have made peace with her. I believe that we would soon have had the largest navy in the world, and that we would have occupied the same position with regard to overgrown Germany that England occupied with regard to overgrown France from 1793 to 1815, or that Athens occupied with regard to Persia for more than a century after Salamis. The United States can never stand placidly by and watch the strongest military power in Europe become also the

strongest naval power. This was threatened in 1916 and 1917 and was the real cause of our entry into the World War. Mr. Wilson and the Congress of the United States understood this point in 1916 and hence our great naval program of that year. Most people think that we went to war with Germany on account of the submarine horrors. I want to tell you that we went to war for a deeper reason. We went to war because our people sensed the danger that would come to us if Germany became the dominant military and naval power in Europe.

Some one may ask what would the effect be if the airplane becomes as effective against ships as its advocates would lead us to believe. Granting that the airplane can vanquish the battleship, the sea will be controlled by the air ship instead of the water ship, and what I have said in regard to the control of the sea will still remain true in its essential details.

The Factor of Geography

This brings us up squarely to a question of political geography. As a nation, we profess defense as our military policy in time of peace. I do not mean to discuss the merits of this policy. I think we will all agree that our non-aggressive attitude toward our fellow nations is part and parcel of the highest wisdom. But when we talk of defense, do we ever ask ourselves the question, Whence may danger come? Do we fear attack from Canada, or Mexico, or South America, or Africa? Certainly we do not. Danger may come to us from two possible sources—from Europe and from eastern Asia. One lies across the Atlantic and the other across the Pacific. If any power threatens to unite the teeming and warlike millions of Europe under an efficient and aggressive government, we sit up and take notice. Presently we go to war and we astonish the world by our earnestness, by the seriousness of our mental attitude, by the magnitude of our preparations, and by our aptitude for making war when it comes to a pinch. Nevertheless, we profess indifference to European affairs as our settled policy. On the other hand, we frankly admit that we are not indifferent to the possibilities of political combinations in Asia which may be danger-

ous to us. We have a settled policy toward eastern Asia. We call it the open-door policy. It is political in character, though couched in the language of commerce. Why do we profess indifference toward Europe and assert the open-door policy toward Asia as pious creeds? I think I can give an answer.

Between the western shores of continental Europe and the eastern shores of Asia are two Anglo-Saxon naval powers, England and the United States. England lies close to the European continent, and she has always shown a peculiar sensitiveness to the efforts of ruthless conquering nations to unite Europe under a single hegemony. We lie closer to Asia than England, and we have shown the same sensitiveness toward Asia that England has shown toward continental Europe. England has counted European battleships alone whenever she has discussed the strength of her navy, and we have kept a watchful eye upon the number of battleships built and building in eastern Asia. In other words, we unconsciously trust to England to pull our chestnuts out of the European conflagration; and England, perhaps a little more consciously, trusts us to pull her chestnuts out of any fire that may break forth in Asia. But when England was on the edge of disaster in the last great war, we suddenly awakened to the fact that the success of Germany meant the loss of all that we hold dear in life; and we entered the war. It requires no great stretch of the imagination to see that if England did not exist or if she fell into a premature decay, we would be just as sensitive about European affairs as we are about eastern Asiatic affairs. By the same token, England would be as sensitive about eastern Asia as she is about Europe, if we did not exist to shield her and her weak Asiatic dependencies and possessions. Physical geography, not blood or language, makes us the natural ally of England. Physical geography makes both England and the United States the natural allies of the weaker nations of Europe and eastern Asia, America, and Australasia. We acknowledge this obligation in regard to the American nations by our Monroe Doctrine and in regard to eastern Asia by the so-called open-door policy.

Neutrality

At the outbreak of the European war we proclaimed our neutrality and boasted of our indifference to the results of the conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. A Welch legend well describes our psychologic state during the first years of the World War. According to this legend, a happy, careless people once lived in a luxuriant valley sheltered from the outside world by lofty mountains. They cared little for what happened on the other side of the mountains or on the sea beyond the horizon. One day some of the young men, more hardy than the rest, climbed to the top of the mountains and were astounded at what they beheld in the world on the other side—the menace of war, the law of sacrifice. Thus lived rich and heedless America in 1914, 1915, and well into 1916. And then our President, who had trusted to neutrality as the great panacea for war, suddenly saw what the young Welshmen saw when they climbed to the top of the mountains, and he made a great speaking tour of the United States, preaching preparedness for war. I would recommend Woodrow Wilson's preparedness speeches made in 1916. They are sound and logical, good reading matter, and should form a part of our military literature.

It is a significant fact that President Wilson, who proclaimed the neutrality of the United States in 1914 with such ardent fervor, took a leading part in formulating a treaty, at the end of the war, designed to prevent any nation from being neutral in future world wars. It is still more significant that he desired the United States to ratify a treaty which, if it were observed in good faith, would take from his successors the discretion which he himself exercised in 1914 in keeping us out of war. If we had been a part of the League of Nations in 1914, we would automatically have gone to war with the Central Powers when they began an unprovoked war of aggression against their immediate neighbors. I do not wish to discuss the merits and demerits of the League of Nations, but I do wish to bring out three points which bear upon our immediate subject.

Keep America from Becoming a Developing Menace

1. I wish to cite Mr. Wilson as an expert witness to the fact that the United States is most deeply interested in events in Europe which would unite 500,000,000 white men under a single hegemony, such as Germany expected to impose upon Europe. The United States could not live at peace with such a monster power. Mr. Lincoln had such a possibility in mind when, in one of his early speeches, he said: "All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not, by force, take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years." I quite agree with Mr. Lincoln, but I wish to observe that we cannot afford by indifference and neglect to allow things to drift so that we may have to prove to the world that we are invincible upon the American continent.

What Might Have Been

2. I wish to express the personal conviction that if Mr. Wilson's historic studies had been along lines that would have given him in 1914 a little of the background of the basic principles of international war and politics which he acquired in two years by watching the European war, he would not have proclaimed our neutrality and indifference in 1914. In this connection it is well to remember that we did not proclaim our indifference when France attacked Mexico in 1862. We expressed sympathy for the Mexicans and aided them in every possible way short of going to war to assist them, and finally served what amounted to an ultimatum upon France, inviting her to leave Mexico to its own devices. If we had pursued a similar enlightened course in regard to Germany in 1914, we may well believe that the Allies would have won a victory without the necessity of our actual intervention by force of arms. Let us hope that our future statesmen will have been educated by a study of our participation in the First World War.

The Device of the Coalition

3. I wish to call attention to the fact that the remedy proposed by Mr. Wilson at Paris and embodied in Article X of the League of Nations Covenant is identical in principle with the remedy embodied by the Allies in the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, at the end of the long coalition war against France under Louis XIV. It is also identical with the purpose of the Holy Alliance of 1815, formed by three of the allies at the end of the long coalition war against Napoleonic France. It is also identical with the central theme of the international law of Grotius, written during the course of the Thirty Years' War. Grotius was a native of Holland, one of the weaker allies in the coalition wars against the aggressions of the German Empire of his day.

In the Treaty of Utrecht the Allies agreed to maintain the balance of power. The term "balance of power" has a primary and a secondary meaning. In the Treaty of Utrecht the term was used in its primary sense. Now, one of the best definitions of the term "balance of power," in its primary sense, is the first sentence of Article X of the League of National Covenant. It is as follows: "The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League."

The idea is better expressed in the Constitution of the United States, if we bear in mind that the framers of the Constitution used the word United States as a plural noun, the subject of a plural verb. The Constitution says: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion." Note the sense of the words: "The United States shall protect each State against invasion." The purpose of the great treatise of Grotius, of the Treaty of Utrecht, of the Holy Alliance, of Section 4, Article V, of the Constitution of the United States, and of Article X of the League of Nations is the same. Each seeks to unite a number of States to protect one another from invasion. Our Constitution expresses the idea in the clearest, plainest language.

In 1713, 1815, and 1919 the members of successful coalitions attempted to take steps to prevent future world conflagrations. They had seen great coalitions formed to resist aggressive nations which attempted to make wide conquests. These coalitions had been gradually formed, as the nations which composed them saw that they must join the coalition and fight or become a victim to the universal conqueror. The same thought has occurred to the treaty-makers at the end of each great war, namely: Why not prevent future wars of conquest by having a ready-made coalition, prepared to take the field against the aggressor? The thought is fine, if proper machinery can only be found to carry it into effect. Germany would never have gone to war in 1914 if she had realized that England and the United States would join her intended victims in a league of mutual defense.

The victorious allies attempted to solve the problem in 1713 and 1815 by means of a treaty; and they were successful in each case to a degree that is not adequately acknowledged by historians. They sought to accomplish the end in view by binding the signatory powers to go to war under certain circumstances defined in the treaty. Each nation signing the treaty was the judge of its own obligations under the treaty. In 1919 a new departure was made. An international body was formed, charged with the duty of deciding when the members should go to war. Herein lies the fundamental weakness of the scheme. You will find that in every nation in existence today the right to declare war is lodged, for all practical purposes, in a body which has power to raise and support armies and navies and to raise revenue to carry on war. The power which controls the purse invariably controls the sword. This is a universal rule of human government. Thus our Congress has the right to declare war and it controls the purse strings.

We all know what a miserable failure our government was under the Articles of Confederation, when Congress had the power to declare war and the various State legislatures alone could tax the people to pay for war. You can never take from the Congress of the United States its power over the sword and give

it to an international body unless you give the international body the power to tax us to pay for making war. Manifestly we will never do that.

Limitations of the International Legislative Plan

I have stated that there is no moral equivalent for war for the settlement of political questions that arise between States. If it were possible to establish an international legislature which had power to make war and unlimited power of taxation, the ballot would, of course, become the moral equivalent of war for settling political questions in the world State. The most enthusiastic internationalist, however, has never proposed a real legislative union of the world. He contents himself with proposing the mere shadow of a world State with all of the weaknesses of our government under the Articles of Confederation. Now, it is a peculiar fact that there has never been a real legislative union between peoples separated from one another by wide stretches of the ocean. For instance, a legislative union of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa is unthinkable. Formerly it was thought that such unions were impracticable only because the legislative bodies could not conveniently assemble. This particular difficulty has been removed by increased transportation facilities; but deep-seated objections still remain to the union, even of peoples of the same race, language, origin, ideals, and religion, living in widely separated quarters of the globe. The American revolution illustrates the real difficulty. Great Britain chose civil war with the United Colonies rather than admit them to a full and equal representation in the British Parliament. She knew, of course, that if the American representatives got into her Parliament, they would soon, by force of numbers, rule not only themselves, but the mother country also; and the Americans never raised the question until the shrewd men amongst them, like Samuel Adams, saw the possibilities.

Absence of a Definitive Policy

We will all agree that it would be highly desirable to have a ready-made coalition prepared to make war on the international

bandit of the type of the German Empire of 1914. The Treaty of Utrecht furnishes the model for such a treaty, and Section 4, Article V, of our own Constitution furnishes the language for the binding clause, the new Article X, if I may use the expression. Reduced to plain English, this article would read as follows: "The signatory powers shall protect each other against invasion." But, coming down to earth, I would like to ask whether the United States would ever sign such a treaty. I do not believe it would. Our relations with the Latin American States furnish much light upon the question. By our Monroe Doctrine we declare in effect that we will be the ally of any American nation that is attacked by any non-American nation; but we have steadily refused, for nearly a century, to enter into a treaty with these States which would bind the American republics, one and all, to aid each other against invasion. We have declared our policy, we have lived up to it religiously, and it is a national creed, sacred in our eyes, but we refuse to embody that policy in a general treaty. Treaties of mutual aid and leagues of nations are for others, not for us. We will be content to declare policies which will serve to enlighten our statesmen, guide our footsteps, and warn prospective trespassers.

In the Monroe Doctrine we have such a policy as regards purely American affairs, and in the Open-door Doctrine we have such a policy as regards Asia. We lack a wise, enlightened policy toward Europe. Our professed indifference serves not to keep us out of war, but to create the conditions which compel us to go to war. When our Secretary of State, prior to the outbreak of the World War, declared that we would never go to war while he was Secretary of State, he did all that was humanly possible to create conditions that would compel us to go to war. Unwittingly he assured Germany that she need fear no danger to her world-wide designs by interference on the part of the United States.

We entered the European war not because of the submarine horrors, but because we realized that German success meant disaster for the whole world, including ourselves. Since the events of

1917 and 1918, no country would deliberately start a war if it knew that it would thereby bring down upon itself an avalanche of war from the United States.

It is not compatible with our peace and safety for Germany, or France, or any other European country, to absorb its neighbors and build up a formidable power that could compel the obedience and active alliance of the rest of Europe. We will go to war to prevent such a consummation, just as we went to war in 1917. Why not say so and make a creed of it, as we have made a creed of the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door? It will avert the necessity of our going to war. The great unsolved problem of the United States is to make the fact unmistakably known to the world that we will not be blind to any developing menace in Europe. If necessary, let us use cryptic language, susceptible of many interpretations and much discussion, as we did in announcing the Monroe Doctrine and the Open-door Policy. To proclaim indifference, as we are now doing, is to invite war.

We have no desire for territorial gains; we have no desire to take over additional

lands inhabited by races whom we cannot admit on terms of equality into our national system. We have no desire for territory inhabited by people whom we do not choose to admit to a full legislative union with ourselves. The fortunes of war may place such peoples under our flag, but we will never go to war deliberately in order to acquire them. The demands of one of our insular possessions to be admitted to statehood are, to say the least, very embarrassing today.

A Final Word

Our international political policy in time of peace is defensive; but we must remember that when war comes upon us our people demand action and our military and naval policy must be offensive. We have only to recall the cries of former wars, civil and international: "On to Washington!" "On to Richmond!" "On to Havana!" "On to Berlin!" In the heat of conflict, our people, East and West, North and South, are glorious and warlike. We must not confound our peace doctrine when war is far distant with our war policy in conducting military operations.

GREAT PREACHING IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA

By WALTER A. MORGAN

What Is Great Preaching?

THE place of the Christian preacher in English and American history is very great. Mighty preachers have stood at the center of mighty spiritual movements. In the records of England's beginnings there is a chapter that tells of men who preached Christ. The universities and cathedrals of the motherland are in debt to the art of preaching. The Pilgrim and Puritan migrations to America were inspired by the spirit of God made vocal through preachers. Harvard and Yale colleges came into life because there was a need of preachers. The great preacher is more potent than his hearers know. In these plastic times, when the words of the preacher go broadcast upon the waves of day and night, we must believe that his place is not a diminishing one. An English-speaking tradition demands great preaching.

But what is great preaching? To seek the direction of the answer is the purpose of this paper. The question brings before one's mind a long line of great preachers. No one would question the names of Henry Ward Beecher or John Jowett. To mention men whose voices now are vibrant among us, proclaiming the Eternal Gospel, is to select from a great number who are shaping our spiritual ideals. Dean Inge and George A. Gordon we recognize as great. What shall we say of Norton and Cadman, of Bishop Gore and Bishop McDowell, and many others of our time, who are touched with the prophetic fire? But to mention a list of names, whether they symbolize men whose tongues are dust or whose tongues are living flames, is not to answer the question. These mighty dead were great preachers when they were

alive; but why were they great? Those who are among us now may preach our hearts into high resolve and great peace; but how do they do it?

At the outset a sound judgment says that no adequate answer ever can be given. The deep things of man and God are beyond full analysis. Hidden within personality are the fires that set other souls aflame. Or, to change the figure, the living springs well up out of the deeps. Thirsty men drink and are satisfied, but who can answer how the needs of a parched soul are met by another soul? Here we are dealing with one of humanity's most common facts and likewise one of life's profoundest mysteries. If this be true, then why try to answer the question at all? Simply to determine the direction in which the answer lies. To determine the direction of the city, even though one may never count her battlements, is to make progress. So whither away to great preaching?

Six Illustrations

During the past few weeks the writer has been trying to answer this question for himself. The method has been very practical, though the results have not been as complete as he could have wished. To arrive at a tentative conclusion concerning direction, he selected six living preachers who are recognized as among the best. Three of these were English and three were American. Then he secured a book of sermons by each of these men. To read a sermon is not always edifying. Until a few weeks ago, he had an inward pride that he seldom read sermons written by other men. But his pride had a fall as he looked at six volumes of sermons piled upon his desk with a mingled feeling of expectancy and guilt. The guilt has been lulled into a drowsy non-resistance, while the expectancy has been merged into a spiritual adventure.

To read a sermon is to miss the atmosphere created by the place, the time, and the person preaching. Many a mighty sermon, as far as results are concerned, would make a poor showing upon the printed page. It often happens that a perfectly written sermon, in form and matter, is a dud when delivered. So, obviously, there are many reasons why

reading sermons will not give one all that is desired.

But here it was the best that could be done. The fact that a preacher is held to his own pulpit every Sunday makes it impossible for him to go to hear other men preach. So preachers, all of whom were recognized as possessing personality, were selected. For argument's sake, the personal equation was written as follows: $A=B=C=X=Y=Z$. Of course, no two personalities are equal, and so this was a leap of faith. But, as our greatest discoveries of truth in every realm have been made through just such leaps, it is worth while taking it.

All the preachers are interesting men, and they write well. Rev. J. D. Jones, of Bournemouth, England, is a Congregational preacher of high standing. Rev. John Hutton, of Glasgow fame, now of Westminster Chapel, is well known to many Americans. Rev. Hubert L. Simpson is a Glasgow preacher who writes with insight and mystic charm. Rev. Charles R. Brown, Dean of Yale School of Religion, is one of America's foremost preachers. Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, of New York, is, in the words of a leading New York divine, "Year in and year out, the greatest constructive force in the metropolitan pulpit." Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick is not only the target for the fiery darts of conservatives, but, in the judgment of many, the spiritual leader of more thoughtful young people than any other preacher in America.

Are these men great? Only time will tell. They have a wide hearing, and in the realm of thoughtful journalism as well as in the sphere of pulpit leadership they hold prominent places. Anyhow, they will serve as a frame upon which to hang our arrows pointing toward the high places of great preaching.

Certain Contrasts

What do they possess? It will be well to answer this question, in part, by a comparison of the homiletic differences between these men. The study for such a comparison will make it easier to discover the deeper elements which all six men possess in common. These undergirding factors, if they can be determined, are the personal subsoil out of which all great

preaching grows. Of course, they differ as English and American. Out of a different background have they come and toward somewhat different goals do they aim. The Englishman is old in culture and hoary with a pulpit tradition. The American is a youth in culture and his pulpit traditions are in the making. The Englishman carries a sense of assurance; God and himself he never questions. The American carries the spirit of adventure; God is leading him and his country out to untried ways.

There are five contrasts which are suggestive. The Englishman is Biblical in his preaching. There is a strong flavor of the Word everywhere. He is steeped in Old Testament pictures and Old Testament phraseology. The Psalms have been meat and drink for his soul. The prophets have walked up and down through his heart. The wisdom of the great books is his wisdom. As a boy, he learned to love the Book and as a preacher he reveals his first devotion. Jesus is a character of history, it is true; but often more is he, like the prophets, a mystical figure to create mystical experiences. One cannot read Jones, or Hutton, or Simpson without feeling that the Bible lives again in the souls of these men.

The American, on the other hand, is more ethical in his preaching. He, too, knows his Bible, but it is not bone of his bone and blood of his blood. Rather is it a tool to be used for concrete ethical results. There are ethical ideals written across its pages. These must be brought out and put into operation in our present world. There are definite ethical results much to be desired in our American present-day civilization. From a study of the need, our American goes to the Bible to find the remedy. His approach is ethical and concrete. Of course, all comparisons smack of partiality and none are perfect. Yet one could say that the Englishman goes to his world from his Bible, while the American goes from his world to his Bible. The methods are different, and the results necessarily show the earmarks of national characteristics.

Again, the Englishman arrives at his goal in a roundabout way. If he desires to reach the city gate, he is quite liable to take a little stroll across a near-by hill and reach the city, by a circuitous route,

after sunset. His descriptions of the view from the hill are beautiful. The thoughts that arise in one's mind as he pictures the far-away hills of Moab or suggest snow-capped Lebanon are long, long thoughts. He is upon his way to the city, but the winding journey is pleasant and there is no sense of haste. To take a weary man upon a journey, to show him old landscapes, and to fill his arms with flowers and his heart with peace, and then to bring him to his soul's home at eventide, is to enrich him forever. This the Englishman can do. He may journey far, but his wanderings are across pleasant fields and through fertile valleys. To go with him is to go toward God, and often the walk is in the divine presence.

The American is no loiterer by the way. If he starts out for the city, to the city he goes. The road can be none too straight for him. If there are long windings, he cuts across lots. If high hills bother, he may tunnel through them. Away beyond, there is the city and every bit of energy is expended in reaching the gates while the sun is yet high. In other words, the American is direct in his method. If he wants to tell his people about their pet sins, he goes to his task and tells them straight out of his heart. If he feels that America should become a member of the International Court, he does not leave his hearers to discover his convictions as he preaches a sermon upon Isaiah and Egypt. Jefferson is direct; Brown goes straight; Fosdick keeps his eye upon the city.

This difference is a fact, in part, because of a difference in logic. The Englishman's sermon is logical, but it is the logic of suggestion. As an assistant in psychology in Dartmouth College, the writer often tried this experiment. He would give the students a suggestive word and ask them to write it down. Then for the next minute they would write down as many words as came into their minds, and in the order in which they came. They would then write out their reasons why one word, such as "lie," for instance, was followed by "John," as an illustration. There was always some such reason as this: "Lie" brought up John's face because "John lied to me once." This is the logic of suggestion; it is the Englishman's logic as well. Not that he lacks in the logic of the schools, but his sermon is not the

product of such a logic. He speaks of Moab. Moab suggests Ruth, and Ruth makes him think of a great devotion, and so on, and so on. This is the logic of the poet and the child. It is often the logic, on the one hand, of the most cultured and, on the other hand, of those who have no culture at all.

The American lays down his proposition. If it is in the form of a text, there are certain well-formulated theses therein contained. These he suggests and often writes down. More than likely is his text a verse of Scripture that may suggest his sermon subject. But there is a fundamental proposition and several logical steps leading up to it or away from it. How many American sermons have an introduction, followed by Roman numeral one, with two or three Arabic numerals; then Roman numeral two, and more Arabic numerals; and Roman numeral three, etc., and then a conclusion? The logic of suggestion is made to stand back, while the logic of sequence has full play. The American has been busy in clearing away the woods, buildings churches and school-houses, while his English brother has been looking out upon churches and schools all but crumbling with years. The Englishman has had time to wander, while the American has been compelled to get results by the most direct method. The American's preaching is as relentless in its logic as his clearing of the woods and the building of cities is direct in its method. One is born out of days that are unhurried; the other is a child of days that are full of falling trees and the dust of hustling cities.

Further, the Englishman has a peculiar cultural quality. This is revealed in the language he uses. Not only does he know his Bible, but he is familiar with a great literature. While he is not given to quotation more than his American brother, yet the language and thought of the masterpieces of English literature are part of the warp and woof of his language and thought. Shakespeare, Wadsworth, Tennyson—these he knows, and evidences of his knowledge are found upon every page. Centuries of history, a mighty literature, ancient universities, sublime cathedrals, quiet country lanes—how these suggest an indefinable something that becomes part of a man.

The American is rugged. He has read

widely, but in a hurry. His thoughts shape themselves in the molds that are meaningful to his hearers. Two generations from the ax and the plow are not enough to create a demand for phrases that root in an ancient cultural tradition. There is a ruggedness about the thought and the expression of our American preachers that is somewhat like the same quality in the prophets of Israel. Amos and Isaiah broke away from an old order, and their creative ideas and hot emotions had to flow in new channels; so the American is picturesque and often abrupt; but there is the strength of a great passion leaping through all his words. Culture is a rich possession and back of it there must be centuries of spiritual life. Ruggedness is a human virtue and often is akin to honesty and high purpose.

The last comparison is from among many that might be suggested. The Englishman depends for his results, in the main, upon a general impression. After reading an Englishman's sermon or hearing an Englishman preach, one is liable to go away with a sense of having *felt* something. It may not be well for one to try to analyze this experience any more than it is well to try to analyze the emotions experienced at a symphony concert. Yet somehow the Englishman makes one feel things that are beyond words. The emotions are aglow and one's soul is possessed of an indefinable something that cannot be painted or told. In brief, the Englishman gives one the mystical sense of yearning and partial finding, with the element of thought a bit submerged in the entire complex of a religious experience. Thought is there, but beyond it and around it there is quiet and God. One can throw one's self back into the arms of the Eternal and for that high hour, at least, be possessed of a great peace.

The American is, upon the whole, not so much of a mystic. He seeks to hold men with a great idea; it unfolds before us; it is seen in all its logical bearings; it leads to certain conclusions; it is as irresistible as a rushing tide. There is emotion there, but it is caused more by the stress of thought. In America men have had to think their way along. The Puritan broke virgin ground, not only in Massachusetts, but in the universal area of the soul. To create a new civilization, lay the

foundations of States, and to live at the same time has not been easy. The mind has been alcapp. It could not rest upon a couch made ready by other generations. The preacher has reflected his environment. This is not saying that he can think beyond his English brother. But his preaching places an idea at the center and all else must give way to that. The entire comparison can be summed up in the following imperfect illustration: The Englishman makes one feel, "I can rest a bit, because God is sure. He is very sure." The American makes one say, "I must work now and ever, because the issues of God await my labors."

Similarities

Now, what is great preaching? This might be suggested: the combining of these two great schools into one spiritual appeal. It is an Herculean task. No one can realize it in the bigness of its meaning. But the arrows point in that direction. To make men sure of God, and then to send them forth to do His will, is the supreme task confronting all preachers. The Englishman does the first well. The American does the latter with no less success. To make the way toward this prayed-for goal a bit clearer, there are several common factors which are found in all six men. Beneath their differences there are universal prophetic qualities. They are of value as further sign-posts along the way. Of course, all great preaching grows out of great souls. Only true men can preach well. This is assumed. Not all true men can preach, however. There must be more than goodness. What more?

In the first place, there is a common element in all great preaching. Every real prophet of God possesses it. To sense its presence is a commonplace, but to analyze it is difficult. For the lack of a better name, it may be called *personal power*. This is something that has its roots in a great mystery. We may understand a few of the reasons why some men have power and others do not. But who is able to plumb the hidden depths of personality and write the "whys" of personal power so that all may read? Why is this man, molded to look like some old Greek god, mentally furnished with all that university and seminary can give, with a voice as rich as the tones of a cathedral

organ, a sickening fizzle when he attempts to preach; while this other man, homely, self-trained, with a voice that rasps and sobs, is able to lift his hearers into the August Presence? One may not be able to tell why, but all recognize the presence or the lack of this personal power. All great preaching must grow out of it.

Its expression is threefold. It takes personal power to *win* a congregation to a listening confidence. Jefferson makes men want to listen. When Brown begins to speak, most hearers are anxious to follow him, wherever he may go. At the very first, Hutton woos his congregation to a receptive mood. Beyond the power to *win*, there must be the ability to *hold* a congregation. Not for twenty or thirty minutes only, but for months, years. Many a flashy parson owes his appointment to the fact that he can preach well once or twice; but before a year is over he is thin and tinkling. The more often one hears Fosdick, the more one wants to hear him. The spirit grows with what it feeds upon. Beyond the power to *win* and to *hold*, there is the ability to *convict*. A verdict is ever the goal. Some men hold great throngs for many years and have preached but very little. Pulpit committees often are unable to judge spiritual results because the bug for numbers has got them. The plate collections frequently become the standard of progress in Christ's Kingdom. No man has preached until he has convinced men of the folly of sin and inspired at least a few to seek God and the new life. This personal power, in all three of its manifestations, may be as tempestuous as lightnings and thunders or as calm and sweet as moonlight; but it is the background of all great preaching.

In the second place, these six men have this further in common: they all preach under the spell of the imperiousness of the sermon hour. They are created of God for just such a time as the sermon is delivered. The mighty matters of the Kingdom hang in the balance. The Eternal is voiceless now unless they speak. There is an immeasurable gulf between the fussy self-importance of the parson who wears the habiliments of his office at such a tilt, mouthing his words in tones that tickle the ears of men, and the man who trembles with humility in the presence of the need of a people and who

speaks with a "Thus saith Jehovah." "For this hour was I born," calls the prophet. "In this hour I must speak or die," is the necessary soul urge for the man who would follow in the footsteps of these great preachers.

In the third place, these men speak directly to the consciences of men. Each does it in his own way, but he does it. There is no shading and no apologizing. The souls of men are laid bare, and sins are uncovered before their eyes. No opportunity is given for the sinner to hide behind the faults of another. It is as though the inner moral self had broken through its crust and now stood crying, "This do or perish." Deep calls unto deep, and the preacher often becomes the scourge of God. The writer listened to Charles Jefferson last October. He spoke to the individual conscience and through that to the conscience of America. He was pleading for a warless world. How the deeps were broken up at these simple words, "Hear that, England. Listen to that, Germany. Pay attention to that, France. Heed that, America." There was a sense that if the nations did not heed, our civilization was only a thin shell, all ready cracking for the outpouring of a molten liquid that would engulf us. God was vocal.

The fourth common element is not so much a possession as the result of possessions. It has to do with the effect of great preaching. These six men produce the same effect, each in his own way. And so what is the final test of greatness in preaching? Surely not the learning of the preacher nor the beauty of his message. Neither is it the throngs that hang upon his words. Many can draw the multitudes because they make them laugh. Great preaching is not necessarily attractive. John the Baptist was a stern man, and he compelled them to listen. The final test is this: The hearer must say, "God has spoken to me." If it fails here, it is not preaching at all. It may be lecturing, entertaining, saying the words of the prophet and wearing the robes of the priest; but unless man senses God the words are only sound, and there is no voice in the soul.

"God has spoken to me." This is the test. Some will know Him in the sense of moral guilt. The sins of other days will call with trumpet tongues, and the

soul will be lashed with great lashings. The voice of the Eternal will ring through all the corridors of life. And more, the Presence may be known in the beauty of some high resolve. Old duties that remain undone; new tasks that call men to high endeavor; friendships that have been neglected and now are vocal for renewal; fellowship with Christ that was commenced and forgotten; the building of the Kingdom of Heaven in a broken world—any of these and many more may serve as the summons of God. All great preaching sends one forth saying in one's heart of hearts, "I must serve Christ's Kingdom today. Let me go and tear down the strongholds of sin in order that the children whom Jesus loved may live in safety. Christ needs me and God bids me go." The great preacher makes men say, "*It was God.*"

Or at last, and in another way, these men create the sense of the Mystic Presence. One leaves them under the spell of a Divine Mood. Sins do not trouble then, and there is no consciousness of any exalted moral purpose. "God just is, and He is mine, and that is enough." For that hour there is assurance, and one throws one's self back upon Him. Out of the deeps of the soul comes the glad cry, "Oh God, I have found Thee; for this little hour let me have peace." Conscience will lash one later, and the old ideal will glow afresh because of this brief experience of Eternal Reality. "God is, and He is mine, *now*," is the fulfillment of a human longing. The great preacher meets life's deepest need just here. Blessed is he who makes God sure and brings men peace.

And Finally

Such is the way of great preaching. Many who are dust traveled the road almost to the end. They left a race richer than they found it. Others who are alive today are close to this holy place. England and America thank God for them. A multitude crave the joy of pressing nearer to the hour when they, too, shall preach with authority. The way toward the city is known. For the world's sake, may all preachers set their faces in that direction. Whether they arrive or not, eternally, may not matter. It is not given to all to be great. To fail to try for the journey is to miss the meaning of a high vocation.

A MISLEADING BOOK

By GORDON GORDON-SMITH

ONE of the most insidious forms of current propaganda is the tireless effort that is being made in certain quarters to undermine the belief of the people of the United States in the justice of the cause it defended in the World War. If the nation could be persuaded that Germany was the victim of a conspiracy of hostile powers to crush her, and that she was really the victim of an unprovoked attack, the national conscience would be greatly troubled and the confidence in the President and the statesmen who presided over her policies would be greatly shaken. If this feeling could be transformed into an active feeling of hostility to the former Allies of the United States, Germany would benefit by it.

If public confidence can be shaken a state of distrust and anxiety will be created such as might again endanger the peace. A nation that is torn by doubts and the unrest they cause, might easily be brought to a state of mind which would render it liable to panic. I therefore regard it as an effort toward the maintenance of peace to maintain the belief of the American nation in the justice of the sacred cause for which it fought and for which so many of its sons died. It is for this reason that I invoke the aid of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE*.

This work of demoralization is mostly carried on by the written word. A large number of books and articles have been written by various writers inspired by so much prejudice and *parti pris* that they are calculated to confuse the issues and render the task of presenting them fairly and impartially more and more difficult.

The Author

One of the contributions of this kind is a work by Mr. Frederic Bausman, former member of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, entitled "Let France Explain." This work constitutes a savage attack on the French Republic and its policy since 1870 and practically accuses the French Government and its allies and associates of having deliberately planned the war of 1914 and forced it on an unwilling and peace-loving Germany.

Judge Bausman disclaims all German influence in the writing of his book and states that "no German suggested it" or "ever saw the written page"; but all the same it is written in a spirit of pure propaganda and is filled with so much *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*, from cover to cover, as to deprive it of all claim to be an impartial contribution to history. What is still more extraordinary is that this book found an English publisher. There has been no edition published in the United States; but it is significant that the English edition has been largely imported into this country and has been sent out widely to the press for review.

Now, there are two ways of writing history. One is to have lived in the countries during the period under description; to have studied and absorbed the feelings and opinions of the peoples, listened to the debates in their parliaments, had a personal acquaintance with the political and military leaders, and made a daily study of the public press. The other method, which is, of course, the more usual one, is to study public documents and the utterances of the political leaders, follow the tendencies of public opinion as expressed in the daily press and the leading reviews, and consult all possible authorities. Judge Bausman has, as far as I can see, followed, or attempted to follow, the second method. He seems to have made a number of visits to Europe, but does not seem to have made any prolonged sojourns there. He therefore depends chiefly on his study of the written word as expressed in public documents and in publications of all kinds.

If this study is carried out in a judicious and impartial spirit and made by some one with a clear and judicial mind, the result should be a valuable contribution to history; but if the writer starts out with a strong bias in favor of one side and only brings forward documents calculated to support his preconceived ideas, and suppresses everything which weakens his point of view, the result is a travesty of the truth. This, I am afraid, is the case in Judge Bausman's work.

A Personal Word

I would like first to furnish my readers with what I regard as my qualifications for criticising and replying to Mr. Bausman's book. From 1886 to 1914 I spent most of my time in France and Germany. I lived altogether fourteen years in France and ten in Germany. The remainder of the time I was in London, in Russia, in Austria-Hungary and the Balkans. I have acted as newspaper correspondent in Paris, London, Rome, Vienna, Brussels, Warsaw, Belgrade, Athens, Sofia, and Constantinople.

Between 1887 and 1913 I attended twenty grand maneuvers of the French army and seventeen of the German army. The first French maneuvers I witnessed were those of the 13th Army Corps, at Clermond-Ferrand, in 1887, then under the command of the famous General Boulanger; and my first German maneuvers, during the reign of the old Emperor William, were those of the 1st Army Corps, at Koenigsberg-in-Preussen, in the same year. The last I attended were the French maneuvers at Castel Sarazen, under General Joffre, the year preceding the war, and the German maneuvers at Preussisch Holland, in East Prussia, in the same year. I have, therefore, closely watched the development of the armies of France and Germany and the growth of the military spirit. I was thus able to make an exact study of the great general staffs of the two armies and to make the personal acquaintance of the men responsible for the military leading in both countries.

I have for over twenty years personally known all the leading men of the Paris and Berlin press, of all shades of opinion, and was for years a member of the Verein Berliner Presse. I was one of the founding members of the Anglo-American Press Association of Paris and an active member till I left Europe for the United States in 1917.

It has been my privilege to know every German chancellor from Prince Bismarck to Prince Buelow and most of the leading French statesmen since 1887. I was for years in close touch both with the Wilhelmstrasse and the Quai d'Orsay and attended hundreds of debates in the Chamber of Deputies and the Reichstag.

I was in Paris at the outbreak of the

war and acted as war correspondent on the French front until Italy came into the war, when I proceeded to that country, where I remained till August, 1915. In that month I went to Serbia and was with the Serbian army during the 1915 campaign and took part in the famous retreat through Albania. When the Serbian army was reorganized and landed in Saloniki, I joined it once more and was with it till after the capture of Monastir.

In February, 1916, I was sent on a special mission by the Prince-Regent of Serbia to Paris and London and was later sent to Washington. My reason for citing this *état de services* is not one of personal vanity. I merely wish to show that when I speak of events in Europe for the last thirty years I do so *en connaissance de cause* and with knowledge of people and events learned on the actual spot. It was this knowledge which caused me to read with ever-growing astonishment the book written by Mr. Bausman.

Guilty France

The thesis which he adopts is that France, after suffering a well-merited defeat at the hands of Germany in 1870, in a war which she had forced on that peaceful and peace-loving country, dreamed of nothing but a war of revenge, and that her preparations for this forced upon the pacific and peace-loving Germans the necessity of continually increasing their armaments. Russia he represents as a hopelessly corrupt and reactionary State, governed by unscrupulous scoundrels, animated with only one desire, that of crushing Austria-Hungary. These Russo-French ambitions are represented as keeping Europe in a state of unrest and forcing the peace-loving Central Powers to embark on an endless competition of armaments. France is represented as continually increasing her army and forcing the pacific Germany to follow her lead.

A Travesty of History

No greater travesty of history could be written than Mr. Bausman's book. He completely ignores the *fons et origo mali*, the wresting by force from France in 1870 of the two provinces of Alsace-Lorraine. This the Germans knew—no one better—to be an act of high-handed injustice, such as was bound to rankle in the

heart of every Frenchman. In order to keep France crushed and powerless, Prince Bismarck imposed a war indemnity on France which he thought and hoped would take her generations to pay and would justify German occupation of her territory for decades.

The Cause of the War of 1870

Mr. Bausman's travesty of history begins with his misrepresentation of the origins of the war of 1870. It was again a case of the wicked France forcing a war of aggression on the peace-loving Germany. "The French people," he says, "wished to inflict some sort of punishment upon one of the German States because it had had a successful war with Austria—an infamous attitude, which cannot possibly be pardoned in a people who had successfully imposed their will upon Italy in an exactly similar situation."

Mr. Bausman passes over in complete silence the fact that Prince Bismarck desired a war with France, and that his whole policy was devoted to jockeying that country into declaring it, thus placing herself in a false position. That this is so is today known to everybody (with apparently the single exception of Judge Bausman), beyond all possible doubt, from the confession of Prince Bismarck himself.

"I did not doubt," he writes in his memoirs, "that a Franco-German war must take place before the constitution of the United Germany could be realized. I was at that time [1866] preoccupied with the idea of delaying the outbreak of this war until our fighting strength should be increased by the Prussian military legislation. This aim of mine was not even approximately reached in 1867. Each year's postponement of the war would add 100,000 trained soldiers to our army."

When he decided the moment had come to provoke a war with France he launched the famous candidature of a Hohenzollern prince for the throne of Spain. It would, he knew, rouse protest in France and give him a chance to embroil the two countries.

Prince Bismarck thus describes the incidents of the fateful dinner he gave to von Moltke and von Roon, while awaiting the dispatch from Ems describing the French ambassador's interview with King William: "I put a few questions to

Moltke," he writes, "as to the extent of his confidence in the state of our preparations, especially as to the time they would still require in order to meet this sudden risk of war. He answered that if there was to be war he expected no advantage to us by deferring its outbreak. In presence of my guests I reduced the Ems telegram by striking out words, but not by adding or altering."

Prince Bismarck then informed his two guests that the result of the telegram as changed would undoubtedly be to force the Emperor of the French to declare war. "This explanation," he writes, "brought about in the two generals a revulsion to a more joyous mood, the liveliness of which surprised me. They suddenly recovered their pleasure in eating and drinking and spoke in a more joyful vein. Roon said, 'Our God of old still lives and will not let us perish in disgrace.' Moltke so far relinquished his passive equanimity that, glancing up joyously towards the ceiling and abandoning his usual punctiliousness of speech, he smote his hand upon his breast and said, 'If I may but live to lead our armies in such a war, then the devil may come directly afterwards and take this old carcass.'"

These quotations from Prince Bismarck's own book prove that the war of 1870 was deliberately planned and brought about by him. I think I can also prove that the war of 1914 was equally well prepared for, definitely planned, and directly forced upon the world.

Backgrounds

I will, therefore, now give my version of the causes of the war, based, as I have said, on thirty years of close acquaintance with and observation of the policies and public sentiments both of France and Germany.

The Germans, until 1870, were a purely agricultural people, "ein ackerbauendes Volk," as they would themselves express it, living from the produce of the soil. The population was about forty million, all that the country could feed. The surplus population was forced to emigrate. This accounts for the millions of citizens of German origin in the United States.

Then came the war with France and the payment of the French war indemnity of five billion francs in gold, for those days

an enormous sum. The German Government, by undertaking great public works, brought this money into circulation. This flood of gold had the effect of completely changing the destinies of the nation. It embarked on the creation of a national commerce and industry the growth of which was one of the marvels of the second half of the nineteenth century. The first result of this transformation of the national life was a practical cessation of the stream of emigration. From several hundred thousand emigrants a year it fell to a few thousands. The demand for labor in the newly founded workshops and factories gave work for all at home.

In consequence the population increased by leaps and bounds, and its support soon exceeded completely the natural agricultural resources of the country. But the immense revenues from the flourishing commerce and industry enabled Germany to purchase abroad the foodstuffs necessary to feed the ever-increasing population. As the nation grew in wealth and power, its entirely justified ambition of playing a leading rôle in Europe steadily increased. It aspired to be a "Weltmacht," or world Power, and under Prince Bismarck its "Welt Politik" was inaugurated. When, in 1878, the Congress of the Powers to settle the problems raised by the Russo-Turkish War was held in Berlin, this fact consecrated Germany as one of the Great Powers of Europe. The little Kingdom of Prussia of 1869 had become the mighty German Empire, with its boundless ambitions.

The Berlin Congress sowed the first seeds of enmity between Germany and Russia. Bismarck at the congress had pretended to play the rôle of the "honest broker" ("der ehrliche Makler," as he phrased it); but in reality he played his cards so skillfully that Russia, which had won the war, went from the Congress nearly empty-handed. Bismarck well knew the deep resentment he had aroused in Russia, and henceforth the one object of his policy was to keep that Empire and France, the two countries to which German policy had been inimical, from joining hands.

But it was soon clear that, in spite of his efforts to keep them apart, the inevitable result of German policy would cause them to gravitate toward one another. He proceeded accordingly to seek alliances to

counterbalance any such combination. The result was the alliance with Austria-Hungary, later transformed into the Triple Alliance by the inclusion of Italy.

Ever since 1870 Germany had been increasing her armed forces. The number of men with the colors had steadily grown. The first great addition was in 1886, when the famous "Septennat" was introduced in the Reichstag, adding nearly 50,000 men to the peace effective. In order to force the Reichstag to vote this measure, Prince Bismarck engineered the notorious "Schnaebele incident" on the French frontier (a French police commissary named Schnaebele was lured on to German territory by a trick, seized, handcuffed, and conveyed to Strassburg and charged with espionage), an outrage which caused intense indignation and excitement throughout France and seemed to threaten war. In the midst of this excitement the German elections were held and the army increase assured. As soon as this was certain, M. Schnaebele was released, apologies were made to the French Government, and the incident closed. But from that moment a profound distrust of a country which could have recourse to such unscrupulous political methods was implanted in France. Such features of German policy are passed over in silence by Mr. Bausman.

It must, however, be admitted that as long as Prince Bismarck was in power Germany's policy, though strongly national and aggressive, did not threaten the public peace. His aim was chiefly to consolidate the advantages gained and rendered Germany's position in Europe impregnable. Though his methods were sometimes brutal, on the whole he showed wise statesmanship.

Coming of William II

But with the disappearance of the Iron Chancellor and the advent of William II everything changed. Everything in the national life—the army, the industry, the trade and commerce—were pushed to the utmost limits. Germany became at one and the same time an armed camp and a hive of industry. Soon her foreign trade no longer satisfied her ambitions. She must have colonies, and the "scramble for Africa" began.

Carl Peters, von Wissmann, von Tiede-

mann, Emin Pasha, and a score of other explorers headed expeditions to the Dark Continent, and German East Africa, German Southwest Africa, Togoland, and the Cameroons were annexed in rapid succession. Some German agents showed a considerable amount of truculence and arrogance in their methods, which caused friction with the British, the Belgians, and the French; but in the end the new frontiers of the African possessions were drawn and a *modus vivendi* established. For the colonial policy Prince Bismarck showed little enthusiasm. "Ich bin kein Colonial Mench von Hause aus," he declared in the Reichstag; but he bowed to the national will and carried out the aspirations of his fellow-countrymen with his habitual firmness and continuity of purpose.

But when he retired from power the Colonial Party, the "Kolonial Fanatiker," as he called them, had a free hand, and proceeded "to paint the map of Africa blue" with more zeal than discretion, aided and encouraged by the young Kaiser. With the acquisition of colonies came the necessity for a great fleet, and its creation was preached in season and out of season. The "Flotten Verein," or Navy League, was founded, to which every commercial and industrial magnate with social ambitions and desirous of currying favor with the Kaiser subscribed largely. It soon had a membership running into the millions and conducted a strenuous campaign with unlimited publicity. In the waiting-rooms of every station on the state railways huge charts of the sea power of the various nations, but chiefly that of Great Britain, were displayed. Rivalry with that Power was admitted to be Germany's aim. Year by year the national fleet grew in power, until it secured the second place among the fleets of the world.

Year by year the growth of the land forces kept pace with it, until the peace effective reached the enormous total of 700,000 men. Each year the grand maneuvers of the army increased in importance. Before the advent of William II these rarely exceeded a couple of army corps, or 50,000 men; but each year saw some fresh innovation until, bit by bit, the number of army corps engaged rose to three, four, and even five, strongly reinforced with reservists. The Kaiser in

person directed masses of troops numbering a quarter million of men. And these maneuvers were no mere military parades. Every effort was made to realize actual war conditions, and the press devoted columns upon columns to the accounts of this mimic warfare. Day by day, month by month, and year by year the belief in Germany's military and naval power was forced on the nation, until something like military intoxication of the public mind was attained. On each of my visits to Germany (and I followed seventeen grand maneuvers of her army) I saw an increase of the military spirit, an ever-growing arrogance based on the belief that Germany could, if she desired it, crush all foreign opposition to her "world policy" by force of arms.

The country was at the same time a hive of industry. Magnificently equipped factories and industrial plants of all kinds existed by thousands. Germany's splendid merchant marine carried her flag to the ends of the earth. Her world commerce extended to every part of the globe, while her teeming population was increasing by hundreds of thousands every year. Her bureaucracy stood alone in Europe for efficiency and devotion to duty. Its hands were clean; bribery and corruption were practically unknown in her political life. The whole huge governmental machine worked at high pressure for the greater glory and advancement of the Fatherland. And all of this power was concentrated in the hands of one single man and the statesmen and soldiers selected by him to carry out his will.

Many people in foreign countries believed that Germany was a State with a constitution which allowed the people to decide their own destinies. Outwardly it seemed so. People saw the Reichstag, elected by universal suffrage, functioning like any other parliament. It seemed to be passing laws and carrying out its legislative duties in sovereign independence. This, however, was a huge mistake. Germany was an autocracy as complete (but much more intelligent) than that of Russia.

The constitution drawn up after 1870 was a mere façade. By it the Reichstag could only consider and vote upon measures which already had been approved and adopted by the Bundesrath, or Federal

Council. The Federal Council of 61 members was composed of the personal representatives of the kings, princes, and grand dukes ruling the various States which composed the Empire. The Kaiser, as King of Prussia, appointed 17 members, and nearly a score of the smaller States conceded to Prussia the right to nominate their representatives in the Federal Council. These members were the *personal* representatives of the various sovereigns and revocable at their pleasure. They merely carried out the orders they received. The Kaiser, therefore, had a clear majority of the votes of the Council, which he could thus force to obey his every wish. As the Reichstag could do nothing the Federal Council did not approve, and as the Federal Council was completely in the hands of the Kaiser, William II behind this façade of pretended constitutionalism really ruled as an autocrat. And that he actually did so history has shown beyond all doubt.

As Germany increased in power and might the Kaiser began to dream a dream of world power. This was the creation of "Mittel Europa," or the Central European Empire, the founding of a great State which should run from the Baltic and the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. If this was brought into being, Europe would be cut clean in two down the center. With Germany master of the Cattegat and the Dardanelles, the Baltic and the Black Sea would become German lakes. To realize this dream, the Kaiser would have to hold supreme power over Austria-Hungary, the Balkan Peninsula, and Asia Minor. Russia would thus be completely cut off from the rest of Europe and would, slowly but surely, be pushed back in Asia.

In presence of such a power, France and Italy would be helpless and would be forced to bow to the inevitable. Then would come the struggle with the British Empire, the defeat of which would spell German domination of Europe, preliminary to the domination of the world.

That such a dream was dreamed by William II and enthusiastically adopted by an immense majority of his subjects is beyond all doubt. For thirty years before the World War Pan-Germanism was preached as a national doctrine. Scores of volumes were published describing the great heritage of world power to which

Germany was called. Maps were published broadcast with the future world dominion of Germany indicated, so "that he who ran might read." Societies were founded all over the Empire to preach its future greatness, while the Flotten Verein and the patriotic and military societies stoked the patriotic machine to white heat.

Thrust at the Balkans

One by one the necessary steps were taken to realize this grandiose ambition. The first thing necessary was an alliance with Austria-Hungary so close as to amount to the absorption of that empire. This alliance was effected in 1879, and year by year the bonds were drawn tighter, till finally the Wilhelmstrasse, in matters of foreign policy, completely dominated the Ballplatz. The relations between the Great General Staffs of the two Empires were also drawn so close that the tactics and strategy of the Austrian army was practically drawn up in Berlin. The Kaiser's *fiat* thus ran from Koenigsberg in Prussen to the Serbian frontier.

Any chance of Italian opposition to German aims was eliminated by including her in the Austro-German alliance. In order to bring this about, Prince Bismarck cleverly exploited the anti-French feeling engendered in Italy by France's policy in Tunis and elsewhere, at which the Italians took umbrage.

The next step was to draw the Balkan States into the combination. German influence in Rumania was assured by placing Carl von Hohenzollern on the throne of that country, and in 1892 Austria-Hungary and Rumania concluded a secret treaty of alliance. This was renewed in 1896, 1903, and 1913, and in February of the latter year the alliance was extended to Germany.

German predominance in Bulgaria was assured by placing a German prince, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, on the throne of that country and by sapping and mining the influence of Russia (the country to which Bulgaria owed her existence as an independent State) by Austrian intrigues.

German influence in Greece was assured by the Kaiser giving his sister Sophie in marriage to the Crown Prince (afterwards King) Constantine. Prince Constantine was also brought to Germany, where he

underwent a long period of military training as an officer of the Prussian Corps of Guards and was thoroughly imbued with the idea that Germany as a military power was invincible.

The Kaiser took advantage of the marriage festivities at Athens to push on to Constantinople, where, with Sultan Abdul Hamid, he laid the foundations of the offensive and defensive Turko-German alliance which was to play such a decisive rôle in the World War. It was, however, necessary to weld this huge complex of "Mittel Europa" into a homogeneous whole. The means of accomplishing this was the creation of the Berlin-Bagdad Railway, which was to be the backbone of the new world empire. From this steel vertebral column lines would branch out right and left and firmly establish the grip of Germany on the immense empire of her dreams.

The Serbian Obstacle

There was only one link necessary to complete the chain. This link was Serbia, the courageous little nation for which Mr. Bausman cannot find enough insulting terms. This "most infamous people in Europe," whose "whole history is one of crime and violence," dared to commit the crime of maintaining its independence. For thirty long years nothing was left undone to force Serbia to accept German-Austrian domination. Her whole history during that period is one long series of arbitrary and oppressive acts on the part of Austria-Hungary. A cruel and crushing customs tariff was enforced against her to ruin her commerce and bring her to her knees before the Central Powers. Threats and cajoleries were tried in turn. The criminal weaknesses of King Milan were exploited to get him to sell his country's liberty.

Hand in hand with Austria's hostile policy towards the Serbian Kingdom went her oppression of everything Serb in her own dominions. Croatia, Dalmatia, the Voivodina, the Slovene country, Bosnia, and Herzegovina were held in the ruthless grip of Vienna and Budapest. Up to the beginning of the present century it would have been possible for wise statesmanship to have saved the Austrian Empire from dissolution by concessions to the Slav elements. If, instead of holding them down

as inferior vassal States, the Slav element had been admitted to the government of the Empire on an equal footing with Austria and Hungary, transforming it from a Dual to a Tri-*al* Monarchy, the Empire of the Hapsburgs might have been saved. But such a step would have marked the end of purely German influence. The Slav element in the Austrian Empire, being numerically the strongest of the three, would have caused a new orientation of Austrian policy, one calculated to eliminate the preponderating influence of the German Empire in Austrian affairs.

This had to be prevented at all costs. So the régime of Vienna and Budapest became more and more oppressive. In order to leave no doubt as to the views and intentions of the reactionaries of Vienna, Budapest, and Berlin, the Austrian Government, in 1909, cynically informed the other Powers that it intended to tear up the last shred of the Treaty of Berlin and declared that it would purely and simply annex the Serbian-speaking provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, temporarily handed over to her in 1878, to be held till pacified and a stable government established.

This act of arrogant oppression was the "last straw." From that time on the movement of the southern Slavs of the Austrian Empire for liberty and recognition within the empire changed to a frankly separatist one, favoring secession and union with their brothers-in-race in Serbia and Montenegro, to form a strong and compact independent Serbo-Croat nation of thirteen million souls.

The Will to Power

Germany now saw that she must force Europe to admit her predominance and, if it refused to do so, must impose it by the sword. She made one last desperate effort to compel France to abandon the struggle against German supremacy. In 1912 she suddenly decided to add nearly 200,000 men to her peace effective, raising it from 750,000 to 940,000 men. The French peace effective at that time was about 500,000 men. The national defense law called for two years' service with the colors, with two annual contingents of recruits of 250,000 men each. This was all that France, with her population of less than forty millions could furnish. She

would thus find herself faced by a German active army of double her own. Germany, with her population of nearly seventy million, had no difficulty in finding half a million recruits every year.

The only way France could meet this menace would be by going back to three years' military service with the colors, and thus have three contingents of 250,000, or a total peace effective of 750,000 men. The Germans, however, believed that the French would never go back to three years' military service. Nothing, they thought, would induce the French peasant to send his twenty-year-old son to pass three years in a military barracks. This being so, France, being outnumbered by two to one, would gradually accept the position, admit Germany's supremacy, and bit by bit allow the German domination of Europe to be established.

For months the Kaiser and his entourage consulted every available authority. All the people they consulted were convinced that France would never consent to return to three years' military service, and the German aim would be attained. The necessary legislation was introduced and railroaded through the Reichstag. And then something happened which upset all the Kaiser's calculations. France saw the danger and, with a heavy heart, made the necessary effort to meet it. The Parliament voted to return to three years' military service, thus raising the French peace effective to 750,000 men. The Germans had underestimated French patriotism and had overreached themselves. They had added enormously to their financial burdens, but the relative military strength of the two countries remained unchanged. It was, if anything, changed to the detriment of Germany, as the French soldier, serving three years, would be better trained than the German soldier serving only two.

I do not hesitate to say that from that moment the Kaiser resolved on war as the only way out of the *impasse* into which he had brought himself by his underestimation of French patriotism. Germany, he knew, could never permanently bear the strain of maintaining a peace effective of nearly a million men. An attack by the Central Powers, therefore, became inevitable. It was further necessary to lose no time, but to attack France before the three

years' military service Germany had forced upon her bore its fruits. That this meant a European conflagration Berlin and Vienna well knew, but they had made up their minds to it. All that was required was a plausible pretext.

Serbia's Gift

This was furnished by the assassination, at Sarajevo, on June 28, 1914, of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, the heir to the Austrian throne. On the excuse that the assassin was a Serb (how could it be otherwise in a Serbian province), the Belgrade Government was accused of having inspired the crime. The famous ultimatum, probably the most insolent diplomatic document ever penned, was presented to King Peter's Government. It was not intended that it should be accepted. And yet Serbia, on the advice of the Entente powers and in the interests of peace, did accept it. M. Pashitch's Government merely asked for further information regarding some points which were obscure. But as the Central Powers had resolved on war, this sufficed. Baron Giesl von Gieslingen, the Austrian minister, declared the reply unsatisfactory, broke off diplomatic relations, and left Belgrade. Twenty-four hours later war was declared.

Mr. Bausman cannot find epithets insulting enough for the Serbian people. "Infamous," "vile," and other terms are used to describe them. He expresses regret that Austria was not allowed to crush them under its booted heel. May I be permitted to give, in my turn, my estimate of that little people. I have been with them through "good report and evil." I have the honor of knowing King Alexander, one of the most democratic and high-minded sovereigns in Europe; but I have also marched and suffered with the peasants of the Shumadia and the Morava in two campaigns. I consider the Serbs to be one of the bravest, most hospitable, and kind-hearted people I have ever met, and inspired with a love of liberty and independence for which they would die to the last man.

As soldiers, they have few equals and no superiors. They are brave, disciplined, and patient under suffering to an incredible degree. That they aided to save Europe from the domination of the Teuton

even more than Belgium did is beyond all doubt. If their resistance had collapsed in the first four weeks of the war, as the Kaiser fondly hoped it would, what would have happened? The armies of the Central Powers would have swept triumphantly down to Constantinople. Bulgaria would have received them with open arms; Rumania, having a treaty with them, would have joined them: Greece, too, would have welcomed them, and "Mittel Europa" would have come into being six weeks after the war started.

Under the circumstances, Italy would not have moved or, if she did, would have remembered that she was a member of the Triple Alliance. The Kaiser had then only to organize and weld together the fighting forces of Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, and the Ottoman Empire, add them to those of Germany and Austria, and pour them by millions against France and Russia.

But Serbia nobly did her duty. Single-handed against the might of the Austrian Empire, King Peter's faithful troops twice hurled back, in hopeless rout, the flower of Francis Joseph's army. For one long year, unaided by any ally, the Serbs, single-handed, held the Danube front and prevented a European catastrophe. Then, when Germans, Austrians, and Bulgarians were banded against her, Serbia still fought for months, outnumbered three to

one, with the courage of despair. When her armies, shrunk to 150,000 men, were driven to the frontier they still kept their plighted word. They faced the desolation of the snow-clad Albanian mountains, retreated to Corfu, reformed their broken ranks, landed at Saloniki, and resumed the desperate struggle.

The last glorious phase of this great Serbian *épopée*, the attack on the Dobra Polje, the breaking of the Bulgarian lines, and their triumphant advance back to their beloved Serbia, proved them men of an indomitable race, the soldiers of the "nation that will never die."

Today the Serbs are once more installed in the position they held centuries ago, the "Guardians of the Gate," barring the route to any conqueror who will again try to dominate the East. As long as King Alexander's gallant army fulfills this mission, Europe can sleep in peace. "On ne passera pas."

And it is for such a people that Mr. Bausman can only find words of insult; and all for what? To justify his thesis that the pacific and peace-loving Kaiser was provoked and wantonly attacked by the wicked and perfidious France. A book such as he has written, defending the German Empire and its attack on civilization, is an insult to the thousands of his gallant countrymen today lying dead on the soil of France and Flanders.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

BRITISH NOTE TO RUSSIA

Following is the text of the note sent by the British Government to the Soviet Government:

February 1, 1924.

1. I have the honor, by direction of my government, to inform Your Excellency that they recognize the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics as the *de jure* rulers of those territories of the old Russian Empire which acknowledge their authority.

2. In order, however, to create the normal conditions of complete friendly relations and

full commercial intercourse, it will be necessary to conclude definite practical agreements on a variety of matters, some of which have no direct connection with the question of recognition, some of which, on the other hand, are intimately bound up with the fact of recognition.

3. In the latter category may be cited the question of existing treaties. His Majesty's Government are advised that the recognition of the Soviet Government of Russia will, according to the accepted principles of international law, automatically bring into force all the treaties concluded between the two countries previous to the Russian revolution, except where these have been denounced or

have otherwise juridically lapsed. It is obviously to the advantage of both countries that the position in regard to these treaties should be regularized simultaneously with recognition.

4. Technically unconnected with recognition, but clearly of the utmost importance, are the problems of the settlement of existing claims by the government and nationals of one party against the other and the restoration of Russia's credit.

5. It is also manifest that genuinely friendly relations cannot be said to be completely established so long as either party has reason to suspect the other of carrying on propaganda against its interests and directed to the overthrow of its institutions.

6. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government invite the Russian Government to send over to London at the earliest possible date representatives armed with full powers to discuss these matters and to draw up the preliminary bases of a complete treaty to settle all questions outstanding between the two countries.

7. In the meantime I have been given the status of charge d'affaires pending the appointment of an ambassador, and I am to state that His Majesty's Government will be glad similarly to receive a Russian charge d'affaires representing the Government of the Union at the Court of St. James.

SOVIET CONGRESS'S RESPONSE

A resolution, a copy of which has been forwarded by the Russian Mission to the British Foreign Office, was adopted by the Second Union Congress of Soviets after Mr. Litvinoff's report on the *de jure* recognition of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by Great Britain. The resolution states that the congress "notes with satisfaction that this historic step (of *de jure* recognition) was one of the first acts of the first Government of Great Britain chosen by the working classes." The resolution continues:

The working class of Great Britain has been the true ally of the working masses of the U. S. S. R. in their struggle for peace. The peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics remember the efforts of the working masses of Great Britain and the advanced section of British public opinion for the ending of the boycott, the blockade, and armed intervention. They realize that the recognition which has resulted is the consequence of the unflinching will of the British people, which unanimously demanded the political recognition of the Soviet Government as a necessary condition for the establishment of universal peace, the economic reconstruction of the world after the ruin caused by the imperialist war, and in particular for a successful fight against industrial stagnation

and unemployment, in Great Britain itself. As a result of these united efforts of the pacific policy of the Soviet Government (under the guidance of V. I. Lenin) and of the loudly expressed determination of the British people, there has resulted at last the establishment of normal relations between the two countries in a form worthy of both great peoples and laying the foundations for their friendly co-operation.

In the tense atmosphere of international relations today, fraught with the dangers of new world conflicts and justly constituting a subject for anxiety among the working people of all countries, this step of the British Labor Government acquires special and striking importance.

This Second Congress of Soviets of the U. S. S. R. declares that co-operation between the peoples of Great Britain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics remains as before, one of the first cares of the Union Soviet Government, which, in keeping with all its preceding policy of peace, will make every effort to settle all disputed questions and misunderstandings and to develop and consolidate economic relations, which are so necessary for the economic and political progress of the peoples of both countries and of the whole world.

This Second Congress of Soviets of the U. S. S. R. stretches out its hand in friendly fraternal greeting to the British people and empower the Union Government to undertake the necessary *démarches* before the British Government arising out of the fact of recognition of the Soviet Government.

BRITAIN AND FRANCE

Text of Premiers' Letters

Following is the text of the letters recently interchanged between the Prime Minister of Great Britain and M. Poincaré:

FOREIGN OFFICE, S. W. 1, Jan. 26, 1924.

MY DEAR PREMIER:

Our two countries have gone through such trying times side by side and have made such sacrifices together for a common cause that on coming into office I address you a personal note, not only to inform you of the change, but to send you my greetings and good wishes.

I grieve to find so many unsettled points causing us trouble and concern, and I assure you it will be my daily endeavor to help to settle them to our mutual benefit. You have your public opinion, and I have mine; you have your national interests to conserve and protect, and I have mine. Sometimes at first they may be in conflict, but I am sure by the strenuous action of goodwill these conflicts can be settled and policies devised in the pursuit of which France and Great Britain can remain in hearty co-operation. We can be frank without being hostile, and defend our

countries' interests without being at enmity. Thus the Entente will be much more than a nominal thing, and France and Great Britain can advance together to establish peace and security in Europe.

Pray accept these assurances and my sentiments of personal respect, and believe me to be, your obedient servant,

RAMSAY MACDONALD.

M. Poincaré's Reply

Following is M. Poincaré's reply:

PARIS, January 28, 1924.

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

I am much touched by the kind letter which you have been good enough to write to me, to inform me yourself that you have entered on your high functions and to send me your personal good wishes.

I hope with all my heart that your efforts for the welfare of your country will be crowned with success. The bonds which unite it to my own have been knit together, as you recall, in times of common trial and sacrifice. You may be sure that the memory of these times is ever present to my mind, as it is to yours.

I also deeply regret that several questions of importance to our two countries have not yet been settled. Like you, I will do my utmost to solve them by friendly agreement and to our mutual advantage. If we have to take into account public opinion in our respective countries, if we have both to safeguard our national interests, I am confident that in applying, each in his own sphere, the vigorous action and the goodwill of which you speak to the settlement of problems arising between us, we shall solve them in such a manner as to maintain between Great Britain and France the policy of co-operation essential to our two countries and to the tranquillity of the world.

My own frankness shall be no less than yours, and if in the defense of French interests I show the same fervor as you in the defense of British interests, you may be sure that nothing will ever change the cordiality of my deep-rooted feelings. It is impossible that, animated as we both are by such sentiments, we should fail to make the Entente effective and fruitful of the results which it can and ought to bear in order that Europe as a whole should find once more peace, security, and freedom to work. I beg you, my dear Prime Minister, to accept the assurance of my high consideration and my most cordial good wishes.

R. POINCARÉ.

CHICHERIN ON

MR. MACDONALD'S DECISION

According to the *Manchester Guardian* of February 8, Mr. Chicherin, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, has given Mr. Arthur

Ransome an exclusive interview in which he spoke as follows:

"Our Soviet Congress characterized the recognition of the Soviet Republics by Great Britain as an historical event. This is quite true, and it is impossible to exaggerate the rôle which this event will play in the development of the world situation. Two factors in Great Britain have brought about this result. The first was the unanimous demand of the working class, which, in the form of unemployment, feels bitterly the present disruption of the world's economic system and, with the whole strength of its just instincts, strives for the only real remedy, namely, the drawing of Soviet Russia into completely normal intercourse with Great Britain. The second factor was the far-seeing enlightened comprehension of the most thoughtful elements in English political quarters.

"From the first beginning of our Republic I have unceasingly pointed out the unparalleled flexibility, capacity, and adaptation of the best section of English ruling quarters. Many times, for example, when the British Government, alone among the great powers, supported Esthonia in her desire to conclude peace with Soviet Russia, I pointed out that on the Thames there are most long-sighted statesmen who can perceive in advance the coming of new forces and the need of adaptation to those new forces. Compromise has long been the great art of British statesmanship. In the first days of our existence, when other governments showed unmitigated hatred, the British Government alone among western powers, showed some willingness to compromise with our new-born government. Even when the wave of intervention was at its height, Mr. Lloyd George raised his voice for agreement with Soviet Russia, and the Liberal press, which represented a far-seeing section of British public opinion, has never ceased, even in the worst periods, to denounce intervention and speak out for agreement with our government.

British Initiative in Trade Relations

"The resumption of trade relations with Russia was the result of the initiative of the British Government, and through all the vicissitudes of the relations between our two countries the truly Liberal press never ceased to advocate conciliation and agreement. Working-class opinion and enlightened political thought are the two forces which brought about the present admirable result. I completely concur with the Liberal press in thinking this the wisest step yet taken by the British Government after the war. It is a great example of the genuine statesmanship which understands the powerful psychological forces that underlie the policies of States. The men who advocated and carried through this step obviously understand the effect it will have on the minds of the 130 millions of the great Soviet Federation. As the result of the enormous interest which the masses

in Russia show for foreign politics, Great Britain will forthwith enjoy such popularity as will be a real political factor. It can be said that with a single stroke she has strengthened her international position and has altered the combination of forces on the political chess-board.

"But the wise thing must be thoroughly wise, and must not be left unfinished. Wise things cannot be done half-heartedly. Hamlet could never have been a real statesman. Why, then, in the British note announcing such a grand decision is there a sort of intermixture of limitations of that original decision? Instead of leaving a feeling of full and complete satisfaction and joy, the British note leaves in the mind some doubt and a feeling of vagueness of purpose. What mean these subtle distinctions between recognition and normal conditions? After reading the first paragraph of the note I thought it gave us full recognition, but in the second paragraph I found that normal conditions between us will be restored only after vexed questions about debts, private property, and so on have been solved. We have recognition, but not normal conditions. What does recognition imply if not normal relations between the States in question? Why cannot we at once nominate an ambassador? Obviously, because there are no normal conditions between us. What, then, remains of recognition? What demon of doubt has with his icy breath blasted the grand resolution of full recognition? Whose unlucky influence has, at least in part, tarnished the gilt of the wise historical event of the restoration of full and complete friendly intercourse between our peoples?"

"But let us hope for the best. Let us go on with our work. From the first day when Mr. Krassin appeared in London we have striven for opportunities of thrashing out all our differences and mutual suspicions. Until now British rulers have evaded the work of complete outspokenness. We have much to say. Lord Curzon's diplomacy has not been tender towards us, and I am especially glad to have as partner in this full and complete frankness Mr. MacDonald, the best friend of the much-regretted Keir Hardie.

Relations with the East

"Mr. MacDonald will understand that our unbreakable friendship for the peoples of the East does not mean aggressiveness on our part, but, on the contrary, means the putting in practice of the principles which the great Keir Hardie so magnificently advocated. In so far as my friend Mr. Clifford Allen and my friend Mr. Fenner Brockway are struggling for peace and brotherhood among nations, I may say that the Soviet Government are supporting the same cause.

"When Gladstone, who tried in vain, but still tried, to put in practice the idea of a non-aggressive Little England, strove for agreement with Russia, he had before him the extremely aggressive Russia of Alexander

III, and his Copenhagen interview with Russian statesmen was doomed to failure in view of the incurable greed of Russian Tsarism. Mr. MacDonald is in a better position, for he is faced not by greedy Tsarist Russia, but by a great federated republic of peace, which writes on its banner: 'Full independence, full freedom, and self-disposal for every nation.' Alexander III in conciliation was no match for Gladstone. To Mr. MacDonald I can put the opposite question and ask: 'Will his love of peace and his conciliatory spirit be as great as our own?'"

TREATY BETWEEN ITALY AND THE KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS, AND SLOVENES.

The following treaty between Italy and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was ratified by the Chamber of Deputies, at Belgrade, February 19, 1924:

Article I. The Italian Government recognizes the full sovereignty of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes over Porto Barosh and the Delta, which will be evacuated and handed over to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes two days after the exchange of ratifications.

Article II. The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes recognizes the full sovereignty of Italy to the town and harbor of Fiume, with its territory, which will be handed over to Italy with the frontier lines described in the following article.

Article III. The frontier lines of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in regard to Fiume, which were laid down by Article III of the treaty of Rapallo, on November 12, 1920, are to be modified in the sense of the above-quoted Article II. This modification will be carried out by a mixed commission composed of Italian delegates and delegates of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. The modification will take place according to the following lines: the road from Kaslav to Fiume will be held by the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes from a point to the east of Tometich to the cross-roads to the north of Bergudi. The frontier line will be traced on the terrain which lies between the railway line and the above-mentioned road. In a northeasterly direction from this point the frontier line will be so modified that Belin will remain in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and to the north, near Drenova, it follows a convex line to a point on the Fiumara, which will be drawn in the northern half of the present frontier, between the eighth and the ninth frontier boundary mark.

Article IV. The Kingdom of Italy recognizes the full sovereignty of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes to the territory which will be handed over to it and which will be evacuated after the delimitation of the new frontier line by the Mixed Commission. This Commission will carry out

its task in such a manner that the above-named territory will be evacuated and handed over five days after the exchange of ratifications.

Article V. The frontier between Fiume and the Porto Barosh along the Bankino will be laid down in conformity with the line laid down and marked on the map accompanying the Repallo Treaty. The line will be laid down in the manner which, in the opinion of the frontier commission, will be most suitable for the customs control of the two States. The connecting road, as well as the draw-bridge between the Porto Grande on the Fiumara and the harbor of Barosh, remains on Italian territory. The Kingdom of Italy recognizes the full sovereignty of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes over the Fiumara River. The frontier line will accordingly be drawn in such a manner that it will not interfere with the navigation on the Fiumara itself. For the use of this river the Italian Government will pay a yearly tax of one gold dinar per annum to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

Article VI. The relations between the frontier zones, the frontier committee of Kaslav, and the Italian frontier territory, which until the conclusion of a commercial treaty are subject to the conditions in this treaty, will be settled by a frontier traffic committee. Both powers are in agreement that in the commercial treaty all questions concerning frontier traffic will be settled in such a way that due allowance will be made for the economic relations between the individual zones, and special attention will be given to the special interests of the inhabitants.

Article VII. The Kingdom of Italy leases to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes for fifty years the covered and uncovered spaces on the Porto Grande, which are included in the Taon de Revel basin. In conformity with Article XXI of the convention annexed to this treaty this lease excludes all extraterritorial character from this territory and extends to the unlimited use of the large warehouses on the Molo Nepoli, the two warehouses along the bank of the Taon de Revel basin, and farther to the warehouses on the Molo Genova, as well as to the privileged use of that bank which is on the frontier of the basin. The officials and the employees of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes who will be in charge of the traffic in their State in this basin, will carry out their functions in the terms of the convention which is annexed to this treaty. The Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes will pay the Italian Government a yearly rent of one gold lira.

Article VIII. The chief railway station of Fiume will be organized as an international frontier station, to which a delegation of railway employees, composed of railway experts and other persons, such as is usual in international railway stations, will be attached. This delegation will, together with the Italian employees, regulate the traffic on the section which connects the railway station of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats,

and Slovenes with the basin and with Porto Barosh. The fashion in which this common activity will be regulated is laid down in the convention annexed to this treaty. In regard to the water supply of Fiume, this will be also regulated according to the conditions laid down in the convention annexed to the treaty.

Article IX. The Slavic minority in Fiume will create a régime on the same lines as that regulating the rights and duties of the Italian minority in Dalmatia.

Article X. This treaty will be ratified and ratifications exchanged in Rome within twenty days from the signature of the treaty, drawn up in duplicate in Rome on January 27, 1924.

News in Brief

LABOR SHORTAGE IN INDIA has greatly stimulated the use of coal-cutting machinery in the Indian coal mines. Most of the large collieries in the various fields are now equipped with electric power. Forty electrically driven coal-cutting machines were in operation in the Ranegunge and Jherria fields, and during 1922 these machines cut a total area of 1,065,456 square feet. In addition, three machines operating on compressed air cut 190,890 square feet in the Jherria field. One colliery has introduced a mechanical loading conveyor which operates by compressed air.

IN NORWAY BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE interests are pursuing conservative policy with the object of establishing finances as quickly as possible on a sound basis. In a recent message to the Storting, the Norwegian Government outlined its program, which shows a determined intention of balancing the budget and carrying through economic reconstruction. The message further recommends the repeal of the prohibition act with the express purpose of aiding government finances, and the opening of negotiations with Soviet Russia for the settlement of all pending questions. The proposed 1924-25 budget is characterized by rigid economy.

THE GERMAN MERCANTILE FLEET is steadily recovering its former position among the world's maritime carriers. Little by little the German fleet operators are exploiting

lines of sea traffic which they were constrained to abandon at the outbreak of the World War. German traffic via the Suez Canal indicates notably the steps of this progress. According to statistics furnished by the Suez Canal Company, the German flag made its first appearance along the Suez route October 23, 1920, after a total suspension of 86 months. In 1913, with a total of 3,352,000 tons, Germany held first place after Great Britain among the nations represented in the traffic of the Suez Canal. In 1920 only three German ships passed through the Suez Canal. Two belonged to the Deutsch-Australische Gesellschaft, sailing from Hamburg to Java, and one owned by the Hansa Line, which sailed for the British East Indies. In 1921 thirty-five passages were made through the canal by vessels flying the German flag. During 1922, however, vessels under the German flag passed through the Suez Canal 149 times, and during the first eight months of 1923 the German tonnage passing through the Suez Canal was greater than during the entire year 1922.

ZAGHLUL PASHA, THE NEW PREMIER of Egypt, will be likely, under the 1922 agreement with Great Britain, to negotiate a final treaty between that country and his own. This treaty will have to cover four principal subjects—security of communications (involving the Suez Canal), the protection of the rights of minorities, the problem of foreign residents and the capitulations, and the control of the Sudan. Just what the new premier's attitude will be toward these important fundamentals of policy is not yet known.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE LITAS in place of the German mark and the Russian ruble as standard currency in Lithuania has saved the State from ruin. The litas, said the Finance Minister, in introducing his budget for 1924 to the Parliament, is now accepted in East Prussia, in Polish Lithuania, and is quoted on foreign exchanges. Agriculture in the country has reached its pre-war volume and every department of industry shows an increase over 1914. There is great lack of fertilizer, unobtainable during the German occupation, and the minister stressed the great need for better internal transportation facilities. He was able, however, to announce a loan of £1,000,000 from a British firm for the supply of materials for railways, elevators and similar undertakings. Lithuanian

state economy was, last fall, on the brink of an abyss, but with a stable national currency, with her wide field of raw material in agriculture and forests, and the establishment of better transportation facilities, the outlook is distinctly encouraging.

THE SWISS FEDERAL COUNCIL has approved the arbitration treaty which has been drawn up with Portugal and which will be submitted to Parliament for ratification. Other arbitration treaties are in preparation with Holland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Austria, and negotiations are also proceeding with Hungary.

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS has resolved to organize two summer schools in the year 1924, one of which will be held at Schönbrunn Castle, near Vienna, from July 21 to August 2, and the other at Ruskin College, Oxford, from 18th to 30th of August. Both schools are primarily intended for young men and women who are active workers in the Labor movement.

THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD line in Mexico is about to complete a gap in railway lines between Tepic and La Quemada, in Jalisco. This will give a direct outlet to the west coast from Mexico City and central Mexico. The distance to be covered is about 103 miles and involves the expenditure of about \$15,000,000.

NICARAGUA CELEBRATED THE 102D ANNIVERSARY of its independence September 14 and 15, 1923. The day was marked by patriotic exercises in the schools, by parades and addresses.

JAPAN NOW REQUIRES FOUR YEARS of English for graduation from a middle or secondary school and for admission to a higher institution of learning. For advanced technical and commercial schools five years' study of English are required.

THE FASCISTI GOVERNMENT has pursued a policy in Italy which recognizes the principle of a mutual interest between the State and private enterprise. This policy has done much to remove the former fear on the part of business interests that their activities would be curtailed by government interference. The improvement in the finances of the Italian Government has been accelerated.

THE SHARE OF THE UNITED STATES in the trade of the Philippine Islands has increased from 11 per cent in 1900 to 65 per cent in the first ten months of 1923. Manila hemp and sugar of the islands are the leading exports, and cotton manufactures rank first in imports from the United States.

AN IMPROVEMENT IN CABLE COMMUNICATIONS with France has recently been inaugurated. It has been necessary hitherto for all messages to be handled by the French post-office, and to be retransmitted to and from Havre. This arrangement left loopholes for mistakes and involved inevitable delay. On January 1 the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the Commercial Cable Co. began to do business directly with the French general public, thus eliminating the handling of matter by the post-office entirely.

THE NAVAL DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE at Rome has begun the examination of the League of Nations' project for extending the stipulations of the Washington Treaty to all other States having naval forces, that did not sign the treaty. The main difficulty is the maximum tonnage to be allotted to each nation. There is a natural divergence of views on this point.

A DELEGATION KNOWN as the Pan-American Highway Commission will, in the near future, visit this country to study the highways and highway transport system of the United States. It will be made up of forty delegates from twenty Latin-American countries, men of broad experience in highway affairs in their respective countries. They will be the guests of the Highway Education Board, assisted by officials from several of the departments and of the Pan-American Union. It is proposed to conduct the visitors on a tour of approximately three weeks' duration through several of the States progressive in road construction. It is probable that the United States as well as the visiting governments will be benefited by exchange of views and experience.

"AS A MARK OF APPRECIATION to a generous people for their beneficence after the recent disaster in Yokohama and Tokyo," the Japanese Government has authorized the sending of a commercial exhibit valued at more than \$100,000 to this country about April 1. This will ultimately be a part of the International

Commercial Museum contemplated by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

"GOODWILL DAY" is the new name given to Peace Day by the World Conference on Education, held in San Francisco in 1923, under the auspices of the National Education Association. Provision for the world-wide observance of the 18th of May as Goodwill Day was made during this conference; foundations were also laid for a closer integration of the work of educators throughout the world.

RECONSTRUCTION IN TURKEY is now going forward rapidly. Animated by national pride and the hope of permanent peace, the peasants are working as they have probably never done before, and building operations of the cheaper variety in the interior are proceeding on a large scale, both under private initiative and public subsidy. All railroad lines have been put on an operating basis. Since the fall of 1923 the Ministry of Reconstruction will have spent about £3,500,000 by March 1, 1924. A French company has contracted to build over 3,000 houses in Aidin under a municipal guaranty of rentals.

TURKEY'S POLICY ON RECONSTRUCTION and nationalization lines may be gauged by some of its recent legislation, such as a law requiring all business places to exhibit signs in the Turkish language and heavily taxing signs in foreign languages; the abrogation of certain ship-yard concessions and laws enacted regarding the coastwise trade; prohibitive duties on edible oils, flour, and box shooks; requirement that public utilities employ only Moslem Turks; that troops be instructed in the use of farm machinery; and the registration of all residents.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN HOLLAND continues to increase, the total registered unemployed numbering 106,206 on February 1, compared with 102,225 on January 1. Slight improvement is reported in the building and metal-working trades, but conditions in the clothing industry are worse, as are those among office help, while increased unemployment is most marked in unskilled labor irregularly engaged. There is no visible change in prospects of the textile lockout, as both employers and operatives refuse to make concessions, it is said.

THE FOURTH BIENNIAL CONGRESS of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom will be held in Washington, D. C., May 1-7, 1924.

SETTLEMENT OF THE TERMS of the Serbian war debt to the United States is the object of a delegation recently sent by the Yugoslav Government to the United States.

LEGISLATION RECENTLY PASSED by the Colombian Congress is one of the most noteworthy achievements in current international banking. A financial commission from the United States prepared and presented to the congress, within three months of its arrival in Bogota, reports leading to legislation which the Finance Minister of Colombia characterizes as "transcendental in importance." These new laws placed the Colombian currency upon the gold standard. They gave the Republic a new general banking law, conforming to the best modern practices in the United States and Europe. They provided for a system of banking supervision and control closely modeled on the system of New York State. Within the brief period of four days the new Bank of the Republic was founded, with an authorized capital of \$10,000,000. The new budget law is in harmony with best modern budgetary legislation. The Department of Fiscal Control is being organized under a capable Colombian controller, acting directly under the President. A member of the American commission is remaining in Bogota in an advisory capacity and will help put in operation a modern accounting system.

POULTRY RAISING IN BELGIUM has developed considerably since the armistice, owing partly to the fact that nearly all the fowls in the country were killed or taken away during the war. The comparatively high price of chickens and eggs has also stimulated the industry. Before the war eggs could be bought in Belgium at ten centimes each, while the present average price is one franc.

THE LAST SESSION of the legislative council of Bombay, India, adopted measures for mitigating the hardships of the "untouchables." Recently a meeting of the depressed classes was held in Bombay, and it was resolved to request the government to affix boards at public places, such as law courts, schools, dispensaries, tanks, wells, and so on, to enable the

members of the depressed classes to take advantage of the resolution passed in the last session of the legislative council. It is satisfactory to note that some Hindu religious leaders are giving their earnest attention to relieving the disabilities of the "untouchables."

THE PAN AMERICAN PEDAGOGICAL CONGRESS, which is to meet at Santiago, Chile, in September, 1925, is already in process of organization. It is intended to be truly representative of the ideals of the twenty-one democracies of the New World. A writer in the *Pan American Union Bulletin* outlines the purposes of the conference as follows: "How best to advance knowledge in every field; how best to diffuse and apply the knowledge so gained; how to promote progress and still to conserve the finer simplicities and humanities of life; how best to utilize all that is most valuable in the common experience and effort; in brief, how best to develop and perfect that American civilization which is to shed light where before was darkness and to find a safe foothold in the road toward American—and world—peace and unity; these are the real problems which confront such significant gatherings as the Pan American Pedagogical Conference."

A NORWEGIAN COMPANY recently established two direct steamship lines to Colombian ports. One runs from Montreal, Canada, and the other from Antwerp.

A CENTRAL AMERICAN AIR-MAIL CONFERENCE was held in Guatemala City on October 29. A contract was presented by the Central American Aviation Co., discussed by the representatives of the five countries assembled, and taken back to the governments interested for further examination.

THE LATVIAN PRIME MINISTER, speaking at a gathering of journalists, states that previous to the Conference of the Baltic Border States at Warsaw and Kovno, a conference will take place at Riga in which Soviet delegates will take part. The main subject of discussion will be a Russo-Latvian treaty, the terms of which have been drafted by the Moscow Government. The proposed treaty provides for mutual neutrality in case of attack from a third party, for a guarantee of existing interstate frontiers, for freedom of transit trade, and for neutrality as regards

the internal affairs of Germany. In view of the importance of the proposals put forward by the Soviet Government, Latvia has decided to place these matters before the other Border States for discussion.

DANISH AGRICULTURE is, on the whole, in a favorable condition at the beginning of the year. In spite of the fact that prices for feed and much of the fertilizer used have risen during 1923, it is calculated that the net revenue from capital invested in farming has increased considerably as compared with the year 1922. Wages remained stationary until November 16, 1923, when by agreement they were increased 10 per cent. The exchange situation is not so encouraging.

THE RUSSIAN RED CROSS celebrated on November 20, 1923, its sixth anniversary since its reorganization on a working-class basis. Since November, 1918, its activities may be divided into four periods: First, a period of civil and foreign war; second, the famine, third, the post-famine period, and, fourth, the present, when it has turned its activities entirely to peaceful tasks. It is spending much energy combating tuberculosis and other menaces to health.

TRAFFIC THROUGH THE PANAMA CANAL for the year 1923 was greater than in any previous year. The increase over 1922 was 68 per cent in the number of ships, 90 per cent in tonnage, and cargo 84 per cent. Tolls collected in 1923 amounted to \$33,966,838, an increase of 83 per cent over the previous year.

THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT IS CONTEMPLATING a project for the construction of a railroad from Algeria, across the Sahara Desert, to the Niger River. When this road is in operation it will permit of subsequent extension to Tchad and the Congo.

THE EFFECT OF THE RUHR OCCUPATION on Netherland commerce is shown in a decrease of 19 per cent in the tonnage through Rotterdam in each direction for the first nine months of 1923 as compared with the same period the previous year.

IN AN EFFORT TO HELP promote international good will, the National Kindergarten Association, 8 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y., is sending free of charge its weekly

articles on "Home Education" to every newspaper and magazine, located in any part of the world, which desires to print them. They are now being sent by request to twenty-six foreign countries.

PEAT MINING is rapidly gaining in importance in Germany, owing to the loss of pit-coal districts in the eastern and western parts of the country. A law has been drafted in the State of Prussia regulating the working of peat areas and embodying about the same regulations as the law of December 11, 1920, relative to the exploitation of bituminous coal.

MARKETS OF ALL SORTS in India depend to an appreciable extent on the success or failure of the monsoon. Good monsoons mean good crop yields, which in turn improve the purchasing power of India's millions. The country has now enjoyed three good monsoons in succession, and while the inability of Europe to purchase its surplus crop yields at fair prices has somewhat deterred its prosperity, there has been a general improvement of living conditions of the masses throughout the land, and the good monsoon of the present year will further improve the condition of the people in 1924.

THE NEWLY APPOINTED AMBASSADOR TO ITALY is Henry P. Fletcher, now ambassador to Belgium. He will succeed Richard Washburn Child, who some time ago asked, for personal reasons, to be relieved from diplomatic duty. Mr. Child's record, especially during the two Lausanne conferences, has received much favorable comment. Mr. Fletcher is one of the most experienced American diplomats, having been in the foreign service since 1902. His first post was secretaryship to the legation at Cuba. Since that time he has served in China, Portugal, China again, Chile, and in 1916 he was appointed ambassador to Mexico, where he served during the turbulent times until he resigned, in February, 1920, to become Undersecretary of State.

"THERE CAN BE NO QUESTION about any proposals to reopen the settlement of the British debt to America," said Premier MacDonald in the House of Commons, February 18. "The British Government having accepted the terms of settlement," he said, "the matter is closed."

AN ANGLO-POLISH COMMERCIAL AGREEMENT was signed at Warsaw, November 26, 1923, to become effective 15 days after the exchange of ratifications and to be binding for one year from the date of coming into force, and if not terminated at that time by three months' notice of such intention by either party, until the expiration of three months from the date of denunciation. Reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment is accorded by the contracting parties in all matters relating to commerce, navigation, industry, and the exercise of professions, and applies to all that concerns importation, exportation, customs duties and formalities, carriage and transit, the carrying out of commercial operations, and the establishment of the subjects or citizens of either contracting party in the territories of the other.

CHILE NOW HAS AN INCOME TAX established through the passage and the putting into effect of the income-tax law as of January 1. This law marks a new departure in the tax system of Chile, and its passage has been under serious discussion in the Chilean Congress for many years.

LETTER BOX

OAK PARK, ILL., Jan. 25, 1924.

GENTLEMEN :

Your communication addressed to my husband, Dr. Phillip S. Moxom, was forwarded to me here. Dr. Moxom passed on to higher work last August. Knowing, as I do, how earnestly he has worked for a world peace, I have longed to send you some of his own words to show that his vote would be one of approval for any plan which would bring the United States into closer participation in world affairs.

Today I found a report of an extemporaneous speech that he made before the Twentieth Century Club of Boston the last time he was there, about a year ago. These words are just what I wanted to send to you :

"I believe," he said, "that our opportunity,

our resources, and our power lay upon us a supreme obligation to take our part in the problems of the world, and not simply in the problems of local politics, and that we owe it to ourselves to have a share in bringing about the better day in Europe and Asia.

"We need morally and materially to dispel the horrible illusion expressed by the phrase 'America first.' We can no more live alone; for to live alone is to be accursed. To do our duty is to exert the great power we have attained and to apply our enormous wealth and greatly diffused intelligence, in taking our place by the side of the best minds of other peoples and in working with them for the emancipation of humanity from the superstitions and the old habits and memories of bloody wars, to the bringing of the world out into the sunlight of peace.

"Great changes are coming, and they must come through the recognition by the American mind of America's supreme obligations, because of its supreme opportunity and its outstanding power."

I hope this is not too late to do its work for the great cause.

Sincerely yours,

JESSIE DAGGETT MOXOM
(MRS. PHILIP STAFFORD MOXOM.)

DRESDEN, GERMANY, Dec. 28, 1923.

DEAR SIR :

I am always glad to receive the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, and I thank you very much for sending it all the year we finish now. I show many articles to my friends and other persons. Sometimes I send a few lines, translated and drawn from the *ADVOCATE*, to a newspaper.

The peace movement highly needs support in Germany. It was in a *gut stand* a year ago, but now it is to be deplored, there is a change for the worse. The cause of it lies certainly in many mistakes of our politics, but the French could do much more for the world peace with a little more generosity.

For better sentiments I reckon upon the youth, especially the youth in the elementary schools. There will grow up a new generation, with more sense for peaceful interstanding between nations than there is to be found in most of the grown-up people of today.

Sincerely yours,

O. WAGNER.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE INEXCUSABLE LIE. By *Harold R. Peat* ("Private Peat"). New York, Barse and Hopkins. Pp. 186. Price, \$1.50.

It is encouraging to find another of the old truths about the causes of war freshly discovered and hotly argued. Private Peat has found that children are alike the world over, and that hatred has to be taught. The war has demonstrated to him that the great lie, the inexcusable lie, continually taught to children is that war is glorious and the soldier is to be emulated.

He looks down his own past to find the beginning of the lie for him; he looks over the world today and finds where it is now being perpetuated. Through rushing and indignant chapters he follows them—these lies.

Will any sculptor mold the pitiful figure of what is left of a wounded soldier—legless, armless, blind, gibbering in insanity, with horribly mutilated features? What city will put on such a picture its bronze tablet with gilded letters, "Encourage youth to emulate"?

And also with medals. "Give us medals; give us awards; . . . but to the youth tell the truth, . . . that every medal means another, another, another, and yet another dead man, . . . horribly dead, . . . done to death, . . . murdered. . . . I do not deride the war hero. I do not grudge him the prominence earned and deserved—more greatly deserved than any civilian can know; but his very eminence lifts war to a pinnacle with him, where the filthy institution has no right, alongside honorable men. If heroes and war cannot be thought of separately, then scrap both. The heroic veteran will be acquiescent; . . . more, he will be pleased. He fought to end wars."

Through education, then, from six to fourteen—those pathetic, helpless years, "when our progenitors do to us what they will"—Mr. Peat would have the authorities definitely plan to eradicate the age-long propagation of a lie. History must be unbiassed by so-called patriotism; it must be truthful history. Hero-worship should be of the great constructive geniuses of whatever race; there

should be a comprehension of the brotherhood of man. In religion, images should be shown of the Christ in the market-place, the friendly, virile helper of men—a Christ which a live youth will wish to emulate.

Every man of common honesty and decency wishes to leave a world better for posterity. "We, ourselves," he says, "have started with a handicap. . . . Life has come to us unfiled and unlisted. Yet there is no excuse. . . . Our knowledge has been bought bitterly. We know war." Therefore the author concludes that it is our task to see that the race is re-created spiritually, that the blind echoing of old lies is stopped, and the new generation is given a chance to win the accolade of peace.

GOOD READING FOR CHILDREN

By M. W. S. CALL

Parents and other educators are wondering, in these troublous times, how they can modify the education of the youth of the world so that the generations, as they rise, shall be less and less disposed to war.

We are told that, among other mistakes, we have given the child wrong ideals through his reading; that there is a great preponderance of war matter in our hero tales and histories. Yet wars have happened in history, and, hideous though war is, self-sacrifice and courage have been shown by soldiers. Evidently our juvenile literature has been untrue to fact, in that it has not maintained a truthful balance between war and peace literature. It has been said that the most significant facts in history have not been in the great cataclysms. But, recognizing the youth's taste for thrills, we have somehow written as if only battles were thrilling. It would be truer, as well as wiser, if the bulk of his reading were at least non-military in its appeal.

It is of no possible use, however, to dress up for a normal child "wax works of high moral principles." Artificiality offends him at once, and he is instantly immune to all that we would teach him.

The first requisite of any child's literature is that it be literature. That which is pompously or amateurishly written will not impinge upon his imagination and become a vital force.

The next consideration is that the book shall be true; that is, if it narrates facts, it should give them in proper balance. It should not be necessary, for instance, in order

to rouse interest in the home-land, to vilify other nations. The spirit of boastfulness is essentially untrue. If the book is a work of imagination, it should still ring true, not so much as to material facts as to psychological and moral truth.

The third requisite for any worth-while book is that it be suitable to the child on the basis of his age and interests. If it has no appeal, if it does not associate itself with other things he knows and likes, he will not re-read the book, talk about it, and lend it to his mates. He will do all those things if the book vitally serves him.

When these three requisites of good juvenile literature are complied with, we may choose all we can find of hero tales in science, exploration, social leadership, or whatever is inspiring—including histories that tell of everyday life and adventure. No parent would take away Robin Hood, King Arthur, or the romances of Scott. Chivalry, however, contains much of bloodthirstiness as well as idealism. It must, in modern times, be balanced by stories of life among the people. Mark Twain, philosopher as well as humorist, sent out his "Connecticut Yankee" for that purpose.

Then there is national priggishness to avoid, that self-satisfaction so beautifully satirized in the little poem by Robert L. Stevenson, which ends

"Little Turk or Japanese,

Oh, don't you wish that you were me?"

To cultivate appreciation for other races than our own, there are folk tales, travel stories, and stories staged in other lands.

There is a great field of interest in science told for young folk, a field broadening every day. Allied to this is out-of-door adventure, with its nature lore, animal stories, and fables.

Well-chosen fairy tales have often great truth and beauty, and there are a few great parables liked by children.

The following list of fairly recent books is not meant to be exhaustive. It is merely to suggest a few of the good things already in the market. Their number will increase more rapidly, the more a peace-loving public asks for them.

HEROES OF THE FARTHEST NORTH AND FARTHEST SOUTH. By *Kennedy Maclean*. Revised by J. Walker McSpadden. Thomas Crowell, New York. Pp. 288. Price, \$1.75.

Here are thrills and suspense, daring, perseverance, and intelligence enough to take the place of any war tale. Beginning with the year 890 and continuing until 1922, the strenuous search for the poles and their final discovery is graphically told.

A DUTCH BOY FIFTY YEARS AFTER. By *Edward Bok*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 217. Price, \$0.80.

This is adapted from the *Americanization of Edward Bok*, which recently won the Pulitzer prize as "the best American biography teaching patriotic and unselfish service to the nation." The children's edition suffers little because of its condensation. A story of an every-day boy (with, maybe, a little more than every-day character) making his way in his adopted country, that is the book. Perhaps the secret of its success, both as a life and as a story, lies in the precept of the grandmother, so faithfully followed, "Make the world a bit more beautiful and better because you have been in it."

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By *John Bunyan*. Abridged by *Edith Freelove Smith*. Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston. Pp. 152. Price, \$1.50.

This modern edition retains the quaint, vigorous language of the 17th century, but omits the doctrinal theology, which is inappropriate to the present day or to children. The idea of combat is not avoided. Indeed, among the many lively silhouette illustrations, that of Apollyon is most rampantly dramatic. But it would be a very dull little boy, indeed, who would miss the spiritual allegory when he reads the story of the fight between Christian and Apollyon. Giants, dungeons, and perils of all sorts beset the hero. No Knight of the Round Table ever came through more dangers with honor and credit than does the Pilgrim. No fairy tale ever ended more happily. Incidentally, Pilgrim's Progress is a classic every educated person should know.

EARLY CANDLELIGHT STORIES. By *Stella C. Shetter*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 250.

Stories of every-day adventure from the long ago, of the sort that all real children love, are these which Grandmother tells. There is a strong ethical content in the book, but little readers will not know it. It will be imbibed like wholesome milk and eggs in

the daily diet. And is not this, after all, the best way to be nourished?

A HISTORY OF EVERY-DAY THINGS IN ENGLAND, 1066-1799. By *Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 208. Price, \$5.00.

In this two-volume book the political history is merely outlined in parallel columns at the beginning of each century. Then follow charmingly written chapters, enriched with striking drawings and colored illustrations of costumes, castles, churches, mills, ships, coaches, toys, and games. A windmill from an early century has its outer wall removed so any boy can see how the wheels went round. Children in quaint dress are shown playing at "Hot Cockles" or some other old game, all of which is explained in the text, so a modern child may learn to play it if he likes. A 13th century family is shown gathered about the fire in the great hall of the manor house, or castle. Anecdotes, too, are sprinkled in where they fit, and altogether any child fond of romance or history will find here the setting for much of it.

LADY GREEN SATIN AND HER MAID ROSETTE. By *the Baroness des Chesnes*. Macmillan Co., New York. Pp. 275. Price, \$2.00.

This little tale, beloved by many French children of a past generation, has been recently translated and published in this country. It follows the fortunes of a small peasant boy with such sympathy and imagination that Jean Paul, his itinerant show of white mice, and his simple adventures in thrift and friendship are very real and living. France will always be one of the home-lands to the child who pores over this book.

WISP: A GIRL OF DUBLIN. By *Katherine Adams*. Macmillan & Co., New York. Pp. 309. Price, \$2.00.

The writer of this wholesome story for girls in their 'teens knows her Ireland, but she avoids any political slant in picturing it. The place and the people are made lovable. Miss Adams has also written a book with its setting in Paris, and another in a Swedish background. This sort of book, when well done, is invaluable in giving young readers a feeling of familiarity with other lands.

AFRICAN ADVENTURES. By *Jean Kenyon Mackenzie*. George H. Doran Co., New York. Pp. 182. Price, \$1.25.

Adults who have read Jean Mackenzie's delightful African sketches in the *Atlantic Monthly* will gladly give this intimate picture of the African child-mind to their children. The piquancy of life and customs so different from their own, combined with the essential similarity of human relations the world over, will hold the young reader's attention all the way through. The story of Livingstone is embodied in the tale. The author has strikingly preserved in her language the unconscious poetry, which is a natural gift of the African negro. It is dedicated to the children of Christian missionaries.

FAIRY TALES FROM BRAZIL. By *Elsie Spicer Ecls*. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. Pp. 210. Price, \$1.50.

This delightful collection of folk-tales is written by the wife of a superintendent of schools in Bahia. They are in easy, vigorous English—stories simple enough for very little folk, but entertaining enough for any one. Nearly all animal tales, they come from the folk-lore of Indian, African, and Portuguese peoples.

JAPANESE FAIRY TALES. By *Teresa Pierce Williston*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 74.

To interest little folk in the stories of Japanese children, this is the best book we have seen. "Our practical little Jonathans and Columbias," says the author, "need a touch of the imagination and poetry embodied in these tales, which have been treasured through hundreds of years by the little ones of Japan." Mr. Ogawa, a native Japanese artist, has lavishly scattered beautiful illustrations in color through the book.

GREEN WILLOW AND OTHER FAIRY TALES. By *Grace James*. Macmillan & Co., New York. Pp. 231. Price, \$2.50.

These Japanese stories, though clothed in simple language, will hardly be useful for young folk below the later 'teens. For the more adult, the poetry, humor, and sadness will be interpretive of the Orient. It is a beautiful volume, with exquisite illustrations in soft colors.

JOHNNY BLOSSOM. By *Dikken Zwelgmeyer*. Translated from the Norwegian by *Emilie Poulsson*. Pilgrim Press, New York. Pp. 163.

There is so much of the universal, genuine boy in this story that it cannot fail to enthrall young American readers. Johnny is a right-minded, "square" little chap, with a normal propensity for getting into scrapes. Something is always happening. When sudden wealth descends upon the lad, his parents wisely manage to protect him from the disintegrating effects of sudden power. He just goes on in his simple, unpretentious way. Without the cloying sweetness of Pollyanna or Ceddie Errol, Johnny is, nevertheless, a warm and wholesome little comrade for those who read his story.

THE STRANGE ADVENTURES OF A PEBBLE. By *Hallam Hawksworth*. Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 296. Price, \$1.20.

Children really like this science book. It does not matter to them in the least that adults call it a physiography. There are many pictures to arrest the eye and rouse a question. The story of the earth is told in plain, lively language. You know from the way it runs that Mr. Hawksworth is thrilled with the whole subject himself, and, what is more to the point, that he understands modern boys and girls. There is a chapter for each month in the year, and at the end of each a chatty appendix called "Hide and Seek in the Library."

WINGS AND STINGS. By *Agnes McClelland Daulton*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 203.

Through the form of gay stories, the author successfully gives to dry scientific facts the breath of out-of-doors. Her object is not only to teach facts as such, but, what is far more important, to help children think of insects, birds, and blossoms as kinsfolk. It is a book for younger readers.

JOCK OF THE BUSHVELD. By *Sir Percy Fitzpatrick*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

This is a well-told and thrilling story of a dog and his master in hair-raising adventures in Africa.

THE WONDERFUL ADVENTURES OF NILS. By *Selma Lagerlöf*. Translated by Velma Swanston Howard. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. Pp. 430. Price, \$2.00.

Here is an author who seems akin to flowers, birds, animals, sea, and childhood, speaking the language of them all.

She was commissioned, in 1906, by the Association of School Teachers in Sweden, to write a book on that country for primary schools. This happy mingling of elves, geography, adventure, and ethics is the result. It has proved quite irresistible, not only to little people, but to their elders as well.

Soon after writing this book, Miss Lagerlöf was awarded, in 1909, the Nobel prize for literature.

Other Juvenile Books Received

HEROES AND GREATHEARTS AND THEIR ANIMAL FRIENDS. By *John T. Dale*. D. C. Heath Co., Boston. Pp. 240.

PANAMA AND ITS BRIDGE OF WATER. By *Stella Humphrey Nida*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 208.

GOD'S TROUBADOUR: THE STORY OF SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By *Sophie Jewett*. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York. Pp. 185. Price, \$2.00.

THE KING OF IRELAND'S SON. By *Padraic Colum*. New York, Macmillan & Co. Pp. 316. Price, \$2.20.

THE CHILDREN OF ANCIENT ROME. By *L. Lamprey*. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. Pp. 262. Price, \$1.50.

THE CHILDREN OF ANCIENT BRITAIN. By *L. Lamprey*. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. Pp. 225. Price, \$1.50.

A CHILD'S STORY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE. By *Algernon Tassin* and *Arthur B. Maurice*. Macmillan. New York. Pp. 353. Price, \$2.25.

THIS EARTH OF OURS. By *Jean Henri Fabre*. Translated by Percy F. Bicknell. Century Co., New York. Pp. 339. Price, \$2.50.

ANIMAL LIFE IN FIELD AND GARDEN. By *Jean Henri Fabre*. Translated by Florence C. Bicknell. Pp. 391. Price, \$2.50.

THE ADVENTURES OF MAYA, THE BEE. By *Waldemar Bonsels*. Thomas Seltzer, New York. Pp. 224. Price, \$3.00.

THE EARLY SEA PEOPLE. By *Katherine Dopp*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 224.

THE EARLY HERDSMEN. By *Katherine Dopp*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 231.

THE STORY OF CHAUCER'S CANTERBURY PILGRIMS RETOLD FOR CHILDREN. Edited by *Katherine Lee Bates*. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. Pp. 316.

For Debaters

Permanent Court of International Justice

JULIA E. JOHNSEN, Compiler

AFFIRMATIVE

—— and ——

N E G A T I V E

ARGUMENTS

—— and ——

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Price 90 Cents

Any Book on
International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

ADVOCATE OF
PEACE
THROUGH JUSTICE

Advocate of Peace, published regularly since 1834—the oldest, largest, and most widely circulated peace magazine in the world.

Advocate of Peace is supported by men and women who believe in it. The subscription price of \$2.00 a year does not cover the cost of printing. The magazine is in no sense a money-making enterprise.

Advocate of Peace aims to interpret the problems of war and peace in the light of history, of science, and of international law.

Advocate of Peace is the official organ of the American Peace Society, with headquarters in Washington, founded by William Ladd in 1828. Its purpose is to promote a better international understanding.

American Peace Society

612, 13, 14 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 4

April, 1924

International Convention of 1787

Is Our Republic Declining?

Our Will To End War

Treaty Texts

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD..... 195

EDITORIALS

Federal Convention of 1787—Is It the Decline of Our Republic?—
America Finding Herself—The Government at Washington Still
Lives—Rift in the Financial Clouds of Europe—Interparliamentary
Union Next Year?—Another Prize—Sergius A. Korff—Editorial
Notes 197-206

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

Interparliamentary Union, Twenty-first Annual Meeting—As to Our
Freedom of Speech—Labor Government in Britain—The Makeup of
Soviet Russia—End of the Ottoman Caliphate..... 207-215

GENERAL ARTICLES

Recent Questions and Negotiations..... 216
By the Secretary of State

The Will to End War..... 228
By Arthur Deerin Call

Food and Peace around the Pacific..... 238
By Alexander Hume Ford

America and Japan—An Appeal..... 240
By Baron Yoshiro Sakatani

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

Mr. Hoover on Monopolies..... 243

Text Pan American Treaty..... 244

Text Franco-Czechoslovakia Treaty..... 247

NEWS IN BRIEF..... 248

BOOK REVIEWS..... 253

Vol. 86

APRIL, 1924

No. 4

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, Miami, Florida.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, former President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Lawyer, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES L. SLAYDEN**, Member Council Inter-parliamentary Union, San Antonio, Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, *ex officio*.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *ex officio*.

GEORGE W. WHITE, *ex officio*.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, University, Alabama.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

WALTER A. MORGAN, M. A., 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., 808 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, President Fairmont Seminary, Washington, D. C.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 West 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chaffonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., 30 Koun Machi, Mita Shiba, Tokyo, Japan.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

Pres. WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, Bloomington, Ind.

GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. H. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Esq., Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

Mrs. PHILIP N. MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

* Emeritus. ** Died February 24, 1924.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective: and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

APRIL, 1924

NUMBER
4

EDITORIALS

FEDERAL CONVENTION

MAY-SEPTEMBER 1787

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ADEQUATE TO ITS PURPOSE

HISTORY SIGNIFICANCE DOC-
UMENTS RELATING TO ONE
SUCCESSFUL INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATION—

The United States of America

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF OUR REPUBLIC?

THE contribution by the United States of America to the science of government lies in the fact that we are a Union of free, sovereign, independent States, "an indestructible Union of indestructible States," a federation of sovereign units, a dual government, a Union with powers specifically delegated to it by the States, a Union with power to deal directly with its citizens without violence to the sovereignty of the States. That, with a rather elaborate system of checks and balances, is the contribution of the United States to political science.

As pointed out by Professor Burgess,* there began about 1898—the year of the Spanish-American War—the development of new processes, threatening to undermine the foundations of our political fabric. Before that period we of America had prided ourselves upon a few definite principles of government. We believed that, under the Union which had been set up in 1787, our central government was the agent of the people, and that political safety and progress can only lie along a path midway between too much and too little government. We believed that this middle course required that sovereignty must be less an attribute of the government than of the people; that our social safety rested upon "a government of laws

* "Recent Changes in American Constitutional Theory," by John W. Burgess, Columbia University Press.

FRIENDS of the United States Constitution will be interested to learn that 25,000 copies of this little book of 84 pages have been distributed. A new, revised and improved edition of 25,000 copies has just appeared from the press of Rand, McNally & Company, publishers. A brief review of the text appears elsewhere in these columns. It is clear from the interest already shown that the work meets a real demand. Parents, teachers, lecturers, historians, and writers speak of it in the highest terms. For one interested in the Constitution of the United States, in the nature of our Federal form of Union, in the ways of effective international conferences, in the possibilities of overcoming the fundamental difficulties facing the Powers of the world, here, in convenient form, at a merely nominal price, is an accurate and illuminating aid. One reading its pages will understand better the reasons behind the attitude of our United States toward the problems of foreign governments.

and not of men," by which we meant a government of men acting strictly under the law. We believed that there must be a minimum of central government and a maximum of self-government. We held that public office is a public trust. We insisted, also, with well-nigh a religious intensity, that we of America must avoid entanglements in the political feuds and broils of Europe, and that under no circumstances should foreign governments extend their colonies or systems in this hemisphere. At that time we viewed government as secondary. To quote from Professor Burgess, "We believed that the freedom of individual thought and expression, of individual initiative and invention, and the free interchange of the results of these great spiritual forces, are the powers which make for civilization, both local, national, and universal, while governmental interference through its orders, commands, directions, limitations, punishments, and wars has done much to restrain, rather than always to advance, the world's true prosperity."

No one can doubt that we have been abandoning more and more these ancient faiths. In certain respects we are today less a government of the people, by the people, for the people than we were thirty years ago. While we maintain as a principle that our government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, there are more powers exercised by the government without reference to the consent of the people than at any time in our history. We have not given up our principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity; but we have given up no little of the substance of each. The new taxing power of the government has brought us nearer to a compulsory socialism, to an exaggeration of government at the expense of liberty. What the government has done upon its own initiative, entering private homes without warrant, holding persons in confinement without due process of law,

could never have been suspected by the men who labored for the upbuilding of our Union through the previous generations. The centralization of power in Washington has become sufficiently great to cause one to recall the course of the Roman Empire.

There is another little book, "*Our Changing Constitution*,"* by Charles W. Pierson, which deals with this same unhappy tendency in our modern American life. This author finds a tendency among our people to lie down upon the Supreme Court as the sole upholder of the Constitution; this in spite of the fact that the duty to uphold the Constitution "rests upon all departments of government and, in the last analysis, upon the people themselves." The author grants that "change is inevitable," and that the Constitution must be adapted "to the conditions of the new age." He believes, however, that the men who framed the Constitution "were well advised when they sought to preserve the integrity of the States as a barrier against the aggressions and tyranny of the majority acting through a centralized power." Alexander Hamilton, arch defender of a strong central government, pleaded in the *Federalist* that the people may "always take care to preserve the constitutional equilibrium between the general and State governments." Mr. Pierson shows how Hamilton's plea has failed of realization. His book, not the product of so much care and experience as is that of Professor Burgess, is, however, the same kind of an argument against the increasing federal encroachment upon State power. He finds the leaven of socialistic ideas working. He sees that representative government is becoming more paternalistic. He senses that the impatience of the reformers endangers real reform.

Both of these books should be read widely. It is as important that we avoid the pit-

* Published by Doubleday, Page & Co.

falls ahead as that we engage in that favorite pastime of chasing the rainbow. Evidently, centralization cannot go on forever. Mr. Elihu Root, when Secretary of State, back in 1906, pointed out that "the true and only way to preserve State authority is to be found in the awakened conscience of the States, their broadened views and higher standard of responsibility to the general public; in effective legislation by the States, in conformity to the general moral sense of the country; and in the vigorous exercise for the general public good of that State authority which is to be preserved."

The truth in these words is the truth upon which we may all ponder unto the glory of our country.

AMERICA FINDING HERSELF

THE American people know that the pursuit of a policy for the sake of developing the policy is indefensible. No policy should become an end in itself. To pursue policies for their own sakes is to pursue trivial things of secondary importance. To follow in the wake of a policy does not appear to be an adequate program for the avoidance of war. If we in America have seemed to the friends of this or that policy to be isolationists, it has been in no small degree because of this fact. When confronted with the proposal that we adopt a policy of becoming one of a permanent foreign organization, agreeing in advance to assume responsibilities in situations the nature of which we cannot foresee, we refuse. We Americans find it impossible to accept an international organization of a number of men dominated by representatives of a few great Powers to control the foreign policies of the world. We steadily refuse to abandon our faith in a government of laws rather than in a government of men; in the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We were not interested

to join in any scheme to perpetuate conditions as they were, either at the time of the Holy Alliance of 1815, or of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. We find it impossible to become enthusiastic to join a league with power to coerce recalcitrant States by force of arms, including, as it must, the power to wage war against any State, including the United States. So far, we have not been quick to give up our civil control of our military, or our open direction of our foreign affairs. We still insist upon the equality of States before the law, and we are not disposed to accept any international organization dominated by the few. It is perfectly clear to us that the moment we take sides in any political broil of Europe we will by that act whittle away a large share of our influence in that portion of the world. We know that the moment we join a superstate, we by that act cease to be independent. We believe in political science and in constitutional law, and we believe that neither of these would be advanced by subordinating our constitutional independence to any outside organization. In short, America is more resolved today than at any time since the war to keep out of the political broils and feuds in other parts of the world. We shall probably accept no policy which would permanently entangle us with such feuds and broils.

On the other hand, we are probably more ready today than at any time since 1920 to render service in any international situation where such service will be acceptable and worth while. This will be particularly true should we find it to our interest thus to help; not because of a fixed policy, but because of our inherent American pragmatism.

In other words, as pointed out by William Hard in the *Nation* of March 19, "this natural combination of reasonable aloofness and of reasonable inclusiveness is now returning to Washington after having been artificially split for some time into its

two component parts, with each part carried to an absurd extreme. . . . As the Senate becomes more radical it becomes more and more disinclined to join in any scheme for the indeterminate perpetuation of the European spoils of the late European conflict."

While today we of America are less inclined, perhaps, than ever to believe that it is our duty to run about the world in uncertain attempts "to settle everything everywhere," on the other hand we are extending our participation in concrete international situations where it seems to be warranted by a definable demand, in matters of international finance, trade, human suffering, or social welfare. The French have a saying: "*Garde toi et Dieu te gardera.*" "Discontent," said Emerson, "is the want of self-reliance; it is infirmity of will."

Writing in the *Federalist*, John Jay, particularly concerned to defend the desirability of the Union contemplated by our Constitution, and its advantages in relation to the nations abroad, pointed out that foreign nations will know and view our situation in America "exactly as it is; and they will act toward us accordingly. If they see that our national government is efficient and well administered, our trade prudently regulated, our militia properly organized and disciplined, our resources and finances discreetly managed, our credit re-established, our people free, contented, and united, they will be much more disposed to cultivate our friendship than provoke our resentment." Otherwise, if they find us divided into parts, "one inclining to Britain, another to France, and a third to Spain, and perhaps played off against each other by the three, what a poor, pitiful figure will America make in their eyes! How liable would she become not only to contempt, but to their outrage; and how soon would dearly bought experience proclaim that when a people or a family so divide, it never fails to be against themselves."

America, becoming increasingly herself again, stands more and more by the things which are peculiarly hers, extending her hand here and there wherever she sees her hand may really help.

THE GOVERNMENT AT WASHINGTON STILL LIVES

SHARP criticism of the government in a democracy is inevitable and usually helpful. The secret of safety with a people such as ours lies in a pitiless publicity and free discussion. Criticism clears the air for the one who criticizes and drives the criticized to wholesome self-examination.

Just now there is an unusual amount of criticism. This is probably due to an unusual number of reasons for such criticism. Washington is full of investigating committees. Feelings are running high. Two outstanding facts appear: there has evidently been dishonesty in the conduct of certain public affairs; this dishonesty is being hunted out, if not always with the best of judicial temper, yet with admirable industry. Every healthy American wants the guilty to be tried and convicted.

Our firm belief is that nowhere in the world is there a government freer from corruption than the Government of the United States. Average the legislative, executive, judicial departments; look upon that average, and the marvel of our modern world is the height and purity of that average. There are in the Congress 96 Senators and 435 Representatives; total, 531. All of these men have been elected to their offices by the votes of the people whom they represent. Any man or any woman can compete for one of these offices. As they stand, they represent the chosen 531, each one of them as intelligent as his constituents deserve. We know of no body of an equal number that ranks higher in intelligence, be it a group of lawyers, ministers, doctors, engineers,

social workers, or peace advocates. From what we know and hear of them, they are, in matters of public concern, clean as hounds' teeth; not entirely because they are morally better than the rest of us, but in part because they are watching each other with an intensity unequalled in any other similar group. A crook in the Congress is short-lived. The light beating upon our public men is a very bright light. A member of the Senate or of the House faithless to his trust is despised probably more by his fellow-members than by his constituents.

We of America will keep everlastingly at the business of improving our government, but just now it is proper to remind ourselves that God reigns and the government at Washington still lives.

THE RIFT IN THE FINANCIAL CLOUDS OF EUROPE

THE financial world has been disturbed because of the recent fall in the value of the French franc. It was announced, under date of March 12, that J. P. Morgan & Company, bankers, had established a credit of not less than \$100,000,000 in favor of the Bank of France. The loan is said to be fully secured by gold held in the vaults of the Bank of France. We understand this to be the first foreign government credit that has been arranged in this country. The only similar banking operation was the credit extended to the British Government during the war, in which British-owned American securities were pledged as collateral.

The immediate result of the operation was a marked rally in the price of the French franc. The financial world breathed more easily. Stock quotations rose on the various exchanges.

The loan, however, has not made everybody happy. Senator Shipstead, speaking in the Senate, remarked: "It will be interesting to know what effect this loan to the imperial government of M. Poincaré

will have in getting us into the next war." Economists, with their unyielding figures, find it difficult to see how such a loan can be more than a temporary help. The French budget presents colossal difficulties still.

But leading financiers are hopeful. The French Senate has ratified the new taxation measures. There is evidence that Germany will be able to furnish more in the way of reparations than for some time has been supposed. Correspondents tell us of a new spirit, friendlier and more forward looking, in Europe. Mr. J. P. Morgan, visiting at Nice, March 18, is quoted by the Associated Press as saying:

"But France has taken the necessary steps to stabilize the situation in the face of all contingencies. We have absolute confidence, not only in the resources of your country, but even more in the intelligent and industrious population, which, after astonishing the world in the war, now is giving a magnificent example of how to win peace.

"If the ruling classes only make a similar effort, France soon will be invincible in the economic domain. In any case we shall always be at her side and sustain her when necessary, because we know we can count upon her as the champion of right.

"General Pershing, on stepping on the soil of France, said, 'Lafayette, we are here!' and behind him stood all America in arms. We have proved that the financial world, often represented as sunk into selfishness, can remember. My father showed it after the war of 1870, and it was with admirable unanimity that the big bankers of the United States answered the appeal to help you vanquish the coalition formed against the franc.

"Nothing justified a panic, for your national wealth has increased to formidable proportions during the past two years. But your enemies counted upon succeeding in shaking the confidence of the country. There were then in existence more than 60,000,000,000 francs in treasury and credit national bonds payable at short notice, without any other means of meeting them than by recourse to the printing press. When a country embarks on that course, it is impossible.

"When we saw with what confidence your country resisted that attack, and that instead of imitating Germany, when the mark began to drop, all citizens of France accepted the necessary sacrifices, we were proud of our former comrades in arms.

"Let France continue in this course, and before two years have elapsed she will have conquered, from the economic viewpoint, the preponderating situation she enjoyed before the war. I shall be sincerely happy, for I love your country, which is beautiful, industrious, and honest.

"Yes, honest," Mr. Morgan added with a smile. "Even the hotel business, which occasionally is subject to calumny."

SHALL THE INTERPARLIAMEN- TARY UNION MEET IN THE UNITED STATES NEXT YEAR?

SHALL the Interparliamentary Union meet in the United States in 1925? The answer to this question should be, Yes.

The Interparliamentary Union has not met in the United States since 1904. Since that time twenty of our delegates from the United States Congress have been entertained at Brussels in 1905; 8 at London, 1906; 8 at Berlin, 1908; 4 at Brussels, 1910; 4 at Geneva, 1912; 7 at The Hague, 1913; 8 at Stockholm, 1921; 9 at Vienna, 1922, and 10 at Copenhagen, 1923. Our Congress realized in 1914 that the time had come for our American group to be the host again to this international body of parliamentarians, and it passed an act requesting the President to extend an invitation to the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1915 in the city of Washington, and in the same act there was carried an appropriation to defray the expenses of the conference.

The facts are set forth in a joint resolution introduced by Representative Temple, of Pennsylvania, a vice-president of the American group and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, known as

House Joint Resolution 204. The resolution reads:

"Requesting the President to Invite the Interparliamentary Union to Meet in Washington City in 1925, and Authorizing an Appropriation to Defray the Expenses of the Meeting.

"Whereas the Congress, in an act approved June 30, 1914, requested the President to extend an invitation to the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1915 in the city of Washington, and in the same act appropriated the sum of \$40,000 to defray the expenses of the said meeting; and

"Whereas when the World War led to repeated postponements of the said meeting the Congress repeatedly extended the appropriation: First, the act of July 1, 1916, extended it and made it available for the calendar years, 1916 and 1917; second, the act of March 3, 1917, extended the appropriation and made it available for the calendar year 1918; third, the act of April 15, 1918, extended the appropriation and made it available for the calendar year 1919; and

"Whereas this appropriation repeatedly extended has lapsed, and no part of it having been expended, and the meeting thus arranged for in Washington City has not been held: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That the President be requested to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1925 in the city of Washington.

"SEC. 2. That for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to said meeting the appropriation of \$50,000, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, is hereby authorized."

Here is an opportunity for our Congress to render needed service to the cause of a better international understanding. Nothing but good could follow such a foregathering of leading European statesmen in Washington. Such a conference, like all similar conferences heretofore, would accomplish benefits in two directions: it

would acquaint not only the Congress, but our American people generally, with many problems of other nations, which problems are for the most part wholly unfamiliar to us of the Western Hemisphere; it would show to statesmen of Europe, Asia, and Africa, as would be possible in no other way, the abundant good will and desire to know which are qualities characteristic of our people.

By the time of such a conference, preferably, we should say, in October, our political atmosphere will have greatly cleared. Our presidential election will have left our statesmen ready to undertake constructive international policies. All the members of our Congress will be especially glad to welcome new acquaintances among the statesmen from abroad. There will be many questions to ask on both sides. The need for intimate counsel will be general. The picture of the American Congress acting handsomely as the host to the members of the various parliaments of the world, in the month of October, at the capital of our nation, presents a challenge of unusual importance, particularly at this period of human history.

ANOTHER PRIZE

WE NOW have an offer of a prize of \$6,000 for the best book "on the connection, relation and mutual bearing of any practical science, or the history of our race, or the facts in any department of knowledge, with and upon the Christian religion." This prize is known as the "Bross Prize," which Lake Forest University, of Lake Forest, Illinois, is enabled to offer on the foundation established in 1876. Under the terms fixed by the donor, "The offer must be open to the scientific men, the Christian philosophers, and historians of all nations." The object in endowing this memorial to his son was set forth by William Bross as follows: "To

call out the best efforts of the highest talent and the ripest scholarship of the world, to illustrate from science or any department of knowledge, and to demonstrate, the divine origin and the authority of the Christian Scriptures; and, further, to show how both science and revelation coincide, and to prove the existence, the providence, or any or all of the attributes of the only living and true God infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth."

The first Decennial Prize on the Bross Foundation, assigned in 1905, was awarded to Prof. James Orr, D. D., of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, for his treatise on "The Problem of the Old Testament." The next prize was awarded, in 1915, to Rev. Thomas James Thorburn, D. D., LL. D., Hastings, England, for his book, "The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels," which has been published as Volume VIII of the Bross library.

This, the third Decennial Prize, will be given to the author of the best book—on the lines indicated—which may be presented on or before January 1, 1925. The manuscript, accompanied by a sealed envelope containing the name of the writer, must be sent on or before the above date, addressed to the President of Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois. It is requested that no manuscripts be sent on or before October 1, 1924. Sufficient postage should be enclosed for the return of the manuscripts. Three type-written copies of each manuscript must be submitted. If the author prefers to submit his manuscript in printed form, he is permitted to do so. In this case the proof-sheets must be anonymous; the book must not be published until the award is made; the author must arrange with his prospective publisher to transfer the copyright of his book to the Trustees of Lake Forest University if he is awarded the Bross Prize.

The regulations governing the competition are as follows:

"1. Three typewritten or printed copies of each manuscript must be submitted.

"2. Books by foreign authors must be presented in English translation.

"3. The copyright of the book to which the prize is awarded shall be the property of the "Trustees" of Lake Forest University.

"4. Manuscripts must have a minimum length of fifty thousand words.

"5. If any writer desires to submit more than one book in competition for the prize, he is at liberty to do so.

"6. Material already published shall be used only in the case that it be a small portion of a projected work, which shall be developed into a larger or broader treatise for the purpose of this competition, or some pamphlet containing the germ of a larger work, expanded into a treatise for the purpose of this competition.

"7. The decision as to the eligibility of any book shall rest with the committee of judges."

Here is a prize that will appeal to the world's best men and women. Once again, and on a high plane, the spirit of idealism is to be promoted by the golden spur of self-interest.

BARON SERGIUS A. KORFF

BARON SERGIUS A. KORFF, Professor of Russian History in Columbia University, lecturer at Johns Hopkins and Georgetown Universities, frequent contributor to the columns of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, died suddenly at his home, in Washington, March 7, at the age of forty-eight. It is difficult to speak within measure of this bright, scholarly gentleman, realizing as we must, that we are to sit with him no more. Educated at the University of Petrograd, he belonged to the intellectual liberal group of Russia. He was at one time Professor of Russian Law and History at the University of Helsingfors, Finland, and at the Women's University, Petrograd, Rus-

sia. His wife, daughter of our Admiral W. K. Van Reypen, and two children survive him. He was one of the most popular lecturers at the Institute of Politics, at Williamstown, Massachusetts. He was the first to lecture before the Academy of International Law at The Hague, at its opening session, in July, 1923. The simplicity and modesty of this genial man of rare culture has left a fine and deep impression throughout the intellectual circles of contemporary America. He was a linguist of rare attainment, speaking Russian, French, German, Swedish, and English with distinction. Charles Downer Hazen, of the faculty at Columbia University, describes Baron Korff's unwonted success in these true and fitting words:

"In his sympathies and in his outlook he was as much an American as any of us. It was once said of Alexander Hamilton that he 'divined' Europe. Baron Korff not only divined America, but he loved her. He identified himself thoroughly with her life. And that life was honored and greatly enriched by the presence here and by the activity of this excellent scholar, this charming, simple, unassuming, friendly, honest, and courageous man."

We cannot close our all-too-feeble statement without recalling those fructifying months we passed with him at the comfortable little hotel in Paris during those harrowing days of the Peace Conference, listening with wonder to his precise French, and with still greater profit to his enlightening views on world affairs. Both of us returning to Washington in the summer of 1919, scarcely a week has passed since without a cheering and soul-refreshing visit with him. Last summer we were together again, this time at The Hague, in lovely Holland. His ten lectures before the Academy of International Law stand out in memory as an epitome of the fineness that marked him in everything he said and did. The world is poorer because of the untimely passing of this gracious man.

THE Conference of Ambassadors, meeting in Paris, has been confronted with the question, how to resume control of the military operations in Germany under the Treaty of Versailles. The ambassadors, under date of March 6, presented to Herr von Hoesch, the German Ambassador in Paris, a note in which Germany is notified that her police forces must be put on such a footing that they cannot be used for military purposes; that her munition factories must be rendered incapable of producing war material; that her excess war material must be surrendered; that documents showing war material existing at the time of the Armistice and indicating the production during the war must be furnished; and, finally, that all necessary laws must be promulgated to prevent the import and export of war material and to prohibit the recruiting and organizing of the army in any sense contrary to the Versailles Treaty. The note insists that mobilization plans in Germany must be discarded and superfluous officers removed. Furthermore, the allied commission must be given proper facilities for investigation.

Thus, it is believed, Germany will find it impossible to escape from her military obligations under the treaty. While there is a widespread feeling in France that since Allied military control of Germany ceased about a year ago, Germany has been quietly at work reorganizing her military resources, and while certain French papers, such as the *Echo de Paris*, recall that the Allies have never shown a desire to enter into any engagements for the defense of France, and that therefore the new note by the Conference of Ambassadors is a mere gesture; yet, in the main, public opinion in France is encouraged by this new evidence of co-operation between the Allies.

THE Council of the League of Nations completed its work of the present session March 15. The treaty, appearing

elsewhere in these columns, between France and Czechoslovakia, was registered with the League on the day of the final session. This session of the Council, twenty-eighth in the series, adjourned in an atmosphere of optimism. The Council elected a new commission for the control of the Saar Basin. Charles Rosetti, an Italian, was chosen to fill the vacancy on the Danube Commission, an act which is felt to indicate a return of a better relation between Italy and the League.

It was found necessary to rebuke Austria. Having balanced their budget, the Austrians want to free themselves from League control, but the Council, after hearing the report of Dr. Zimmermann, League commissioner at Vienna, adopted a resolution that "the Austrian Government entered into a solemn undertaking and that League control can be withdrawn only when the permanent equilibrium of the budget is established and the financial stability of Austria assured."

Austria wants to use for public works, without League supervision, 200,000,000 crowns remaining from the original loan. The Council said that the request would be studied, but that the bondholders must be protected and the Vienna Government should understand the loan could be used only for purposes approved by Dr. Zimmermann and under his direction. The next meeting of the Council is fixed for June 11, at Geneva.

THE British proposal to establish a naval base at Singapore has finally been refused by the House of Commons. This ought to mean a lessening of the tension in the Far East.

WE ARE glad to print elsewhere in these columns the arbitration treaty between the sixteen American republics, drafted and approved at the fifth Pan-American Conference last May and ratified March 18 by the United States Senate.

REFERRING to the trial of Ludendorff in Munich, a correspondent, writing to the *Manchester Guardian* of March 7, describes the whole atmosphere of the trial as "that of the Thirty Years' War, when princelings, robber barons, and adventurers fought for and against each other." The trial reveals that last November Germany was threatened with civil war, anarchy, and famine, with no hope to assuage the situation. Had that *coup* been successful, it undoubtedly would have meant terror and ultimate intervention from abroad. What Ludendorff evidently had in mind was a return of the Hohenzollerns and the elimination of the Catholic Church as a political force, particularly in Prussia. Ludendorff's experiences in the war have left him suspicious, fearful, and bitter.

THE overthrow of the Caliphate ranks in importance with the end of the Holy Roman Empire in the time of Napoleon. It is difficult for the Western mind to understand this new move on the part of the Turk. The Caliph belongs to the dynasty which created the Ottoman State. The Caliph has been to the Islamic world what the emperor of Christendom was until 1801. Until 1922 the Caliph has also been Sultan, spiritual and temporal head of all Islam. In 1922 the Sultan-Caliph was deposed by the Turkish nationalists and the Sultanate was separated from the Caliphate, Turkish sovereignty being transferred to the National Assembly at Angora. The Caliphate remained in the form of a new appointee as the spiritual head only. And now even the spiritual Caliph is banished. One wonders what effect these radical steps will have within Turkey and upon the relations between her own nationals, other members of the Islamic faith, and the peoples of the West.

EVEN the Supreme Court of our United States is not wholly spared from the outbreak of caustic criticism sweeping America. The argument is being advanced again that this our supreme tribunal should not have the power to declare legislative acts unconstitutional; or, if that power is to be retained, it should not be exercised by a 5 to 4 vote, as has been the case. It is not argued that our Supreme Court is unfitted for its duties as set forth in Article 3 in our Constitution. The Court is accepted as one of our three main organs of government, independent in its own sphere. In its relation to the Congress, it can only inquire whether or not, in a given case involving the rights of actual litigants, a given law passed by the Congress is contrary to the Constitution. The Court has no jurisdiction over political questions. But since our Constitution is our paramount law, questions of interpretation arising under it must be decided by a paramount tribunal, even where such questions involve the constitutionality of a law of Congress. There seems to be no other way. We may recall the language of Chief Justice Marshall in the very early case of *Marbury vs. Madison*:

"Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each. So, if a law be in opposition to the Constitution; if both the law and the Constitution apply to a particular case, so that the court must either decide that case conformable to the law, disregarding the Constitution, or conformable to the Constitution, disregarding the law; the court must determine which of these conflicting rules governs the case: this is of the very essence of judicial duty. If, then, the courts are to regard the Constitution, and the Constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature, the Constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply."

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE AMERICAN GROUP,
INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION,
HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
FEBRUARY 25, 1924, 8 o'clock p. m.

The Stenographer's Record

THE meeting was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m. by the President, Senator William B. McKinley.

Among those present were Senator William B. McKinley, Senator Joseph T. Robinson, Representative Andrew J. Montague, Representative William A. Oldfield, Representative Adolph J. Sabath, Representative Merrill Moores, Representative John T. Raker, Representative John J. McSwain, and Mr. Arthur Deerin Call, Executive Secretary.

The PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, we will come to order.

This is the twenty-first annual meeting of our American Group. It is with the greatest regret that we have to report the death during the last few days of two of our members—the Honorable James L. Slayden, a former president of the group and a life member of the Union, and of Representative Henry Garland Dupre, secretary of our group. Appropriate resolutions will be presented for your approval later in the meeting.

During the year 1923 the Interparliamentary Union has continued its activities. The main fact of interest to the American Group was the Twenty-first Conference, at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 13 to 18 last. Twenty-six parliaments were represented at this conference by some 430 delegates. A full report of the proceedings has been prepared and sent to all members of the congress by our Executive Secretary. Our group was represented by six Senators and four Representatives, as follows: Senators Ashurst, Swanson, Harrel, Sterling, Robinson, and McKinley, and Representatives Burton,

Chindblom, Montague, and Raker. These, with seven ladies and five secretaries, made a party of twenty-two.

The next in order is the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting.

Mr. CALL: Gentlemen, since the minutes are printed and distributed to all the members of the House and Senate, it is usual to omit the reading of the minutes.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection it will be so ordered.

We have a letter from Mr. Burton which the Secretary will read. Mr. Burton, as you know, is a member of the Council and of the Executive Committee of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. CALL: This letter is dated February 25, 1924, and is addressed to Senator McKinley. (Reading.)

"MY DEAR SENATOR MCKINLEY:

"I most sincerely regret that I shall be unable to be present at the meeting of the group this evening. I have, however, several suggestions to offer.

"First, my vote would be registered, if I could be present, for the re-election of the present officers, filling such vacancies as may be necessary.

"Second, interest should be maintained and stimulated in the appropriation of fifty thousand (\$50,000) dollars for the purpose of preparing the way for an invitation to the Union to meet in this country next year.

"Third, I have already taken up with the Subcommittee on Appropriations the regular appropriation of four thousand (\$4,000) dollars, with the proviso that it shall be immediately available, and have received a favorable response.

"It should be borne in mind that membership of a representative from the United States on the Executive Committee of the Union terminates this year. The principle of rotation is adopted and we cannot expect membership again until after an interval."

Senator ROBINSON: May I ask a question there. That means that it is intended that some other country takes the represen-

tation that we have enjoyed, passing that recognition about among the different countries? That is the idea, is it?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Mr. CALL (continuing reading):

"It is desirable that propositions which the local group may favor be ready for presentation some time prior to the meeting of 1924.

"I am compelled to say that the place of meeting has not yet been determined and there has been some difficulty in making satisfactory arrangements in the selection. Warsaw and Prague have both been mentioned.

"One further point: Members of the local group have nominated the Interparliamentary Union to receive the Nobel Peace Prize this year. A formal resolution at the meeting this evening or a petition signed by members would be helpful in this regard.

"Very cordially yours,

"THEODORE E. BURTON."

The PRESIDENT: The next is the Treasurer's report.

Mr. SABATH: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Following is the Treasurer's Report:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 25, 1924.

On hand.....	\$246.47	
<i>Disbursements:</i>		
March 3, 1923:		
American Peace Society, printing booklet, Twentieth Conference of Interparlia- mentary Union.....	\$95.90
June 2, 1923:		
American Peace Society, printing	124.50
October 17, 1923:		
American Peace Society, printing	57.08
Total	\$246.47	\$277.48
Amount due Treasurer.....	31.01

Mr. SABATH: And there is one check that I could not find and I do not know what I have done with it.

Mr. CALL: How much are we indebted?

Mr. SABATH: \$31.01, but I think there is another check that I paid while I was in Chicago last winter.

(The Treasurer's report was, without objection, approved.)

The PRESIDENT: The next in order is the election of officers.

Mr. RAKER: I move that the present officers be elected for the ensuing year, in pursuance of Mr. Burton's suggestion, and that we fill the vacancy.

(The motion was duly seconded.)

The PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, are there any other nominations?

(The question was called for, Senator Robinson put the motion to a vote, and it was unanimously voted to re-elect the present officers.

The PRESIDENT: There is a vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Dupre, who was our Secretary.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I nominate Mr. McSwain as Secretary.

Senator ROBINSON: Seconded.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

The PRESIDENT: The next in order is unfinished business. The reports of the delegates to the Twenty-first Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 13 to 18, 1923.

Mr. MONTAGUE: There is a report by Mr. Call, which is printed, that is a very excellent report. I do not believe any of us could either make a report as succinct as this or elaborate thereon. Therefore I suggest that we adopt Mr. Call's report. We have the resolutions all set out in that report. We have the action of the conference in every respect, except the actual votes, which are not recorded, but the final actions are recorded, together with the resolutions that were adopted. So, if you gentlemen will accept that as the report, I submit it as the report.

The PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, Mr. Montague suggests that the report by Mr. Call be accepted as the report of the delegates. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTAGUE: Mr. Call has made an elaborate report.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Montague, I believe, has a resolution relative to the death of Mr. Slayden.

Mr. MONTAGUE: Gentlemen, I offer the following resolution:

Resolution

James Luther Slayden, President of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union from 1915 to 1919, died at his home, in San Antonio, Texas, Sunday morning, February 24, at 3:30 o'clock. Mr. Slayden was born in Kentucky, June 1, 1853. After

attending Washington and Lee University, Virginia, he became a cotton merchant and member of the Texas House of Representatives in 1892, to which he declined a re-election. He represented the Twelfth Texas District in the House of Representatives from the 55th to the 57th Congresses, 1897 to 1903. From 1903 to 1919, 58th to 59th Congresses, he represented the Fourteenth Texas District. In 1883 he married Ellen Maury, of Charlottesville, Virginia, who survives him.

Mr. Slayden's life and work as member of the United States Congress won for him an enviable place in the affections of both the Senate and the House. Perhaps his chief interest throughout his conspicuous career was a better understanding between the nations. From the beginning of this American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, in 1904, Mr. Slayden showed a keen and active interest in its work. For a number of years he was President of the American Peace Society and trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He attended many of the international conferences of the Interparliamentary Union, his last being the conference at Stockholm in 1921. He was recognized as an authority upon the relations between the United States and Mexico.

It is not only fitting, but a duty, for the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, at this, its twenty-first annual meeting, to pause in its deliberation in honor of this valued friend of its work, for the members to remind themselves of his long and valued services, and to express as best they may their gratitude and appreciation.

I therefore move the following:

Resolved, That the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union record its deep appreciation of the services of James Luther Slayden to the Interparliamentary Union and to the cause of international friendship; that the members extend their sympathy to Mrs. Slayden, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Mrs. Slayden.

(The resolution presented by Mr. Montague on James Luther Slayden was unanimously adopted.)

The PRESIDENT: Of course this resolution will be incorporated in the record.

Senator ROBINSON: I suggest that the Secretary be requested to draft, and that there be incorporated in the record, an

appropriate resolution relative to Mr. Dupré.

Mr. MONTAGUE: And that we pass it now, *nunc pro tunc*, so to speak, and that it be incorporated in the records of this meeting.

The PRESIDENT: Without objection that will be done.

(The resolution relative to the death of Mr. Henry Garland Dupré, which was unanimously adopted, is as follows:)

Henry Garland Dupré, member of the United States Congress from Louisiana since 1910 and Secretary of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union for a decade, died at his home, in the city of Washington, on the morning of February 21, 1924. Mr. Dupré, one of the most companionable and winsome members of the Congress, deprived of his life at the meridian of his career, leaves in the memory of his friends of the Congress a deep and abiding regret at his untimely death; therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union record their sorrow because of the death of their esteemed Secretary, and express to the surviving members of his immediate family their heartfelt sympathy and condolence.

The PRESIDENT: As Mr. Burton has suggested in his letter, the annual grant to the Interparliamentary Union for maintaining the Geneva office and paying the one paid man as secretary is \$4,000 per year.

Senator ROBINSON: What bill is that carried in?

The PRESIDENT: That comes in the diplomatic bill.

Senator ROBINSON: A State Department bill.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. The Interparliamentary Union are asking this year for the Nobel Peace Prize. Mr. Burton prepared a letter, and it was signed by as many Senators as we could get hold of at the time, and there were a great many signatures of members in the House. It has been sent.

Mr. MONTAGUE: You followed the customary form in the application?

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Burton prepared it.

Mr. MONTAGUE: They are quite particular about their form. It is some years

since I formulated one for a gentleman in this country, and I know then we went over all the precedents in order to comply with the form for the presentation of this request.

Mr. CHINDBLOM: I saw a record of the meeting of the Swedish Group of the Interparliamentary Union, and they took the same action; they asked for the Nobel Prize for the Interparliamentary Union.

The PRESIDENT: I imagine it was instigated by Mr. Lange, was it not, Mr. Call?

Mr. CALL: Yes.

Mr. RAKER: Have you a resolution on that, Mr. Call?

Mr. CALL: No; the only thing necessary is that a resolution be passed by this group recommending to the Committee of the Storting that the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union hopes that the Nobel Peace Prize for the year 1924 may be granted to the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. RAKER: Mr. Chairman, I move you that it is the sense of this group that the Nobel Prize for Peace be awarded to the Interparliamentary Union, and that the necessary documents be forwarded with that resolution.

(The motion was seconded by Mr. Montague and unanimously carried.)

Mr. CALL: You gentlemen will be interested to know, I am sure, that the man who was the first president of the Interparliamentary Union was the first man to get the Nobel Peace Prize; and the man who founded the Interparliamentary Union got the Nobel Peace Prize for founding the Interparliamentary Union—William Randal Cremer. There have been a number of other persons prominent in connection with this organization who have received the Nobel Peace Prize.

Mr. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, if it is appropriate, I move that we take up the matter of the extending of the invitation for the meeting in America next year. I just put that out as a suggestion rather than to move it, for the time being.

The PRESIDENT: Most of you gentlemen were at the meeting the other night. We discussed the feasibility of inviting the group here in 1925. Such an invitation would probably necessitate from Congress an appropriation of about \$50,000. At the meeting the other night at my

house the chairmen of the Appropriation Committees of both the House and Senate were present and seemed to take to the proposition very kindly. Mr. Madden, in fact, was very outspoken in favor of it. The committee was appointed that night to draft a joint resolution.

Senator ROBINSON: May I ask whether it would not be well to have the matter taken up with the State Department and secure an estimate, and incorporate an item of appropriation in the State Department bill for that purpose? Otherwise, if that is not done, we might find ourselves in the attitude of having invited some guests without any provisions for entertaining them or taking care of the necessary expenses of the meeting.

Mr. RAKER: Was it not suggested at that meeting, Mr. Chairman, that somebody might make the objection that it was not authorized, and Mr. Temple was to draw a joint resolution so we could get that through?

Mr. MONTAGUE: I will state that I made the motion that Dr. Temple be appointed one of the members to examine the precedents. We once voted \$50,000 for this.

Mr. CALL: Yes, in 1914; and it was carried over for three years.

Mr. MONTAGUE: I understand that Dr. Temple is to follow the usual course in the matter.

Mr. RAKER: Dr. Temple said he would do it.

The PRESIDENT: Dr. Temple has been appointed to draft the joint resolution and we will inquire as to what has been done about it.

The PRESIDENT: Article V of the By-laws of this organization provides:

"There shall be, in addition, a permanent Executive Secretary, whose duty it shall be to keep the records of the group; who shall be the custodian of its library and permanent archives. He shall also prepare such official reports from the American Group as may be required by the Interparliamentary Council or the Secretary General of the Union."

At our eighteenth annual meeting, held February 24, 1921, Arthur Deerin Call was elected to this office, succeeding Dr. S. N. D. North, resigned. Since that time Mr. Call has attended to the details re-

quired under our Constitution. During the last year he has prepared three pamphlets, as follows:

1. The Interparliamentary Union;
2. The American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting; and
3. The Twenty-first Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Copenhagen.

Mr. Call serves without pay. I think it would be in order that Mr. Call be given the thanks of this body.

Senator ROBINSON: I move that the American Group tender to Mr. Call its thanks for the very able and efficient manner in which he has performed the duties of Executive Secretary, and that he be requested to continue to perform them.

The PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, I find it has been seconded by every one here; therefore I can hardly see how it can be opposed, and without objection the motion is adopted.

(Thereupon, at 9:30 p. m., the meeting adjourned.)

AGAIN OUR FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The following letter and the reply by the President of Dartmouth College are of more than local importance. Together they present a telling picture of contemporary world views. Our own opinion is that President Hopkins is rendering a service to our generation, conspicuous as it is needed.—EDITOR.

THE AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC.
WASHINGTON BUREAU, 709 ALBEE BLDG.

R. M. WHITNEY, *Director*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *Feb. 23, 1924.*

PRESIDENT ERNEST MARTIN HOPKINS,

Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

DEAR SIR: May I ask if you were correctly quoted in this morning's papers as saying that "if Lenine and Trotsky were available," you would certainly bring them in to lecture at Dartmouth?

Having been a newspaper correspondent all my life, I know the desire for accuracy on the part of Associated Press correspondents, but I cannot believe that the president of a great American college would give expression to such a statement. I am not an alumnus of Dartmouth, but of another college, but I feel very deeply the seriousness of such a

statement credited to the head of a college like Dartmouth.

In spite of the fact that the enemies of this government have made great capital of the fact that William Z. Foster was given hearing at Dartmouth—not officially, but by an undergraduate body—those of us who still believe that we have a form of government better in every way than that advocated by Lenine and Trotsky had hoped that the directors of the studies of the minds of the youth of America would be careful of the material they fed the immature minds of the coming generations.

For nearly two years I have made a special study of the Communist movement in the United States. This study has proved to me conclusively that such remarks as those credited to you could well have been inspired in Moscow and are in strict accord with the well-matured plans of those who would overthrow this government by violence.

Yours for national loyalty,

(Signed) R. M. WHITNEY,
Director of Bureau.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, HANOVER, N. H.

OFFICES OF ADMINISTRATION

THE PRESIDENT

February 26, 1924.

DEAR MR. WHITNEY:

I am sorry that the statement which I made before the Chicago alumni is disturbing to you. I did not say exactly what I was quoted as saying in the Associated Press dispatch, but I have no right to quibble over the exact phrasing of it, for the correspondent's expression was accurate, so far as the significance of what I said was involved.

I believe that truth has nothing to fear from error if truth be untrammelled at all times and if error be denied the sanctity conferred upon it by persecution or concealment. I stated to the Dartmouth alumni in Chicago what I have frequently stated before—that education is quite a different thing from training, and the method of the educational institution calls for diversity in points of view and emphasis upon stimulating the student's thought, while the training school almost inevitably emphasizes instruction and demands conformity to the thought of others.

I stated further that I knew of no reason why there should not be training schools for training the minds of men to various points of view, if people could be found who were willing to offer endowment for such schools, and that it was quite compatible with the theory of democracy that we should have labor colleges and colleges for the defense of capitalism, or schools of democracy and schools for the glorification of benevolent despotism, or schools with the purpose of arguing for the validity of one contention or another in theological belief. But I argued further that there was grave danger in the fictitious value which the mind of youth ascribed to submerged or obscured theories, and that there never was such great need of true educational institutions as at the present day, and that my desire for Dartmouth College was that she should stand for freedom of thought and freedom of speech, without which freedom of thought is impossible, and as an embodiment of confidence in the strength of those things which are right. We should be unafraid that harm could ever come to us mentally, spiritually, or morally by the preservation of those liberties which were guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights.

I further stated that I consider it far more important to stimulate the minds of college men to thought than to prescribe what should be thought or where denial should enter in to tell them what they could not think. I quoted the statement of one of America's great surgeons in commenting upon preventive medicine, that a great mistake was made if assumption arose that health could be understood without understanding disease. I further stated my belief that no good could come, and much possible harm could come, from the misuse of propaganda designed for the establishment of a predetermined point of view. And at that point I stated that I should far prefer to have the presentation of the point of view of a governmental theory which dominated an eighth of the earth's surface through a frank partisan of that theory than through the thoroughly prejudiced presentation of opponents, who utilized now in peace the methods of war and whose avowed purpose was the discrediting of the theory rather than learning the evils of government and society which made possible the imposition of

such a monstrous theory upon so vast a geographical area and upon so great a number of people.

The essential point in the whole contention was, and remains, that the American undergraduate of from eighteen to twenty-two years old is on the threshold of manhood and is as capable of stripping error from truth as he is capable of distinguishing hypocrisy from genuineness, in both of which he is superior to the average man, whose interest has become highly professionalized as apart from the general interest of the college undergraduate.

Of course, the fact is—and I have heard this said within the last few days by some very practical men of large financial and industrial responsibilities—that the corruption and acquisitive self-interest revealed in the Teapot Dome investigation made more Bolsheviks in twenty-four hours than all the agents of the Soviet Government could make in a year. Yet here again I believe that before we get done we shall all wish that we had a people more judicially-minded and more capable of distinguishing between truth and error than we have at the present time. It is with the aspiration, at least, to do its part in creating such a spirit that I believe that the American college works at the present day. If Dartmouth College fails, in the course of striving for this end, to win the approval of the American Defense Society or to gain the endorsement of its able director, I am regretful, but nevertheless I do not see that these facts can be allowed to change the course of events.

I am

Yours very truly,
(Signed) ERNEST M. HOPKINS.

THE LABOR GOVERNMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

THE true significance of the revolutionary change in British politics brought about by the advent of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's Government to power lies not in the fact that it is a Labor Government, but that it is a minority government, thus making, at least for some time, the end of the old two-party system of rule. Mr. Ramsay MasDonald's declaration of policy, which was made immediately after the parliamentary recess in February, took

full cognizance of this fact, with all its implications, when he stated, in no uncertain terms, that he would accept defeat on nothing less than substantial issues—issues of principle, issues that really matter. The well-known parliamentary sport of maneuvering for what is known as a “snap division”—that is, an unexpected vote, which, catching the government napping and turning the parliamentary tide against them, forces them to an appeal to the country—is thus painlessly disposed of, and any analysis of the new government's problems and prospects must be made in view of this novel development.

There is, in fact, but one great problem facing Mr. MacDonald today, but it is a problem which has many unexpected ramifications. Unemployment is the crucial question confronting any statesman in Great Britain, and it may safely be taken that British policy is at present orientated entirely by this situation.

In the two or three declarations of policy made by the new British Premier since his election, all of which have been marked by a true Scottish caution, this fact stands out with the utmost clarity. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald approaches his problem from two angles, namely, immediate temporary relief through unemployment doles and public works, and an attempt at some settlement of the continental situation.

Among the public works designed to relieve the immediate strain may be noted, rather surprisingly, Mr. MacDonald's proposal for the laying down of five cruisers and two destroyers. This plan evoked intense criticism, especially from certain members of the Liberal Party, who issued a manifesto pointing out that the cruisers are being built on the pretext of providing not security, but profitable work for the shipbuilding constituencies, and drawing attention to the unhappy potentialities of such a policy, which, it is claimed, immediately caused a misunderstanding with Italy. At the same time land armament estimates were cut in half.

The outstanding features of Mr. MacDonald's foreign policy may be comprised in the two words: Russia and France. Immediately following his accession to power negotiations for the recognition of Russia were opened, the British representative in Moscow being instructed to present his credentials *pro tempore*. At the same time

Mr. MacDonald took the unprecedented step of announcing his premiership in a personal letter to M. Poincaré, which was answered with all cordiality. Following this, Mr. MacDonald addressed a further communication to the French Premier, dated February 21, in which, after a reference to the friendly nature of M. Poincaré's reply to his previous communication, he stated his desire to pave the way for a more complete mutual understanding by reciting without reserve the difficulties with which he was faced and the manner in which he himself envisaged the situation, and that he was ready to examine the problem in its larger outlines.

The Prime Minister then states that, in the view of many in Great Britain, France was endeavoring to create a situation which would get for her what she failed to get during the peace negotiations. He recognized, however, that some people in France after the war thought that, to avert a future German menace, the frontiers of France should be extended to the Rhine. Instead of this they were offered a joint guarantee by Britain and America, which lapsed when the latter withdrew. The French then, “with some justification,” have sought more tangible safeguards.

Mr. MacDonald, after outlining the economic effects of the German collapse upon Great Britain, points out that the people of that country have been rendered anxious by what appears to them to be the determination of France to ruin Germany and to dominate the continent. They are apprehensive, he says frankly, of the large military establishments in France and disturbed by the French interest in the military organization of the Little Entente. They cannot understand why France should finance these activities when Great Britain has to pay over thirty million sterling a year in interest upon loans raised in America, and also interest upon loans raised by Britain for France. “Such popular sentiments,” continues the letter, “however erroneous they may be, must be considered.”

Security, in the opinion of the British Premier, is not a French, but a European problem. It is conceived of by Great Britain not as security for France against Germany, but as security against war, and he therefore views the present task as comprising the establishment of confidence,

which can only be done by allaying international suspicion. Following an agreement on policy between Great Britain and France, this task might be undertaken by the League of Nations.

The question of reparations is then discussed by Mr. MacDonald, who declares that the French people desire reparations, which they interpret mainly in the concrete form of damage for devastations committed on French territory, but which, as regards Great Britain, must be interpreted in wider terms of ruined markets, vanished purchasing power, decline of trade, and unemployment. But, he suggests, this problem cannot be approached by either country before the experts' reports have been submitted.

Finally, the letter calls for agreement on the main principle as the object to be attained; otherwise nothing can be hoped for but the old wearisome round of controversy and altercation on points that may be important but are not fundamental.

M. Poincaré's reply could not be called unfavorable. After remarking that he is in full agreement with Mr. MacDonald's review of the questions to be settled, he paraphrases the latter's outline of the French and British definition of reparations and finds that the interests and desires of the two countries are in harmony and can be settled by the same means. That France desires to destroy Germany or to annex her territory is denied. "France does not claim," says M. Poincaré, "the Rhine as a frontier, but only that it should not be used as a base for further attack."

Referring to the loans made to the Little Entente, M. Poincaré states that, pending the grant of effective peace guarantees, France has been anxious to maintain contact with all nations which have a loyal interest in the treaties which have produced the present European structure. He reiterates the French assertion that the Ruhr occupation will cease when the Germans have paid their debts, and the occupation of the Rhineland when the treaty conditions have been fulfilled and French security guaranteed. After alluding to his hopes for arriving rapidly at a comprehensive settlement of the situation after the presentation of the experts' reports, M. Poincaré expresses his pleasure at the linking of the question of interallied debts

and reparations by Mr. MacDonald and states that the French Government intends to strengthen the rôle of the League of Nations, and feels that France and Britain owe it to civilization to remain united.

The trend of the new government's policies, therefore, might be summed up as somewhat favorable, showing a distinct basis of common sense, but so far without any startling originality or definite crystallization.

COMPOSITION OF SOVIET RUSSIA

THE British Stationery Office has published a Foreign Office Memorandum entitled "Soviet Russia," which contains a description of the various political units existing on territory subject to the Soviets and the text of the constitution of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of July 6, 1923.

According to this, the Union consists of four States, which, in theory, retain their sovereign rights except to the extent that they, by the terms of the constitution, surrender them to the central authority, and they are, theoretically, at liberty to retire from the Union. These four major States are Russia, the Ukraine, White Russia, and Transcaucasia. To the Union are closely bound by treaty the Republics of Bokhara and Khorezm (the former Khanate of Khiva), but since the memorandum was drawn up the latter has changed its status and may perhaps now form a fifth major State.

Of the major States, Russia is composed of territory directly administered and of a number of autonomous republics and autonomous regions. The Ukraine and White Russia have no autonomous subdivisions, but Transcaucasia is composed wholly of the Republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia, and has no area directly administered by the Transcaucasian Government.

The subdivisions of the Russian State are as follows: Ten autonomous republics administered by councils of people's commissars, the Bashkir (capital, Ufa), population, 3,000,000; the Tartar (Kazan), 3,100,000; the Kirghiz (Orenburg), 4,700,000; the Daghestan (Temir Khan Shura, now called Buinaksk), 1,500,000; the Gorski or Mountain (Vladikavkaz), 300,000; the Turkestan (Tashkent), 5,-

200,000; the Crimean (Simferopol), 720,000; the Yakutsk (Yakutsk), 300,000; the Karelian (Petrozavodsk), 200,000, and the Buryat-Mongol (Irkutsk), 175,000.

Eleven autonomous regions, administered by regional executive committees: The German Volga Labor Commune (Marxstadt), 540,000; the Chuvash (Cheboxari), 800,000; the Votyak (Izhevsk), 740,000; the Kalmuck (Ellista), 200,000; the Marisk (Krasnokokshaisk), 425,000; the Komi-Ziryansk (Ust-Sisolsk), 20,000; the Kabarda-Balkarskaya (Nalchik), 180,000; the Karachaevo-Cherkess (Batal Pashinsk), 150,000; the Oiratsk (Ulala), 112,000; the Adigeevsko-Cherkess (Tokhtomukai), and the Chechensk (Grosni).

The constitution prescribes that the Congress of Soviets of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is to be the supreme organ of the Union, and that its members are to be elected on a basis of one to every 25,000 electors and representatives of provincial congresses of Soviets on that of one for each 125,000 inhabitants.

The preamble to the constitution contains a declaration in which the world is divided into two camps—that of Capitalism, containing "national enmity and inequality, colonial slavery and chauvinism, national oppression and pogroms, imperialist brutalities and wars," and the camp of Socialism—to be found in the Soviet dominions, where are "mutual confidence and peace, national freedom and equality, dwelling together in peace and the brotherly collaboration of peoples. The attempts of the capitalist world over a number of decades to settle the question of nationality by the combination of the free development of peoples with the system of the exploitation of man by man have proved fruitless. . . . The bourgeoisie has been found impotent to organize the collaboration of peoples. Only in the camp of the Soviets, under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, . . . has it proved possible to destroy at the roots national oppression, to establish an atmosphere of mutual confidence, and lay the foundations of the brotherly collaboration of "peoples." The declaration also states that "the danger of new attacks renders inevitable the creation of a united front in the face of capitalist surroundings. Finally, the very construction of

Soviet authority, international by its class nature, impels the laboring masses of the Soviet Republics to the path of amalgamation in one Socialist family.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE OTTOMAN CALIPHATE

THE Mohammedan world, numbering some three hundred million turbulent souls, has been shaken to its foundations by the dramatic action of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, where, after a stormy session on March 3, a motion for the abolition of the Caliphate was passed, following which a vessel was placed at the disposal of Abdul Mejid to transport him and his household to Alexandria.

On November 1, 1922, the Grand National Assembly, sitting at Angora, declared that the office of Sultan of Turkey had ceased to exist and provided for the election of a Caliph from among the princes of the House of Othman. On November 17 the Sultan, Mohammed VI, left Constantinople, and his cousin, Abdul Mejid Effendi, then 58 years of age, was elected Caliph by the Assembly. The Angora Assembly, however, gradually became restive, as the power of the Caliphate was apparent to it, and on March 2 a preliminary debate was held in a private meeting of the Popular Party, which holds the vast majority of seats in the Assembly, at which the abolition of the entire institution was decided upon.

It was not to be expected that the opportunity thus offered them would be neglected by the Arabs, or more especially by King Hussein, who, with his two sons, Feisal and Abdullah, rules over the three territories of Hedjaz, Mesopotamia, and Transjordan. A conference of the representatives of these territories was immediately held, at the close of which King Hussein was proclaimed Caliph. While both Egypt and Afghanistan claim the reversion of the Caliphate, the *fait accompli* thus produced has its value enhanced by the fact that the holy cities are in the possession of Hussein, whose claim is further strengthened by the fact that his predecessor, Abdul Futeh, was hailed as Caliph in 998.

Reports from the East, therefore, seem disposed to augur the recognition of Hus-

sein, at least by the Arabs, if not by the Indian Mohammedans, whose tendency to Anglophobia would not, in all probability, permit them to consider any leader subject to British influence. Nevertheless, politically speaking, the assumption of the Caliphate by Hussein, who is an avowed enemy of the Turkish State, represents a deliberate blow at Turkish prestige, provides a strong and hostile organization on the Turkish frontiers, and greatly strengthens

Mesopotamian resistance to the Kemalists' desire to secure Mosul. The Angora Government is thus faced by a vast Arab confederation, disputing their territorial ambitions and probably demanding the surrender of the holy relics. In the meantime the British view, with a sigh of relief, the gradual calming of Moslem agitation in India, which has hitherto been largely inspired from Turkish religious sources.

RECENT QUESTIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS*

By HON. CHARLES E. HUGHES
Secretary of State of the United States

IT IS an especial privilege to appear before the members of the Council on Foreign Relations because of their notable endeavor to facilitate an intelligent appreciation by our people of policies and action in the field of foreign affairs. Not only have you provided a forum, but in establishing a quarterly review under highly competent direction you have made one of the most helpful contributions to a better understanding of our foreign relations than has ever been made by private enterprise. The need is obvious.

I see among you those who have won eminence by sound judgment and exceptional facility in mastering facts, yet you constantly realize, I am sure, what slight opportunity you have for any but the hastiest consideration of the more difficult problems of the day, so far as they lie outside your professional activities, and how impossible it is to reach any satisfactory independent conclusion unless you are aided by earlier special studies or by some experience which gives you background and perspective. Even then the old experience may be merely a trap to hold the mind in the clutch of preconceptions when it should be free for new excursions and impressions. If those in our community who are highly favored by training and variety of contacts are encountering such difficulties, what shall be said of the great host of our people—shrewd, fair-minded, but busy, preoccupied with

the exigencies of the competitive struggle and living in the midst of strident appeals and multiplying allurements. With countless organizations, we especially prize the few, such as yours, that seek the careful opinion, the sober matured judgment—an effort prosecuted, as your editors have said, with “a broad hospitality to divergent views,” but none the less controlled by a sense of values and of responsibility.

It seems to me that I can make no better use of this occasion than to speak on certain recent questions and negotiations with which I have not been able to deal in other addresses. I shall not confine myself to a single topic, and, although the various subjects of my remarks tonight are not directly connected with each other, I trust that, taken with what I have previously said, they will aid you in obtaining a conspectus of the present state of our foreign relations. The point of view of the responsible officer is not that of the debater or the reviewer. Others may discuss; he must act on his best judgment. In most instances, when all the circumstances have been carefully considered, he is likely to feel that there is a certain inevitableness in that action. But I am here simply to report, not to claim agreement or challenge criticism.

Questions Arising from the Smuggling of Intoxicating Liquors

Foreign nations are naturally tenacious of their rights upon the high seas, and, on the other hand, our government cannot look with indifference upon the attempts of hovering vessels, claiming the protection of foreign flags, illicitly to introduce

* An address before the meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations, held at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel, New York City, on the evening of Wednesday, January 23, 1924.

their cargoes of liquors into the commerce of the United States. This government must use every proper means to put a stop to this illegal traffic. It should be remembered, however, that authority with respect to the high seas cannot be effectively conferred by acts of Congress, if these are in contravention of international law, even though such legislative acts as municipal law would govern the decisions of our own courts.

Where international rights and obligations are involved, controversies not otherwise adjusted would naturally come before an international arbitral tribunal whose decisions would be governed by international law and would not be controlled by municipal law. This principle was explicitly recognized in the recent decision by Chief Justice Taft, as arbitrator in the controversy between Great Britain and Costa Rica, where the Chief Justice illustrated the point that, while in our system an act of Congress might for municipal purposes repeal a treaty, the United States could not thus get rid of an international obligation, which would continue and would be enforced by an international arbitral tribunal. The Chief Justice said:

"This is not an exceptional instance of an essential difference between the scope and effect of a decision by the highest tribunal of a country and of an international tribunal. The Constitution of the United States makes the Constitution, laws passed in pursuance thereof, and treaties of the United States the supreme law of the land. Under that provision, a treaty may repeal a statute and a statute may repeal a treaty. The Supreme Court cannot under the Constitution recognize and enforce rights accruing to aliens under a treaty which Congress has repealed by statute. In an international tribunal, however, the unilateral repeal of a treaty by a statute would not affect the rights arising under it and its judgment would necessarily give effect to the treaty and hold the statute repealing it of no effect."

The Government of the United States has repeatedly asserted that the limits of territorial waters extend to three marine miles outward from the coast line. This has been asserted by our government in making claims upon other governments. With respect to Spain's claim of jurisdiction over the waters adjacent to Cuba,

Secretary Seward wrote to the Spanish minister as follows:

"It cannot be admitted, nor indeed is Mr. Tassara understood to claim, that the mere assertion of a sovereign, by an act of legislation, however solemn, can have the effect to establish and fix its external maritime jurisdiction. His right to a jurisdiction of three miles is derived, not from his own decrees, but from the law of nations, and exists even though he may never have proclaimed or asserted it by any decree or declaration whatsoever. He cannot, by a mere decree, extend the limit and fix it at six miles, because if he could, he could in the same manner, and upon motives of interest, ambition, or even upon caprice, fix it at 10 or 20 or 50 miles, without the consent or acquiescence of other powers which have a common right with himself in the freedom of all the oceans. Such a pretension could never be successfully or rightfully maintained. . . .

"In view of the considerations and facts which have been thus presented, the undersigned is obliged to state that the Government of the United States is not prepared to admit that the jurisdiction of Spain in the waters which surround the island of Cuba lawfully and rightfully extends beyond the customary limit of three miles."

Secretary Fish, writing to the British minister in 1875, said: "We have always understood and asserted that, pursuant to public law, no nation can rightfully claim jurisdiction at sea beyond a marine league from its coast." And Secretary Evarts, in a communication to the minister of Spain concerning the visitation and firing upon certain American vessels near Cuba in 1880, said: "The government must adhere to the three-mile rule as the jurisdictional limit, and the cases of visitation without that line seem not to be excused or excusable under that rule." The general principle was thus stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent case of the *Cunard Steamship Company v. Mellon* (262 U. S., 100, 122): "It now is settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbors, bays, and other inclosed arms of the sea along its coast, and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coast line outward a marine league, or three geographic miles."

In the Bering Sea arbitration it was held that the United States had no jurisdiction in the Bering Sea fisheries beyond the three-mile limit, and in the case of the British schooner *Sayward* the United States was required to compensate Great Britain for interfering with its sealing operations outside the three-mile limit. The American-British Claims Arbitration Tribunal in December, 1920, awarded damages against the United States on account of the interference by officers with the British vessel *Coquiltam* because of transfer of cargo off the Pacific coast outside the three-mile limit.

It is quite apparent that this government is not in a position to maintain that its territorial waters extend beyond the three-mile limit, and, in order to avoid liability to other governments, it is important that in the enforcement of the laws of the United States this limit should be appropriately recognized. It does not follow, however, that this government is entirely without power to protect itself from the abuses committed by hovering vessels. There may be such a direct connection between the operation of the vessel and the violation of the laws prescribed by the territorial sovereign as to justify seizure even outside the three-mile limit. This may be illustrated by the case of "hot pursuit," where the vessel has committed an offense against those laws within territorial waters and is caught while trying to escape. The practice which permits the following and seizure of a foreign vessel which puts to sea in order to avoid detention for violation of the laws of the State whose waters it has entered is based on the principle of necessity for the "effective administration of justice" (Westlake, Part I, p. 177). And this extension of the right of the territorial State was voted unanimously by the Institute of International Law in 1894.

Another case is one where the hovering vessel, although lying outside the three-mile limit, communicates with the shore by its own boats in violation of the territorial law. Thus Lord Salisbury said, with respect to the British schooner *Araunah*, that Her Majesty's Government were "of opinion that, even if the *Araunah* at the time of the seizure were herself outside the three-mile territorial limit, the fact that she was, by means of

her boats, carrying on fishing within Russian waters without the prescribed license warranted her seizure and confiscation, according to the principles of the municipal law regulating the use of those waters." A case similar to this was that of the *Grace and Ruby* (283 Fed., 476).

It will be noted that in the case of the *Araunah* it was the vessel herself that was deemed subject to seizure outside the three-mile limit, and not simply her small boats, and this was manifestly because of the direct connection between the conduct of the vessel and the violation of the law of the territory. It may be urged with force that this principle should not be limited to the case of the use by the vessel of her own boats, where she is none the less effectively engaged, although using other boats, in the illegal introduction of her cargo into the commerce of the territory. Such a case was that of the *Henry L. Marshall*, recently decided by the circuit court of appeals of the second circuit (292 Fed., 487-488). The *Marshall*, a vessel sailing under British registry, in 1921 obtained clearance from the Bahama Islands laden with a cargo of intoxicating liquors. She had two clearances, both dated the same date, signed by the same collector of revenue, one of which stated that she had cleared for Halifax with the cargo in question, and the other that she had cleared for Gloucester, Massachusetts, in ballast.

The same collector furnished two bills of health, simply differing as to destination. It was abundantly proved that the real object and only business of the *Marshall* was to peddle liquor along the coast of the United States, and particularly did she pursue her vocation while lying from nine to ten miles off Atlantic City and sent liquor on shore, pursuant to previous arrangements made in the United States, by motor boats. She was seized outside the three-mile limit and condemned. Circuit Judge Hough, speaking for a unanimous court, after referring to the case of the *Grace and Ruby*, said:

"The difference between the facts there presented and those at bar is that, instead of arranging to unload and deliver the cargo of the schooner by, through, or with some assistance from the schooner's crew or equipment (as in the case cited), the whole matter

was performed by a previous arrangement with those controlling the *Marshall*, but with small boats that did not belong to the schooner and were not even partially manned by men from her crew. But it is just as true in this case as it was in the case of the *Grace and Ruby*, that "the act of unloading, although beginning beyond the three-mile limit, continued until the liquor was landed."

The vessel was thus found to be engaged, not in the exercise of her admitted rights upon the high seas, but in unlawfully unloading her cargo into the territory of the United States, in "an actual introduction of a part thereof into the commerce of the United States" contrary to its laws. It should be added that while the British Government originally made a protest in this case, it was finally withdrawn upon the ground that the vessel was not of *bona fide* British registry, and it should be said that in this withdrawal the British Government did not acquiesce in the principle of the ruling. In view, however, of the historic practice of nations in the protection of their territory from the violation of their laws by hovering vessels, the United States Government cannot admit that the accepted rules of international law preclude such action as that taken in the circumstances of the *Marshall* case.

But it is apparent that, whatever measures this government may believe that it is free to adopt in accordance with the principles of international law, these, so far as they are practicable, are far from adequate to meet the exigency; and, further, the diplomatic history of the United States reveals the fact that maritime powers, including the United States itself, are highly sensitive to attempts by foreign authorities to seize their vessels on the high seas in time of peace. In each case of seizure there are likely to be serious questions of fact and law, and at any time there may be collisions of authority which would be embarrassing to friendly relations. It is precisely in matters of this description, where the sense of grievance and resentment are so easily aroused, that the effort should be made to reach an international agreement suited to the case. We need to put the measures that are required for the adequate enforcement of our laws on an impregnable basis and to

invite and secure the friendly co-operation of the maritime powers.

Again, foreign powers have complained of what they regard as a departure from international comity through the maintenance of the present restrictions of law under which their vessels are not permitted to enter our waters or call at our ports if they have cargoes of liquors on board, although these may be kept under seal and are not to be delivered within the territory of the United States. Nations who fully appreciate our authority and our right to enforce our own policy cannot understand such a restriction which interferes with their trade with countries other than our own. They cannot understand why a ship from a foreign port with a cargo consigned to another foreign port is unable even to traverse our waters, or to visit our ports, because the cargo on board, which is destined for other countries, is of the sort we do not wish for our own. In this situation there is the plainest opportunity for a fair agreement not in derogation of our principles, but to aid in their proper enforcement—not only without the slightest departure from, but with a manifest increase in, the safeguards required for our protection against the introduction of intoxicating liquors.

Accordingly, negotiations have been undertaken to reach an appropriate international agreement upon this subject, and I am happy to say that such an agreement has been concluded with Great Britain today. There are other powers which I believe are quite ready to act in a similar way. This will be a long step toward removing causes of irritation, and it is precisely as we remove such causes that we shall really make progress in furthering the interests of peace.

It is hardly necessary to observe that there is no intention on the part of this government to violate, in the negotiation of such agreements, the provisions of the Constitution. The purpose is to facilitate their enforcement. I know there are some who have expressed doubt whether such an international agreement can be made under our Constitution. This doubt I do not entertain. As the Supreme Court of the United States has said, "It is not lightly to be assumed that in matters requiring national action, a power which must belong to and somewhere reside in

every civilized government is not to be found" (*Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U. S., 415, 433). It would be most extraordinary if the United States were in such a situation that such causes of international friction could not be removed by an exercise of the treaty-making power which in no way impaired the efficacy of our policy, but, on the other hand, greatly aided in preventing the illicit introduction of intoxicating liquors.

But, viewing the question in its technical aspect, it is quite sufficient to point out that the eighteenth amendment has expressly confided to the discretion of Congress the determination of penalties and forfeitures, and it is manifest that this discretion can be competently and wisely exercised in maintaining the morale of enforcement and in providing that just and adequate enforcement which does not interfere with the appropriate freedom of commerce, an interference with which would serve no interest of the United States, but would be to its most serious injury. Congress in the exercise of its discretion is undoubtedly entitled to protect the substantial interests of the country. Congress has already appreciated this authority and has acted accordingly in excepting from penalties and forfeitures transit through the Panama Canal, an exception which the Supreme Court in its recent decision has fully recognized as being within the competency of Congress. What Congress has thus done can equally be accomplished through the treaty-making power, which, under adequate restrictions, may put such cargoes as those to which I have referred, not destined for our ports or to be delivered within the United States, in the same status as those passing through the Panama Canal.

Mexican Relations

Recently, in connection with the centenary of the Monroe Doctrine, I have had occasion to review our policy with respect to the republics of this hemisphere, and I wish at this time merely to add a word as to our relations with Mexico. It is unnecessary for me to describe the difficulties of the past 13 years. Turmoil and internecine strife produced political and economic instability and disregard of international obligations. We had the friendliest feelings for the people of Mexico and

were sensible of their desire for social and political betterment, but revolutionary tendencies and chaotic conditions made it impossible to find a sound basis for intercourse. At last, under General Obregon's administration, there was a restoration of stability; commerce and industry began to regain confidence; there was a hopeful endeavor to put the finances of the country on a better footing; provision was made for the payment of the foreign debt. When it appeared that there was a disposition to discharge the obligations which are incident to membership in the family of nations, this government was glad to recognize the existing Government of Mexico and to resume diplomatic relations.

Two claims conventions were at once concluded—a special convention relating to claims arising from revolutionary disturbances and a general convention dealing generally with the claims of the respective States and their nationals. Diplomatic relations were resumed and these conventions were concluded last September; the special convention has received the assent of the Mexican Senate and the general convention is about to be acted upon by that body. Both conventions have been submitted to the Senate of the United States.

After this happy result had been achieved, and as we were looking forward to a period of quiet and to opportunities of advantage to both peoples, suddenly there was an attempt to overthrow the established Government of Mexico by violence. It is plain that the purpose of those engaged in this enterprise of arms is simply to determine by forcible measures the succession to President Obregon. It is not a revolution instinct with the aspirations of an oppressed people; it is a matter of personal politics. It is an effort to seize the presidency; it means a subversion of all constitutional and orderly procedure. The contestants, seeking to overthrow the established government, have taken possession of certain portions of the Mexican territory and either are claiming tribute from peaceful and legitimate American commerce or are attempting to obstruct and destroy it.

In these circumstances the established Mexican Government asked the Government of the United States to sell to it a

limited quantity of arms and munitions. The request was one which could not be ignored; it had to be granted or denied. This government had the arms and munitions close at hand; it did not need them and could sell them if it wished. If the request had been denied, we should have turned a cold shoulder to the government with which we had recently established friendly relations and, whatever explanations we might make, we would in fact have given powerful encouragement to those who were attempting to seize the reins of government by force. The refusal to aid the established government would have thrown our moral influence on the side of those who were challenging the peace and order of Mexico, and we should have incurred a grave responsibility for the consequent disturbances. In granting the request, there was no question of intervention, no invasion of the sovereignty of Mexico, as we were acting at its instance and were exercising our undoubted right to sell arms to the existing government. Nor was there any departure from the principle involved in President Harding's policy as to the sale of arms.

That particular declaration was simply a feature of our well-known general policy as to the limitation of armaments. It is our fixed purpose that our surplus war equipment should not be employed in encouraging warfare by fostering militarism and the building up of the competitive armaments that threaten the peace of the world. It in no way precludes us from furnishing arms to aid in the putting down of insurrectionary attacks upon public order in a neighboring State whose peaceful development is especially important to us. Indeed, one of the grounds upon which, under President Harding's administration, this government declined to become a party to the Convention of Saint Germain relating to the traffic in arms was that the convention not only left the signatory governments free to supply each other with arms *ad libitum*, but prevented the sale of arms to governments not signatory, and it was then pointed out that this would prevent our government from selling arms to our neighboring republics not parties to the convention, however necessary that course might be to the maintenance of stability and peace in this hemisphere.

As the question is obviously one of expediency, each case rests on its own facts. So far as precedents are concerned, we have followed rather than departed from them. In standing for constitutional procedure and frowning upon attempts to conduct political campaigns by force of arms, we create no precedent that embarrasses us. Many of our people are solicitous with respect to the contribution of the United States to the cause of peace. That duty and privilege begin at home. In aiding stability in this hemisphere, in throwing our influence in an entirely correct manner in favor of the development of constitutional government and against unwarrantable uprisings, in protecting the legitimate freedom of commerce, we are making the greatest contribution directly within our power, and in accord with our established traditions and manifest interest, to the cause of world peace. This hemisphere should be the exemplar of peace, and we look with confidence to the creation of a unity of sentiment of the American republics against resort to the brutal arbitrament of force in political controversies. To this end the United States gladly gives its co-operation.

The Near East—Turkey

Let me now direct your attention to affairs in the Near East. The events of the past few years have created a new situation, and the difficulty in clarifying present problems is largely due to the fact that so many of our people discuss them in terms which belong to the past. While there was some consideration of Turkish questions in 1919, and certain inquiries were prosecuted, it was not until 1920, after the Austrian and Bulgarian treaties had been disposed of, that the Allies definitely took up the Turkish treaty. This treaty, called the Treaty of Sevres, was signed in August of that year. Its terms were severer than those of the European peace treaties, not only depriving the Turks of vast territories, but imposing upon them an even greater measure of foreign control than had been the case before the war. In spite, however, of the Allied occupation of Constantinople, the Greek occupation of Smyrna and its hinterland, and the French occupation of Cilicia, the Turks refused to ratify the

treaty. The Allies were not in a position to compel them to do so.

As one of the results of the World War, a new spirit of nationalism and a desire for freedom from outside control had made itself felt in the Near East. Nowhere had the evangel of self-determination found a more eager response. The nationalistic movement was particularly significant in Turkey. That this movement had often been accompanied by violence is not to be wondered at, although it is none the less to be regretted. The outcome of the movement in Turkey was the establishment of a government which claimed the right to be dealt with as sovereign and which by its military achievements made good that claim.

As early as January, 1920, the so-called Turkish National Pact had been voted by the Ottoman Parliament, which was then assembled at Constantinople. This pact set forth the aspirations of the Turks and later was adopted by the National Assembly at Angora as summarizing the object of the Turkish Nationalist movement. Among its provisions was the following:

"Article VI. It is a fundamental condition of our life and continued existence that we, like every country, should enjoy complete independence and liberty in the matter of assuring the means of our development, in order that our national and economic development should be rendered possible and that it should be possible to conduct affairs in the form of a more up-to-date regular administration.

"For this reason we are opposed to restrictions inimical to our development in political, judicial, financial, and other matters."

In March, 1921, the allied powers clearly appreciated that it would be impossible, short of armed allied military intervention in Turkey, to impose the Treaty of Sevres. It would seem that at no time was such armed allied intervention seriously considered, although from time to time certain of the allied powers gave a measure of support to the Greek forces in the hope that the latter would be able, through their victory over the Turks, to make possible the realization of the Sevres Treaty at least in part. There were unsuccessful attempts to revise the treaty. At last the total defeat of the Greek forces and the withdrawal of the Greek army

from Anatolia completely changed the situation to the advantage of Turkey and effected the elimination of the Treaty of Sevres as a basis for negotiation. A victorious Turkish army being in complete control of Anatolia and threatening Constantinople, the allied powers intervened to bring about an armistice between Greece and Turkey, which was signed at Mudania in October, 1922. The Lausanne conferences of 1922 and 1923 followed.

The Allies frankly recognized that the situation of 1918 no longer existed and that after the stubborn resistance of the Turks, culminating in their recapture of Smyrna, it was impossible to dictate the terms of peace. A treaty was therefore negotiated in which the Turks ceded very considerable territories and for the first time in their history agreed to open the Straits not only to merchant ships, but to foreign warships, but in which the Allies, on the other hand, agreed to renounce their historic capitulatory rights in Turkey.

In 1919 and 1920 the question was directly presented to the Government of the United States as to the nature and extent of its participation in the political and territorial readjustments of the Near East. At that time the spokesmen for the allied powers at Paris suggested that the United States assume a mandate for Constantinople and Armenia. The former proposal was never presented for the consideration of the Congress, as it was clear as early as 1919 that the American people would not favor the assumption of a mandate over Constantinople, which would immediately and directly involve this government in one of the most vexing political and territorial problems of the world—the storm center of historic rivalries and bitter contests.

When the question of an Armenian mandate was formally presented in 1920, as a result of the action of the allied representatives meeting at San Remo, the Congress declined to sanction it. It thus again became apparent that the United States Government was not prepared to intervene in Near Eastern affairs to the extent of assuming any obligations of a territorial character. This course was in accord with our traditional policy. The United States had taken no part in the

Turkish settlements which were embodied in the treaties of Paris in 1856, of Berlin in 1878, or in those which followed the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. Even during the World War we did not declare war on Turkey or take the initiative in breaking relations with that country, notwithstanding the serious provocation, from a humanitarian standpoint, of the extensive Armenian deportations. Presumably it was felt that the policy then adopted was better calculated to enable the United States to exert its influence and to protect its interests, so long as this country was not to join the military operations on the Near Eastern front.

If there ever was a time when we could have successfully intervened and have backed up our intervention by armed forces, it was early in 1919, when we had a large army abroad and were in a position to prosecute such a policy if deemed advisable. But this opportunity passed. It should be added that, contrary to an impression which is somewhat widespread in this country, this government, while it has always exerted its influence in a humanitarian way, has not assumed political obligations with respect to the Armenians or other Christian minorities in the Near East. Treaties concluded by other powers undertook, however, to deal with such questions. This government took no part in the negotiation of the Treaty of Sevres.

Such, then, was the situation prior to the year 1921. In developing our relations with the Near East subsequently, it was necessary to take into account the established policy of the government and at the same time to serve American interests and humanitarian ends. It should also be remembered that a large part of the distress in the Near East has been caused by encouraging action which failed of adequate support. At various times the Armenians and Greeks have been encouraged to take up arms, later to be left to their own devices. This government, however, would not be justified in promoting such a policy on the part of others which it was not prepared itself adequately to sustain. It has no mandate from the people to intervene by arms and thus to impose by force a solution of the problems of the Near East, and for this very reason it could not essay the rôle of a dictator in order to determine how others should solve these problems.

This, however, did not prevent this country from co-operating in a spirit of helpfulness and from bringing, as it has brought, its moral influence to aid in dealing with a situation of the utmost difficulty. This influence was brought to bear at the Lausanne Conference, where the efforts of the American representatives undoubtedly contributed in no small degree to the final agreement upon provisions regarding the protection of minorities, the recognition of charitable, educational, and philanthropic institutions, the appointment of judicial advisers, and the maintenance of equality of opportunity.

As I have said, a state of war had not existed between the United States and Turkey, and the course of events following the German War had reaffirmed the historic policy of refraining from intervention in political and territorial readjustments. Turkey had severed diplomatic relations with us in 1917, however, and these had not been resumed. But the formal conclusion of peace between the Allies and Turkey, entailing as it would the resumption of full diplomatic and consular relations, would leave the United States, unless appropriate action were taken, in a relatively disadvantageous position. Accordingly, negotiations were undertaken between American and Turkish representatives which resulted in the treaty of amity and commerce and the extradition treaty signed on August 6 last.

The treaty of amity and commerce followed very closely the Allied treaty without its territorial, political, and financial features. The United States gained the same general rights and privileges as the Allies, including the freedom of the Straits, and, like the Allies, consented to the abrogation of the capitulations, that is, of the exercise of the extraterritorial rights in Turkey, which the Turks regarded as in derogation of their sovereignty.

In making this important decision the American representatives were obliged to take account of the following considerations: It was quite apparent that the only basis upon which negotiations could be conducted was that of most-favored-nation treatment and reciprocity. Either the Turks were to be dealt with on this footing or not at all. In these circumstances three courses were open to us: (1) To compel the Turks by force to give us

better terms than the Allies; (2) not to negotiate at all; or (3) to negotiate with the Turks on equal terms as with a State enjoying an unqualified sovereignty.

The first course was out of the question. However desirable the maintenance of extritorial rights hitherto enjoyed might be, it was obvious that the public opinion of this country would not countenance a war for the purpose of maintaining them. Neither did it appear to be practicable to forego negotiations, in an attempt to maintain the *status quo*. After the armistice of 1918, we sent to Constantinople a high commissioner, with a naval detachment under his command, and in spite of his unofficial status in relation to the Turkish authorities he has succeeded in affording American interests appropriate protection. But this anomalous situation could not continue indefinitely. When the treaty of peace between the Allies and Turkey comes into effect, and diplomatic and consular officials of the allied powers return to Turkey, we should find ourselves in an extremely difficult position if action meanwhile had not been taken to regularize our own position, and in the absence of a treaty American interests in Turkey would be without adequate safeguards. In this event the humanitarian interests which are closest to the American heart would suffer. It was also perfectly clear that no period of waiting would avail to secure for us extritorial rights which on their part the Allies surrendered.

In these circumstances, the only practicable course was to negotiate a treaty as with a fully sovereign State. If such a treaty falls short of expectations, especially in that it acquiesces in the abrogation of the capitulations, it should not be forgotten that the only way to maintain the capitulations was to fight for them. It should also be borne in mind (1) that the Lausanne Treaty is such a treaty as would be negotiated with any other sovereign State, (2) that it gives us the same rights as other countries will enjoy under the new régime, and (3) that by regularizing our relations with Turkey, now interrupted for nearly seven years, it will provide safeguards for American educational, philanthropic, and commercial interests in Turkey.

Let me emphasize a further point. At no stage in the negotiations was the American position determined by the so-called

Chester concession. This had been granted before negotiations of our treaty with Turkey had been begun. This government took no part in securing it; this government made no barter of any of its rights for this or any other concession. Our position is a simple one. We maintain the policy of the open door, or equality of commercial opportunity; we demand a square deal for our nationals. We objected to the alleged concession to the Turkish Petroleum Company, owned by foreign interests, because it had never been validly granted, and in so doing we stood for American rights generally and not for any particular interest. Opening the door for American nationals, we give them impartial and appropriate diplomatic support in the assertion of what appear to be their legal rights, but without otherwise involving this government.

During the course of our recent negotiations, the Department of State was in frequent consultation with those whose interests in Turkey it is its privilege and duty properly to protect, particularly those whose humanitarian enterprises have long been established. They have clearly indicated their accord with the position that the present situation in Turkey should be frankly faced, and that the Turkish authorities should have an opportunity to show that their expressed desire for American friendship and help and their willingness to protect American interests are sincere. It is on this basis that our policy toward Turkey is being developed. Let it be understood that Turkey, while insistent upon unqualified sovereign rights, does not reject the international obligations which are correlative to such rights. Let it also be appreciated that Turkey is not endeavoring to undermine our institutions, to penetrate our labor organizations by pernicious propaganda, and to foment disorder and conspiracies against our domestic peace in the interest of a world revolution.

No one is more competent to speak on the subject of the treaty than Dr. James L. Barton, secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Permit me to quote from his recent letter (November 24, 1923):

"To say that I have followed with keen interest the making of this treaty and its fate up to the present time is to express but

mildly my own feeling as well as the feeling of the American board and its friends. While the treaty does not contain all that we would like, yet I am sure I express the judgment of the officers of the American board and, so far as I know, the missionaries, both on the field and here at home, when I say that it is our earnest hope that the treaty will be ratified by the Senate and that without acrimonious debate. We are convinced that this is the best treaty that could be secured under the circumstances, but that it will furnish a basis for negotiations and for securing privileges not covered in the treaty.

"If the treaty should be rejected, I am convinced that the continuance of American institutions in Turkey, with their large invested interests, would be jeopardized. Under the treaty, there are grounds for believing that they will be permitted to continue. I refer to educational, religious, medical, industrial, and philanthropic enterprises hitherto carried on by Americans, representing large American investments in Turkey. There are indications that the government will look with increasing favor upon the continuation of these institutions and grant them enlarging privileges. This has already taken place in Smyrna, Tarsus, and at some other points."

Let me add to this the statement of the distinguished educator, Dr. Caleb F. Gates, president of Robert College of Constantinople. After referring to the views of objectors, he says:

"Let us ask for a moment why it is that we have not made a treaty more in conformity with the wishes of so many of the American people. Is it because the American representatives were not skillful and allowed themselves to be outwitted by the Turks? The American representatives acquitted themselves exceedingly well; they gained the respect of their opponents as well as of the representatives of the allied powers. They came out of the conference with a reputation enhanced by the ability and fairness they had shown, and they gained for their country fully as much as the representatives of the allied powers gained for theirs. . . . The Turks were determined to become sovereign in their own domain, and they were willing and prepared to fight in order to obtain this sovereignty, while the Allies were not. Even those Americans who now denounce this treaty as unsatisfactory were determined

that their country should not go to war over these questions. . . . It is the only kind of a treaty which could have been made under the circumstances, when one party knew exactly what they wanted and were ready to fight to obtain it, and the other party was not willing to fight, but still wished to retain the former conditions. . . . As to the treaty itself, what does it give to us? It gives the good will of the Turks instead of their ill will. That is certainly worth something to all who live and work in Turkey. To them the treaty affords an opportunity to work out the problems which their life in Turkey presents and to exercise what influence they may possess in favor of the right. It still leaves an opportunity for missionaries and educators to try to make the principles of righteousness known and practiced in Turkey, and it gives to business men a field for their legitimate activities. . . . The schools and colleges established by Americans are carrying on their work and many of those that had been closed are reopening."

In order to accord adequate protection to American interests in the Near East during the period following the World War, the Department of State has maintained its representatives throughout this area and a naval force has been stationed in Near Eastern waters since 1919. Until October, 1922, this force consisted of from three to nine destroyers, with various other craft from time to time. When news was received of the Smyrna disaster twelve additional destroyers were immediately dispatched, arriving in Turkish waters during October of that year. These vessels have been of inestimable service to the representatives of the Department of State and to all American interests in the Near East. Through their radio they have furnished communication when no other means were available. They have transported American missionaries, philanthropists, relief workers, and business men, saving days and weeks of time, when no other adequate means of transportation were available. They have assisted in the evacuation of refugees and they have been instrumental in serving manifold humanitarian purposes. It is a pleasure to commend the admirable work that has been performed by the officers and men of these vessels.

Mandated Territories

Under the recent peace settlement between the allied powers and Turkey, the Arab portion of the former Turkish Empire is detached from Turkey. In Syria a mandate is being exercised by France and in Palestine by Great Britain, while in Mesopotamia a native kingdom is being developed under British guidance. These territorial changes have made it incumbent upon the United States to readjust its treaty relations which, with respect to these territories, were formerly controlled by our treaty with Turkey. In its correspondence with the British and French governments in relation to these territories, this government has made clear its position that the changed situation is a consequence of the common victory of the allied and associated powers over Germany, and that in view of its relation to this victory the United States is entitled to insist that no measure could properly be taken which would subject the United States to discrimination, or deprive its nationals within these territories of equality of treatment with the nationals of any other power.

The rights of States which are members of the League of Nations are set forth in the terms of the French mandate for Syria and of the British mandate for Palestine, respectively. As the United States is not a member of the League of Nations, separate agreements are being negotiated with Great Britain and France, under which the United States is to secure in these territories all rights and privileges enjoyed by States which are members of the League of Nations. Under these treaties American interests would be adequately safeguarded. There has been a development in Mesopotamia along slightly different lines, in view of the establishment of an Arab Government with which Great Britain has concluded a treaty, and as soon as this situation has been further clarified this government will not fail to take proper steps to regularize its relations with the appropriate authorities of Iraq with a view to the protection in Mesopotamia, as in Syria and Palestine, of American interests.

Persia

The Persian Government more than a year ago sought the aid of American ex-

perts in the reorganization of their finances. While this government could not assume any responsibility in this matter, it was glad that the services of competent American citizens could be secured, and a financial mission accordingly proceeded to Persia and for the past year has been rendering important expert aid, as Persian officials, to the Persian ministers in reorganizing the financial administration of the country. While this is not an official mission of this country in any sense, it has helped to cement the relations between the two countries, making more firm the ties of mutual friendship and esteem.

Greece

The death of the late King Alexander of Greece was followed in December, 1920, by the return to Athens of Constantine. In accordance with the usual practice in the case of monarchical countries, the Greek representative in Washington tendered new letters of credence, the acceptance of which would have constituted formal recognition of the new government. In view of the special circumstances which attended Constantine's return to Athens, it was deemed important, before according recognition, to take into account not only the part that Constantine had played in the war, but also the policy of the new régime with regard to the acts and obligations of its predecessor and the attitude of the associates of the United States in the war. With respect to Constantine's attitude toward the engagements of the former government, there was for a time an uncertainty whether Constantine considered the government of King Alexander as a *de jure* government. This was important, for if the Government of the United States had extended recognition it might have put itself in a position of acquiescing in a possible review of the acts of King Alexander's Government, which had borrowed substantial sums from the United States. It will also be recalled that none of the principal allied powers recognized Constantine subsequent to his return.

So far as the records indicate, these considerations controlled the policy of the United States Government during the period subsequent to Constantine's return and prior to March, 1921. Upon the

change of administration the question arose whether there was a sufficient reason for changing this policy and for taking a course of action different from that followed by the allied powers. Other considerations had intervened making affirmative action in the matter of recognition undesirable. Constantine developed a militaristic policy in Asia Minor, in which Greece was already engaged, by which he desired to justify his hold upon the throne.

Separate action by the United States at this time could hardly have been interpreted otherwise than as an expression of sympathy and support by this government for this policy of Constantine and as an indirect participation in the politics of the Near East, which it was desired to avoid. The wisdom of refusing recognition was indicated by the overthrow of Constantine when Greek military plans in Asia Minor failed, an overthrow which was attended by a complete revolution. It will be recalled that Constantine fled the country, and that his prominent supporters and cabinet ministers were arrested and after summary trials were executed. The British Government, which previously had maintained a *chargé d'affaires* in Athens, although not recognizing Constantine, withdrew this representative, while the representatives of other powers, including that of the United States, took occasion to interpret to the Greek authorities the unfortunate impression which the execution of the Greek ministers had caused.

The régime which succeeded that of Constantine was frankly based on military power and did not regularize its position by holding elections. Meanwhile the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the allied powers, Greece and Turkey, was undertaken at Lausanne, and it seemed undesirable, pending the conclusion of these negotiations, for the United States to take separate action in the matter of recognition.

The situation has now materially changed. The Lausanne negotiations have been concluded, peace has now been ratified by Greece and Turkey, and elections were held in Greece on December 16, 1923. These elections, it is hoped, will result in the establishment of a government which will enable this government

to extend formal recognition. The fact that recognition has not been extended during the past three years does not indicate an attitude of unfriendliness toward the Greek people. What American agencies have done in assisting the refugees in Greece is clear evidence to the contrary, and this humanitarian work could not have been carried out more effectively even if formal relations had been resumed, thanks to the initiative of American agencies and the helpful co-operation of the Greek authorities.

Egypt

I should not omit the mention of the recognition of Egypt, where we have had a minister for a considerable time, and whose minister in turn we are now receiving. We have a deep interest in the most cordial relations with Egypt, and it is interesting to note that the Egyptian Government has been anxious to take advantage of the facilities offered in this country for perfecting the technical education of Egyptian students, particularly along lines of trade and engineering. A group of students came to the United States a year ago and other similar student missions are now on their way.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I may say that the new spirit of the Near East must be met sympathetically, not by arms, not by attempts at dictatorship or by meddlesome interventions, but by candor, directness, and just appreciation of nationalistic aims and by a firm but friendly insistence upon the discharge of those international obligations the recognition of which affords the only satisfactory basis for the intercourse of nations. In this way the Orient and the Occident may find ground for co-operation and for the maintenance of peace sustained by the reciprocal advantages of cultural relations.

FROM EDMUND BURKE

"Sir, to speak the plain truth, I have in general no very exalted opinion of the virtue of paper government, nor of any politics in which the plan is to be wholly separated from the execution."

THE WILL TO END WAR

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

MEN have always felt the paradox of civilization, especially of Christian civilization, to be its wars; the amazing incongruity of human history to be its recurring outbursts of collective homicide.

Before the great war a few of us were calling attention to the distressing cost of it all in the terms of wealth; to the far more unhappy cost in terms of misery and perverted judgments.

We were not without hope. We saw even in those threatening days the slow development of a more rational interpretation of international behavior, the gradually increasing substitution of judicial and other peaceful methods of settling disputes between States. We argued that the ways of justice make for an inevitable improvement in an otherwise intolerable world situation; that, indeed, they mean the ultimate doom of international wars. We aimed to make our arguments against war more than mere emotional, personal, and subjective ravings of "well-meaning pacifists." We thought them more than simply transcendental fulminations of theorists and dogmatists. We believed them more valuable than vain ex-cathedra utterances wholly lacking in proof. We assumed our arguments to be capable of scientific demonstration. We had long known that it is difficult to dogmatize upon the causes of war, and, similarly, upon the prospects of ending war. We were always ready to grant that the world presents no problem more intricate than the problem of substituting reason for force in the settlement of international disputes. Hence with fear and faith, we sought out arguments founded, we believed, in logic and honest research. We saw that there have been successful group controls of individual crimes of violence; so it should be possible to develop methods for the limitation of international violence. The individual highwayman leads a precarious and a hunted career. The same should be true of the nation highwayman. Objective inquiry shows that the fighting instinct among men has been curbed and altered by law. The same kind of inquiry tells us that the war instinct of nations must accept the same fate; for otherwise,

with our growing scientific means of destruction, the nations cannot long endure. We saw all these things clearly before the war.

Yet, as we feared, a war came—a devastating war. But the supreme lesson of all that now is that we were right before the war; and that now, if civilization is to survive, the nations must again go collectively about the job of ending, if possible, once for all, this paradox, this amazing scourge, this incongruous orgy, this needless horror of war. The war has been a sufficing demonstration of the truth we aimed then and still aim to teach. Hence this will to end war is, partly because of the war, more apparent and outspoken among men everywhere. That is a gain. There *is* balm in Gilead; there *is* a physician there.

THE BENUMBING COSTS OF IT

In Money

Reasons for this will to end war are apparent and easy to state. For example, the money cost of it all has been brought home to us anew, and the will to stop it strengthened.

And that cost is bewildering as it is impressive. The national debts of the world increased during the seven years following 1913 from \$43,200,931,000 to \$265,305,022,000. They are still mounting. The per capita debt of the United States increased during the same period from \$11 to \$225; of Great Britain, from \$78 to \$850; of France, from \$160 to \$1,150. The building of the Panama Canal cost us approximately \$400,000,000. By 1918 the direct money cost of the war had risen to \$10,000,000 an hour—a Panama Canal every one and two-thirds days. The total direct expense during the period of the war was equivalent to 465 Panama canals. If to the direct costs we add the no less tangible indirect money costs, we have the amazing equivalent of at least 930 Panama canals.

And the indirect costs are no less distressing. The 13,000,000 dead boys mean at least 13,000,000 others prematurely dead because of lowered vitality. But just those 13,000,000 dead boys,

representing a number considerably more than twice the total deaths due to all the wars of the nineteenth century, including the twenty-five years of the Napoleonic struggles, mean 13,000,000 less among our best producers. Prof. Ernest L. Bogart finds, and he has been confirmed by such statisticians as O. P. Austin, the direct and indirect money costs of the great World War to have been \$337,946,179,657. That was in 1918. The costs are still accumulating, let us repeat. As Professor Bogart adds:

"The figures presented in this summary are both incomprehensible and appalling; yet even these do not take into account the effect of the war on life, human vitality, economic well being, ethics, morality, or other phases of human relationships and activities which have been disorganized and injured."

Since a billion is such an incomprehensible number, the staggering financial situation of the world may be more nearly realized if the case be put thus: One year after the war the total debts of the nations were \$265,000,000,000, which means \$221,000,000,000 more than in 1913. The annual interest on those debts was over \$9,000,000,000—five times greater than before the war. Now, according to the latest figures, the number of men, women, and children in all the world is only 1,692,604,366. There were slightly over one billion minutes from the beginning of our Christian era to the opening of the war, in 1914. Thus we can sense in a way the magnitude of the debts. And yet these inconceivable debts do not include the money value of crippled soldiers, or of invalidated and devitalized armies and civilian populations. The property loss in France, \$13,000,000,000, is not included. The figures do not tell us of the destruction of productive machinery, the reduced production, the lower birth-rate, and the accelerated race deterioration around the world. Figures cannot tell us of the broken hearts.

It is said that the fear of costs does not deter nations from going to war. I believe it does. Whether it does or not, it ought. When we think of what it all means in the way of a continuing expense through the century that lies before, and try to compute it in terms of the unimaginable billions, we have to accept the fact that all

of our efforts to apply our theories of social organization are to be tragically retarded. The better homes, the more general education of our people, the better health and the reduction of the death-rate, the new machinery, the new artisans, the new roads and river channels, the forest conservation, the development of water-power, of agriculture, of irrigation, of the arts and sciences, all must feel, and that for generations to come, the handicap of our enormous expenditures because of war.

A member of our war Cabinet, when asked what he would do if he had the war money at his disposal to expend upon constructive work, replied that he would take the carnotite ores of the West, reduce them to radium, and eliminate one-half the cancer. He would go scientifically into the business of finding out what is in our mountains. He would search out the deposits of potash in kelp and valley. He would eliminate the fly and mosquito, and build up a better national health. He added:

"So is it not plain that if the world would spend upon man-making rather than upon man-killing, wonderful things might be accomplished? . . . The curse of war and preparation for war is not that men die, but that they do not live to do their share towards the solution of the problems of social and commercial life. . . . Such a people as ours, encouraged by a century of peace, would develop a civilization that not only materially, but artistically would surpass anything which the world has ever seen."

Common sense leads us all to wish that the expense of collective killing might cease. As Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill, English First Lord of the Admiralty before the war, speaking at that time on the expenses of the killing system, remarked in substance, "What a wasteful, purposeless, futile folly it all is; what a stupid, unnatural chapter in the history of human endeavor."

In Ways More Serious Than Money

And yet the least of the influences leading to our will to end war is that the business costs money. Belgium did not stop to count the cost when she was overrun by Germany; neither did France. England's decision to enter, with her standing army of only 100,000, upon a conti-

mental land war seemed well-nigh suicidal. When once it was clear to the United States that the only way to end the war was to defeat the Central Powers of Europe, we joined in the job, regardless of cost. It was so with all the belligerents.

But war means costs of a more serious nature—costs in erroneous thinking and twisted judgments.

For example, there are honest and intelligent men who believe that war is a divine institution and as such it is beneficial and desirable. This is the argument of the Von Moltkes, Bernhardis, Maudes. Mr. Hudson Maxim argues in his *Defenceless America* that war is desirable because it secures the "survival of the fit." It is pointed out that war is a wholesome moral influence, increasing, and often creating the virtues of patriotism and self-sacrifice. They say that war gives rise to efficiency, courage, and discipline; that war has made powerful States possible, and the powerful States have given to us the arts, literatures, religions. They tell us that war gives play to physical virility and advances the meritorious traits of keenness and alertness; that it decides differences, promotes progress, and prevents overpopulation—an important economic fact for human society. They go on to argue that war is the natural expression of human nature, that man is a fighter, and by the means of war he reaches to the supreme height of self-sacrifice, and therefore of his moral possibilities. As long as human nature remains as it is, differences are inevitable; hence the fighting instinct, the love of adventure, the human impulse following in the steps of honor and justice, will mean war for the human race throughout time. Thus wars always have been and always will be. The history of the world has been practically a continuous history of human warfare. One authority finds that throughout nearly 3,500 years there have been 227 years of peace—thirteen years of war to one of peace. Because of such facts war is inevitable. So run the arguments for war.

But, of course, these are but half-truths. If men really believed that war is a divine and helpful institution, they would systematically urge and promote it. The universal aim would be to bring about war for the purpose of furthering the divinity of the institution, quite as now we aim

to spiritualize the church. By the same course of reasoning we should burn houses to benefit firemen, spread disease germs to improve our doctors, rob banks systematically, and shoot up our neighbors generously unto the efficiency of our police and the good of our souls.

Again, the history of all animals, including the human animal, is not a history of fixed instincts, but a history of the modifications of their instincts. The social progress which we have made is due to the modification of our human instincts. We not only modify our instincts, but we direct them to new objects and subordinate them to other and higher instincts. If there seem to be an inevitable conflict among men, there is also an abiding instinct of mutual aid. Man is no longer a fighting animal. Men who fight are shut up. The great martial nations of the world have had a hard time. Most of them have passed away. National pride, like individual pride, ends in a paradox, and ever tends to defeat itself. Might cannot be made synonymous with right. Most of us thought we were waging this war to overcome a nation that had not outgrown the fighting instinct.

But perhaps no one fact shows the fallacy of the pro-war phrase-mongering as does the simple fact that wars are themselves waged avowedly for the purpose of ending war and of establishing peace. When the war is on, all the generals and statesmen tell us that. But, whatever the views of the military leaders, certainly the fathers and mothers give up their sons with pride and tears that by the only practical means they are able to see the war may be ended. At such times war is seen to be an unmitigated evil, to be ended at whatever cost of blood and treasure.

Furthermore, it is only in a most limited sense that preparation for war is an "insurance against war," a "premium for the maintenance of peace." To say that it is such an "insurance" is a fallacy. Insurance is a contract by the terms of which a first party agrees to pay to a second party a certain specified small amount, called a premium, for which the second party agrees to pay the first party a much larger sum in case of a contingency nominated in the agreement. Prior to this war we were spending annually upon our army and navy practically \$300,000,000.

If that were a premium as an insurance against war, either one of two things would have happened: we would not have had a war, or, if we had a war, we would have received from some outside party a large sum of money as reimbursement for our losses. The facts are we paid the \$300,000,000 annually, and that we had our war, for which we have paid many billions, with many more to follow. In other words, we have paid the premium and the loss besides. That is all there is to the insurance argument. The fact that all of the leading nations had powerful navies in July, 1914, did not prevent them from going to war. In our present state of international anarchy, preparation for war may be necessary. I believe that a rational amount of it is. But such preparation is not insurance. At best, it is a fire department. Great armaments do not insure peace; they tend to destroy peace. They do not exist to preserve peace; they are kept up for one purpose, and one purpose only; namely, to win in war. Armaments are for victory and, if thought desirable, conquest.

Thus the perversion of judgments represents a more serious cost than the matter of dollars and cents. The supporters of the war system do not distinguish clearly between physical and moral heroism. They seem to forget that war takes men out of productive activities, thus reducing the veritable necessities of life. They do not reckon the loss to industry, the destruction of property, the crippling of beneficence, the scourge of disease, the ruin in terms of life, the injustices, the blood-red madness, the despotism and night following the fights of armies, and the general hell of war. They ignore the fact that true freedom is found only in him who ruleth his own spirit. Wars may be won and justice defeated. Might of itself cannot make right. War is the supreme indictment of human civilization.

As long as men are ignorant, as long as evils prevail, as long as the forces of nature are unsubdued, men may find ample opportunity to exercise their honor, heroism, sense of duty, love of glory, by attacking the inanimate foes—the floods, the fires, the famines, the diseases—a behavior calling for all the virtues of the soldier in war—indeed, a spiritual warfare where affections and sympathies will

bring about those generousities and methods of justice which alone can create the “great society” that is to be.

Following the dire discussions of his Stygian council, Milton was led to say:

“O shame to men! devil with devil damn'd
Firm concord holds; men only disagree,
Of creatures rational, though under hope
Of heavenly grace; and God proclaiming
peace,

Yet live in hatred, enmity, and strife
Among themselves, and levy cruel wars,
Wasting the earth, each other to destroy;
As if (which might induce us to accord)
Man had not hellish foes anow besides,
That day and night for his destruction wait.”

War is a monstrous perversion of the judgments and perspectives of men. The magnificence of war, called “moonshine” by General Sherman, is less picturesque than ever. World armies and navies rest on fear rather than on reason; on hate—and that of no one in particular. The huge armaments of the earth are a cruel slander against reason, a tribute to an utter lack of sincerity within and of any faith in the sincerity of others without. As said by Emerson, war is “an epidemic insanity.” Noah Worcester said in his “Solemn Review”: “War is, in fact, a heathenish and savage custom, most malignant, most desolating, and most horrible, and the greatest delusion, the greatest curse, that ever afflicted a guilty world.” Thomas Jefferson called war “the greatest of human evils.” Franklin’s words, July 27, 1783, to Sir Joseph Banks, were: “There never was a good war or a bad peace.” Washington wrote of war in 1785: “My first wish is to see this plague to mankind banished from the earth.” Gladstone called war the “original sin of nations.” John Fiske characterized war as an “intolerable nuisance.” It has been condemned as detestable by Wellington, inadequate by Napoleon, self-defeating by Sheridan, and unreasonable by Grant. This ghastly institution, inherited out of savagery, must go the way of the other human perversions—human sacrifice, cannibalism, duelling, witchcraft, thumbkin, lynching, slavery, the rack—for war is all of these and worse. What is wrong, as God lives, shall be overcome. Hence persists the will to end war.

A STILL DEEPER REASON FOR THE WILL TO END WAR

The Great Fact of Life

There is, however, a reason for the will to end war deeper than the cost of it all, be the cost in terms of money or of wrong-headedness. It is found in the fact that war runs counter to the basic principle of all life; namely, that life exists primarily that there may be more life. Every protoplasmic cell, every flower of the field, every child sent to school, every social worker, every courtship and marriage, every law, institution, invention, every worthy ideal, are all expressions of this great fact of life struggling to produce more life. War, in practically all of its phases, is the antithesis of this principle.

The rise of the conception of this truth can be traced only imperfectly. Our earliest ancestors seem to have apprehended it but dimly. Unable to use tools or fire, slowly developing the notion and habits of family life, frequently fighting literally tooth and nail, we think of them in the human scale as savages merely. Thus they began—"savages." Then, down the ages, cunning gradually crept into the ends of their fingers, rude tools extended the length of their arms, wild weapons expanded their powers of conquest, families united in clans—still fighting, to be sure, but no longer "savages," we say, but "barbarians." Later the clans multiplied into cities and states. The efficiency of their weapons increased. The spirit of competition grew stronger. Still living under the rule that might is right, they waged continuous and increasing wars against each other, unpeopling the world by feud and sword. As we have seen, it has been one year of peace for thirteen years of war. That we call "civilization."

But the process does not end there. The great principle of life has led some men out of savagery, out of barbarism, out of mere civilization, for a new hope is beckoning unto them, a larger revelation. These few have discovered all of us to be "members one of another." They have beheld us related consciously, still more unconsciously related with each other around the globe. They have seen the vision of a universal solidarity. Under this prime principle of life, the doctrine of strife has tended to give way—gradually, very gradu-

ally, but surely—to a creative belief in the social principle of mutuality, in a limitless human interrelation, in a world-wide co-operation. Thus men have the will to end war.

And now, once again, therefore, men are listening more readily and sympathetically to schemes for international co-operation. Because of the war they believe more than ever that we needs must base our institutions upon this great fact of life—that, on the whole and in the long run, life exists that there may be more life. Such, they hold, is the supreme teaching of the religions—indeed, of plain reason.

Thus survives faith in the still more hopeful march toward the world's "Gleam," toward a new humanism indeed—international, world-wide, founded in law and justice—for life means that there must be more life. In the main, wars are inconsistent with this most fundamental of all laws. Hence wars are forordained, very gradually, but inevitably, to cease. This is what Ralph Waldo Emerson meant when, in 1838, he said, in his address before the American Peace Society, "All history is the decline of war, though the slow decline."

THE WILL TO END WAR AN HISTORICAL FACT

The will to end war prevailing through the centuries means more than a fear of the costs, more than a pious wish. It is an historical fact influencing the course of events. Out of it have arisen institutions and a worthy literature, both to be reckoned with.

Beginnings of the Modern Peace Movement 1815

The modern peace movement had its beginning about the year 1815, a year which marked the dawn of an interesting period in the growth of the will to end war—indeed, in the development of a variety of social organizations and reconstructions. For example, at that time forces were converging toward a more militant democracy, soon to express itself in a marked extension of public education, of agitation for woman suffrage, of temperance, and of various labor and political reforms. It was at the beginning of the transcendental movement of Kant, Schelling, Emerson. It was the year of the

useless battle of New Orleans and of the waste of Waterloo; of the beginning of the Holy Alliance, and hence of the Monroe Doctrine. In that year Belgium was taken from France, to be neutralized in 1831. In that year the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg was added to Holland and headed toward her neutralization in 1867. It was the year in which the Treaty of Ghent was ratified, the instrument which we may well believe ended forever international wars between English-speaking peoples. It was the year that marked the Congress of Vienna, with its league of nations that established the Kingdom of the Netherlands, united Norway and Sweden, neutralized Switzerland, reorganized Germany, maintained a sort of peace in Europe for over a generation, and directed its statesmanship for a century, yet a league that lamentably failed. It was the year in which Benjamin Lundy began the first anti-slavery societies, the beginning of the end in America of the institution of slavery. Humphrey Davy invented his safety lamp during that year. But more important than any of these, it was the year that found the world sick and tired of "seven," "thirty," and "one hundred years" wars, of Napoleonic slaughters, and of the miseries following the French Revolution, the American Revolution, the War of 1812. Battles had for the time quite consumed in their blasting flames the war passions of men. The blood lust of nations had been surfeited by 1815. The will to end war had been aroused.

Beginning of Peace Societies

As a result, and for the first time in the history of the world, *peace societies* began. In that year, 1815, three peace societies, no one knowing of the plans of the others, sprang into being. The first was founded August 16, at the home of Mr. David Low Dodge, in New York City; another in Ohio, December 2; another, upon the initiative of Noah Worcester, December 26, at the home of William Ellery Channing, Boston. The following year peace societies began in Europe. The oldest existing peace society, "The Peace Society," London, was formed June 14, 1816.

The peace societies had an influence. During the nineteenth century the will to

end war increased markedly. While, because of his part in inserting arbitration clauses in the treaty between this country and Great Britain, in 1794, John Jay was burned in effigy in the streets of Boston, yet since that time there have been over six hundred international arbitrations between various countries of the world. The most rapid increase in the number of these treaties occurred within the last generation. The importance of these treaties is illustrated by the fact that the violation of one of them turned a continental war into a world war. This peace sentiment grew in no small measure out of the work of the peace societies.

The countless reams of pamphlets published by these societies played their part toward expressing this will to end war. The first *tract* professedly and exclusively published for the promotion of peace was published by Mr. David Low Dodge, merchant of New York City and "father of the peace movement," in the year 1809. This first pamphlet by Mr. Dodge, called "The Mediator's Kingdom Not of This World," and a second by the same author, entitled "War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ," published in 1812, both met with pronounced opposition from clergy and laity. Today tons of such literature are being constantly spread before the world.

Noah Worcester had great difficulty in finding a publisher for his essay, "A Solemn Review of the Custom of War." It was published on Christmas Day, 1814, but only on condition that it be issued "anonymously." Yet this tract was and is spread broadcast, appearing in translated form in many languages. Its influence has been profound. Largely because of it, *peace societies* spread rapidly. It converted William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society.

In spite of the war, peace pamphlets of today are sought far and near. Furthermore, and again in spite of the war, no one has today to apologize for writing in defense of international peace. Indeed, that is what most writers are writing about and all political parties pleading for. The war, we were told, was "a war to end war."

Following the organization of the societies in New York, Ohio, and Massachusetts, we are able to record the organization of a peace society in Portland, Maine,

January 31, 1817; in Providence, Rhode Island, March 20, 1817; in Vermont, 1819; in North Carolina, 1819; in Pennsylvania, December, 1822; Windham County, Connecticut, 1826; Hartford County, Connecticut, 1828. By 1828 there were peace societies in New Hampshire and Georgia. Indeed, it was estimated at that time that there were over fifty peace societies in the United States alone. As an indication of the interest in the movement, it is known that by 1833 there was a county peace society in every county in the State of Connecticut. By that year they existed also in France, Ireland, England, Nova Scotia, and Canada.

American Peace Society

At a meeting of the Maine Peace Society at Minot, Maine, February 10, 1826, a motion was carried to form a national peace society. Minot was the home of William Ladd. The first constitution for a national peace society was drawn by this illustrious "Apostle of Peace," at the time the corresponding secretary of the Massachusetts Peace Society. The constitution was provisionally adopted, with alterations, February 18, 1828; but the society was finally and officially organized, through the influence of Mr. Ladd, May 8, 1828, and with the aid of David Low Dodge, in New York City. As Mr. Dodge wrote in the minutes of the New York Peace Society: "The New York Peace Society resolved to be merged in the American Peace Society, . . . which, in fact, was a dissolution of the old New York Peace Society, formed 16 August, 1815, and the American, May, 1828, was substituted in its place."

Today this society, with headquarters at Washington, is an incorporated organization. It has initiated the American peace congresses; it attempts to co-operate with the government, and to influence legislation in behalf of arbitrations and international good will. It maintains a lecture bureau, a library of peace information, and distributes tons of literature to writers, speakers, schools, colleges, and libraries. It co-operates in every possible way with other effective organizations in this country and abroad.

Its program, outlined so convincingly by Mr. Ladd in 1840, is the basis of The Hague conferences, of the conception of

a world governed by self-imposed laws. It is a program based upon American political experience, and calling, therefore, for a Congress and High Court of Nations to the end that international relations may be conducted in the interests of that concrete justice which flows only from law mutually made and proclaimed. The American Peace Society believes that by compromise, intelligence, and good will the nations will wish increasingly to develop for their interests and protection a more perfect union of themselves, a union built upon laws and not men, a society of all the nations resting upon the free consent of the governed. It believes that established States, large and small, will wish to remain free, sovereign, and independent; that they will always retain certain rights, such as the right to exist, to conserve their independence and well being, to preserve their territory and jurisdiction over it, to be treated as equals before the law, to expect every respect and protection from their sister States in the maintenance of these rights. It believes also that States can and should be led to observe certain duties, such as the duty to commit no unjust act against an innocent State, to interfere with the rights of no other State; in short, to cherish and uphold the laws which they themselves have passed and accepted.

In 1916 the American Peace Society approved the Declaration of Rights and Duties of Nations, adopted by the American Institute of International Law at its first session, in the city of Washington, January 6, 1916; and in 1917 the recommendations of Havana, also adopted by the American Institute of International Law, in the city of Havana, Cuba, January 23, 1917. In May, 1921, the Society adopted a series of fourteen proposals which it has printed from time to time under the caption *Suggestions for a Governed World*. In May, 1923, the Society adopted the following self-explanatory resolutions:

"WHEREAS war as a method of settling international disputes has been again revealed to us not only in its uncivilized ruthlessness, but in all its inadequacy and futility;

"WHEREAS the World War has left the nations for the most part estranged, each striving in unco-ordinated ways to improve

the international economic and political distress;

"WHEREAS it is the ideal of all civilized States that 'Justice is the great end of man on earth'";

"WHEREAS the supreme indictment of the war system lies in the fact that wars may be won and justice defeated;

"WHEREAS, as between man and man, so between State and State, there can be no abiding or desirable peace except a peace of justice:

"Resolved, That we urge upon press, pulpit, and platform, upon Congress, the President of the United States, and all well disposed people everywhere, that they make every possible effort:

"(1) To bring about at the earliest practicable moment a conference of all the nations for the restatement, amendment, reconciliation, and declaration of international law.

"(2) To extend to those international disputes not capable of solution through the ordinary channels of diplomacy the application of the long-established processes of good offices, mediation, commissions of inquiry, councils of conciliation, and arbitration.

"(3) To promote an independent International Court of Justice, to which all civilized States shall of right have direct access, to the end that justiciable disputes may be settled in accordance with the principles of law and equity."

As far as the American Peace Society adheres to a program, the program is that. It measures its work by those standards. Upon them it bases its hope for that governed world where wars shall be lessened and laws enthroned.

Up to the rumblings of the World War, the peace movement of America was almost exclusively the American Peace Society and its work. And that work was a worthy and notable work. The story of it would itself fill many volumes. As I have said elsewhere, William Ladd was pleading, in 1828, for a Congress of Nations. It was the American Peace Society that stood for a "Congress of Nations for the amicable adjustment of international disputes" in its Fourth Annual Report of 1832. In February, 1835, a peace petition, "signed by several thousand persons," was presented to the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, with the result that that body adopted the following reso-

lution, first peace resolution to be adopted by a legislature:

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of this legislature, some mode should be established for the amicable and final adjustment of all international disputes instead of to resort to war.

"Resolved, That the Governor of this Commonwealth be requested to communicate a copy of the above report and of the resolutions annexed to the Executive of each of the States, to be laid before the legislature thereof, inviting a co-operation for the advancement of the object in view."

Again, through the influence of the American Peace Society, a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts adopted unanimously, in 1837, in the Senate, and practically unanimously in the Lower House, other resolutions condemning war as a means of adjusting international disputes, approving a "Congress or Court of Nations," and recommending to the Executive of the United States negotiations, "with a view to effect so important an arrangement." The following year the Massachusetts legislature passed four other resolutions, the third of which reads:

"Resolved, That the institution of a Congress of Nations for the purpose of framing a code of international law and establishing a High Court of Arbitration for the settlement of controversies between nations is a scheme worthy of the careful attention and consideration of all enlightened governments."

The fourth resolution was as follows:

"Resolved, That his Excellency the Governor of this Commonwealth be requested to transmit a copy of these resolves, with the accompanying report, to the President of the United States and to the Executive of each of the States, to be communicated to their respective legislatures, inviting their co-operation in the proposed object."

The Society submitted petitions to the United States Congress in 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1849. Just prior to 1840 the agitation for a Congress of Nations for the purpose of establishing an international tribunal was, because of the work of the American Peace Society, pop-

ular and widespread. In 1849, for example, Richard Cobden submitted to the House of Commons on the 12th of June a proposal that England enter into communication with foreign powers for the purpose of referring matters in dispute to the decision of arbitrators. Meeting with the opposition of the Palmerston Cabinet, the proposition was rejected by a vote of 176 to 79. In 1851 the American Peace Society presented, through Robert C. Winthrop, a petition to the United States Senate, with the result that Mr. Foote, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, affirmed that arbitration as a system was "perfectly reasonable," and with the further result that the committee unanimously reported:

"That it would be proper and desirable for the Government of these United States, whenever practicable, to secure, in its treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation, in the first instance, before a resort to hostilities shall be had."

In February, 1853, largely through the efforts of the American Peace Society, particularly because of the work of its President, the Hon. William Jay, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Senate advise the President to secure, whenever it may be practicable, a stipulation in all treaties hereafter entered into with other nations, providing for the adjustment of any misunderstanding or controversy which may arise between the contracting parties by referring the same to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators to be mutually chosen."

The principle of arbitration was established between this country and Great Britain in a treaty relative to fishing grounds, under date of June 5, 1854. Among other things, the treaty provided that:

"The Commissioners shall name some third person to act as an arbitrator or umpire in any case or cases on which they may themselves differ in opinion.

"The high contracting parties hereby solemnly engage to consider the decisions of

the Commissioners conjointly, or of the arbitrator or umpire, as the case may be, as absolutely final and conclusive in each case decided upon by them or him respectively."

The American Peace Society continued to plead with Congress and State legislatures for a Congress and High Court of Nations and for stipulated arbitration up to the opening of the Civil War. In 1866 it sent a deputation to Congress with a petition in behalf of stipulated arbitration and a Congress and High Court of Nations. In 1872 the Society presented a new memorial to Congress in behalf of a permanent system of arbitration and a High Court of Nations, a petition which was signed by some twelve thousand citizens. The result was that, with the aid of Mrs. Charles Sumner, there was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate a series of resolutions advocating a permanent system of arbitration.

The next year Mr. Henry Richard secured a parliamentary declaration from the House of Commons, under date of July 8, as follows:

"That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to instruct her principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with foreign powers, with a view to the further improvement of international law and the establishment of a general and permanent system of international arbitration."

In 1874, because of the influence of the American Peace Society, petitions from different parts of the country were again sent to Congress, with the result that on the 17th day of June of that year the House of Representatives unanimously adopted resolutions in favor of arbitration, and the Senate approved them also, with unanimity, on the 25th of that month.

The Society sent repeated petitions through the eighties to the Congress, calling attention to the desirability of a conference of the States of this hemisphere in the interest of peace and better trade relations. Following its memorials, ten bills were presented in Congress for such a conference of all the Americas, until finally the Pan-American Congress, duly authorized by Congress, met in the autumn of 1889.

In 1888, 235 members of the British Parliament forwarded a communication to the President and Congress of the United States, urging the conclusion of a treaty of arbitration between this country and Great Britain. Petitions and memorials from multitudes of individuals and associations across the country, and mass meetings, particularly in New York, supported the British proposal. As a result of this movement, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate reported a joint resolution embodying the principle of arbitration in the case of differences or disputes arising between this government and other nations. January 11, 1897, a permanent treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain was signed, but failed of ratification in the Senate.

Perhaps the most important illustration from those days of the prevailing interest in arbitration was the publication by the Government of the United States, in 1898, of John Bassett Moore's six volumes dealing exhaustively with the history and digest of the international arbitrations to which the United States had been a party.

Rules governing the procedure of international tribunals of arbitration were discussed by the Institute of International Law, at Geneva, in 1874, and again at The Hague, in 1875. Another set, submitted by a committee of lawyers at the Universal Peace Congress, Chicago, 1893, revealed something of the attention serious-minded men were giving to the judicial settlement of international disputes. John Hay, Secretary of State, in his instructions to the American delegates to The Hague Conference of 1899, submitted an "annex," setting forth a plan for an international tribunal.

Many resolutions passed by many conferences indicate clearly the wisdom of William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society, as set forth especially in his essay on a "Congress of Nations," said by one of America's leading authorities on international law "to contain every worthy thing that has been said or can be said on international peace."

Thus the American Peace Society has been a no insignificant factor in the rise of the will to end war.

The First Peace Periodicals

Periodicals also have played a part in the will to end war. The first periodical devoted exclusively to the cause of international peace was entitled "The Friend of Peace," the product of Noah Worcester's intelligent and consecrated spirit, the first number being published in Philadelphia in 1816. Worcester had seen service in the American Revolution. He knew war, therefore, at first hand. For twelve years he published his worthy periodical at his own expense. It is profitable reading still.

Pages of this magazine contain analytical accounts of campaigns, war news of current interest, peace sermons and exhortations, peace society notes, many letters, all constituting suggestive historical source material of that early period. It is of interest to note that No. 4 of the series went through seven editions in America.

A peace periodical, *The Herald of Peace*, published by the Peace Society, London, the first number appearing January, 1819, appeared regularly for many years.

Mr. Ladd's *Harbinger of Peace* first appeared, under the auspices of the American Peace Society, in May, 1828. The first number starts with a "Circular Letter of the American Peace Society," written by the editor. The letter begins with a historical summary of the peace movement and closes with a staunch appeal for international peace, mentioning at that early period the need of a "congress of nations."

For the months of May and June, 1831, *The Harbinger of Peace* was increased to twice its original size and the name changed to the *Calumet*. This was published bimonthly by the American Peace Society, under almost the exclusive editorship of Mr. Ladd, until 1835, the last number being for the months of March and April of that year. Its editorials, essays, and poems are for the most part excellent in thought and style, and, together with the many reports, they present an interesting picture of early nineteenth-century views in America.

In 1835 the American Peace Society "relinquished" the *Calumet* for the *American Advocate of Peace*, which had been established by William Watson, of the Connecticut Peace Society, in Hartford,

beginning June, 1834. The first number of the *American Advocate of Peace*, "put out for the American Peace Society," was printed in June, 1835. It continued to be published at the headquarters of the American Peace Society, in Hartford, until the death of William Watson, November, 1836; after which the society moved to Boston and began there the publication of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* in June, 1837. From August, 1884, to June, 1892, the official organ was called *The American*

Advocate of Peace; but since it has been called again simply *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. The virility of this monthly expression of the peace movement in America is shown by the fact that its circulation increased under the editorship of Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood* by over thirteen times that at the beginning of his administration. In 1915 the magazine contained 24 pages. Beginning with Volume 86, January, 1924, it was enlarged to sixty-four pages and cover.†

WORLD PEACE THROUGH CONSERVATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS IN THE PACIFIC AREA

By ALEXANDER HUME FORD

Director of the Pan-Pacific Union

WORLD peace through the conservation of food products in the Pacific area is the purpose of the Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Conference, to be held in Honolulu in August.

Steps Already Taken

In 1920 the Pan-Pacific Union called the first Pan-Pacific Science Conference and induced the scientists of the Pacific to organize. These scientists state that the Pacific area must feed the world in the future, and a hungry world, or even a hungry Europe, is a terrible thing for humanity to deal with.

The scientists point out that the Pacific Ocean is being so rapidly depleted of its fish that in another generation, under present wasteful methods, it will cease to be a source of supply; yet if this area is brought under scientific methods of propagation and protection of food-fish and a start made at once, before it is too late, that the Pacific may be made to supply the whole world with its fish food. Not only this, but they point out that the Pacific, especially the tropics, can be made to make up the world shortage of grain as well as animal food, as the pinch of increasing population is felt more and more.

The Pan-Pacific Union held a Pan-Pacific Press Conference in 1921, followed the same year by a Pan-Pacific Educational Conference, inaugurating around the greatest of oceans a desire for better knowledge of each other's countries and

peoples. It is around the Pacific and tributary to its waters that two-thirds of the world's population live; so that this area has become the theater of the world's commerce. Here we find traditions of peace and co-operation, and this is becoming now a part of the people's training.

In 1922 a Pan-Pacific Commercial Conference was called to meet in Honolulu, the ocean's central station, and here concrete steps were taken to interest the Pacific countries in the organization of a permanent Pan-Pacific Chamber of Commerce, that will call its own commercial and industrial conference. Practically every country of the Pacific was represented at this conference.

Food Conservation Conference

Every country of the Pacific, it is promised, will have delegates at the coming Food Conservation Conference in August. The Director of the Union has just completed a trip entirely around the ocean, visiting those who have attended former conferences and acquainting himself with those who are to attend the Food Conservation Conference. It is a rule of the Union to invite by personal contact rather than by correspondence.

* Because of ill health Dr. Trublood resigned the secretaryship of the American Peace Society in May, 1915. He died at his home, in Massachusetts, October 26, 1916.

† To be concluded in the next number.

The main object of the first of any series of Pan-Pacific conferences is to get together the leaders in some particular line of thought or action from all Pacific countries, to meet each other daily; so, without the outside distractions of a great city, they are kept together until they know each other well and have formed lasting friendships. The second and succeeding conferences are called in the larger Pacific cities and may have hundreds of delegates; but the Honolulu conferences are limited to about one hundred carefully selected key men from Pacific lands who speak English fluently, as that is the secondary language of the Pacific. These key men are urged, after the conference, to organize permanently and to go home to sell the idea of Pan-Pacific co-operative effort to their people; and this they do. In this way there is a constantly growing number of groups of men throughout the Pacific who are forming a network of interests for the advancement of Pan-Pacific co-operative effort.

The chief executives of the Pan-Pacific Union are the heads of the governments of Pacific lands; the directorate is made up of men of all Pacific nationalities; the Union is an unofficial organization, supported in part by government appropriations and in part by private subscription.

Newspapers approve heartily the invitation in Pacific lands to co-operate in the holding of Pan-Pacific Conference. The *Portland Oregonian* recently said:

That is a fine ideal, to form the nations around the Pacific Ocean into a Pan-Pacific Union for the purpose of conserving the resources of their countries and of their great ocean in order to make the Pacific feed the world.

Around the Pacific are some of the world's richest countries, yet backward in development, and that ocean has on its shores two-thirds of the world's population. Owing to waste of its food resources and to encroachment of the desert on cultivated land, many of those people are always hungry, and hunger is a potent cause of war. The vision before the mental eyes of Mr. Ford, the Director of the Pan-Pacific Union, and his associates is a league of Pacific nations to halt waste and destruction and to increase production of food in order that the Pacific countries may have enough for their own

peoples and may contribute to the supply of all other nations. By banishing famine they would promote the peace of the world.

Effective Conservation

All countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean have a common interest in its fish, for these in their migrations become the prey of widely separated nations, which by destructive methods of fishing deplete the food supply not only for themselves, but for far distant nations. We know practically nothing of the life history of fish, where they are spawned and whither they travel with the changes of seasons. Until we know, we can not so use this abundant source of food that we shall conserve and perpetuate it.

Effective conservation is possible only by concerted action of all the Pacific nations, to which interchange of knowledge gained by scientific study, international conventions founded on that knowledge, and a body of international law to support those conventions are essential. We can judge from what has been learned and accomplished by single nations the possible results of working together for the common welfare. For example, the uloa fisheries of Hawaii became so exhausted that fishermen went hundreds of miles to sea in order to make a catch before it was discovered that the small fish that were used as bait were the baby uloa. We on this coast have revived the salmon fisheries by means of hatcheries and control of fishing, but destructive fishing continued in Alaska till Secretary Hoover stopped it, and it continues in Siberia. Meanwhile New Zealand has stocked its streams with salmon after 25 years of patient effort. Nothing but common action founded on exact knowledge will preserve the far-roving deep-sea fish.

Though China is reputed to have a dense population, vast areas of once cultivated land have been converted into desert by destruction of forests and by sands blown down from the north. Reforestation on a vast scale can set bounds to the desert and drive it back, as it reclaimed the dunes of Denmark. If China should suffer the fate of North Africa, which was the granary of Rome, and where, it was said, a man could travel in the shade of trees from the site of Carthage to the Nile, the matter would concern the whole world. Siberia might supply the young trees, but means of transportation are so lacking that they could be more

economically taken from America. Not only the cause of humanity, but national self-interest, forbid indifference to the fate of hundreds of millions whose ancestors wasted their timber much as we have wasted ours.

Ease of communication has extended to transmission of diseases of plants and animals across broad oceans, to destroy in one season whole herds and orchards, and with them the livelihood of many people. Nothing but free interchange of information on these subjects, to be followed by international protection of the health of animals and plants, can save these classes of food. By the same means the food plants and animals of one country can be colonized in another, just as

the potato was transported from America to Europe, to become a staple article of diet.

Ties That Bind

It is to organize and carry forward this work of reciprocal help among nations that a food conservation conference of Pacific nations is to be held at Honolulu next summer. Neighborly help between nations, much as it is given between families, should result. A priceless by-product will be a close friendly understanding among diverse peoples of varied race in America, Asia, the isles of the Ocean, and Australasia. No thought of war could enter where men are moved by such a common purpose, and bonds will be formed which jangling statesmen could not sever.

AN APPEAL TO THOUGHTFUL AMERICAN CITIZENS ON THE RECENT RELATIONS BETWEEN AMERICA AND JAPAN

By BARON YOSHIRO SAKATANI

BEING one of the friends of America and being also an ardent worker for peace, I should like to call the careful attention of American citizens to the following facts:

It is being reported here that Senator Jones, from Washington State, has proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States the following resolution for the exclusion from citizenship of all Japanese.

The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides (Article 19):

First, that the children of alien parents ineligible to citizenship have neither the right of naturalization nor the rights of citizenship.

Secondly, that children who have been born in America of parents ineligible to citizenship shall not have the rights of citizenship.

This amendment is carefully worded, so as not to show that it refers to the Japanese, but it is clear that the intention is to expel all Japanese and to prohibit Japanese immigration, and to deprive American-born Japanese of citizenship, thus driving them into a state of denationalization.

That Japan has faithfully adhered to the "gentlemen's agreement" concluded

between the two countries in 1908, and that far more Japanese leave America than enter it, is proved by the statistics issued by the United States Government.

This amendment proposed is not only to exclude Japanese from the country, but also to deprive Americans of Japanese blood of citizenship rights. American statistics show that there are only 220,000 Japanese resident in America, including those born in the United States, to whom, according to the Constitution of the United States, the right of citizenship is guaranteed; 110,000 of these are in Hawaii, 80,000 in California, and the remaining 30,000 are distributed over the other parts of the United States.

These immigrants at the earliest period were not sent over by the Japanese Government, neither did they go by their own wish, but were invited by American capitalists, who felt keenly the shortage of labor. These immigrants in California are mostly engaged in farming, and have cultivated lands neglected by former owners, and greatly increased the production, thus contributing considerably to the wealth of America. During the World War they gladly offered themselves for service with the American army, or sent their children, and voluntarily contributed

to the war loan; and thus they have faithfully done their duty as American citizens.

The population of Hawaii is 260,000, of which 110,000 are Japanese. A solitary island in the Pacific, Hawaii was independent until it was annexed by the United States in the year 1898. The relations between Japan and Hawaii had commenced before annexation by the United States, and thus brings the position between Japan and America regarding Japanese in Hawaii into a different standing from the position regarding those resident in America proper. In America there are 110,000 Japanese, and of these only 30,000 are American-born. It is difficult for me to understand why the American should persecute these Japanese American citizens so far as to amend the United States Constitution. Most of these are resident on the Pacific coast, in the States of California and Washington, and this may be the reason why Senator Jones, of Washington, presented his resolution to the Senate on December 6. On December 5 Mr. Lecker, of California, and Mr. Johnson, of Washington, presented a resolution in the same spirit to the House of Representatives.

For some time the anti-Japanese immigration movement in California has been growing severer, as witnessed by the discrimination in education and the land-law bill. In 1920 this law was rendered much more strict by a state-wide referendum of the same to popular vote. This land law was much more assured by the recent well-known decision of the United States Supreme Court, so as to leave no room for any exception. Eleven States out of 48 are said to have adopted land laws similar to those of California, and this makes Japan very anxious in regard to the future of Japanese in America.

Until the year of 1850 A. D. Japan had adopted such a strict "closed-door" policy that foreign communication was absolutely prohibited. It was about this time that Commodore Perry landed on these shores and invited Japan to take part in international affairs. Thanks to this action, the present Japan has risen to its power and fortune. Japan has always been grateful to America for this act, and has never dreamed of any ill-feeling against America. We Japanese are very sorry that this anti-Japanese movement has risen in

California, and thus clouded the relations between the two nations. In order to avoid this situation, many methods have been tried earnestly by the leaders and governments of the two nations, and yet they have not been satisfactory.

At its earliest period the anti-Japanese movement was limited to California and to the laboring classes, and its reasons were purely social and economic. Later it has spread to other States, and editors, militarists, statesmen, and others have joined the movement, and recently it has taken on an international aspect. Looking back over these steps in the progress of this movement, we become very pessimistic as to the future, as we think of what further steps may be taken. If the amendment to the Constitution is passed, the results will be very bad for the relations between the two nations, and on this account I am very anxious.

I am happy to see that the present relations between America and Japan are on a basis of good understanding and are most intimate. This is on account of the following reasons:

(1) Japan has strictly observed the "gentlemen's agreement" and prohibited the so-called picture-bride marriage.

(2) At the Washington Conference we paid due respect to American wishes in regard to naval limitations and in regard to our Russian and Chinese policies, and thus the conference was smoothly and satisfactorily concluded. It is needless to say here that Japan has strictly observed and enforced these naval limitation treaties, one after another.

(3) The prompt and sincere sympathy shown and the aid given by the American Government and people at the time of Japan's national disaster, the great earthquake of September 1, 1923, fills all Japanese with gratitude towards Americans. At the end of last October, when Ambassador Woods left Tokyo for a short visit to America, the Japanese people, on their own initiative, made a wholly unparalleled demonstration at Tokyo station. Such international feeling is a great factor for world peace.

I wonder if Americans are too much at ease to pay attention to such dangerous seeds as are being sown by two or three Senators and Representatives in their countries. While after the World War

most countries tried in vain to escape from the chaos and ruin brought by it, America and Japan were comparatively tranquil, because they suffered comparatively little by the war. There are people in some portions of the globe who would seize any opportunity offered to endanger the relations between the two nations, and who knows but they are waiting their opportunity to plunge America and Japan into war.

Of course, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is an internal question, but the proposed one affects our interests, and we do request that Japanese be treated equally with other nations in regard to nationalization and other rights. We also request that, in regard to land and other laws, Japanese should be treated equally with those of other civilized nations, according to the existing treaties between the two nations. The colored people of America enjoy complete nationalization rights, thanks to the efforts of enlightened statesmen, such as Washington and Lincoln, who were always mindful of the rights of humanity and justice. It is unfair that Japanese should be placed on a lower basis than the negroes, and we wonder how America would feel in Japan's position.

The resolution adopted by the Eighth World's Sunday School Convention, October 13, 1920, held in Tokyo, runs as follows:

"1. We affirm our unshaken belief in the solidarity of the human race, and further affirm our conviction that any conception of racial or national integrity that ignores this basic fact imperils the security of the world.

"2. We record our appreciation of every movement that makes for a deepening sense of mutual indebtedness and obligation among the nations, and likewise deplore every action that makes for misunderstanding, discord, and dissension.

"3. We attest our confidence in the practicability of a world brotherhood and hold that fealty to the principle of the common good is more cohesive than mere similarity in customs, habits, and manners.

"4. We maintain that any national or international policy that seems to discriminate in the treatment of nations and races endangers bitterness and is subversive to the best interests of mankind and inimical to the peace of the world."

(Paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8 are omitted.)

At this convention there were more than 2,000 delegates present, representing over 30 nations and 30,000,000 pupils and teachers. Among these delegates over 500 were Americans.

This is a very fair resolution, and the wise and enlightened statesmen and people of the world should be in line with this spirit, and it is needless to say that the natural evolution of human society is directed toward this line. I believe that American leaders did not hesitate to be supporters in putting forward this resolution. Therefore I do not believe the proposed amendment to the Constitution will ever be carried. But I earnestly appeal to all true Americans lest it lead to a crisis in world peace.

Of course, I do not mean to say that should the amendment be carried, it would at once involve the two nations in war, but I do feel that it would put an end to the warm and sincere friendship between them. Should the news come to Japan that it has been carried, the effect will be a resentful and hateful feeling on the part of the seventy millions of Japanese.

It is seventy years since Commodore Perry opened the door of Japan, and thus led her to acquire her present learning and civilization. Our thanks to America for this would give place to a strong sense of injury. This amendment will foster unpleasant feelings, and will do away with the spirit of the agreements entered into at Washington, etc. The injustice will not affect Japanese only, but will extend to the Chinese and all other Asiatics. It will build a barrier forever between America and Asia and will effectually close the door to permanent world peace as promoted and longed for so long by peace workers. It is nothing short of disastrous to the cause of world peace and balks the progress of civilization.

It would be a great sin on the part of America to exclude the 119,000 Japanese in America, 30,000 of whom are American-born citizens. How can we believe that this will be carried in the land where liberty and justice are most respected? How can we suppose that in this enlightened twentieth century such a crime will be committed? Since the "gentlemen's agreement" was concluded, no Japanese laborers have been allowed to enter the

country, and if intermarriage is allowed between Japanese and other races in America, Japanese blood will gradually diminish until it is extinguished. Why, then, does the United States wish to pass this amendment?

The reason for so many Japanese being in Hawaii is that they had entered before the annexation, and on account of the climate and other reasons, it was not possible for white laborers to compete with the Japanese, who made themselves indispensable to the cultivation of the soil. The Japanese in Hawaii should not be considered on the same basis as those in America,

and it is needless to say that they have served the Island of Hawaii as faithful citizens of the United States. I wonder if the two or three Senators and Representatives have taken this up for political purposes, and if Americans generally are not aware of the serious nature of the amendment? I wish that Americans would be as generous in justice as they are in charity.

It is needless to say that I love America as I love Japan, and pray earnestly for the coming of world peace and the perpetual friendship of the American and Japanese peoples.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

MR. HOOVER AND FOREIGN MONOPOLIES

Eleven imported raw materials essential to American industry are potentially or actually in the control of foreign monopolies or combinations, according to the letter addressed by Secretary of Commerce Hoover to Senator Capper under date of March 6. Mr. Hoover believes that there is a way open under the Webb-Pomerene Act for the betterment of this situation. Mr. Hoover's letter follows:

DEAR MR. SENATOR:

In accord with your request, I give the following summary of our conclusions as to combinations in our import trade.

The last Congress made a special appropriation to this department to provide for investigation of imported raw materials essential to American industry which are under control of foreign combinations in restraint of price or distribution. While the reports upon this topic have not all been completed, they will be ready at an early date, and abundant material is at hand to prove unquestionably that foreign monopolies or combinations are potentially or actually in control of prices and distribution of the following commodities:

Sisal for binding twine is controlled through a combination of producers, reinforced by legislative action of the Yucatan Government.

Nitrates and iodine are controlled through a British selling agency and reinforced by export duties in Chile.

Potash is controlled by combinations of German producers.

Tin is controlled by a combination of British producers.

Crude rubber and gutta percha are controlled by partly legislative and partly voluntary combinations of producers in the British and Dutch colonies.

Quinine is controlled by a combination of Dutch producers.

Mercury is controlled by common selling agency of Spanish and Austrian mines.

Coffee is controlled by the Government of Brazil.

Quebracho (for tanning purposes) is controlled by a combination of producers and foreign manufacturers.

You will note the importance of most of these commodities to the farmer.

The value of our total imports of the above in 1923 exceeded \$525,000,000, and prices are undoubtedly much higher than would otherwise be the case. There are several others of partial control or of minor order, aggregating altogether large sums.

The prices of these commodities enter into the cost of living of all our people. An instance of the special importance to the farmer lies in sisal, for binder twine, where, although present prices are possibly not extortionate, yet a few years ago they were deliberately advanced 300 per cent., and during the period fully \$100,000,000 of excess prices was taken from our producers which apparently did not even reach the Mexican farmer. Such combinations cannot, of course, be effectively reached under the Sherman Act, as they are or can be seated outside of our jurisdiction.

This department has given a great deal of thought to measures which can be taken in

protection of the American consumer. Indirect security can be obtained in some instances by the stimulation of production in other parts of the world free from these controls, and in other cases by the encouragement of synthetic manufacture in our own borders. Yet these measures at best require much time before they could afford protection. They will not apply in all cases. We shall be able at a later date to offer some recommendations in these directions.

Legislative Relief Proposed

It is our conclusion that some relief can be reached legislatively. Our exporters and manufacturers are permitted by the Webb-Pomerene Act to undertake joint selling agencies abroad under certain restrictions. If by an extension of this act our consumers were allowed to set up common purchasing agencies for these imported raw materials where there is positive combination in control, I am confident that our people could hold their own in their dealings with such combinations. The danger of such common purchasing agencies attempting to make improper prices against our buying public could be met by provision in the act to include proper assurance that all consumers who wished to participate would be allowed to act through such common buying agencies with full equality of treatment, that such agencies would not be conducted for profit in themselves, and any other necessary restrictions. You already have before you a legislative suggestion of this order which I believe can be simplified into amendments of the Webb-Pomerene Act.

There are comparatively limited numbers of primary purchasers of each of these raw materials and common purchasing agencies would not be impossible of organization. There is active competition among our manufacturers in the sale of goods in the production of which these raw materials are used. It is my belief that this competition would naturally result in passing along to the public economies that can be made in the purchase of these materials, but in any event provision could be made in the amendment to the act which could adequately protect our own public against any restraint of our domestic trade by such common buying agencies.

I am confident that a unity of buyers is in the long run stronger than any combination of producers, because the producer usually has the disadvantage of being compelled to maintain continuous production, whereas the consumer can so organize his business, if necessary, to become an intermittent purchaser.

It is my belief that joint action of our consumers dealing single-handed with such combinations could in general cases at least greatly moderate the present cost of these supplies. We seek nothing further than protection against wrongful treatment, and our consumers are fully alive to the necessity for

proper profits to foreign producers, and thus the assurance of full supplies.

I may add that the investigations which have been in course have already given some relief, because apparently some of those combinations have realized that immoderate action on their part would stimulate counter activities on ours.

The matter is one of urgent importance and should have early relief.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Secretary Hoover expects soon to be able to submit to Congress reports in detail in proof of his statement that combinations are in positive control of the commodities he named.

PAN AMERICAN TREATY

A treaty to prevent or avoid conflicts between the American States was drafted and approved by the delegates of sixteen American republics at the fifth Pan American Conference in May, 1923. In executive session, March 18, 1924, the following treaty was ratified by the Senate and, on motion of Mr. Lodge, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom. With a view of receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, it had been submitted by President Coolidge under date of January 31, 1924. The treaty reads:

Treaty to Avoid or Prevent Conflicts Between the American States

The governments represented at the Fifth International Conference of American States, desiring to strengthen progressively the principles of justice and of mutual respect which inspire the policy observed by them in their reciprocal relations, and to quicken in their peoples sentiments of concord and of loyal friendship which may contribute toward the consolidation of such relations, confirm their most sincere desire to maintain an immutable peace, not only between themselves but also with all the other nations of the earth; condemn armed peace which increases military and naval forces beyond the necessities of domestic security and the sovereignty and independence of the States; and with the firm purpose of taking all measures which will avoid the conflicts which may eventually occur between them, agree to the present treaty, negotiated and concluded by the plenipotentiary delegates whose full powers were found to be in good and due form by the conference:

Venezuela: César Zumeta, José Austria.

Panamá: José Lefevre.

United States of America: Henry P. Fletcher, Frank B. Kellogg, Ailee Pomerene, Willard Saulsbury, George E. Vincent, Frank

C. Partridge, William Eric Fowler, Leo S. Rowe.

Uruguay: Eugenio Martínez Thedy.

Ecuador: José Rafael Bustamante.

Chile: Maunel Rivas Vicuña, Carlos Aldunate Solar, Luis Barros Borgoño, Emilio Bello Codesido, Antonio Huneeus, Alcibiades Roldán, Guillermo Subercaseaux, Alejandro del Río.

Guatemala: Eduardo Poirier, Máximo Soto Hall.

Nicaragua: Carlos Cuadra Pasos, Arturo Elizondo.

United States of Brazil: Afranio de Mello Franco, Sylvino Gurgel do Amaral, Helio Lobo.

Columbia: Guillermo Valencia.

Cuba: José C. Vidal Caro, Carlos García Velez, Aristides Agüero, Manuel Márquez Sterling.

Paraguay: Manuel Gondra.

Dominican Republic: Tulio M. Cestero.

Honduras: Benjamin Villaseca Mujica.

Argentina: Manuel E. Malbrán.

Haiti: Arturo Rameau.

Article I

All controversies which for any cause whatsoever may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties and which it has been impossible to settle through diplomatic channels, or to submit to arbitration in accordance with existing treaties, shall be submitted for investigation and report to a commission to be established in the manner provided for in Article IV. The high contracting parties undertake, in case of disputes, not to begin mobilization or concentration of troops on the frontier of the other party, nor to engage in any hostile acts or preparations for hostilities, from the time steps are taken to convene the commission until the said commission has rendered its report, or until the expiration of the time provided for in Article VII.

This provision shall not abrogate nor limit the obligations contained in treaties of arbitration in force between two or more of the high contracting parties, nor the obligations arising out of them.

It is understood that in disputes arising between nations which have no general treaties of arbitration the investigation shall not take place in questions affecting constitutional provisions, nor in questions already settled by other treaties.

Article II

The controversies referred to in Article I shall be submitted to the commission of inquiry whenever it has been impossible to settle them through diplomatic negotiations or procedure or by submission to arbitration, or in cases in which the circumstances of fact render all negotiations impossible and there is imminent danger of an armed conflict between the parties. Any one of the governments directly interested in the investigation of the facts giving rise to the controversy may apply for the convocation of the commis-

sion of inquiry, and to this end it shall be necessary only to communicate officially this decision to the other party and to one of the permanent commissions established by Article III.

Article III

Two commissions to be designated as permanent shall be established, with their seats at Washington (United States of America) and at Montevideo (Uruguay). They shall be composed of the three American diplomatic agents longest accredited in said capitals, and at the call of the foreign offices of those States they shall organize, appointing their respective chairmen. Their functions shall be limited to receiving from the interested parties the request for a convocation of the commission of inquiry and to notify the other party thereof immediately. The government requesting the convocation shall appoint at the same time the persons who shall compose the commission of inquiry in representation of that government, and the other party shall likewise, as soon as it receives notification, designate its members.

The party initiating the procedure established by this treaty may address itself, in doing so, to the permanent commission which it considers most efficacious for a rapid organization of the commission of inquiry. Once the request for convocation has been received and the permanent commission has made the respective notifications, the question or controversy existing between the parties and as to which no agreement has been reached will *ipso facto* be suspended.

Article IV

The commission of inquiry shall be composed of five members, all nationals of American States, appointed in the following manner: Each government shall appoint two at the time of convocation, only one of whom may be a national of its country. The fifth shall be chosen by common accord by those already appointed and shall perform the duties of president. However, a citizen of a nation already represented on the commission may not be elected. Any of the governments may refuse to accept the elected member, for reasons which it may reserve to itself, and in such event a substitute shall be appointed, with the mutual consent of the parties, within 30 days following the notification of this refusal. In the failure of such agreement, the designation shall be made by the president of an American republic not interested in the dispute, who shall be selected by lot by the commissioners already appointed from a list of not more than six American presidents, to be formed as follows: Each government party to the controversy, or if there are more than two governments directly interested in the dispute, the government or governments on each side of the controversy shall designate three presidents of American States which maintain the same friendly relations with all the parties to the dispute.

Whenever there are more than two governments directly interested in a controversy,

and the interest of two or more of them are identical, the government or governments on each side of the controversy shall have the right to increase the number of their commissioners, as far as it may be necessary, so that both sides in the dispute may always have equal representation on the commission.

Once the commission has been thus organized in the capital city, seat of the permanent commission which issued the order of convocation, it shall notify the respective governments of the date of its inauguration, and it may then determine upon the place or places in which it will function, taking into account the greater facilities for investigation.

The commission of inquiry shall itself establish its rules of procedure. In this regard there are recommended for incorporation into said rules of procedure the provisions contained in articles 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of the convention signed in Washington, February, 1923, between the government of the United States of America and the governments of the republics of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, which appear in the appendix of this treaty.

Its decisions and final report shall be agreed to by the majority of its members.

Each party shall bear its own expenses and a proportionate share of the general expenses of the commission.

Article V

The parties to the controversy shall furnish the antecedents and data necessary for the investigation. The commission shall render its report within one year from the date of its inauguration. If it has been impossible to finish the investigation or draft the report within the period agreed upon, it may be extended six months beyond the period established, provided the parties to the controversy are in agreement upon this point.

Article VI

The findings of the commission will be considered as reports upon the disputes which were the subjects of the investigation, but will not have the value or force of judicial decisions or arbitral awards.

Article VII

Once the report is in possession of the governments parties to the dispute, six months' time will be available for renewed negotiations in order to bring about a settlement of the difficulty, in view of the findings of said report; and if during this new term they should be unable to reach a friendly arrangement, the parties in dispute shall recover entire liberty of action to proceed as their interests may dictate in the question dealt with in the investigation.

Article VIII

The present treaty does not abrogate analogous conventions which may exist or may in the future exist between two or more of the

high contracting parties; neither does it partially abrogate any of their provisions, although they may provide special circumstances or conditions differing from those herein stipulated.

Article IX

The present treaty shall be ratified by the high contracting parties in conformity with their respective constitutional procedures, and the ratifications shall be deposited in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Chile, which will communicate them through diplomatic channels to the other signatory governments, and it shall enter into effect for the contracting parties in the order of ratification.

The treaty shall remain in force indefinitely; any of the high contracting parties may denounce it and the denunciation shall take effect as regards the party denouncing one year after notification thereof has been given.

Notice of the denunciation shall be sent to the Government of Chile, which will transmit it for appropriate action to the other signatory governments.

Article X

The American States which have not been represented in the fifth conference may adhere to the present treaty, transmitting the official documents setting forth such adherence to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Chile, which will communicate it to the other contracting parties.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries and delegates sign this convention in Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French and affix the seal of the Fifth International Conference of American States, in the city of Santiago, Chile, on the 3d day of May, in the year 1923.

This convention shall be filed in the ministry for foreign affairs of the Republic of Chile in order that certified copies thereof may be forwarded through diplomatic channels to each of the signatory States.

(Signed) For Venezuela: C. Zumeta, José Austria; for Panama: J. E. Lefevre; for the United States of America: Henry P. Fletcher, Frank B. Kellogg, Atlee Pomerene, Willard Saulsbury, George E. Vincent, Frank C. Partridge, William Eric Fowler, L. S. Rowe; for Uruguay: Eugenio Martínez Thedy, with reservations relative to the provisions of article 1 (first) in so far as they exclude from the investigation questions that affect constitutional provisions; for Ecuador: José Rafael Bustamante; for Chile: Manuel Rivas Vicuña, Carlos Aldunate S., L. Barros B., Emilio Bello C. Antonio Huneeus, Alcibiades Roldán, Guillermo Subercaseaux, Alejandro del Río; for Guatemala: Eduardo Poirer, Máximo Soto Hall; for Nicaragua: Carlos Cuadra Pasos, Arturo Elizondo; for the United States of Brazil: Afranio de Mello Franco, S. Gurgel do Amaral, Helio Lobo; for Colombia: Guillermo Valencia; for Cuba: J. C. Vidal Caro, Carlos García Vélaz, A. de Agiero, M. Márquez Sterling; for Paraguay:

M. Gondra; for the Dominican Republic: Tulio M. Cestero; for Honduras: Benjamin Villaseca M.; for the Argentine Republic: Manuel E. Malbrán; for Hayti: Arthur Rameau.

APPENDIX

Article I.

The signatory governments grant to all the commissions which may be constituted the power to summon witnesses, to administer oaths, and to receive evidence and testimony.

Article II

During the investigation the parties shall be heard and may have the right to be represented by one or more agents and counsel.

Article III

All members of the commission shall take oath duly and faithfully to discharge their duties before the highest judicial authority of the place where it may meet.

Article IV

The inquiry shall be conducted so that both parties shall be heard. Consequently, the commission shall notify each party of the statements of facts submitted by the other, and shall fix periods of time in which to receive evidence.

Once the parties are notified, the commission shall proceed to the investigation, even though they fail to appear.

Article V

As soon as the commission of inquiry is organized it shall, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, have the right to fix the status in which the parties must remain, in order that the situation may not be aggravated and matters may remain in statu quo pending the rendering of the report by the commission.

MANUEL RIVAS VICUÑA,
Secretary General.

[Seal of the Fifth Pan American Conference.]

Está conforme.

ALBERTO CRUCHAGA.

[Stamp of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile.]

TEXT OF TREATY BETWEEN FRANCE AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The President of the French Republic and the President of the Czechoslovak Republic, standing firmly by the principle of respecting the international obligations solemnly confirmed by the pact of the League of Nations, being equally anxious to safeguard peace,

the maintenance of which is necessary for the political stability and the economic recovery of Europe, determined for this purpose to ensure respect for the international juridical and political order established by the treaties which they have signed in common, considering that in order to attain these objects, reciprocal guarantees of security against possible aggression, with a view to the defence of their common interests, are indispensable to them, have appointed for their plenipotentiaries, namely, the President of the French Republic; M. Raymond Poincaré, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs; the President of the Czechoslovak Republic; M. Eduard Benes, Minister of Foreign Affairs, who after having exchanged their full powers which are recognized in due and good form, have agreed upon the following dispositions:

Article 1. The governments of the French Republic and of the Czechoslovak Republic bind themselves to consult one another on questions of foreign policy of a kind which might endanger their security and threaten the arrangements established by the treaties of which the two governments are signatories.

Article 2. The high contracting parties will agree on measures to safeguard their common interests in the event of their being menaced.

Article 3. The high contracting parties, being fully in agreement as to the importance, for the maintenance of universal peace, of the political principles contained in Article 88 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye of September 10, 1919, and also in the Geneva protocols of October 4, 1922, of which they were both signatories, bind themselves to consult one another on the measures to be taken if there should be any threat to the fulfilment of these principles.

Article 4. The high contracting parties, taking into special consideration the declarations made by the Conference of Ambassadors on February 3, 1920, and April 1, 1921, by which their policy will continue to be guided, and also the declaration made on November 10, 1921, by the Hungarian Government to the Allied diplomatic representatives, bind themselves to consult one another in the event of their interests being menaced by the non-observance of the principles set forth in these various declarations.

Article 5. The high contracting parties confirm their full agreement on the necessity

which is imposed upon them of adopting, for the maintenance of peace, a common attitude in the event of any attempt being made to restore the Hohenzollern dynasty in Germany and bind themselves to consult one another on the measures to be taken in such a case.

Article 6. In accordance with the principles set forth in the pact of the League of Nations, the high contracting parties agree that disputes which may arise between them in the future and which cannot be settled by friendly agreement and by diplomatic means shall be submitted either to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to one or several arbitrators chosen by them.

Article 7. The high contracting parties bind themselves to communicate to one another the agreements which they have already made affecting their policy in central Europe, and to consult one another before concluding further agreements. They declare that nothing in the present treaty is contrary to the above-mentioned agreements and, in particular, to the Treaty of Alliance between France and Poland, to the agreements or arrangements concluded by Czechoslovakia with the Austrian Federal Republic, Rumania, and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, or to the agreement recognized by the exchange of letters of February 8, 1921, between the Italian and Czechoslovak governments.

Article 8. The present treaty will be communicated to the League of Nations in accordance with Article 18 of the pact.

The present treaty will be ratified and the ratifications will be exchanged at Paris as soon as possible.

For which purpose both plenipotentiaries have signed the treaty and have affixed their seals thereto.

Given in duplicate at Paris this twenty-fifth day of January, 1924.

DR. EDUARD BENES.
RAYMOND POINCARÉ.

News in Brief

DR. GILBERT BOWLES, member of the Friends' Mission in Japan, is spending some months in the United States. For a decade

Dr. Bowles has devoted one-half of his time to promoting international peace in the Orient. He is the secretary of the International Friends' Committee of the Federation of Missions and chairman of the board of trustees of the Friends' Girls School, Tokyo. He is an honorary vice-president of the American Peace Society.

THE FINAL DECISION relating to the Hungarian loan was taken on February 21 by the Reparation Commission. The necessary requirements having been met by all the interested countries, the League of Nations has been enabled to proceed immediately to the flotation of a loan to put Hungarian finances on a sound basis, following the same program as that applied to Austria. By the unanimous vote of the commission, W. P. G. Harding, former governor of the Federal Reserve Bank, was made financial director in Hungary. The amount of the loan is limited to 250 million gold crowns, which is to be repaid during a period of twenty years, but short-term loans, to be repaid out of the yield of the principal of the reconstruction loan as soon as issued, are possible.

The Loan Reparation Commission exempts the gross receipts of customs on the tobacco monopoly and sugar tax, the net receipts of the salt monopoly, as well as any other such government revenues, other than government railways and receipts thereof, for twenty years from the charge provided for by Article 180 of the Treaty of Trianon. Virtually, the commission's proposal amounts to the following: A reduction of reparation payments during the next three years to a maximum value of 880 tons of coal for each working day. From the beginning of 1927, payments will increase from five million crowns, by averages of one million a year, to 14 million in 1942 and 1943.

The terms were accepted by the Hungarian Government. Meanwhile the Hungarian financial situation continues in a state of slightly ameliorated collapse.

THE RESIGNATION OF PROF. ARNOLD TOYNBEE, author of the "Western Question in Greece and Turkey," and various other authoritative publications dealing with the Near Eastern situation, from the Chair of Modern Greek at London University, is the climax of an interesting little drama.

Toward the end of the war various chairs were founded at the university destined to

facilitate studies of the language and history of certain allies of Great Britain, and were endowed by the interested countries. Thus, in 1918 a group of Greeks inhabiting England endowed a Chair of Modern Greek and Byzantine Languages, which was accepted by Professor Toynbee. Professor Toynbee took up his work with enthusiasm and learned Greek and Turkish, which greatly facilitated his work in the East. His findings in the matter of the Elovos massacres, which were committed by Greeks, were so sensational as to cause him to offer his resignation to the rector of the university, in view of the feeling that was likely to be aroused against him. This was not, at the time, accepted. Professor Toynbee continued his travels in the East and found himself obliged to utter further disagreeable truths in regard to the Greeks. At the end of 1923, however, the founders of the chair addressed a letter to the rector, complaining of not having received a program of the academic work of the term or a report which would enable them to judge of its value. Neither the rector nor Professor Toynbee felt able to accede to such a demand and the latter's resignation, under the circumstances, was accepted.

FRANCE IS THIS YEAR ADOPTING an interesting system to simplify the re-engagement of seasonal foreign labor. Previously, long and complicated formalities were involved in re-engaging in the spring the foreign workers in seasonal industries which practically cease work in the winter. With a view to avoiding the delay and expense thus involved, arrangements have been made to enable building and public works contractors, instead of terminating the contract with seasonal workers, simply to send the workers back to their own country on leave. Forms are employed for this purpose which certify that the worker in question has been employed during the 1923 season, and that the employer is prepared to take him again in the following season, provided that he presents himself for work on receipt of the summons, which will be sent to him, and not later than April 13th. This form is delivered to the worker at the same time as his identity papers and serves as a passport. In order to re-enter France, the worker has merely to show the letter from his employer notifying him to resume work. The plan was tried

last year with Italian workers and this year is being extended to all nationalities.

NEW ZEALAND IS REPORTED to be trying out a novel scheme of placing unemployed workers in the outlying districts of the country. Arrangements have been made by the Labor Department in Wellington with the Post and Telegraph Department by which all postmasters act as employment agents. It is hoped that this will bring the farmers into closer touch with the labor markets in the cities. Under this arrangement, any employer desiring the services of a worker may apply at the nearest post-office, and if no suitable labor is available in the locality the postmaster communicates with the nearest office of the Labor Department. Similarly, workers in need of employment communicate with the nearest postmaster, who endeavors to place them.

A BILL IS BEING DRAFTED by the Ministry of Justice in the Czechoslovak Republic for the extension of the powers of the existing industrial courts. It is proposed to institute labor courts in all localities. These courts specialize in handling complaints growing out of the labor contract. They carry out a specialization in judicial practice analogous to that of juvenile courts, domestic relations courts, and commercial courts. Their processes emphasize conciliation and simplification in procedure.

THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE for Law Enforcement will hold a convention in Washington, D. C., April 10 and 11. The committee is working for enforcement of all law, with special stress at present on the prohibition law. The Scottish Rite Temple has been offered the committee and the sessions will be held there. Features of the convention will be speeches by prominent men and women and a pageant entitled "America the Beautiful."

IN ITALY, HOURS OF WORK in industry and commerce are at present governed by the legislative decree of March 15, 1923, and the administrative regulations of September 10, 1923. The decree provides that the normal maximum actual hours of work may not exceed eight per day or forty-eight per week. When technical or seasonal conditions necessitate it, the eight-hour day or forty-eight-

hour week may be exceeded, provided that the period of the extension does not exceed the period of greatest pressure of work in seasonal industries, and three months in industries working all the year.

INCREDIBLY BAD HEALTH and sanitary conditions, combined with native indifference, prevail in our insular possessions and protectorates of the West Indies, says Ernest P. Bicknell, of the American Red Cross. These conditions vary greatly in the different island governments; but poverty, disease, ignorance, and superstition prevail among the masses of the population to a degree with which nothing in the United States is comparable. The American Red Cross chapters are, therefore, plowing through a jungle of conditions difficult to imagine. Happily, each country has its own intelligent and devoted men and women, who are leading their people in a long contest against the adverse influences growing out of generations of oppression and neglect.

A CANADIAN CARAVAN, under the direction of Senator Baublen, secretary of the Canadian group of the Interparliamentary Union, advertising the agricultural and industrial output of "New France," as well as its scenic grandeur, has been touring France the past winter. The caravan consists of some thirty large motor trucks decorated with French and Canadian colors; the sides of these trucks can be displaced, like those of a circus menagerie, whereupon each one becomes a miniature exhibition hall. Placed end to end, they constitute a gallery nearly two hundred yards long, or, disposed in a circle, they form an enclosure that can easily be sheltered with a canvas awning. The exhibition trucks proper are supplemented by a number of other trucks utilized for the transportation of lighting equipment, cinematographic apparatus, materials for repairs, and a gang of workmen. There is a daylight cinema, which has proved a great attraction by reason of its novelty in Europe, and two open-air screens for the amusement of the populace at night. Lectures also are provided for the serious-minded. This immediate visual propaganda is followed up by an intellectual propaganda of longer range, in the form of a series of bright-covered, copiously illustrated brochures in French, prepared especially for the caravan. And they are so attractive withal that they are sure to be

taken home, read, and even preserved by the visitors, to whom they are lavishly distributed. The exhibition finished its tour of propaganda in Paris at the Tuilleries Gardens, where it was daily visited by large crowds. In 1921, France, on invitation of Canada, toured the Dominion with a railway-train exposition, which has resulted in largely increased Canadian imports from France. The present caravan tour comes as a return courtesy from France to Canada.

CERTAIN COMPLICATIONS between the United States and Canada are threatened over the fisheries question. The Canadian Government, invoking a treaty of 1818 on the Atlantic coast, has discontinued the issue of *modus vivendi* licenses to New England fishing vessels, enabling them to enter Canadian Atlantic ports for purpose of purchasing bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies, and also for the shipping of crews and the transshipment of catches in bond. It is reported that fishing interests in Boston and Gloucester are retaliating by demanding increased duties on fish. In return for this it is urged upon Ottawa from some quarters to bar American fishing vessels from British Columbia ports, except for the four humanitarian purposes of obtaining wood, water, shelter, and repairs.

In the Pacific the main fishing banks are off the western portion of British Columbia or Alaska, and a large number of United States fishing vessels land their catches at Prince Rupert, the nearest railway port, whence they are forwarded to the United States markets in bond. The United States authorities refuse to give Canadian fishing vessels clearance from American ports to the fishing grounds, and the application by Canada of the same policy to American fishing vessels would make it impossible for them to operate out of Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

Many Canadian leaders in the fishing industries disapprove the action of their government in falling back upon the old treaty, negotiated in the time of George III. Both sides to the controversy are aware that they would suffer great losses should a retaliatory war be provoked.

THE HAWAIIAN REHABILITATION PROJECT is going forward rapidly. Prince Kalaniana'ole, for 20 years Hawaii's delegate to Congress, first stressed the need of placing as many

native families as possible back upon the lands, once extensively tilled by natives. Plans were made, and the work was authorized by act of Congress. Many acres on the fertile island of Molokai were cleared, and the Hawaiian Housing Commission organized in Honolulu. Care was exercised in choosing among the many applicants for land, those families likely to be thrifty and permanent colonists. More than fifty families were placed. With some financial aid from the territorial government and advice from a superintendent who is an expert in agriculture and animal husbandry, these families have built up homes, a school, and a flourishing land development.

The commission is now enlarging its homesteading plans and many more families can soon be established on the land. Pineapple packing corporations are also offering assistance in the way of capital.

HUNGARY FOLLOWS AUSTRIA in giving the Soviet Government recognition *de jure*. It is said that the recognition treaty will contain a clause guarding against the infusion of Communist propaganda from Russia. There has been much bitterness in Hungary against the Bolsheviki, owing to experiences under the Extremist regime just after the war. Commercial considerations have overcome this feeling, however, of late, and the prospect of the opening of southern Russia's markets to Hungary has led to the resumption of diplomatic relations.

RAIL MOTOR VEHICLES are among the proposals under consideration in the Union of South Africa for reducing the cost of working branch railway lines. Such vehicles could carry passengers, parcels, and light perishable traffic. The general manager for railways and harbors of the Union states that experiments are under way to determine the relative cost and efficiency of such vehicles.

AN IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY is planned at Tokyo. The building is expected to be modeled on the general plan of the Library of Congress at Washington, D. C. While 700,000 books were lost in the fires of September, the authorities state that foreign institutions have already pledged 500,000 volumes; in addition, many purchases are to be made abroad. The University has also been offered the use of the famous Nanki library of approximately 110,000 volumes.

THE FOURTH CHILD WELFARE CONGRESS, to be held in Santiago de Chile this coming September, bids fair to be of continental significance and interest. Twenty-one American democracies will be represented there. The reason for American interest in child welfare is stated by a writer in the Pan American Bulletin for March, as follows: "It is the democracies of the world which more than any other form of government need sane and educated electorates. They, more than others, must realize that national progress can best be measured by their attitude toward the nation's children, and that no democracy, can be completely socialized until its children have entered into their full and complete heritage."

The four "themes" to be treated at the congress are medicine, hygiene, sociology, and legislation.

TO REVIVE THE ACTIVITY of the port of Fiume, the Italian government is preparing to restore the former Hungarian fleet to its pre-war proportions. There were then three important Hungarian navigation companies in Fiume. They were the Atlantic Company, the Levant, and the Adria. It is now the purpose of the Italian Government to reconstitute these companies and return the ships to their former owners. Baron Polnay is carrying on negotiations with the Italian Government on behalf of the three companies. The Atlantic Company has already been reconstituted, having its headquarters in Fiume. Baron Polnay will be its principal manager, and has obtained already seven ships against a payment of 4,000,000 lire. All the ships will fly the Italian flag, but the personnel is composed of Hungarians, while there will be two Italian delegates in each company.

GERMANY'S FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE, maintained throughout the months of November and December, 1923, was wiped out during January, according to figures just issued by the German Federal Statistical Office (Statistisches Reichsamt). On a gold-mark base these figures show that January imports totaled 568,000,000 gold marks and exports 431,000,000 gold marks, leaving an adverse balance of 137,000,000 gold marks. On a quantity basis, imports were 2,650,000 metric tons and exports 750,000 metric tons, as against the December figures of 2,850,000

metric tons and 1,104,000 metric tons respectively.

CONTINUED WIDESPREAD INTEREST is being shown in cotton-growing in South Africa, and the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation has recently offered to defray the expenses of three specially trained officers to help develop the industry in that country. Since 1919 cotton production has been increasing, and during the 1922-23 season it amounted to 2,400,000 pounds of lint, or about 4,800 bales at 500 pounds each, compared with 1,096,182 pounds for the previous year. It is estimated that the area under cotton cultivation at present is approximately 20,000 acres. Practically all of the cotton is exported to England.

THE RECENT FINANCIAL REFORMS IN POLAND have resulted for the time being, at least, in checking the fall of the Polish mark. With the stabilization of the currency, however, has come a period of commercial depression which, with the increased burden of taxation, has been the cause of a great deal of distress. In carrying out the new fiscal policy, which necessitates the payment of all taxes in gold or gold equivalent, some difficulty has been experienced in making tax collections, to the point of obliging the government to take forcible measures against the individual.

THE POLISH GOVERNMENT IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE will complete negotiations with an Italian syndicate for a loan of 400,000,000 lire for 20 years at 7 per cent. The security will be, it is reported, part of the property and profits of the Polish Tobacco Monopoly and Poland will agree to buy 60 per cent of its raw tobacco requirements from Italy. Mining and raw material concessions to Italy are rumored, but unconfirmed.

THE UNDERTAKING BY A GERMAN-RUSSIAN commercial organization to re-establish the old trade route from Petrograd to Persia via the St. Mary Canal system and the Volga River is being carried on with increased activity. The venture began with the dispatch of a 200-ton vessel from Hamburg on June 24, 1922, which took almost six months to reach Enzeli, on the Persian coast of the Caspian Sea. The success of this trip led to the formation of the Russian-Deutsch Transit and Handelsgesellschaft, capitalized at 250,-

000 gold rubles, of which half was paid in by a consortium of German firms. The other half of the capital represents the share of the Soviet Government, which has reserved the right to one-half of the cargo space on the boats. During the 1923 season some half dozen German vessels arrived at Enzeli, the terminus of the route, heavily loaded with German merchandise. A specially designed one-deck motorship *Ispahan*, of 1,100 tons displacement, was recently completed and placed on this route. In addition to cargo space the new vessel has three two-passenger staterooms, a smoking-room, and a hospital. This boat reached Enzeli in November, 1923, and discharged approximately 726,000 kilos of cargo, consisting of sugar, electrical goods, machinery, and miscellaneous commodities.

DURING 1923 THE NUMBER OF POLISH MARKS that could be received for \$1.00 increased from 18,090 at the beginning of the year to 6,460,000 at the end. In other words, the dollar could be exchanged for more than 357 times as many marks at the end of the year. These figures are interesting in comparison with the amount of paper money in circulation. At the end of the year 1922 there were in circulation less than 794 billion Polish marks in paper currency. At the end of 1923 the amount had increased to over 125 trillions, thereby reaching a figure more than 157 times that at the end of 1922. At the exchange rate current at the end of 1922, the Polish Government would have needed over 43 million American dollars to redeem all the Polish currency in circulation, whereas at the end of 1923 the total paper currency in circulation was worth, at the prevailing rate of exchange, only about 19 million American dollars.

THE AUSTRIAN GOVERNMENT, IN ACCORDANCE with a law passed on December 21, 1923, has decided to withdraw from circulation bank notes of 5,000 and 10,000 crowns and to replace them with silver coins. The total amount of such coins may not exceed 60,000 crowns (84 cents) per head of the population, making a total authorized issue of about \$5,400,000. Coins are to be minted with a face value of 5,000, 10,000, and 20,000 crowns. The 10,000-crown coin is to be called a shilling. They are eight parts silver and two parts copper and are to be unlimited legal tender.

BOOK REVIEWS

FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787. By *Arthur Deerin Call*. American Peace Society, Washington, D. C. Pp. 80, illustrated. Price, \$0.25.

There is a renewed interest throughout our land in the Constitution of the United States. Societies for the promotion of interest in this document are springing up in many places. The newspapers are carrying on a prize contest throughout the high schools of the country, to the end that our young men and women may better understand the place our Constitution occupies in the history of this country and of the world. The Department of Superintendents of the National Education Association unanimously adopted a set of resolutions in Chicago February 28, one of which reads: "We recognize both that another war would destroy civilization and that the hope of today and the security of the future lie in an adequate education. To this end we demand a program of education which, by bringing about a better understanding among the people of the world, will speedily produce a situation in which offensive wars will become impossible." In this "program of education" familiarity with our Constitution is considered most important. Much of our Americanization work centers around our Constitution.

Two years ago the American Peace Society published a brochure entitled, "Federal Convention, May-September, 1787, an international conference adequate to its purpose, history, significance, documents relating to one successful international organization—the United States of America." An edition of 25,000 copies of this brochure has been exhausted. A new edition of 25,000 copies has just come from the Rand-McNally Press.

The book contains an introduction by James Brown Scott. There are colored maps and many illustrations. The Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution and the amendments to date, are included. There is a list of references. The history of the Federal Convention, particularly in its relation to international organization, is clearly but briefly set forth.

The nature of the delegates to the Convention, the kind of men they were; steps leading to the Declaration of Independence, to the Articles of Confederation, to the Convention in Philadelphia, are accurately described. How the Convention was an international conference is made plain. One sees here, as in no other book of its size, how our founding fathers established a Union of free, sovereign, independent States, overcoming all difficulties of representation by the big and small States, of the judicial settlement of international disputes, and of the coercion of States.

The distribution of this book, at the price of 25 cents, prepaid, is in no sense a money-making enterprise. The purpose is to reveal to patriotic Americans what our forefathers did on an international plane 137 years ago. The little book has been used by classes in political science in various universities and in classes of foreign service. The author is Secretary of the American Peace Society and Editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. Ordered in dozen lots, copies may be had at the rate of 22½ cents each, prepaid; 25 or more, 20 cents each, prepaid.

THE WESTERN QUESTION IN GREECE AND TURKEY. By *Arnold J. Toynbee*. Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. Pp. 408. Price, \$5.00.

The Turkish question is of especial interest to the world in these days. It is not well understood by most of us, because we have not the historical background necessary to accurate judgment.

The author of this book, Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and History at London University, furnishes just those elements lacked by the casual reader of history. To this knowledge he adds an impartial and judicial temper, scientific accuracy, and lucid style.

Much of the book is a narrative of Professor Toynbee's personal adventures in the Near East as correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian*, and an interpretation of the facts thus gleaned.

THE MALADY OF EUROPE. By *M. E. Ravage*. Macmillan Co., N. Y. Pp. 250. Price, \$2.00.

In rapid style and with trenchant wit, Mr. Ravage enacts the rôle of physician to Europe. If he seems considerably more concerned with the disease and its diagnosis

than with the method of cure, there may be very good reason for that. Indeed we suspect there is.

"Who shall decide when doctors disagree,
And soundest casuists doubt, like you and me?"

The analysis, however, is suggestive and, on the whole, as far as it goes, satisfying. He draws a strong contrast between America controlling her own foreign policy, and Europe, which, though blessed in many of her States with real internal freedom, is yet at the mercy of irresponsible chancelleries in the matter of foreign relations. He is scornful of much that was American, both during and since the war. His analysis, however, of the making of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations is both daring and discriminating. As regards the French policy in the Ruhr, he seems to pursue an opposite course of reasoning; and if, as we now hear, that policy is founded upon a desire on the part of France to gain a controlling voice in the inevitable merging of interests in the coal and iron districts of Europe, the conclusions of Mr. Ravage, here, are wide of the mark.

The five prescriptions for the cure of Europe's malady come, seemingly, as an afterthought to the body of the book and do not quite win our confidence. Nevertheless the book as a whole bristles with challenging thoughts, sometimes bewildering, but sure to provoke reflection.

THE PROBLEM OF ARMAMENTS. By *Arthur Guy Enoek*. Macmillan Co., New York. Pp. 196. Price, \$1.50.

The appeal of this book is indicated in the subtitle, which is "A book for every citizen of every country." The body of the work is made up of chapters which summarize facts about the armies and navies, their cost, and the economic aspect of armaments during the recent European war; also the far-reaching effects upon the people of the age-long rivalry in armaments.

Yet the author disclaims any intent of contributing merely another book to the academic discussion of his theme. The background of his thinking is that of an ethical and religious lover of peace. Being an Englishman, it is not astonishing to find him assuming that the League of Nations can be one of many means of restraining armament rivalry. He gives enthusiastic tribute to the Washington Conference as well.

One of the most hopeful notes of the book is the author's belief in the attainability of one ideal—that is, the internationalization of human progress in science and mechanics. If such things were freely shared, as they should be and might easily be, it would be more difficult for any nation to suspect the uses to which another nation might be inclined to put fresh discoveries and inventions.

ON BRITISH FREEDOM. By *Clive Bell*. Harcourt, Brace & Co. Pp. 86. Price, \$1.50.

Mr. Bell has been known to write caustically and illuminatingly on various phases of modern art. Less effectively, perhaps, because less detachedly, he turns to the question of *mœurs*, and has given us, in a series of essays a blast of warning as to British freedom, which, according to him, is in a most precarious state.

Freedom, of course, is always in a precarious state. Somebody has very truly remarked that one man's freedom ends where his neighbor's rights begin. A definition of freedom, however, is an extremely difficult achievement except from the negative angle. It becomes more difficult, as democratic forms of government become more prevalent.

Somewhere in our past an optimistic gentleman (it must have been a man, because only men create truly vast and nebulous phrases) linked together the words "liberty, equality, and fraternity" and called the result a social and political formula. He did worse—he believed in his formula. Unfortunately, it is becoming apparent that nothing could be more doubtful than the coexistence of these three abstractions, except to the most limited extent. Perfect liberty, perfect equality, perfect fraternity, could only exist were there but one human being in the world, and he, as the Irish say, God.

But there has been—in the past, at least, since Mr. Bell denies its present existence—a practical compromise, which the English characterize as British freedom. What it amounts to is best demonstrated by the phrase about the Englishman's home being his castle. In an extremely overcrowded island, where no expansion was possible except at the cost of a severe wetting—or, worse yet, of sea-sickness, followed by exile—some practical method of escaping from the attentions of one's fellowmen had to be arrived at. Failing a general massacre, the next best thing was what has been called the mental chalk-line. Every English man

or woman instinctively knows how to draw around himself or herself a mental chalk-line, across which no other English man or woman dreams of stepping. Thus some sort of privacy may be attained, and the complete acquiescence of all England in this system is most clearly shown by the horror of any English native when the unsuspecting foreigner, by addressing him in a public place unannounced, steps across the chalk-line and intrudes.

This chalk-line has been observed, even by the church, which, in England, never intrudes. Reforming agencies have tacitly confined their exertions to the very poor, who under the social laws of England, which seem to assume poverty to be a crime, have no rights. But the World War and the introduction of American soda fountains have caused fatal rifts in the English social structure. Lady Astor, who means well, was not brought up in a deep and instinctive observance of the chalk-line. She comes from a country where people talk readily in public places and are formally and painfully introduced at gatherings in private houses. She therefore believes in the value of general reform, and has been returned to Parliament on the strength of her repartee. These things, some of which Mr. Bell omits to mention in his book, make for uncertainty in the social future of Britain, and it is quite probable that British freedom is, as it has been since 1066, a disappearing quantity. Thus saith the author.

MONETARY REFORM. By *John Maynard Keynes*. Harcourt, Brace & Co. Pp. 227. Price, \$2.00.

Mr. Keynes once more comes forward to elucidate the economic problems of the age. In his latest work the author puts forward proposals for the regulation of currency and credit and examines the main monetary problems of the time with especial reference to the abandonment of the gold standard.

Mr. Keynes does not, apparently, share the usual English reverence for the gold standard, which he makes no bones about dubbing "primitive," "obsolete," and so forth. He is especially withering when he considers the Cunliffe Report of 1918, which he dubs an "unadulterated pre-war prescription. . . . belonging to an extinct and almost forgotten order of ideas." "Few think on those lines now," says Mr. Keynes; "yet the report re-

mains the authorized declaration of our policy, and the Bank of England and the treasury are said to regard it as their marching orders."

Mr. Keynes makes the proposal that the gold reserve be separated from the note issue, the volume of paper money to be consequential on the state of trade and employment and on bank rate and treasury-bill policy, with the gold reserves of the country concentrated in the hands of the Bank of England, to be used for the purpose of avoiding short-period fluctuations in the exchange. The governors of the system, says the writer would be bank rate and treasury-bill policy, the objects of the government would be stability of trade, prices, and employment, and the volume of paper money would be a consequence of the first.

With reference to the United States, Mr. Keynes declares that the theory on which the Federal Reserve Board is supposed to govern its discount policy, by reference to the influx and efflux of gold and the proportion of gold to liabilities, is "as dead as mutton." "It perished," says he, "as soon as the Federal Reserve Board began to ignore its ratio and to accept gold without allowing it to exercise its full influence, merely because an expansion of credit and prices seemed at that moment undesirable. From that day gold was demonetized by almost the last country which continued to do it lip service, and a dollar standard was set up on the pedestal of the golden calf. For the last two years the United States has pretended to maintain a gold standard. In fact it has established a dollar standard, and instead of ensuring that the value of the dollar shall conform to that of gold, it makes provision, at great expense, that the value of gold shall conform to that of the dollar."

All of which is very interesting and sensational and leads one to wonder just what Mr. Keynes will do next. Mountebank? Perhaps. Nevertheless, this is a book deserving of persusal by every student of international conditions.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ. By *Arthur Symonds*. Bobbs Merrill Company. Price, \$2.50.

How far, how fading, how nearly grotesque seem to us now the artistic gods and goddesses of that almost-forgotten epoch which ended when war broke out. Rejane, Verlaine, the two Rossettis, Maeterlinck, George Moore, Yeats—the Belgian twilight through

which moaned Melisande, the Gaelic revival in its two aspects of material grossness as personified by George Moore, and somewhat hazy poeticism as illustrated by Mr. W. B. Yeats—how curiously dead even those who survive seem now to be. And what vitality they had while they lived! What robust heartiness it took to contrive and endure the decadences of the so-called "yellow nineties!" Only a comparatively young, comparatively unworn, comparatively unburdened generation could have put so much interest in abstinence and purple passion and at the same time absorbed itself so much in so often unnecessary literature and art. They enjoyed themselves so splendidly, they insisted upon their sinful decadence with such enthusiasm! And if, perhaps, to our somewhat mournfully critical vision, their production was not of the very greatest importance, yet who would grudge them all that fun?

Mr. Arthur Symons is supremely the interpreter of that happy age. So beautifully is he imbued with its spirit that he can so discuss Leonardo or Joseph Conrad as to make them appear contemporaries, in spirit if not in fact; and so of Aubrey Beardsley and Oscar Wilde. It throws over his valuable and delightful book of criticisms a certain fascination, a certain charm—if perhaps, a little sadness.

SILBERMANN. By *Jacques de Lacretelle*. Translated by Brian Lunn. Boni & Liveright, New York. Pp. 191. Price, \$2.00.

The publisher's blurb compares Silbermann to Ludwig Lewisohn's unfortunate autobiography, "Up Stream"; but the former is really not to be compared to the latter. "Up Stream" was, in certain respects, a somewhat peevish and exaggerated statement of the Jewish case against the European and his American descendant. Monsieur de Lacretelle, in a work of consummate art, epitomizes the whole situation with cruel impartiality.

Silbermann is the story of a Jewish youth during a period of his school days at a French lycée. On the face of it, Monsieur de Lacretelle has portrayed an entirely unjustifiable persecution of one race by another, but there is not a line in his book which does not go to show how inevitable such a persecution becomes, given the two racial types concerned. His thesis is a challenge. The Jew is disliked, not because he makes money, not because he has a different religion, not be-

cause he is of a different race, but because he is a Jew, because he is one of a race whose peculiar characteristics, intensified by century upon century of inbreeding, happen to be basically alien to the instincts and thought processes of the races with which he claims equality, with which he attempts to mingle, and which, violently or passively, refuse to accept him. It is not surprising that, under the circumstances, the Jew should feel bitter; but neither is it surprising, given the fundamental difference in his approach to life, that the non-Jew should dislike, despise, and sometimes fear the Jew, whose aggressive desire for possession threatens his spiritual heritage. The ultimate result of this age-long struggle cannot yet be foreseen; its unhappy incidence has already marked almost every page of European history with blood and tears.

Mr. Brian Lunn's translation of this beautifully written work is excellently done. Were all translations as adequate as his, the demand for foreign authors would show a decided increase.

ADDITIONS TO OUR LIST OF PAMPHLETS available at the headquarters of the American Peace Society, the price quoted being for the cost of printing and postage only.

Call, Arthur D.:

Federal Convention, May-September, 1787. Published 1922, republished 1924 \$0.25

Dealey, James Quale:

Contributions of the Monroe Doctrine to International Peace. Published 192310

Emerson, Ralph Waldo: "War."

Address before the American Peace Society in 1838. Reprinted 1924... .15

Morgan, Walter A.:

Great Preaching in England and America. Published 1924..... .10

Snow, Alpheus H.:

International Reorganization. Published 191710

BOOKS

Johnsen, Julia (Compiler):

Permanent Court of International Justice. Reprints of selected articles90

For Debaters

Permanent Court of International Justice

JULIA E. JOHNSEN, Compiler

AFFIRMATIVE

— and —

NEGATIVE

ARGUMENTS

— and —

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Price 90 Cents

Any Book on
International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Introductory Note.....	7	Relation of Judicial to Political Con-	
The New World's Gift to the Old..	9	troversies.....	25
The International Experiment.....	9	Departments.....	25
The Ideas of the Founders.....	10	"The International Mind".....	25
Delegates in Convention.....	11	An International Court.....	26
History.....	11	The Limited Jurisdiction.....	26
The Great Men.....	12	Political Questions May Become	
Transferring Sovereignty of the		Judicial.....	26
Crown to the People.....	13	As to the Coercion of States.....	27
The Declaration.....	13	Powers Retained by the People..	27
A Lesson for Kings.....	14	A Union of States.....	28
A Confederation of Free, Sovereign,		Two Sovereignties.....	28
and Independent States.....	14	Settlement of Disputes.....	28
Confederation.....	14	Enforcing Decisions.....	28
Sovereignty of States.....	15	Elimination of International	
Trial and Difficulty.....	15	Force.....	28
Troubles in the Way.....	15	Coercion of Individuals Only... 29	
Efforts to Improve the Situation	17	A Government of Laws and Not of	
Logic of Events.....	18	Men.....	30
Evolution in America of the Idea		Laws of Nations.....	30
of Union.....	19	Checks and Balances.....	30
The First Union.....	20	The Court of Last Resort.....	31
William Penn's Plan.....	20	A Civilian Not a Military Union 31	
The Albany Plan.....	20	Final Steps.....	32
Proceeding from the Known to		Submitted to People of States	
the Unknown.....	20	for Ratification.....	32
Faced with Rebellion.....	21	Ratifications.....	32
The International Conference.....	21	Opposition.....	33
The Ways of an International		The Bill of Rights.....	33
Conference.....	21	The Preamble.....	33
A Bold Change of Plan.....	22	Declaration of Independence.....	35
Significant Change of Words... 22		Articles of Confederation.....	37
Its Distinguished Reporter.....	22	Map, United States at Close of Rev-	
James Madison of Virginia.....	23	olution.....	40
Father of the Constitution.....	24	Map, United States of Today.....	41
Satisfying the Large and Small States		Constitution of United States.....	50
Questions of Equality.....	24	Amendments to the Constitution... 66	
A Compromise.....	24	The American's Creed.....	75
		Conclusion.....	76
		Suggestions for a Governed World... 77	
		References.....	82

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society
Colorado Building Washington, D. C.

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 5

May, 1924

Dawes' Report Analyzed

Hughes-Hanihara Letters

An American Way Toward an
Association of Nations

International News

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	259
EDITORIALS	
Our "Federal Convention of 1787"—Observance or Enforcement?— Economic Aspects of the Dawes Report—Senator Pepper's Resolu- tion—Can Nations Act as Gentlemen?—Britain Extends Her Par- liamentary Control of Foreign Policies—A Woman's Sensible State- ment—Mother of Parliaments—The Republic in Hellas—Editorial Notes	261-274
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
Analysis of the Dawes Report—The Foreign Policy of Czecho- slovakia—Polish Finance.....	275-284
GENERAL ARTICLES	
An American Plan for an Association of Nations.....	286
By George A. Finch	
The Political Situation in China.....	294
By Gilbert Reid	
Esperanto and International Peace.....	295
By Henry W. Hetzel	
The Will to End War (Part II).....	297
By Arthur Deerin Call	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
The Hughes-Hanihara Letters.....	309
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	312
BOOK REVIEWS.....	318

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:

Annual Membership is two dollars;

Sustaining Membership, five dollars;

Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, Miami, Florida.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, former President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Lawyer, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES L. SLAYDEN**, Member Council Inter-parliamentary Union, San Antonio, Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, *ex officio*.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *ex officio*.

GEORGE W. WHITE, *ex officio*.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, University, Alabama.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

WALTER A. MORGAN, M. A., 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., 808 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, President Fairmont Seminary, Washington, D. C.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 West 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., 30 Koun Machi, Mita Shiba, Tokyo, Japan.

Dear CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

Pres. WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, Bloomington, Ind.

GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. H. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Esq., Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

Mrs. PHILIP N. MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salda, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus. **Died February 24, 1924.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective: and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

MAY, 1924

NUMBER
5

EDITORIALS

OUR BOOK THE "Federal Convention of 1787"

"It is a useful review which cannot fail to be of value in promoting an understanding of the genesis of our institutions."

CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.

"... It appears to me a valuable collection of facts and documents, likely to be very useful in the educational institutions of our country. I hope it will have a wide distribution."

DAVID JAYNE HILL,
*Diplomat, Historian,
President National Association
for Constitutional Government.*

"I wish to express my thanks and appreciation. Your booklet, 'The Federal Convention of 1787,' has been received and examined. You ask for 'criticisms.' No, I am inclined to believe that quite so much vitally interesting American history was never before presented in so condensed a form. The whole make-up is admirable. You may think I exaggerate, but the suggestion you speak of is this—as an old scholar in the half-digested records of our nation—there is not a historical library nor a student digging into our foundations that ought not to obtain a copy of this book of ready reference."

WILLIAM O. STODDARD,
*Well-known Author, Former
Secretary to President Lincoln.*

This pamphlet—25c each, 22½c each for twelve or more, 20c each for twenty-five or more, postpaid—should be ordered from

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

OBSERVANCE OR ENFORCEMENT?

THE job of balancing Germany's budget and of stabilizing her currency is appreciably clarified by the reports of the two committees submitted to the Reparation Commission April 9. One of these committees, headed by Brigadier General Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago, deals in its report with Germany's capacity to pay her debts; the other, headed by Reginald McKenna, of England, submits its findings relative to the flight of capital from Germany.

Following the submission of the reports, events moved rapidly. Both reports, outlined elsewhere in these columns, were unanimously approved by the Reparations Commission April 11. Premier McDonald announced the British acceptance of the entire report April 15. On the same day Premier Poincaré also accepted the plan. Foreign Minister Stresemann, of Berlin, sent Germany's acceptance to Paris for transmission to the Reparations Commission, also on April 15. Italy was favorable to acceptance, also Belgium, the day following the announcement of the reports. The Allied governments are now being asked whether or not they are ready to accept the plan officially. Germany accepts it as a basis for further negotiation, but accept it she does, and with a greater relief, we believe, than we of America at first suspected.

An objection has been raised to the plan, namely, that the experts have not fixed the

amount Germany must pay. This criticism, of course, is not tenable. In the first place, it was not the special committee's job to fix this amount, and in the second place the sum has already been determined. Under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, it was the duty of the Reparations Commission to fix the amount of Germany's indebtedness before May 1, 1921, the treaty in the meantime assessing against Germany a minimum of one hundred billion gold marks bearer bonds, twenty billion of which fell due May 1, 1921. The Reparations Commission then fixed the total German indebtedness at 132 billion gold marks. The Supreme Council presented a plan for the payment of this amount, which plan was accepted by Germany. Germany has known, therefore, for three years the maximum which she will be called upon to pay.

There are criticisms of the report which may be sustained. It is true that it is unhappily wordy and not wholly free from political considerations. Nothing in it indicates to the taxpayer of France what amounts can be expected from Germany. Assuming that the plan is put into operation and funds are actually raised in Germany, there can, of course, be no transfer of these funds into the pockets of the French unless Germany has an excess of exports over imports. If this excess is to be accomplished, it must mean a vastly increased purchase of German goods by France, England, America, and other peoples. As yet, there seems to be no marked willingness on the part of these nations to open their gates to German goods. Before the plan can be put into operation, investors in the United States must come forward and take over a large share of the \$200,000,000 needed to put the bank of issue on its feet. One wonders if these investors can be found. If the plan is put into operation, will Allied pub-

lic opinion accept the situation without complaint, when it is found that the funds deposited in Germany to the credit of the Reparations Commission cannot be drawn out. The purely economic aspects of the plan are discussed in the next editorial; but there are other elements complicating the situation. Germany is faced with an election May 4. French elections are to take place May 11. The fact that we of the United States are to have our Presidential election next November has a bearing. Politics not only makes strange bedfellows; it sometimes breaks up the furniture. The Dawes proposals are based on present conditions in Germany, and those conditions are changing, some of them very rapidly. The reports are marked by expediency as much as by precise justice. There is the problem of the occupation of the Ruhr and of the interallied debts. One gathers the impression from the reports that Germany can pay, providing there is a rehabilitated Germany. But we are left in doubt as to how much Germany must be rehabilitated and as to how much of a will there is in Germany to pay. The whole plan is based upon the Treaty of Versailles, which is more of a war treaty than it is an instrument of peace.

And yet in the main the reports have left the problem of reparations much more hopeful than at any time heretofore. The president of our National City Bank considers them "an admirable piece of work." The whole matter is now farther away from mere military and political influence. Dr. Kurt Sorge, director of Krupps, is quoted as saying that the plan "must be accepted." Stinnes, just before he died, said the same thing. The comparative unanimity with which the proposals have been accepted in France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and by Germany is most encouraging. Evidently French pride remains intact, for the reports seem to grant

that Germany has been deliberately delinquent, and that the French policy in the Ruhr has been effective.

The success or failure of the whole plan depends upon the will in Germany to observe its terms. Mere attempts to enforce these terms can end only in disappointment. President Coolidge recently remarked, "I sometimes wish that people would put a little more emphasis upon the observance of the law than they do upon its enforcement." The McKenna committee sensed the fact that German capital now in countries outside of Germany can be brought back only as the Germans are led to wish to bring it back. There is no known way of compelling this capital to return. The same thing is true as to the terms of the Dawes report. Germany can pay reparations in gold, in goods, or in services. There is no other way. Any effective payment in one or all of these ways depends upon the good will and co-operation of the German people. Forced payments are destined surely to destroy the sources from which the payments must come. The future of the situation, therefore, rests upon a maximum of observance on the part of the German people with a minimum of enforcement on the part of her creditors.

Now is a poor time for the Allies to enter into public debates over penalties in the event of German default, or for Germany to take up again any variety of schemes for possible evasion. The Reparation Commission should submit its plan for putting the scheme of the experts into effect at once, for time is now of the essence of things. Mr. Poincaré says that his policy is to safeguard the rights of France and to consolidate the peace of the world. So be it. Both debtor and creditor nations of Europe can afford just now to soft-pedal their rights and to concentrate more openly upon their duties. Enlightened self-interest demands fewer porcupines in the wilderness of European politics.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE DAWES REPORT

FROM the point of view of the sound economic principles involved in the problem of Germany's reparation payments, little, if any, criticism can be made of the report given to the world on April 9 by General Dawes's committee of experts. On the contrary, the report performs a real service, in that it is the first official document dealing with the whole complicated subject of reparations in which these principles are stated clearly and with the necessary distinction, as between the various phases of the process of reparation payments.

It is only to be regretted that these various phases are not presented in such a way as to place them in their proper perspective with regard to their comparative importance. Some of the most important propositions put forth in the report are buried in a mass of much less important detail. The result of this is that a person uninitiated in the intricacies of national and international finance is apt to be misled entirely as to the really vital phases of the plan contained in the report. The editorial comment in some of our daily press bears ample witness to this limitation of the report.

Nor is this confusion helped by some of the statements contained in General Dawes's letter transmitting the report. When the chairman of the committee of experts says that "with normal economic conditions and with productivity restored in Germany, the most hopeful estimates of the amounts receivable are justified," he goes far beyond the assumptions warranted by the report itself.

The report sets forth the proposition that large reparation payments represent a twofold process, involving the State budget and the foreign trade of the paying country. Since the reparation payments are to be made by the German Govern-

ment, it is necessary, first of all, that its budgetary receipts must be in excess of its budgetary expenditures, at least by the amount of the payments required. But these budgetary receipts from German taxpayers are in the form of German marks. Before they can be applied to foreign payments, they must be converted into foreign currencies, acceptable by the creditor countries, by means of the various processes involved in foreign trade.

This is not a new doctrine. It has been enunciated time and again in the last five years—by Keynes in England, by Rist and Decamps in France, by Moulton in the United States. Its enunciation in the report of the Dawes Committee simply adds to it a new authoritativeness.

The first task, therefore, visualized by the plan of the Dawes Committee is the balancing of the German budget in such a way that the amounts of the reparation payments prescribed by the plan may be obtained within Germany by the German Government. After a thorough study of the German resources and possibilities, the experts came to the conclusion that a series of difficult, but apparently feasible, financial reforms would make it possible for the German Government to obtain within the country large sums of money that can be applied to reparation payments. These amounts would start with one billion gold marks and gradually rise to two and one-half billions, which would be the fixed annuity.

A balanced budget, achieved by means of adequate taxation, would be a very important element in the stabilization of the German currency. The technical apparatus for the establishment of such stabilized currency is provided for in the plan by means of a new bank of issue, which would take over the task of providing Germany with a new national currency, adequately secured and rigidly controlled. This bank of issue will also serve as the instrument for converting the sums ob-

tained within Germany by the German Government into means of payment acceptable to France and the other creditors.

On the above two points, viz., the balancing of the budget and the stabilization of the German currency, the plan is clear and specific. On the third point, however, viz., the transfer of reparation payments across the German frontiers, the plan is far from being definite.

This part of the twofold process of reparation payments is left very largely to the eventualities of the future and the ingenuity of a transfer commission to be set up under the plan. It is here that lies the principal and really vital limitation of both the report and the plan.

The bank of issue will receive and deposit to the order of the transfer commission—*i. e.*, the Reparation Commission—the sums provided by the German Government out of budgetary revenues. Thereupon the responsibility of the German Reich to the Reparation Commission will cease. The next step will devolve upon the creditors themselves.

The normal process by means of which these deposits in the bank of issue can be transferred abroad is as follows: Every time Germany sells goods abroad, or carries foreign freight on her railroads or in her ships, or provides accommodations for foreign tourists, some individuals in Germany gain possession of foreign currencies or foreign bills of exchange. These currencies or bills of exchange are turned back to foreigners whenever Germans buy goods abroad or have similar services performed for them in other countries. Whenever the amounts of bills of exchange (actual currencies play a very small part in the transaction) in the hands of the Germans for any year exceeds the requirements for payments abroad and there is a surplus of them in the country, we say that Germany has in that year a favorable balance of payments. Only when this is the case can the bank of issue go into the mar-

ket and purchase with the marks in its possession the surplus of the bills of exchange, which it can turn over to the creditor countries and thus effect a transfer of reparation payments.

This means that the world must buy from Germany more goods and services than it sells to Germany; and, since Germany's principal customers before the war were the other countries of Europe (in 1913, 76 per cent of Germany's exports went to the countries of western, central, and eastern Europe), it means that Germany's creditors must buy from her in the future as much as or more than they bought before the war and, incidentally, sell to her less than they sold before the war.

Thus, the problem of transfer is the central and the really vital phase of the whole process of reparation payments. In it are involved factors that are entirely outside of Germany's control. Germany may be willing to produce and sell, but will the world be willing to buy enough of what Germany has to offer, not only to pay for what she herself must buy abroad, but also to pay the billions of gold marks required by the Reparation Commission? The German Government may be able to deposit in the bank of issue the amounts prescribed by the Dawes plan, but will the transfer commission be able to make these amounts available beyond Germany's frontiers? And it must be remembered, too, that the process of this transfer is a most delicate one, since its handling, without regard to the whole national and international economic situation of Germany, will have immediate and disastrous repercussions on the German exchange and undo everything already accomplished.

Into these phases of the problem the report does not venture far. Some of them it ignores altogether. There is no gain-saying the fact that technically this is due to the rigid limitations imposed upon the committee of experts by the terms of

reference laid down for them, and that practically it is the result of the political circumstances surrounding the work of the committee. But, whatever the reason, this limitation of the plan is none the less all too significant and vital.

SENATOR PEPPER'S RESOLUTION

APRIL 6, Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, submitted a resolution in the United States Senate (S. Res. 204), as follows:

Whereas the International Peace Conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 were found to present useful opportunities for the friendly exchange of views and opinions upon great world questions; and

Whereas the progress subsequently made at the Washington conference of 1922 in the direction of limiting armaments may well be conserved and extended in the near future, if the attention of all nations be simultaneously focused upon a matter so vital to civilization; and

Whereas all proposals for the limitation of armaments necessarily presupposed the existence of a body of international law adequate to the present and future needs of the nations and of courts of arbitration and of courts of justice to interpret and to apply its recognized and accepted principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, 1. The Senate advises the President of the United States that, in the judgment of the Senate, the time has come when a world conference similar to the conferences heretofore held at The Hague may with advantage be assembled for the consideration of questions affecting the peace of the world.

2. That the Senate further advises the President that, in the judgment of the Senate, the agenda at such a conference should include the following:

(a) A consideration of the further reduction of naval armaments and of the limitation of land and aerial armaments;

(b) A consideration of the ways in which international law may be made at once more certain and more responsive to present and future needs; and

(c) A consideration of plans for a

world court, either through a further development of the present Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague or through the disassociation of the present Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague from the League of Nations.

This, in our judgment, is an important resolution. It is a clear statement of what America could do on an international plane without violating our Constitution and without arousing any appreciable opposition on the part of our people. Senator Pepper carefully refrains from any reference to an economic conference because Senator Borah has already introduced a resolution covering that. The Senator from Pennsylvania realizes the growing determination on the part of the peoples of the world further to reduce naval armaments and to begin the process of limiting armaments on land and in the air. He also realizes the necessity of returning to international law in proportion as we decrease our reliance on force of arms. He calls attention also to the fact that it is most important that we establish and strengthen the World Court "without attempting the impossible task of reconciling divergent views in regard to the League of Nations."

Every friend of the American Peace Society will see at once that Senator Pepper's proposal is in direct line with everything for which this Society has stood and still stands. When it is recalled that the author of the resolution is a Philadelphia lawyer of the highest standing, a professor of law for many years in the University of Pennsylvania; that he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and that the resolution was offered after consultation with other and leading members of the Senate, one's sense of the importance of the resolution increases. We are peculiarly fortunate to be able to present to our readers, elsewhere in these columns, the article by George A. Finch, Esquire—*An American*

Plan for an Association of Nations—which amplifies the proposals embodied in Senator Pepper's resolution.

As pointed out by our Secretary of State in his New York speech of April 16, the people of the United States cannot take kindly to political commitments opposed to the genius of our institutions. "The American people cherish their independence. They were unwilling to enter into ambiguous commitments, which in one breath were sought to be explained away as having little significance, and in another were strenuously demanded as being of vital importance. They refused to assume, by any form of words, an obligation to take part in the never-ending conflicts of rival ambitions in Europe. But, nevertheless, they earnestly desire peace and seek in every way consistent to their tradition to promote it."

Later on, Mr. Hughes added :

"The United States is recognized throughout the world as possessing and exercising an influence second to none in promoting international peace. We favor international conferences whenever there is a reasonable prospect of forwarding in this manner conciliatory measures or of reaching useful agreements."

Thus Senator Pepper's resolution is an American step toward the realization of an American ideal in an American way, violating, the while, nothing of the principles or aspirations of other powers.

In his address on April 22 President Coolidge showed himself to be in sympathy with the substance of the proposal, expressing his belief in the efficacy of "frequent international conferences suited to particular needs." Judging from recent utterances of Senator Robinson of Arkansas, leader of the Democrats in the Senate, both of our political parties are substantially in accord upon this most important matter. The ship of justice between nations is in a fair way to be supplied once more with a chart and with a compass.

CAN NATIONS ACT AS GENTLEMEN?

“EVERY ONE has his ‘d’rathers’” may be a colloquialism, but it is a profound psychological observation. Club life, so popular in every circle, rests upon the principle of exclusiveness. Peoples are particular. We Americans are choosy. We began that way. As early as March 26, 1790, our Congress enacted a naturalization law limiting the privilege of admission to citizenship from abroad to free whites. The fourteenth and the fifteenth amendments to our Constitution extended the privilege to alien blacks, but the prohibition of the yellows and the browns has stood from 1790 until today. Our Monroe Doctrine enunciated thirty-three years later, was, of course, an act of exclusion, although not of a racial character. We have passed special legislation against the naturalization of Chinese in this country. Because of our race consciousness we have long been troubled with the problem of dealing with the sensitive Japanese. Under the terms of an act now before the United States Congress, which act is supported by an overwhelming majority of both houses, alien immigrants ineligible for citizenship are not to be admitted to the United States. This act, if it becomes law, will end the so-called “gentleman’s agreement” arranged in 1908, during Mr. Roosevelt’s administration, the substance of which agreement is set forth in Mr. Hanihara’s letter, printed elsewhere in these columns. It will exclude all Japanese immigrants from the United States.

This rather unexpected procedure, following the correspondence between Mr. Hughes and the Japanese Ambassador in Washington, has greatly disturbed the relations between this country and Japan. The Japanese grant that under our Constitution the matter of immigration is within the jurisdiction of our Congress. They agree that questions relating to im-

migration are domestic questions, and that every independent nation has the right to admit or to exclude whomsoever it may choose. Informed Japanese must realize the American point of view, namely, that if we admit large numbers of any race as permanent residents of this country, and then deny them the privilege of being naturalized, the results can be anything but desirable. Our American people cannot view with complacency segregated groups of foreigners organized for their self-protection, retaining their allegiance to their mother-land and rearing their children to the same allegiance. The problem facing us is, therefore, essentially simple; namely, shall we change our policy of over a century and grant the privilege of naturalization to the Japanese who come to our shores, or shall we limit the number of Japanese immigrants? Congress is evidently bent upon excluding them altogether.

This decision on the part of the Congress follows a long series of difficulties, particularly in California, Oregon, and Washington. Japanese alien residents, with their different standards of living, with their Japanese language schools, have given rise to State anti-alien land laws, and other measures equally embarrassing to Tokyo and to Washington. The net result has been agitation, and then more agitation.

The unpleasantness of the situation is set forth in Mr. Hanihara’s letter. This letter, with its unfortunate phrase, “grave consequences,” produced something little short of a sensation in the Senate. One Senator, who had been in favor of continuing the gentlemen’s agreement, took the position that the instant the Japanese Ambassador sent his formal communication to this government, suggesting through proper diplomatic channels that unless certain legislative action is taken by us the gravest consequences are likely to ensue, at that moment the whole matter

passes out of the sphere of a gentlemen's agreement." In other words, it was felt in the Senate that the Ambassador of the Japanese Government, speaking for his sovereign, had terminated the gentlemen's agreement. So the Senate proceeded to do its share toward the ending of that agreement.

It is all most unfortunate. Even if the proceeding ultimately clears the air, as did our Chinese exclusion act, the situation at the moment is distressing. When confronted with the question whether or not two nations can act as gentlemen, Mr. Hanihara and the United States Senate seemed to agree that it is impossible. The situation is an illustration again of the difficulties involved in international intercourse.

Our American institutions depend entirely upon the nature of our citizenship. As President Coolidge has said, "New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them into the ranks of good citizenship. America must be kept American. For this purpose it is necessary to continue a policy of restricted immigration."

We must accept that doctrine. Japan has a similar doctrine for herself. As a doctrine, it is a racial Monroe Doctrine, a natural spirit of exclusiveness, peculiar to no one family, State, or race. Japanese people acquainted with America know that this policy of exclusion is intended in no sense as a reflection upon the Japanese people. Throughout America there is nothing but admiration and respect for Japanese civilization. But the will to maintain a racial solidarity in America, while confronted with many difficulties, is nevertheless very strong.

The Japanese immigration problem has been rather sorely bungled. The Japanese have not been altogether happy in the manner of their insistence upon "equality" with other nations. It is not especially dignified to press oneself upon another. We suspect certain Japanese have pro-

tested too much. There has been a great deal of talk about the pride and sensitiveness of the Japanese people. Pride and sensitiveness do not go well with egotism or with insistence upon equality. On the other hand, the members of our Senate should not forget that together they constitute our diplomatic council in matters of foreign affairs. These representatives of the States are responsible for the reputation of our Union before the world. It was not in the best of taste to construe the Hanihara note in its most unfavorable light and then to blame it for the vote to end the gentlemen's agreement. There are theoretical and practical objections to the gentlemen's agreement: The Japanese have been accused of evading it; the entire responsibility for carrying out the agreement rests upon Japan; under its terms, our immigration authorities have to accept every passport presented at our doors by Japanese, an arrangement existing between us and no other nation; it has, therefore, produced no little suspicion and irritation. Our Senate would have been in a more defensible position had it rested its case upon these objections. As it is, our government is in the position of having been unnecessarily brusque. An unflinching courtesy is no abrogation of the nation's dignity or sovereignty.

Assuming that the exclusion law becomes effective, there is no reason for concluding that Japan has lost any of her self-respect. In no real way has her equality with other nations been impaired. We shall continue to treat her as an equal under the terms of all our treaty engagements—indeed, in all world affairs. It does not seem reasonable to suppose that our action will have any appreciable bearing upon Japan's relations to other powers. The social position of Japan, the dignity and worth of that people, can be affected helpfully or injuriously only by the Japanese people themselves.

BRITAIN EXTENDS HER PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OF FOREIGN POLICIES

LIBERALS abroad have been struggling for many years to extend the control of foreign policies by their respective parliaments. It is difficult for us in America to realize how little most legislative bodies abroad have to say in matters of treaties, understandings, agreements, and declarations. With us of the United States, the Senate may consent or withhold its approval to a given treaty at will. It may reject or fail to act upon it. It may amend or approve it with reservations. In any event, under our system no treaty can come into force secretly. It has been left for the British Labor Party to herald a new day in the conduct of foreign affairs at Westminster.

It all came about most casually, April 1, during the debate in the House of Commons over the treaty of peace with Turkey. Mr. Ponsonby, the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, announced the government's intention to inaugurate a new practice in the matter of treaties and similar international obligations. Mr. Ponsonby announced it to be the intention of the government to lay on the table of the House every treaty, when signed, for a period of twenty-one days before ratification. In the case of important treaties, discussion is to be asked for. The purpose clearly set forth is to render impossible all secret treaties or secret clauses of treaties. The treaties not disapproved by the Parliament will be considered approved. It is proposed that Parliament shall exercise supervision not only over treaties, but over agreements, commitments, and understandings by which the nation might be bound in certain circumstances and which might involve questions of war or peace. Mr. Ponsonby went on to declare it to be of the highest importance that England should not find her-

self compelled to take action along certain lines without the public being prepared. It is understood that the Prime Minister favors the innovation.

This is a noteworthy event. That it could happen so incidentally is a compliment to the constitutional system of Britain. Statesmen, including Mr. Gladstone, have held that the treaty-making prerogative was absolutely and in all cases outside the interests of Parliament. During the life of the Labor Government this is evidently all to be changed. Mr. H. A. L. Fisher characterized the proceeding as "an Americanization of the British Constitution." In a sense, this is the fact—a most encouraging fact.

A WOMAN'S SENSIBLE STATEMENT

VARIOUS women's organizations are seriously struggling to do something worth while in behalf of international peace. Many of them—like organizations of brethren—find it difficult to go about the business with wisdom. Before us is a statement by Mrs. W. F. Blackman, of the International Relations Committee of the State Federation of Women's Clubs in Florida. The suggestions, prepared upon the request of the committee for the press and publicity department, are sane, balanced, and interpretive not only of woman's, but of man's relations to our government. The statement runs:

What attitude should the women of the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs take toward the question of the relation of the United States to the other nations of the world, and toward the activities of various organizations and individuals who are presenting their plans or propaganda to us for our signatures and endorsement?

First, let us remember that the President and the Senate are charged by the constitution with the duty and the responsibility of determining the foreign policies of the United States.

May we not assume that these men are,

for the most part, as anxious to promote peace and co-operation among the nations as are the women of the country?

We must recognize the fact that they have information respecting the attitude of other nations toward us and toward one another which we do not possess, and which we have no right to compel our State Department to divulge in order to quiet ignorant or sentimental clamor.

Also, we must remember that much of the agitation in this country for peace and disarmament may be simply a camouflage behind which the enemies of all government can work for their pernicious ends.

The men on whom the responsibility of determining the policies of the government rests are no doubt often embarrassed and bewildered by the avalanche, threatening to overwhelm them, of telegrams and letters and petitions making demands upon them which they cannot possibly or wisely meet.

What, then, shall we do respecting these urgent problems upon which we may not be experts, but in which we know that our own and our children's welfare is vitally concerned?

Well, we have a group of competent and conservative experts in the International Relations Committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, whose leadership and recommendations we may safely accept. Moreover, we have a capable committee of our own, the International Relations Committee of the Florida Federations, which co-operates with the committee of the general federation, and upon which we have laid the responsibility of suggesting and guiding our actions in these matters. Let us confide in their judgment and await and follow their counsels.

Finally, I must add, that if any Senator should be playing politics, as I regret so many are, for his own or his party's advantage, instead of giving his attention to these paramount questions, the women—and the men—of his constituency should call him to account in no uncertain terms. And those Senators who sit indifferent and silent before such a disgraceful use of power, should be prodded from their inertia by their constituents, who ought to be indignant, but seldom are. One thing the women can do. They can take interest enough in the well-being of our country

to help put men and women of unquestioned ability and character in the places of leadership and power. Those who refuse to accept this obligation had better forever after hold their peace.

MOTHER OF PARLIAMENTS

HISTORY has no chapter more interesting than the story of the British Empire. One bent upon explaining Britain's acquisition of her wide stretches of world dominion finds one's self faced with the whole complex of human emotions, ambitions, abilities.

This is illustrated once more by her recent achievements in Bagdad, capital of Iraq, a re-established kingdom along the Tigris and Euphrates. Undoubtedly the hard-headed Englishmen, by pouring some thirty million dollars into that section of ancient Mesopotamia, have had an eye to their commercial advantage. Mosul, with its hypothetical resources in oil, is a part of Iraq. But there is another motive in the Englishman's mind. He feels that here is a chance to render a service, and that Britain of all other nations is peculiarly qualified to render that service. The Britisher is a world-minded man. He is trained on an international plane. That is the reason why offspring of the British Parliament are found full-grown and lusty in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, and South Africa. The Englishman enjoys watching the parliament of India struggling infant-like under the mothering care of Westminster. It is warming to the English heart to pose as tutor to the more adolescent Egypt, and to feel that he is leading Palestine by the hand. Just now, again, he is filled with joy because he has been able to establish a parliament for Iraq, under King Feisal, in the one-time glorious city of the Abbassides, a city which nearly a thousand years ago was the splendor of the Eastern World.

Under the terms of the treaty between London and Bagdad, the British mandate in Iraq is to continue by mutual consent only four years after the ratification of peace with Turkey. So the British have been making hay while the sun shone. The mandate will probably be extended. Anyhow, at the moment, Iraq is officially at the feet of London.

Through a millennium Iraq rendered a service to civilization in education, in morals, in the arts. Her devastation and decay followed centuries of onslaughts from without and from within. The great war brought the British army to Bagdad. Iraq being left without a government, England at once saw its "primary duty to create one." As a result, the outside and the inside enemies of Iraq were unhorsed. And now we have the establishment, with the aid of British brains and funds, of a parliament once more in Bagdad.

The effects, in the main, have been consonant with the traditional statecraft of Britain. Assuming direction of affairs, the British agents drove away the Turks, threatening from the outside, and the foreigners, who had generally misruled within. They then went about the business of establishing public security. The result is that the laborer goes forth to his toil without a gun, the roads are safe for traffic, and the trade along the river to the Persian Gulf is no longer in danger from the "snipers." Motor traffic is increasing rapidly. Train service has been greatly improved. There is a regular mail and passenger airplane service to Palestine and to Egypt. Mindful of the educational preëminence of Bagdad in the long ago, a university has been opened. The budget has been balanced, albeit with English pounds and shillings. Ports and bridges have been built. This is the British way of doing business, when at its best.

It does not detract from the merits of the work to grant that London sees the

beneficial effects of all this upon English policies in India. Of course, as a result of the policy, Britain is in a position to play a most important rôle in any attempt to complete the railroad connections between the Baltic and the Persian Gulf. These things are a part of the complex. But the secret of Britain's success in such large matters lies deeper. Even when she muddles and bungles her enterprises, at bottom, if one penetrates far enough, her statesmanship is found to rest upon an abiding principle. There is in the mind of the Briton, especially since 1783, an unquestioned desire that the group which he is trying to aid shall come eventually into a complete independence. It is because of this that the world has Ottawa, St. Johns, Dublin, Wellington, Cape Town, Melbourne, and the English Government has come to be known as the "mother of parliaments."

REPUBLIC IN HELLAS

THE Greek National Assembly, by practically a unanimous vote, passed a resolution March 25 favoring for Greece a republican form of government. On April 13 the Greek people voted by a majority of 3 to 1 for such a change. A president *pro tem.* has been chosen. The legislative branch is to be composed of a senate and a chamber of deputies. Dispatches indicate that former Premier Alexander Zaimis, friend of Venizelos, stands the best chance of being elected president at the forthcoming election. To insure domestic stability and peace, it is proposed to prohibit discussion of the constitution for a period of at least five years.

Thus another European kingdom passes from the stage. A people "so democratic that they cannot choose from their own number one to preside over them" have decided to do that thing. The fact is of interest to all followers of democracy, especially to us of the United States. At one

time in our history we of this country were keenly interested in the political aspirations of Greece. It was during those years, a century ago, when that land was stormed from within and from without; when the French Revolution had played no small part in arousing there the spirit of nationalism and a desire for freedom, particularly from the domination of the Turk; when events were leading to the destruction of the Turko-Egyptian fleet at Navarino, in the fall of 1827, and the end of the war for independence.

During those trying years our United States expressed interest on Greek affairs in no uncertain language. In his sixth annual message of December 3, 1822, President Monroe, referring to the unsettled conditions in Europe, said :

"The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty, are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

In his seventh annual message, December 2, 1823, President Monroe reverted to the matter when he used these words :

"A strong hope has been long entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. . . .

Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people."

President John Quincy Adams, in his first annual message, December 6, 1825, called attention to "the heroic struggles of the Greeks themselves, in which our warmest sympathies as free men and Christians have been engaged." And in his third annual message, December 4, 1827, he spoke with still greater feeling of the Greek "sufferings in the cause of liberty" and expressed the hope "that their independence will be secured by those liberal institutions of which their country furnished the earliest examples in the history of mankind, and which have consecrated to immortal remembrance the very soil for which they are now again profusely pouring forth their blood."

It was seriously proposed during those trying days that the United States Navy should be sent to help the Greeks. Webster and Clay pleaded their cause. Committees, called Philhellenic committees, were organized in this country to raise funds for their aid. Not a few Americans enlisted in the Greek army.

Greek civilization, its arts, its literatures, its philosophies, have been woven into the fabric of our America. Swinburne referred to Greece as "The litany of nations"; Helen Keller calls the Greek language "the violin of human thought." Only the Hebrew has influenced our modern world as has the Greek.

No one can forecast the outcome of the new order of things in Greece; but our interest of a century ago, not to mention our concern for the cause of liberty and self-government everywhere, is revived again by the birth of this new republic, where

The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea.

and where, musing there an hour alone, Byron dreamed that Greece might yet be free.

IT is difficult for a big nation to sit idly by and watch complacently a fiery revolution in the midst of a much smaller nation near at hand. This the United States has been obliged to do for several months. The end of this revolution in Honduras is not yet in sight. President Coolidge has instructed Sumner Welles, our American commissioner to the Dominican Republic, to offer the friendly assistance of the United States for the establishment of peace in Honduras. How difficult it is for us to keep out of such a situation appears from the fact that our customs officials in New Orleans were called upon, April 11, to seize certain war supplies aboard a Norwegian steamer bound, it was alleged, for Central American ports. The captain of this vessel is charged with violating our embargo on war material destined for Honduran ports.

THE most serious problem facing the world, particularly at this hour, is to forestall the calamity of another world war. Observers who were telling us six months ago that there could not be another war for a generation are talking now as if such a war is already possible if not probable at any time. When we recall that there are more men under arms than in 1914, that nearly a dozen European nations are on a war footing, that there are more real causes for war, particularly in Europe, than at any time since the Franco-Prussian war, and that the conditions of living throughout Europe are in the main practically intolerable, the situation is grave indeed.

BUT underneath the skin none of the peoples of Europe wants war. Take the Balkans. The Associated Press, under date of April 19, quotes Foreign Minister Kalloff, of Bulgaria, as saying in Sofia:

"If the negotiations recently concluded or now approaching conclusion are successful, the danger of war will be averted in

the Balkans for many years. The latest of these agreements, that with Rumania, is about to be signed. The preliminary agreement already signed provides for a joint action to prevent incursions across the Rumanian frontier, with two mixed commissions sitting. A blanket agreement covering all points of possible dispute, including payment by Bulgaria for the war seizures, is practically completed, only a few details remaining to be settled. The agreement with Jugoslavia is working out well. The situation between the two countries is considerably eased.

M. Kalloff is quoted as adding:

"The negotiations of the mixed commission regarding Greece are proceeding with excellent prospects of early agreement. The chief difficulty there is the question of repatriating and re-establishing the refugees, but that does not appear insuperable, as only refugees of Bulgarian or Greek nationality are involved.

"We look forward to the time when the Balkan States shall co-operate instead of disagree. As a defeated country, we are especially desirous of earning the sympathy of the Great Powers, which is indispensable to the resumption of our normal national life.

"Our agreement to pay the occupational expenses removed the last big issue with the Powers; only minor questions remain, the principal of which are covered in a new agreement. As payment for our share of the expenses incurred, a strip of territory was turned over by Turkey to us, but in view of the other and far heavier obligations we shouldered, this may be considered negligible."

If this spirit can spread in the Balkans and find lodgment in Western Europe, peace has a fighting chance in its "war against war," even in Europe.

THE International Peace Bureau of Berne, Switzerland, notifies us that the International Peace Congress has been called to meet this year, October 2 to 7, in Berlin. This will be the twenty-third of the universal congresses. *Le Mouvement Pacifiste*, periodical and official organ of

the International Peace Bureau, makes this announcement with enthusiasm. The general features of the program for the congress were decided by the council at its recent session. Like the congresses of other years, the subjects for discussion will come under one of three classes: facts, legislation, or propaganda. There will be a special commission to prepare the report as a basis for discussion under each of these headings. All interested to know more of the congress may write either to the American Peace Society, or directly to Dr. H. Golay, Secretary *Bureau Internationale de la Paix*, Berne, Switzerland.

IF the press is a fair expression of the moral and intellectual aspirations of a people, a study of the moral and intellectual caliber of the press covering a considerable period of time ought to give a fair index of our social direction. We are of the opinion that our American newspapers are printing considerably more international news than before the war. Unfortunately, so far as we know, there has been no scientific or systematic study of this question. The editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, however, informs us that he has recently asked the heads of the two chief news-collecting agencies, the United Press and the Associated Press, as to whether the newspapers with whom they deal show any inclination to ask for more of the light and trifling stuff and less of the serious items. From both agencies the answers were the same.

The Associated Press said:

"For a long time now our correspondents have been given the general instructions to look out for interesting political, industrial, and economic matter, and we frequently send them specific instructions covering certain stories in these fields. Our members seem to appreciate this kind of news, which means, of course, a decrease in subjects criminal or scandalous, light or trivial."

While the United Press said:

"There are still certain types of newspapers in the United States that like 'monkey dinner' stories and similar sorts of stuff, but I have noticed within the last five or six years a decided expansion in the volume of foreign political and industrial news and a contraction in stories of crime, scandal, and of trivial events."

The editor continues:

"I think that these are important facts, but, optimist as I am, I don't insist that they are all-conclusive. A little less than two years ago I was in Berlin, and seeing the sign of a well-known American newspaper, stepped in to chat with the correspondent, who informed me that the proprietor of his paper had just been in town, and on leaving had said: "If you want to get on the first page of the paper, don't send in all this stuff about economics and politics and the condition of the German people. Send us some good scandals or horrifying crimes. That's what sells papers." It is fair to say, however, that on scanning the columns of the paper referred to, it seemed to me that either the correspondent had not accepted his superior's instructions or else the superior had lost the courage to print the matter he had ordered.

WE are in receipt of a cablegram from Dr. Christian L. Lange, Secretary General of the Interparliamentary Union, announcing that the Twenty-second International Conference of the Interparliamentary Union is to be held in Berne, Switzerland, August 22, 1924. The meetings are to last five days instead of three as heretofore. The Berne municipality and the Swiss federal government will be hosts. The delegates will go from Lausanne to Geneva, where it is understood they will also be entertained. It now appears that our United States Congress heartily approves inviting the Twenty-third International Conference to meet in the United States in 1925. Resolutions favoring an appropriation for this purpose have been favorably reported in the House and passed unanimously in the Senate.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

THE FRANCO-GERMAN SITUATION AND THE DAWES REPORT

The French Currency Debacle

TURBULENT internal conditions have characterized both French and German political and economic life since the beginning of the year. In the case of France the decline of the franc, which suddenly assumed disastrous aspects, produced a mingling of bewilderment and anger in the French people, which, after some desperate attempts to remedy the situation by legislative proposals, had its repercussion in the downfall of M. Poincaré at the beginning of April. This downfall, however, was of the most temporary nature, M. Poincaré resuming office at the close of a few days with a reorganized ministry, as follows:

Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Raymond Poincaré; Minister of Justice, M. Lefevre du Prey; Minister of the Interior, M. de Selves; Minister of Finance, M. Francois Marsal; Minister for War, M. Maginot; Minister of the Navy, M. Bokanowski; Minister for Public Works, M. le Trocquer; Minister of Commerce and Postal Service, M. Loucheur; Minister of Public Instruction, M. de Jouvenel; Minister of Agriculture, M. J. Capus; Minister for the Colonies, Lt. Col. Fabre; Minister of Labor and Health, M. de Vincent; Minister for the Liberated Regions, M. Louis Marin.

It is worthy of note that at least three members of the new cabinet, M. Loucheur, M. de Jouvenel, and M. de Vincent, were formerly open opponents of M. Poincaré's policy, while such faithful followers as M. Sarraut and M. de Lasteyrie were omitted from the list.

Legislative measures having proved useless as stabilizers of the currency, a foreign loan of some magnitude was finally assured by the bankers of London and New York, which had the effect of pegging the exchange, which has since, owing to a boom in francs following the publication of the Dawes report, reached the neighborhood of 6 francs to the dollar.

At this point it should be remembered that the basic cause of the unsteadiness in the French exchange is to be found in the fact that the French budget does not balance. The net increase of the public debt of France in the last four years has been 98,044,000,000 francs. Toward the close of his tenure of office M. de Lasteyrie, the French Minister of Finance, claimed that the working of the Ruhr for 1923 had produced a surplus of about 500,000,000 francs. The total public borrowing, however, provided for under the special budget this year amounts to 15,000,000,000. Up to date, 118,000,000,000 francs have been expended on German account, and it is estimated that 44,000,000,000 may have to be found in the next six years. The tendency to speculation in francs on the part of both French and foreigners, therefore, appears explicable. The date fixed for the French elections is May 11.

The German Reichstag

Following a deadlock in the Reichstag on the question of the amendments to the decrees passed under the so-called Powers Act, the German legislative body was dissolved, the date fixed for the new elections being May 4.

At the same time a distinct wave of Nationalistic feeling swept over Germany, which found some expression in the German note replying to the demands of the Council of Ambassadors for an Allied inquiry into German armaments. This note not only set forth counter-proposals to the effect that such an inquiry, with all the functions of Allied military control, should be confined to the League of Nations, but urged the claims of national dignity against the permanent maintenance of the formulas of command and subjection. This reply was received in France with agitation and expressions of disgust, and disapproved by Great Britain.

The Dawes Report

On the whole, however, no real crystallization of the European situation could

be expected before the publication of the report made by the committee of experts of the Reparation Commission under the chairmanship of General Dawes. This report, which was published on April 10, may be summarized as follows:

1. *The Problem before the Committee:*

Two problems were submitted for solution, namely, the stabilization of the German currency and the balancing of the budget. In the opinion of the committee, these two problems are interdependent. Each was, therefore, examined separately, on the temporary assumption that the other had been solved. The necessity for economic stability in the countries surrounding Germany was also stressed.

2. *Preliminary Assumptions:*

The necessary conditions for the balancing of the German budget and the stabilization of German currency must include the restoration of the economic and financial unity of the German reich. Economic activity must be unimpeded by control on the part of foreign organizations, except in so far as provided by the report. Adequate productive securities must be provided to take the place of the economic system now in operation in the occupied territory.

3. *Proposals for Currency Stabilization.*

(a) *Present Situation:*

Temporary stability has been assured by the rentenmark, but, in the absence of further measures, this cannot endure for more than a few months.

(b) *The Committee's Proposals:*

The committee proposes the establishment of a new bank of issue in Germany, the principal features of which shall be as follows:

The bank is to have the exclusive right, with certain minor qualifications, to issue paper money in Germany for the period of its charter, namely, fifty years. All German paper money, with the exception of limited note issues on the part of certain State banks, to be gradually withdrawn from circulation, giving place to a uniform currency, bank notes of the new bank. These notes are to be protected by a nor-

mal legal reserve of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent and by other liquid assets; the reserve to be held largely in the form of deposits in foreign banks. The permanent policy of the bank shall make these notes redeemable in gold. At the outset such a policy will not, however, be practicable, and it is, therefore, suggested that the currency be kept stable in relation to gold and placed on a convertible plane as soon as conditions permit. The bank will be empowered to serve as a bankers' bank, rediscounting short-term bills, etc., with power to establish an official rate of discount. It will also handle for other banks the giro system for the transfer of bank credits, and will deal with the public, making short-term commercial loans and discounts, effecting transfers, and receiving deposits. It will be the depository and fiscal agent of the government and may make limited and carefully safeguarded short-term loans to the latter.

The government may participate in the profits of the bank, which is to be kept free from government control or interference.

Treaty funds collected in Germany are all to be deposited in the new bank to the credit of a special account and are only to be withdrawn by creditor nations under conditions and safeguards adequately protecting the German exchange and the interests of creditor nations and German economy.

The new bank is to have a capital of four hundred million gold marks, part subscribed in Germany and part abroad. It is to be administered by a German president and a German board, with the optional assistance of a consultative committee. Besides the German board, there is to be a general board composed of seven Germans and seven foreigners, comprising one of each of the following nationalities: British, French, Italian, American, Belgian, Dutch, and Swiss. The duties of this board cover matters of bank operation and organization affecting the creditor nations. One of the foreign members of the general board, known as the commissioner, will be responsible for seeing that provisions relative to issuance notes and for the maintenance of the bank's reserves are not infringed. Decisions of the general board will require a majority vote of ten of the fourteen members unless both president and commis-

sioner are included in the majority, in which case a simple majority will be sufficient.

4. *The Budget and Temporary Reparation Relief:*

(a) In addition to stable currency and economic unity, the German Budget requires certain relief from immediate charges for treaty purposes, while securing budgetary position, will not imply cessation of all payments indispensable to the Allies in the form of deliveries in kind.

(b) Certain basic principles of Germany's annual burden and their bearing upon the continuity of balanced budgets must be taken into consideration. If the prior obligation for reparation that is fixed for Germany to pay and the irreducible minimum for her own domestic expenditures make up in a given year a sum beyond her taxable capacity, then budgetary instability must ensue. It is regarded as an essential condition of stability that any increased demands to correspond with increasing capacity should be determined by a method which is clearly defined in the original settlement and capable of automatic or, at least, professional, impartial, and practically undisputed application.

An attempt to meet this requirement has been made by providing that, in addition to fixed annual payments, there shall be variable additions, dependent upon the composite index figure designed to meet Germany's capacity as it increases. No limit of years or of amount for the working of an index is provided, nor is the number of annuities to be paid determined.

A burden of taxation commensurate with that obtaining in the Allied countries is indicated.

(c) The committee considers that, at least during the period within which the loan proposed by it is being amortized, the annual charge upon Germany should not be heavier than that which would result from the application of the index figure referred to hereinbefore, and proposes that an average of years, chiefly 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929, be taken as a base, and that the percentage of increase shown by each of six sets of representative statistics, namely, railway traffic, population, foreign trade, consumption of tobacco, etc.,

budget expenditures, consumption of coal, should be ascertained and the average of these six sets be taken as indicating the proportionate increase to be added to the treaty sums demanded in a given future year.

Referring to the treaty obligations which are prescribed in terms of gold, the committee recommends that reduction or increase of the figures, both as regards the standard and the supplementary payments, be made automatically, in correspondence with the general purchasing power of gold, whenever, by the decision of an impartial authority, such changes amount to more than 10 per cent.

(d) A distinction is made between the taxpayers' capacity to pay in Germany and Germany's capacity to pay the Allies, with a view to the preservation of budgetary stability.

(e) The committee recommends that payments be made by Germany from the following sources: her ordinary budget, railway bonds and transport tax, industrial debentures.

Dealing with each of these sources in detail, the committee is of the opinion that, given temporary relief from treaty charges and assurance that future charges will not exceed her capacity for payment, Germany should be able to balance the budget from her own resources. But, while the budget from the fiscal year 1924-25 on might be expected under these conditions to balance, so that an external loan on the basis of those accorded to Austria and to Hungary is not necessary, the committee does not hold out any hope that this budget can provide a surplus sufficient for meeting treaty charges.

As a result of the successful operation of the scheme for dealing with the railways, to which reference is made later, however, the committee estimates that before the end of the year 1925-26 the government will be in effective possession of 500,000,000 gold marks as a result of this transaction. After making allowance for the withdrawal of half this amount in respect of the transport tax, the committee estimates that there will be a balance of 250,000,000 gold marks available for meeting peace-treaty charges, and therefore recommends that Germany be required to meet peace-treaty charges to that amount out of

her budget for 1925-26. Any deficit in this estimate could, the committee feels, be met out of an internal loan.

On the basis of a stable currency and an assured and continued budget equilibrium, it is estimated that Germany can attain normal economic conditions in three years. With this in mind, the committee estimates that the budget can safely provide the following maximum sums for the three years subsequent to 1925-26: 1926-27, 110,000,000 gold marks; 1927-28, 500,000,000 gold marks; 1928-29, 1,250,000,000 gold marks.

On the other hand, since it is difficult to estimate the recuperative power of Germany in 1926-27 and 1927-28, it is proposed that these amounts be regarded as subject to modification by a sum not exceeding 250,000,000 gold marks, on the following plan: If the aggregate controlled revenues as defined in Section XIV exceed one milliard in 1926-27 or one and a half milliards in 1927-28, an addition shall be made to the above contributions equal to one-third of such excess. Conversely, if those aggregate revenues fall short of one milliard in 1926-27 or one and a quarter in 1927-28, the total contributions shall be diminished by an amount equal to one-third of the deficiency. Under normal conditions, the total sum to be provided from the ordinary budget resources would be the standard payment of 1,200,000,000 gold marks plus the additional sum computed upon the index of prosperity from the year 1929-30 onward. Furthermore, it is recommended, as desirable, that the index should be applied to one-half of the total standard contribution (1,250,000,000) for the first five years, namely, from 1929-30 to 1933-34. After that the index should be applied to the total, namely, 2,500,000,000.

(f) Turning to the railways, the committee finds that these have been operated at a constantly increasing loss since the Armistice, from causes partly out of their control. On the other hand, the administration is charged with two serious defects, namely, overstaffing and extravagance in capital expenditure. At the same time, the situation in these respects is now being improved, though room remains for further action.

The capital value of the railways is esti-

mated at 26 milliards, and it is noted that they are unencumbered by debt, their prior charges, which absorbed before the war half the gross profits, being extinguished by the depreciation of the mark. Profits before the war amounted to about one milliard gold marks.

The committee, however, considers that profitable management of the railways depends upon their severance from government control, and therefore recommends they be turned into a joint-stock company under German control. This being accomplished, it is then recommended that there should be paid from the railways 11,000,000,000 gold marks, to be represented by first-mortgage bonds bearing 5 per cent interest and 1 per cent sinking fund per annum. Taking the capital cost of the German railways as 26,000,000,000 and net profits before the war, on the most liberal operating basis, as one milliard, it is estimated that the interest and sinking fund on these debentures represent less than 3 per cent of the capital cost. During the reorganization of the railways it is considered that full interest and sinking fund should not be charged, and the following scale of payments on account of interest is recommended: 1924-25, 330,000,000 gold marks; 1925-26, 465,000,000 gold marks; 1926-27, 550,000,000 gold marks; 1927-28 and thereafter, 660,000,000 gold marks.

In addition to the 11 milliards of bonds, the new railway company is to have a capital of 2 milliards of preference shares, the remainder of its capital cost, namely, 26 milliards, to be represented by common shares. One and a half milliards of preference shares are to be earmarked for sale to private persons to provide funds for the payment of existing indebtedness and future capital expenditures. The proceeds of the sale of the other five hundred millions and all of the common shares are to go to the German Government.

The railways are to be managed by a board of eighteen directors, of whom nine are to be chosen by the German Government and the private holders of preference shares and nine named by the trustees of the bonds, of which nine five may be German. The board will thus have fourteen German members, including the chairman and the general manager of the railways.

The railways are to be free to conduct business as they see fit, with the exception of such control over their tariffs and service on the part of the German Government as may be needed to prevent discrimination and to protect the public. This control, however, to be definitely limited, so as not to interfere with fair earning of profits. A railway commissioner will represent the bondholders, and his principal duty will be, in the absence of default in interest, to receive reports, statistical and financial returns, and generally to protect the interests of the bondholders.

(g) The third source of reparation payments is found in industrial debentures. In this connection the committee suggests that a sum of not less than 5,000,000,000 gold marks be required as a contribution to reparation payments from German industry, this sum to be represented by first-mortgage bonds bearing a 5 per cent interest and 1 per cent sinking fund per annum. This amount of bonds is less than the total debt of industrial undertakings before the war, which has now been practically extinguished. It is further recommended that the interest on these debentures be waived during the first year, be 2½ per cent during the second year, and 5 per cent during the third year and thereafter.

(h) The committee then summarizes the provisions for treaty payments as follows:

Budget moratorium period, first year: From foreign loan and part interest (200,000,000) on railway bonds, total of 1,000,000,000 gold marks. Second year: From interest on railway bonds (including 130,000,000 balance from first year) and interest on industrial debentures and budget contribution, including sale of railway shares, total of 1,220,000,000 gold marks.

Transition period, third year: From interest on railway bonds and industrial debentures, from transport tax and from budget, total of 1,200,000,000 gold marks, subject to contingent addition or reduction not exceeding 250,000,000 gold marks.

Fourth year: From interest on railway bonds and industrial debentures, from transport tax and from budget, total of 1,750,000,000 gold marks, subject to contingent addition or reduction not exceeding 250,000,000 gold marks.

Standard year, fifth year: From inter-

est on railway bonds and industrial debentures, from transport tax, and from budget, total of 2,500,000,000 gold marks.

The first year will begin to run from the date when the plan shall have been accepted and made effective. The total figures indicated for each year include the sums paid by the German budget, the railway company, or the debtors on industrial debentures, whoever may be the actual recipients of the sums, the Reparation Commission, the capitalists who purchase securities, or even the debtors themselves, if they have purchased their bonds. These figures clearly do not include the proceeds from the sale of capital assets which may be effected by the creditor governments. As soon as the plan is put into execution the Reparation Commission will be in possession of bonds for 16 milliards, which may be sold to the extent to which the financial markets are capable of absorbing them. Subsequently, bonds representing the transport tax and the contribution from the budget may be issued and will enable the governments to realize the capital of their claims.

These sums, according to the committee, represent the total liabilities of Germany towards the Allied and Associated Powers in respect of war costs, including reparation restitution, occupation, clearing-house operations, etc., and special payments, such as those due under Arts. 124 and 125 of the Treaty of Versailles. The funds to be deposited in the special account in the bank are to be available for the foregoing purposes.

(h) Referring to the question of deliveries in kind, the committee suggests that these should be limited to such products as are native to Germany and do not have to be imported, such as coal, coke, dye-stuffs, etc. A limitation of these deliveries is suggested and the Allied governments are recommended to continue the system whereby the costs of the armies of occupation were a first charge upon the proceeds of deliveries in kind made to the respective governments.

(i) Recommendations for the making of payments are as follows: All payments for the account of reparations (whether from interest and sinking fund on railways or industrial debentures, the transport tax, or from the budget contribution)

will be paid in gold marks or their equivalent in German currency, into the bank of issue to the credit of the "agent for reparation payments." This payment is the definitive act of the German Government in meeting its financial obligation under the plan. It is easier to estimate the burden that Germany's economic and fiscal resources can bear than the amount of her wealth that can be safely transferred abroad, and it is the former and not the latter that has formed the first objective of the committee.

(j) Provisions for the receiving of payment are then made in the following language: The use and withdrawal of the moneys so deposited will be controlled by a committee consisting of the agent for reparation payments (a co-ordinating official under the Reparation Commission whose position and duties are defined later in this report), and five persons skilled in matters relating to foreign exchange and finance, representing five of the Allied and Associated Powers. This committee will regulate the execution of the program for deliveries in kind and the payments under the reparation recovery act, in such a manner as to prevent difficulties arising with the foreign exchange. They will also control the transfer of cash to the Allies by purchase of foreign exchange, and generally so act as to secure the maximum transfers without bringing about instability of currency.

If the payments by Germany on reparation account in the long run exceed the sums that can be thus transferred by deliveries or by purchase of foreign currency, they will, of course, begin to accumulate in the bank.

Up to a certain point in normal circumstances not exceeding two milliards, these accumulations will form part of the short-money operations of the bank. Beyond this point the committee will find employment for such funds in bonds or loans in Germany under the conditions laid down in the annex; but for economic and political reasons an unlimited accumulation in this form is not contemplated. It is recommended that a limit of five milliards be placed upon all funds accumulating in the hands of the reparation creditors in Germany. If this limit is reached, the contributions from the budget are to be

reduced below the standards set out in our plan, so that they are not in excess of the withdrawals from the account and the accumulation is not further increased. In this contingency the payments by Germany out of the budget and the transport tax would be reduced until such time as the transfers to the Allies can be increased and the accumulation be reduced before the limit named.

(k) By way of guarantees to secure the payments, the committee recommends that certain specific revenues, namely, the taxes on customs, alcohol, sugar, tobacco and beer, be assigned to and placed under the control of Germany's creditors, from which the treaty payments shall first be deducted by an impartial controlling authority for the use of the Allies, and the balance turned back to Germany. The immediate institution of this control is suggested. It is estimated that these controlled revenues will yield about 2,146 million gold marks. These revenues, in the opinion of the committee, should be regarded strictly as security and not determinant of the actual sum to be paid in reparation.

(l) The committee further recommends the issue by Germany of a foreign loan of 800,000,000 gold marks, which is considered essential for the establishment of the new bank and to insure the stabilization of the currency.

(m) The successful launching of the scheme suggested for the economic rehabilitation of Germany and the payment of reparations depends, in the opinion of the committee, upon three factors, namely, limitation of payments for all purposes to one billion gold marks, of which at least eight hundred millions must be spent in Germany, for the first year, and thereafter to such sums as are available under the plan during the succeeding years; co-operation between the Allies and Germany in securing political conditions which will incline the investors of the world favorably toward a German loan on good security; and a loan of 800 million gold marks, which will serve the double purpose of assuring currency stability and financing deliveries in kind during the preliminary period of economic rehabilitation.

The report concludes with an analysis of the taxation situation in Germany and

various comments thereon, and with several annexes covering the technical aspects of the committee's recommendations.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

AN IMPORTANT review of the whole field of Czecho-Slovakian foreign policy was recently delivered before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Czecho-Slovak Parliament by Dr. Edouard Benes, Minister of Foreign Affairs. His speech, which subsequently received the approval of the House of Deputies and the Senate, outlined briefly the difficulties encountered by the new State in connection with external policies and internal consolidation, and contained a statement of the principles upon which Czecho-Slovakian foreign policy is based, as follows:

1. We did not believe that Bolshevik methods of government would be suitable for anything stable to be constructed by them. It was also clear to us that reaction from the right in immature States means simply terrorism, while in more advanced States such a reaction entails the fight of every man against his neighbor, and finally internal confusion and the weakening of the people.

2. It seemed to us superficial and not sufficiently honest to declare that the peace treaties have been to blame for the present difficult conditions in Europe. These difficulties are due to five years of destruction of all values of social life and not at all to the peace treaties. The peace treaties are imperfect; every one knows and recognizes that; but today they are the juridical basis of the political structure of Europe. Their non-recognition or their alteration would mean calling forth a new confusion and a new desperate and bloody struggle. Hence it was necessary to emphasize, and hence it is continually necessary to emphasize, that it is indispensable to recognize the peace treaties and carry them into execution, and that whoever does not desire bloody struggles cannot do anything else but carry out loyally the policy of the peace treaties, being ready at the same time to make improvements wherever possible. We have stressed these points continually in our relations with our discontented elements and irredentists in Czecho-Slovakia and also with our neighbors. Three-quarters of those who did not accept this

policy in 1919 recognize it tacitly now, for events have taught them that any other action would make the situation worse and only bring harm to themselves.

3. We saw that it was necessary to come to an agreement as soon as possible with our neighbors in order that the population, being saved from trouble from without, might devote themselves to work and internal economic and financial reconstruction. It was necessary to create a general atmosphere of tranquillity and get rid of the war psychology, both in our relations to the national minorities in Czecho-Slovakia and also to our neighbors.

4. It was further necessary, by work at home and abroad, to prove that the complaints made against us abroad are not justified. The whole world was tired and merely wanted peace and quietness, reconstruction and co-operation. Those who were calculating on a debacle, and worked for it in secret, by hiding their intentions under a phraseology of revolutionism, nationalist claims, or some other form of justice, did not make sufficient allowance for this universal international exhaustion. In our foreign policy we were guided by this situation. Hence we did not place any confidence in the success of this superficial revolutionary spirit, but strove after peace among our nationalities and the correct and objective informing of foreign countries as to our minority questions and our good attitude toward our neighbors. That is why we have worked so hard for the League of Nations and foreign propaganda. The unjust and inexact things said about us two or three years ago cannot be said any longer today. If in this respect our foreign policy has acted systematically in the direction of moderation on both sides of the minority question, it has rendered great services to the State at home and abroad.

5. Finally, we saw that it was necessary for our foreign policy to follow the spirit of the times and endeavor in a positive fashion to get rid of the smaller disputed points between us and our neighbors, and also to strengthen, by constructive work and the drawing up of agreements with friendly States, the new structure of Europe, so that all those who believe that warlike and other ventures are able to overturn the present political order might be induced to abandon such ideas. That was the origin of the idea of constructing a league of States by means of regional and restricted agreements, so as

to strengthen the present juridical system and hinder the breaking out of warlike conflicts. Such an agreement meant also that the population would feel confident of having peace, whereby the results of its economic activity would not be destroyed by wars. This is, and has been since the beginning, the sole idea of the Little Entente.

6. We have always been aware that the whole of this policy must be in accordance with two preliminary conditions; it must not be contrary to the principles of democracy, for which the war was fought, and it must not be in opposition to the great world movement for peace and quietness, but must take into consideration the fact that mankind is everywhere tired of international disputes, and that the masses resist all oppression—a movement which is stronger today than is generally imagined, and which has found clear and concrete expression in the ideals of the League of Nations. These principles have in no way prevented us from being prepared to defend ourselves. We have taken for our watchword: We must always be sufficiently strong materially in order to be able at the right time to throw in our weight for the defense of actual right.

Dr. Benes then related the circumstances attending the first treaty with Jugo-Slavia and the birth of the Little Entente, which was, he declared, based on far deeper causes than the actual incidents surrounding the Kapp putsch and the Charles Hapsburg affair, though these lent incentive to the immediate and formal agreements between Jugo-Slavia, Rumania, and Czecho-Slovakia. The treaty with Austria was then reviewed and allusion made to Dr. Benes' three attempts to enter into closer relations with Hungary. The moment was approaching, he stated, when a reasonable agreement could be concluded with the latter country.

Referring to Russia, the Foreign Minister felt that, while it was not possible for Czecho-Slovakia to agree with the political conceptions of the party now in power in that country, in his opinion a permanent blockade and the refusing of intercourse tended only to aggravate conditions and injure both Russia and Czecho-Slovakia. The latter country's policy towards the former was also greatly determined by the desire to save the lives of sixty or eighty thousand Czech prisoners. These had been nearly all saved. As regards the

economic interests involved, they were necessarily much limited, the situation in Russia being such that any noticeable economic results could not occur until a considerable time had elapsed. Dr. Benes defined his policy toward Russia as one of "economic intercourse."

Discussing the treaty of January 25, 1924, with France, Dr. Benes claimed that it was but a logical following out of the Czecho-Slovak policy concerning the desirability of separate treaties with other countries. The feeling of his country was profoundly convinced of the necessity of friendly relations, of the closest description, with both France and England. He stated that Czecho-Slovak politics, based, as they were, upon the preservation of the peace treaties, had many of the same interests as French politics, and, referring specifically to the treaty of January 25, 1924, with France, gave the following reasons for its signature:

1. Co-operation for a policy of peace, for a policy of economic reconstruction and the League of Nations, and for a policy of loyal fulfillment of the peace treaties.

2. The treaty further stipulates, that both sides will confer on the uniformity of their policies where common interests are concerned; also on the measures to be taken in case these interests are threatened.

3. The treaty fixes the conformity of our views in regard to our Central European policies, as determined by various previous documents, signed and accepted both by us and other States. It is the question of our treaty policy with Austria, and the question of the Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns.

4. Finally, the treaty fixes the *principle of a compulsory court of arbitration* between the two States.

Continuing, Dr. Benes pointed out that the greatest sympathy existed between Great Britain and Czecho-Slovakia—a sympathy which had increased since the war, owing to the close accord which had been reached over the post-war reconstruction policy, the policy of moderation towards defeated States, the help given to Austria and Hungary, relations with Germany, Russian policy, and general economic interests. The peculiar geographical situation of Great Britain, however, coupled with her distrust of continental entanglements, gave her little interest in

concluding agreements, and he felt that Czecho-Slovakia should be satisfied with the present situation.

The argument that special treaties should not be entered upon by Czecho-Slovakia, in view of the existence of the League of Nations, was met by Dr. Benes with the following pertinent observations:

I am not one of those who look with skepticism on the League of Nations, but on the other hand I do not overestimate its forces today, and I make, therefore, all the greater effort to strengthen it and enable it actually to become what its founders wished it to be. When it is a question of the security of our State, it is my duty as responsible minister to point out the following facts:

1. The power of the League of Nations is not today such as would lead one to expect with absolute certainty her decisive help in the moment of greatest danger for the State. She possesses considerable moral force, which, so far, could only be converted with great difficulty—and only in very special circumstances—into material force. It is common knowledge that two years ago she was unable to intervene in the Greco-Turkish War, while the events connected with the occupation of Corfu are well known.

Among the members of the League of Nations and also outside the League there exist today strong tendencies towards an alteration of Article 10—*i. e.*, just the article which should provide a guaranty for the small States. At the last session of the League attempts were made to weaken Article 10, and it is today asserted that the entry of the United States, and perhaps also the membership of other countries, depends upon an alteration of Article 10.

The statutes of the League of Nations themselves lay down that the opposition of a single member of the Council of the League suffices, in the case of an attack by one State on another, to prevent the League from calling upon all its members to assist the State attacked, to leave the attacked State to its fate or to the mere assistance of those who shall of their own accord desire to help or who are closely connected with the attacked party.

It is just on account of these shortcomings in the League itself that efforts have manifested themselves outside the statutes of the League toward a limitation of armaments, coupled with a special general guar-

anty pact against war. By this pact the different States, in addition to their obligations to the League of Nations, voluntarily declared their adhesion to a policy of peace and gave a special guarantee of one another's security.

I am an adherent of this idea. It is the same idea which, in our Central European policy, we have applied throughout the whole of the last five years. This was also the purpose of our efforts to maintain the Entente at all costs; for to us the Anglo-French alliance, in the difficult times in which we now live, meant peace and quiet in Europe, meant that all other countries had to group round this bloc, and meant the extension of that alliance into an All-European Entente. It was in this sense particularly that I labored at the Genoa Conference. Lloyd George, as is well known, laid before the conference the plan of a guaranty pact which contained no other guaranty than the mere promise that one party would not attack another.

I regarded this as inadequate and proposed, already at that time, as a basis of European peace, a Franco-English guaranty pact, which should afterwards be extended to become an inter-allied pact and later a general European pact. My idea then was, above all, to secure quiet and peace, especially for Central Europe. This plan of mine met with obstacles mainly because it was based upon a respect for existing international obligations. Lloyd George's proposal also fell through for the reason that it took no account of this last principle.

I mention these matters only to justify our policy of treaty-making. In pursuing our policy we have made every possible endeavor to assure peace around us and at the same time to insure the existence of our State. We have not dropped the plan of a general guaranty pact; on the contrary, we shall continue to work for it, and therefore also all the treaties which we have concluded have been made in such a spirit that—

1. They are not in conflict with the spirit of the League of Nations;
2. Their terms are open to all other countries;
3. They may serve as a step to a general guaranty pact and perhaps make possible a gradual limitation of armaments.

Such is also our treaty with France.

If a State has done as much for securing

its own existence and general peace as our Republic has done so far, if in so doing it has exhausted every right and permissible method, and if it consciously pursues a policy of treaty-making with the fixed purpose of arriving at results proclaimed and desired by the League of Nations, no one has the right to reproach it for this policy.

Defending the recent treaty with France from a political standpoint, Dr. Benes said, significantly:

The treaty is said to be anti-German, and to encourage French imperialism, etc. Those who assert this would do well to consider first what I have said here, and then to remember that an accord between Germany and France is nearer than they think.

The speech concluded with an exposition of Czecho-Slovak policy with regard to that country's share of reparations payments.

POLISH FINANCE

THE *London Times* reports that Mr. Hilton Young has returned to London after completing his work as unofficial financial adviser to the Polish Government, which he undertook on the invitation of that government October last. Discussing the report the *Times* says that it covers a wide area and makes many practical recommendations. It leaves the impression that a good beginning has now been made with reform, but, as Mr. Young points out, the first step is not the whole journey. The technical measures now adopted are prudent, but "further and drastic economies," an increase of taxation, and reform of the revenue administration are needed before there can be confidence that deficits will not continue or recur. Mr. Young deals with all these in detail.

Recent historical causes of the present troubles are first described, the ravages of war, the difficulty of unifying parts of three different systems, and the lack of experienced officials. On the other hand, Mr. Hilton Young examines the natural resources and industrial wealth of the country, drawing the conclusion that Poland can be self-supporting, that she has a favorable balance of foreign trade

which promises continuance. The present financial difficulties are summarized in the words—the falling mark. On September 30 last the dollar was worth 3,442m. On December 31 it was worth 6,400,000m. The cost of living has risen in proportion. The depreciation has caused a famine of currency and credit, a general "flight from the mark," and very grave disorder in the life of the community.

The national budget has fallen in ruins. In 1922 there was a deficit of 362 million zlotys [the zloty, equal to a gold franc, is the theoretical unit adopted in Poland for the expression on a gold basis of transactions in the unstable paper mark which is the actual currency] on an expenditure of 890 million zlotys, and in 1923 a deficit of 692 million zlotys on an expenditure of 1,118.8 million zlotys. Military expenditure and the railway deficit accounted in these years for more than half the total expenditure, and the railway deficit for half the total deficit. Poland has been trying to reconstruct her railways out of revenue, and the effort has been too much for her. The deficits have been covered by inflation. On September 30 the mark issue was 11,198 milliards; on December 31 it was 125,372 milliards. "Inflation, and no other thing, is the cause of the depreciation, and of the financial troubles of Poland."

The remedy for the troubles is to avoid inflation by making the budget balance, by decreasing expenditure, by increasing revenue, and by loans. Currency reform is necessary, in particular, to help in increasing the revenue; but it should be accepted as a cardinal rule that the issue of a limited currency on a sound basis should not be attempted until the deficit has been got rid of, and there can be confidence that it has been got rid of for good. Otherwise the new currency must be inflated also and follow the old into the abyss.

The current monthly budgets are reviewed in order to ascertain the measures needed to cover the deficit. It is observed that the following reforms have been effected since Mr. Hilton Young's inquiry began: Full powers have been granted to the executive to deal with the situation; taxes have been valorized on a gold basis; an effort is being made to accelerate and improve the collection of

revenue; and the railway budget has been separated from that of the State. Under these conditions the accounts for February, according to the official estimate, show a balance at 88.5 million zlotys.

Mr. Hilton Young points out that these estimates depend on speculative factors, particularly the collection of a property levy, the effect of valorization, and the result of a railway loan for 100 million zlotys, just announced. He draws the conclusion that it is too early to be confident that a balance will be obtained in the near future, or, if obtained, that it will be maintained.

He estimates the greatest revenue which it is possible to obtain this year, if every possible effort be made to increase it, at nearer 800 than 900 million zlotys, and draws the conclusion that if further deficits are to be avoided further and strenuous efforts are required to reduce expenditure. By means of measures of economy detailed in an appendix, it is suggested that expenditure might be reduced to some 700 million zlotys for the next 10 months, leaving an excess over revenue that it would be not impossible to cover by internal loans. If expenditure be not so reduced, the attainment of a normal balance in the near future appears to him improbable. He draws the conclusion that the time has not yet come to fix a date for the substitution of a limited currency on a sound basis for the mark.

In further sections of the report, and in related appendices [in the preparation of which Mr. Hilton Young acknowledges his indebtedness to Messrs. H. A. Trotter, Nixon, and Penson, who assisted him in his inquiry], Mr. Hilton Young deals in detail with measures for increasing the revenue, for reducing expenditure, for raising internal and external loans, and with regard to the foundation of an independent bank of issue and a sound currency. He recommends the government to invite the assistance of a foreign mission of advisers on revenue administration. The program of capital outlay on railways should be postponed until it can be carried out with borrowed capital. Unessential State enterprises should be leased, sold, or closed down. As to loans, although much cannot be expected until confidence is more restored, the government should be ready to borrow all it can on gold bonds

in aid of the deficit. The time is not yet come at which help can be confidently expected from foreign capital: it will come when Poland has succeeded in covering the deficit and stabilizing her exchange.

"Poland," it is said, "now fully alive to the dangers of continued inflation, has resolved to achieve unaided her own financial salvation." There is no economic impossibility in the task. Should the effort not succeed, owing to the intervention of circumstances other than economic, it would be prudent not to delay making whatever arrangements might be necessary (of which the Austrian settlement is cited as an example as to financial conditions) to secure the assistance from abroad which alone could then protect the nation from the final and worst consequences of inflation.

Mr. Hilton Young expresses general approval of the statutes for a bank of issue and a new currency recently drawn up by the government, subject to recommendations as to the limitation of State participation in the capital, and abstention from the creation of artificial credits for the State. He makes no recommendation on any matter of policy involved in military expenditure, on the ground that it is outside his competence, but he points out that if economy is not to touch an area of 33 per cent of the present rate of expenditure the difficulty of balancing the budget is enormously increased.

The prospect of a balance in the near future depends largely on the collection of a property levy. Mr. Hilton Young dwells on the difficulty of the simultaneous liquidation of capital values for a large amount in the present congested condition of credit in Poland and utters a warning against making the levy a means of inflation rather than a remedy for it, by the State itself providing the credit and currency needed for its payment.

Appendices deal in detail with production, foreign trade, the alleged economic dependence on Germany, taxation, expenditure, control of expenditure and the form of budget, State payments and receipts, cash accounts and control and audit, local authorities' finance, reorganization of banking, the central bank, exchange regulations, and comparative railway rates.

AN AMERICAN PLAN FOR AN ASSOCIATION OF NATIONS

By GEORGE A. FINCH
Of Washington, D. C.

IN his inaugural address of March 4, 1921, the late President Harding expressed the readiness of the United States to associate with the nations of the world in suggesting plans for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration; to clarify and write the laws of international relationship, and establish a world court for the disposition of justiciable disputes.

The plan here outlined provides an association of nations for the purposes stated in that address. It is rooted in the traditional attitude of the United States toward the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It suggests as the model of the instrument of agreement texts already approved by the treaty-making power of the United States. It incorporates as much of the existing international organization as seems consonant with the traditional policy of the United States and not inconsistent with its present policy.

The plan provides for—

- I. A general treaty of arbitration for justiciable disputes.
- II. An agreement to submit all other disputes to international inquiry and not to make war pending such inquiry.
- III. The separation of the Permanent Court of International Justice from the League of Nations and the adherence of the United States to the court.
- IV. Resumption of periodic conferences at The Hague for the advancement of international law.

Part I—A General Treaty of Arbitration

The numerous expressions by the Congress and Executive of the United States in favor of international arbitration and the many instances in which it has been put into practice by this country do not need enumeration to demonstrate that it forms a part of the accepted foreign policy of the United States. The institution has progressively developed from the Jay Treaty of 1794, submitting to arbitration differences arising out of the Revolu-

tionary War, up to The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907, in which the nations of the world considered means for the pacific settlement of international disputes and provided a panel of arbitrators and a system of procedure for the voluntary use of nations.

At both Hague Conferences the United States sought to induce the other nations to enter into a collective agreement to submit their disputes to arbitration. To the First Conference Secretary Hay proposed such an agreement covering "all questions of disagreement excepting such as may relate to or involve political independence or territorial integrity." The farthest that conference would go, however, was a recommendation of arbitration as the most effective and equitable means of settling disputes of a legal nature, and a suggestion to the Powers of their right to conclude individual agreements for obligatory arbitration. After the conference adjourned, the nations proceeded to do separately what they had been unable to do collectively, and up to the Second Conference, in 1907, fifty-six separate arbitration treaties had been communicated to the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

This widespread interest in international arbitration prompted the United States again to propose a general treaty of arbitration to the Second Hague Conference. Precise instructions as to the form of such a treaty were given by Secretary Root to the American delegates as follows:

In December, 1904, and January, 1905, my predecessor, Mr. Hay, concluded separate arbitration treaties between the United States and Great Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Sweden and Norway, and Mexico. On the 11th of February, 1905, the Senate advised and consented to the ratification of these treaties, with an amendment which has had the effect of preventing the exchange of ratifications. The amendment, however, did not relate to the scope or character of the arbitration to which the President had agreed

and the Senate consented. You will be justified, therefore, in assuming that a general treaty of arbitration in the terms, or substantially in the terms, of the series of treaties which I have mentioned will meet the approval of the Government of the United States. The first article of each of these treaties was as follows:

Differences which may arise of a legal nature, or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of the 29th of July, 1899, provided, nevertheless, that they do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two contracting states, and do not concern the interests of third parties.

A large majority at the Second Hague Conference was in favor of a general treaty of arbitration, but the minority, led by Germany, invoked the rule of unanimity and refused to permit the majority to conclude such a treaty.

Following the Second Hague Conference, sixty-seven additional separate arbitration treaties were concluded and communicated to the International Bureau at The Hague up to the end of the year 1921. Included in them were twenty-two arbitration treaties negotiated by Secretary Root with Austria-Hungary, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Great Britain, Haiti, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Uruguay. Article I of the Root treaties is the same as the first article of the unratified Hay treaties of 1904. Article II was revised by Mr. Root to meet the objection of the Senate hereinafter referred to. The treaties were approved by the Senate without amendment or reservation of any kind.

Such was the status of international arbitration when the Peace Conference met at Paris in 1919. The nations assembled in that conference took the step which the minority had prevented the Hague Conference from taking. They incorporated a general arbitration agreement in the Covenant of the League of Nations. The first three paragraphs of Article XIII of the covenant, as later amended to provide for the reference of

disputes to the Permanent Court of International Justice, read as follows:

The members of the League agree that, whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement, and which can not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement.

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement.

For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in accordance with Article 14, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

Since the United States has declined to accept the Covenant of the League, because of objections to other matters which are extraneous to the subject of international arbitration, it is suggested that the United States propose to the nations of the world the conclusion of a general collective treaty by which the signatories shall agree to submit all justiciable disputes which cannot be settled by diplomacy, either to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

The alternative choice of the two courts is suggested because it is not improbable that cases will arise which disputants will prefer to submit to the Court of Arbitration, with judges of their own choice, rather than to the Court of Justice, with its permanent bench. The force of this reasoning was recognized by the framers of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in which it is stipulated that "this court shall be in addition to the Court of Arbitration organized by the conventions of The Hague of 1899 and 1907" (Article 1).

A model for the proposed agreement may be taken in the arbitration treaties now in force between the United States and other nations; or, if the Senate is willing, the phraseology of the first three paragraphs of Article XIII of the Cove-

nant of the League of Nations may be used.

In either case a stipulation should be inserted providing for the submission to the Senate of the special agreement of arbitration to be concluded in each case, in order to avoid raising the objection which prevented the ratification of the Hay treaties of 1904. The necessity for and form of such a stipulation were impressed by Secretary Root upon the delegates to the Second Hague Conference, as follows:

Such a general treaty of arbitration necessarily leaves to be determined in each particular case what the questions at issue between the two governments are, and whether those questions come within the scope of the treaty or within the exceptions, and what shall be the scope of the powers of the arbitrators. The Senate amendment which prevented the ratification of each of these treaties applied only to another article of the treaty, which provided for special agreements in regard to these matters and involved only the question who should act for the United States in making such special agreements. To avoid having the same question arise regarding any general treaty of arbitration which you may sign at The Hague, your signature should be accompanied by an explanation substantially as follows:

In signing the general arbitration treaty the delegates of the United States desire to have it understood that the special agreement provided for in article — of said treaty will be subject to submission to the Senate of the United States.

The arbitration treaties which Mr. Root negotiated subsequent to the Second Hague Conference and which received the approval of the Senate contained such a stipulation in Article II.

Part II—International Commissions of Inquiry for Non-justiciable Disputes

With very few exceptions, all of the separate arbitration treaties so far concluded contain agreements to submit to arbitration only certain classes of disputes, and specifically except from the agreement certain other classes, such as questions affecting national honor, independence, or vital interests. Even Article XIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations limits the arbitration agreement

to disputes which the members of the League "recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration." The statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which is the last word on the subject, merely provides that "the jurisdiction of the court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in any treaties and conventions in force." It is true that the same article provides for an optional clause, by the signing of which States may accept the obligatory jurisdiction of the court; but, it should be noted, such obligatory jurisdiction is limited to classes of legal disputes taken from the categories of disputes enumerated in Article XIII of the covenant as suitable for arbitration or judicial settlement. Nowhere is there to be found a general agreement to submit all disputes to arbitration or judicial settlement, except the few treaties first mentioned.

The advocates of the peaceful settlement of international disputes have recognized that as long as arbitration agreements contain exceptions nations will be free to arbitrate or refuse to arbitrate in almost any case. An effort to close this gap in the system was made during the administration of President Taft, and on November 3, 1911, Secretary of State Knox signed a new form of arbitration treaty with France and Great Britain, which provided that a joint high commission of inquiry should determine whether or not a given case was justiciable; but the Senate objected that such a provision would be a delegation of the treaty-making power, and therefore unconstitutional. The treaties were never ratified.

The effort to enlarge the scope of questions subject to peaceful settlement was continued by President Wilson's administration, and Secretary of State Bryan succeeded in formulating a plan which, it is believed, brings within the domain of peaceful settlement all disputes between nations, as far as that is humanly possible in the present state of development of international organization. Mr. Bryan's plan received the approval of the Senate in advance of negotiations with foreign governments. He subsequently concluded twenty-one treaties with the following nations, and they were promptly

approved by the Senate without amendment or reservation of any kind: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Great Britain, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Under the Bryan treaties, the high contracting parties agree that—

All disputes between them, of every nature whatsoever, other than disputes the settlement of which is provided for and in fact achieved under existing agreements between the high contracting parties, shall, when diplomatic methods of adjustment have failed, be referred for investigation and report to a permanent international commission, to be constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding article; and they agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.

The report of the international commission is required to be completed within one year after the investigation is begun, and the contracting parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject-matter of the dispute after the report shall have been submitted.

The Root treaties of 1908, supplemented by the Bryan treaties of 1914, give the United States a complete system for the settlement of international disputes which makes war a remote possibility. Under the Root treaties the contracting nations agree to submit all justiciable disputes to arbitration. Under the Bryan treaties they agree to submit all other disputes to international inquiry and undertake not to resort to hostilities until the inquiry is completed. For all disputes which are not otherwise settled, a delay is accordingly provided, during which the disputants may cool off or friendly powers offer their good offices or mediation. Failing a settlement during this cooling-off period, the publication of the report of the inquiry would in all likelihood show which nation is in the wrong or suggest some suitable compromise if the right or wrong of the case be doubtful. Public opinion could be depended upon eventually to throw the weight of its influence upon the side of peace, if only an opportunity be given for it to be formulated and expressed.

The covenant of the League of Nations incorporates the principle of the Bryan treaties by providing in Article XV that any dispute likely to lead to a rupture which is not submitted to arbitration shall be submitted to the Council of the League of Nations for investigation and report; but, for reasons extraneous to the merits of the principle involved, the United States is not a party to the League agreements. Therefore, to supplement the general agreement for arbitration of justiciable disputes, with provisions for the peaceful settlement of non-justiciable disputes, the United States should propose a general agreement of the nations to submit to international inquiry all disputes between the contracting parties which are not settled by diplomacy or arbitration, following the terms of the separate treaties now in force between the United States and the twenty-one separate nations.

As the separate commissions of inquiry provided in the Bryan treaties would be too numerous in the case of a general treaty between all nations, the international commissions of inquiry under the general treaty should be selected from the panel of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, as and when occasions arise for their use, in accordance with the stipulations contained in The Hague Convention of 1907 for the appointment of such commissions.

Part III—Adherence of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice

Advocacy by the United States of the establishment of a permanent international tribunal has been a corollary of its efforts to extend the use and enlarge the scope of international arbitration. A plan for such a tribunal was included in the instructions of Secretary Hay to the American delegates to the First Hague Conference, to whom he stated that "the long-continued and widespread interest among the people of the United States in the establishment of an international court, . . . gives assurance that the proposal of a definite plan of procedure by this government for the accomplishment of this end would express the desires and aspirations of this nation."

Secretary Root resumed the American effort in behalf of a permanent tribunal at

the Second Hague Conference, and after pointing out to the American delegates the difference between arbitration and judicial settlement, instructed them to work to bring about "a development of The Hague tribunal into a permanent tribunal composed of judges who are judicial officers and nothing else, who are paid adequate salaries, who have no other occupation, and who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods and under a sense of judicial responsibility."

The American delegates succeeded in having the Second Hague Conference approve a draft convention for the creation of a judicial arbitration court, but it failed of adoption because of the inability of the conference to agree upon the method of selecting the judges, and the conference adjourned with a recommendation to the Powers to adopt the convention and bring it into force as soon as an agreement could be reached respecting the selection of the judges. After the adjournment of the conference the American State Department undertook to establish the court through diplomatic channels, but the negotiations were long drawn out and were cut short by the outbreak of the war in 1914.

The inclusion of Article XIV in the Covenant of the League of Nations, providing for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice; the appointment by the Council of the League of an Advisory Committee of Jurists, and the formulation by that committee of a plan for the court in July, 1920; the amendment of the plan, and the approval of the statute of the court by the Assembly of the League in December, 1920, and the subsequent signing of the protocol establishing the court by the members of the League of Nations are matters of recent history which need no elaboration.

Largely through the efforts of the American member of the Advisory Committee of Jurists, who drew upon American constitutional precedent and parliamentary practice, the difficulty over the election of the judges, which prevented the adoption of the Judicial Arbitration Court by The Hague Conference, was overcome by providing for the election of the judges by the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations.

Because of its non-membership in the League of Nations, the United States is not a party to the court, and Secretary of State Hughes expressed to the President in a letter of February 17 last the view that the United States should not exercise its privilege as a non-League suitor in the court without becoming a party to the protocol establishing the court, participating in the election of judges through representatives delegated for that purpose to the Council and Assembly of the League, and contributing its fair share of the expenses of maintenance of the court. These views were approved by President Harding and incorporated in a recommendation to the Senate, under date of February 24, 1923. The recommendation, however, met with objection on the ground that its acceptance would involve the United States in the League of Nations, and in reviewing the discussion which ensued over his recommendation President Harding said, in an address at St. Louis, on June 21, 1923, that "there admittedly is a League connection with the world court." In the same address Mr. Harding laid down as an indispensable condition to participation by the United States in the court, "that the tribunal be so constituted as to appear to be, in theory and in practice, in form and in substance, beyond the shadow of doubt, a world court and not a league court."

It therefore appears that the United States, the leading advocate of a Permanent Court of International Justice at the two Hague conferences, is not a member of the present court for reasons extraneous to the merits of the court as such. Under the circumstances, the practical thing to do is to try to remove the reasons for the objection, irrespective of whether they be considered well- or ill-founded. To accomplish that end, it is suggested that—

(a) The present membership of the court, which includes an eminent American jurist, be accepted by the United States. The following tribute was paid to the present personnel of the court by Mr. Harding in his St. Louis address: "Its composition is of the highest order. None better, none freer from selfish, partisan, national, or racial prejudices or influences could be obtained."

(b) Hereafter the election of judges and deputy judges shall be transferred

from the League of Nations to a periodic Conference for the Advancement of International Law, referred to hereinafter. The meetings of the conference shall be arranged at times that will coincide with the dates of elections to the court. Vacancies occurring upon the bench during intervals between meetings of the conference may be filled by the court from specified candidates and according to procedure to be provided for that purpose.

(c) To make the conference a bicameral body adapted to perform the functions of the Council and Assembly of the League in the election of judges, there shall be constituted an Executive Council of the Conference for the Advancement of International Law, composed of permanent members appointed by the larger Powers and of non-permanent members elected by the conference, as provided in the covenant for the composition of the Council of the League. Other duties for the Executive Council are suggested below.

(d) The question of the expense of the court may be settled by providing for the payment of each nation's quota to an officer of the court designated for that purpose.

Part IV—Periodic Conference for the Advancement of International Law

The two conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 developed essentially into conferences for the advancement of international law. They were regarded as merely the beginnings of a continuous process through which the progressive development of international justice and peace would be accomplished. As stated by Mr. Root in his instructions to the American delegates to the Second Hague Conference, "The immediate results of such a conference must always be limited to a small part of the field which the more sanguine have hoped to see covered; but each successive conference will make the positions reached in the preceding conference its point of departure, and will bring to the consideration of further advances toward international agreements opinions affected by the acceptance and application of the previous agreements. Each conference will inevitably make further progress, and by successive steps results may be accomplished which have formerly appeared impossible."

Secretary Root therefore instructed the American delegates to "favor the adoption of a resolution by the conference providing for the holding of further conferences within fixed periods and arranging the machinery by which such conferences may be called and the terms of the program may be arranged." These instructions brought forth a recommendation from the second conference that a third conference be held, and that the program be prepared in advance by a committee to be appointed two years before the probable date of the meeting. In the expectation that a third conference would be held in 1915, some of the Powers, before the war, the United States included, appointed committees to work upon the program, but the outbreak of the war, of course, postponed all work of that kind.

The Peace Conference held after the war made no provision for continuing the work of The Hague Conferences, and efforts made to secure a provision in the Covenant of the League of Nations for holding future conferences for the development of international law proved unsuccessful. For instance, the New York Bar Association resolved in the spring of 1919 to request the Paris Conference to add a paragraph to Article XIV of the covenant requiring the Council of the League to "call a conference of the Powers, to meet not less than two years or more than five years after the signing of this convention, for the purpose of reviewing the condition of international law, and of agreeing upon and stating in authoritative form the principles and rules thereof. Thereafter regular conferences for that purpose shall be called and held at stated times." A similar resolution was adopted by the Executive Council of the American Society of International Law in April, 1919. Both resolutions were communicated to the American Peace Mission at Paris, but the paragraph was not included in the covenant. After the Peace Treaty went into effect, the Advisory Committee of Jurists which drafted the plan for the Permanent Court at The Hague, in July, 1920, "Convinced that the security of States and the well-being of peoples urgently require the extension of the empire of law and the development of all international agencies for the administration

justice," recommended to the Council of the League of Nations:

I. That a new conference of the nations, in continuation of the first two conferences at The Hague, be held as soon as practicable, for the following purposes:

1. To restate the established rules of international law, especially, and, in the first instance, in the fields affected by the events of the recent war.

2. To formulate and agree upon the amendments and additions, if any, to the rules of international law shown to be necessary or useful by the events of the war and the changes in the conditions of international life and intercourse which have followed the war.

3. To endeavor to reconcile divergent views and secure general agreement upon the rules which have been in dispute heretofore.

4. To consider the subjects not now adequately regulated by international law but as to which the interests of international justice require that rules of law shall be declared.

The Advisory Committee of Jurists recommended further that the conference be named "Conference for the Advancement of International Law," and that it "be followed by further successive conferences at stated intervals, to continue the work left unfinished."

The recommendations of the Advisory Committee of Jurists were approved by the Council and recommended to the Assembly of the League of Nations, but they failed to receive the approval of the latter body.

It is accordingly suggested that the United States propose to the nations a reconvening of the conferences at The Hague for the purposes stated in the recommendation of the Advisory Committee of Jurists and as recommended by the Second Hague Conference, and that provision be made for holding such conferences hereafter at regular intervals. Such conferences cannot be regarded as supplanting or impinging upon the work of the League of Nations, for the work of that body is largely political, while The Hague Conferences would deal with legal matters. For this reason it would be proper to transfer from the League to The Hague Conferences the election of the Judges of the Permanent Court of

International Justice, as above recommended.

The Executive Council of the Conference recommended to act as the second body in the election of Judges of the Permanent Court, may also be delegated to perform the functions of a preparatory committee for the Conference for the Advancement of International Law. Such a preparatory committee for future Hague Conferences was recommended by the Conference of 1907, to be charged with the task of collecting the various proposals to be submitted to the conference, of ascertaining what subjects are ripe for embodiment in an international regulation, and of preparing a program in sufficient time to enable it to be carefully examined by the countries interested. This committee was further to be intrusted with proposing a system of organization and procedure for the conference itself.

The appointment by the larger Powers of the permanent members of the Executive Council two years in advance of each successive conference would not offer any difficulties, and the non-permanent members elected by each conference might continue to serve until their successors are elected at the succeeding conference.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN CHINA

By DR. GILBERT REID

International Institute of China

(Dr. Reid is editor of *The International Journal*, "a weekly of good news." His address is East Imperial City, Peking, China.)

THESE are days when it is hard to describe accurately the political system of any country. It is even more so of the system that is supposed to prevail in China. What, for instance, is the political system in Great Britain since a member of the Labor Party has been chosen as Prime Minister? What is, or what has been, the political system in Soviet Russia before and since the death of Lenin? Is Communism the prevailing system in Russia? Is Socialism the prevailing system in Great Britain? Are

countries that are called republics really democratic? Are countries that are called empires (at present there are only two) or kingdoms any more imperialistic than those that are called republics?

One who answers these questions and sees how hard it is to make an answer will then appreciate the difficulties of describing accurately the present political system and the prevailing ideas that exist in the Republic of China. Because one has lived many years in China and is supposed to be familiar with Chinese conditions, this is no reason for regarding such a one as an expert or an arbiter on Chinese affairs. I myself have lived in China for over forty years and have known most of the ruling class under the monarchy and in the republic, but I confess that when I attempt to tell what are the actual conditions in China I can do but little more than make a surmise at it.

In general, the political system that prevails in China is not democratic. The people have no more rights, and they even have less protection, under the republic than they had in the days of the Manchu rule. Our miscalculation of the present situation may be traced to a miscalculation as to what existed under the Manchu monarchy. When the first revolution took place, it was generally declared that the monarchy was an autocracy, and that the Manchu emperors were autocrats; but this was far from the truth. During the last few years before the fall of the Manchu dynasty the government was a constitutional monarchy, in which the rights of the people were guaranteed. The great emperors of the Manchu dynasty always found themselves restricted by the decisions of the ministers in council. Even the great Empress Dowager managed to retain her supreme authority because she followed the opinions of wise advisers and also because she gave the officials wide scope for carrying out her imperial decrees.

It is true that when the republic was started, after the first revolution, under the leadership of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and Dr. Wu Ting-fang and others of similar kind, the system as outlined in the provisional constitution was much like that of the United States of America. However, the natural spirit of compromise came in, and by yielding the presidency to Yuan Shih-kai the republic yielded itself to one who still carried out the spirit of monarchy rather than the spirit of democracy. Hence it was that the start was not favorable to the expansion of democratic ideas.

Another great change took place in the year 1917. It was then that Li Yuan-hung was president, and it is doubtless true that he was anxious to make a success of the republic, and that he believed that the Chinese were ready for a republic. Whatever drawbacks there were came from the fact that China could not separate herself from the rest of the world, and that she must take into consideration what was going on, even in Europe. Hence it was that, under pressure from the more advanced nations like the United States, Great Britain, and France, China was advised to concern herself directly with the military and political issues that had arisen in the two groups of warring nations in Europe.

The military element in China came to the front. Those who are called military governors were summoned to a conference in Peking by the premier, who was the leader of the military faction of the north, General Tuan Chih-jui. These men supported the premier in his desire to bring China into direct relation with the Allied or Entente group of the nations at war and definitely against the group of Central Powers. It is true that many of these men asserted that they were deciding in favor of that which was right—in favor of democracy, in favor of liberty, and in favor of liberal ideas. But these military

men were hardly the ones to espouse such a beautiful theory. They were naturally militaristic. They had for years been seeking to get power into their own hands. Many of them had been greedy for gain and had amassed great wealth. Many of the richest men in China were those who held military position. Those who were inclined to methods of autocracy were in the military group.

It thus followed that the military governors, by entering into the World War, became more militaristic and more autocratic. China drifted away from the spirit of democracy under the general influence that issued from the autocratic régime that prevailed everywhere under the exigencies of war. There might be a dream in China, as in the West, for a coming democracy. There might be a hope that the world, including China, was to be made safe for democracy; but certainly, during the four years of war, there was no possibility for democracy to assert itself.

China, therefore, having gone into the general drift of militarism and of autocracy, has continued in that drift down to the present time. The military governors have increased in their power and also in their wealth. The Government of China is under the direction of militarists, not under the guidance of civilians or *litterati*, as in the old days of the Manchu dynasty. The last president, Tsao Kun, who has been elected by Parliament is the recognized head of the strongest military faction in the north, or in all China. China is, therefore, a militaristic government, not a democratic government.

It is supposed by many in the home countries that the democratic element in China is represented by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, and that those who want democracy and who favor liberal ideas are being oppressed by the militarism of the central government. This might be possible if Dr. Sun would only remain true to his professed

ideas. He has had the chance to be the great leader of a democratic movement in China; but in his general attitude he has been as militaristic as the militarists whom he condemns. During the last year he has been waging warfare against a former associate who wanted to make a model of government in the Canton Province. He has also more than once called for a punitive expedition against the government in Peking. He is a generalissimo more than one of the common people. He issues orders rather than consults the wishes of the people, even those who are educated, as many of the merchants are. He talks of democracy, but relies on the force of arms.

Thus it is that there is no great movement at present in favor of the overthrow of militarism except by methods of militarism. There is no way for securing a democracy except by fighting for it. The only way to get rid of certain great generals is for other generals or soldiers to rise up and kill them off. The only revolution that seems to be in mind is a bloody revolution. It is only strife added to strife, and the people continue to suffer.

It would be wise if the Chinese could learn from the English habit of bringing about changes by peaceful revolution and constitutional methods. Whether China will thus learn or not is uncertain at the present time. Those who represent themselves as defenders of democracy seem more inclined to the French type of revolutionist or to the latest Russian type. The three revolutions which have arisen in one decade have not taught the Chinese the futility of continued military uprisings and civil strife. China has yet much to learn.

THE ARBITRATOR is a pacific, progressive, petite, penetrating, peppery, puzzling, perturbing, pessimistic, piquant, playful, poignant, polite, precise, profound, provoking, purposeful digest of news. Samples free. 60 Cents a year. 114 E. 31st St., New York City.

ESPERANTO IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE

By HENRY W. HETZEL*

Philadelphia, Pa.

IT IS evident to thinking people that the peace of the world, if it is ever to be attained, must be established by means of and maintained by the widest possible amount of mutual understanding and co-operation. To a large extent, this necessity is already being met, but without any conscious idea to insure peace, by an enormous—almost a feverish—urge to shorten the distance and the time between ourselves and our neighbors. One fundamental cause of wars is the very remarkable growth of our physical tools of civilization, while the development of our moral and spiritual ideas has not kept an even pace.

However, irrespective of our preferences in the matter, and whether the immediate result is a quickening of moral progress or not, we all realize that the peoples of the world are being brought into contact with one another more than ever before. Big movements of all kinds are becoming as much at home in one country as in another. Problems of statecraft, education, science, and industry are arising which only the united intelligence of mankind can solve. This increasing consciousness of the urgency of world co-operation is fast making an international language an absolute necessity.

Even the most fervent of the advocates of Latin as a revived international tongue admit that it has too restricted a vocabulary for modern purposes, and that the difficulties of mastering it put it out of the running. To make it even a possible competitor to more recent, more logical, and simpler creations would result in a "Latin" of such an unclassical aspect that not even the boldest of its advocates would suggest that it take the place of Cæsar and Virgil in our schools and colleges. Almost or quite as hopeless in this respect would be any one of the several national tongues, with the further disadvantage of being decidedly unneutral, too much tinc-

tured with the national characteristics, psychology, and prejudices of the countries where it is native. Its adoption would confer so great a diplomatic, commercial, political, and cultural advantage on one certain group of nations as to make such a proposition absolutely intolerable to others.

Though not the first project to meet the growing world need, Esperanto, the work of Dr. L. L. Zamenhof, of Warsaw, in 1887, immediately attracted a more than academic attention, and in a few years it had far outdistanced its competitors, both as to the extent of its literature and the number of its adherents. Its root-words, prefixes, and suffixes were selected on the principal of "maximum internationality," and so easy and logical is the formation of derivatives that only a few hundred primary words need be learned. An Esperantist actually coins words as he goes along, and, even by a person who may never have heard such words before, he is instantly and precisely understood. The spelling is phonetic, the tonic accent is always on the penultimate syllable, and the whole grammar is stated in sixteen simple rules (without an exception), which many people have actually learned in an hour! Let us take a sample, almost needing no translation:

"Simpla, fleksebla, belsona, vere internacia en siaj elementoj, la lingvo Esperanto prezentas al la mondo civilizita la sole veran solvon de lingvo internacia; ĉar tre facile por homoj nemulte instruitaj, Esperanto estas komprenata sen peno de la personoj bone edukitaj. Mil faktoj atestas la meriton praktikan de la nomita lingvo."

Esperanto is not intended as a "universal" language in the sense that it seeks to displace any existing national tongue for home use. That it is more than a project and that it is already an everyday, practical means of communication between thousands of people in all parts of the world is a claim that must be admitted by any one taking the trouble to look through the correspondence columns of the journals, now about one hundred and twenty, regularly published in the language in all parts of the world. Every conceivable subject, from stamp collecting to high-brow discussions of philosophy,

* Professor Hetzel is the Secretary of the Philadelphia Esperanto Society. He is connected with the West Philadelphia High School for Boys.

scientific matters, and world politics, is represented. Of original works and translations, many of them from the masterpieces of every civilized tongue, there are several thousands. Instruction books and dictionaries have appeared in at least thirty-eight different tongues.

Esperanto has an obvious use for the tourist. The many thousands who have visited foreign lands with no linguistic equipment but their native speech and the auxiliary tongue are enthusiastic in their praise of the practicality of Esperanto and of the fine spirit of helpfulness which animates the "samideanoj" (fellow-thinkers) in their relation to visitors. Yes, you can "get along" on English alone if you are thereby willing to limit your conversation to the mere necessities of locomotion and nutrition, but to the Esperantist alone belongs the joy of meeting foreigners, as many as one has time to meet in any journey or in any visited city—and intelligent, well-educated folks, too—and of conversing with a freedom and linguistic equality that is never experienced where any national tongue is the medium. In at least a dozen big cities of Europe there are Esperantist policemen, specially trained to be of service to the traveler who has already taken the little trouble to meet him on the linguistic middle ground.

In addition to its abundantly demonstrated utility for general commercial purposes, Esperanto has a special field for advertising the expositions and fairs that, in spite of the ravages of the recent war and the blunders of diplomats, are doing a great service in bringing together the business men of Europe. To name only a few recent examples, the fairs at Paris, Lyons, Frankfort, Breslau, Helsingfors, Genoa, Padua, Leipzig, Prague, Reichenberg, and Valencia have extensively employed Esperanto.

International congresses of the usual kind, whether for professional, religious, commercial, or scientific aims, not only have felt the diversity of tongues to be a serious handicap, but they never have been able to forget the nationalistic differences among their members. Compared to this kind of gathering, with its inevitable division into mutually uncomprehending linguistic groups and its re-

striction to two or three "official" languages, a congress of Esperantists stands out in refreshing contrast. There have been fifteen of these since 1905; that at Nuremberg last year was attended by as many as five thousand delegates from forty-three different countries and representing about the same number of national tongues.

Not only in the general business sessions, where the formal speeches, and even the unprepared discussion and chance remarks, are all in the international language, but in a dozen or more "side congresses" Esperanto is the sole medium heard. Teachers, editors, Red Cross nurses, physicians, vegetarians, railway employees, socialists, Roman Catholics, and Spiritualists—to name only a part of the list—form groups each having its own meetings. Here the delegates "talk shop" with no uncomprehending auditor, with perfect geysers of technical terms, too, and with a vigor and a naturalness that are only paralleled where every one speaks the same mother tongue.

There is usually a play and a musical concert—perhaps an opera and even a vaudeville show—to say nothing of several excursions and many informal social gatherings, and not a word of any national tongue heard the whole week through! At each of two congresses which the writer attended a whole play was rendered by professionals who six or eight weeks before the event had not even begun to study the language. Sometimes the actors are chosen from as many different countries as possible, so that the uniformity of pronunciation can be all the more strikingly demonstrated. In fact, this similarity in sounding the vowels and consonants exits among Esperantists to a degree which others will scarcely believe.

However, it is absolutely true that, so far as speech is any indication, you cannot tell the Spaniard from the Bulgarian, or either from the Swede, and the laughable mistakes in such guesses at one another's nationality are among the commonplaces of Esperanto world-gatherings. The sense of nationality, as many an observer has remarked, completely disappears and is all but forgotten.

The idealistic side of an Esperanto congress finds its climax and its appropriate

symbol in the religious service, always a feature of such a gathering. Here you are in a big church filled with worshipers from at least twenty countries, and you hear, in a language perfectly understood by all, the clergyman preach the brotherhood of man, now being realized through a neutral medium, when heart speaks to heart across the boundary line. Here, when you see every head bowed in reverence before the same and all-important truths and realize that before you is actually assembled *the world*, you will concede the claim that something big has come to pass in the affairs of men. At least here is one new thing under the sun! And, be ye of ever so little imagination, does not the sight before you hold a promise of tremendous importance for civilization and the spiritual welfare of the race?

The League of Nations in 1922 declined to "recommend the teaching of Esperanto in the schools of the leagued nations," though the proposition was backed by the representatives of thirteen States. However, it authorized an investigation of the extent to which the language is used; by what educational authorities, chambers of commerce, international associations, touring clubs, etc.,

it is approved, and where it is taught. The report, which was adopted unanimously, shows an acceptance of the international language that is truly startling to the uninitiated. The recommendation itself was referred to the "Commission on Intellectual Co-operation," which last fall, reporting back to the League, while it declared its appreciation of the good that the adoption of an artificial auxiliary language might do, stated its belief that a study of living tongues and foreign literatures would do more to bring together the peoples of the world in moral and intellectual understanding. It is significant of the temper of the League that this recommendation, out of several on various topics made to it by the commission, was the only one that failed to receive approval, several members of the Assembly who had hitherto been opposed to Esperanto declaring that they had gotten a new viewpoint since the meeting of the Assembly a year before.

Are those who hope and work for an ordered world oblivious to the good that a common neutral speech can do and is doing? Is there not in the progress already made in this direction cause for satisfaction among the friends of peace?

THE WILL TO END WAR *

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

FROM the small beginnings, as briefly told, peace sentiment extended rapidly in this country and abroad. The first international peace congress was initiated at the headquarters of the American Peace Society in Boston during the month of July, 1841, and held in London in 1843, with an attendance of about three hundred delegates. Five years later, Elihu Burritt, who had founded the "League of Universal Brotherhood" in 1846, a league of many thousand members on both sides of the ocean, was able to bring together a second and more representative peace congress in Brussels. The following year, and through Burritt's influence, there was organized a third congress in Paris, presided over by Victor Hugo, with over

2,000 delegates in attendance. In 1850 Burritt successfully promoted a fourth international peace congress in Frankfort, and in 1851 a fifth, which was held in London. It is to the credit of his time that Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," one time secretary of the American Peace Society, and editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, was recognized as a man of vision, prophet and seer. It is to the credit of our time that James Brown Scott can say that "the lowly son of New Britain has entered into the company of the immortals." A congress was held in Edinburgh in 1853, in Geneva in 1867, in Paris in 1878, in Brussels in 1882, and in Berne in 1884.

The second series of international peace congresses was proposed in 1888. In this series there were twenty-one, as follows:

* This is the conclusion of the article before given in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* of April, 1924.

Paris, 1889; London, 1890; Rome, 1891; Berne, 1892; Chicago, 1893; Anvers, 1894; Budapest, 1896; Hamburg, 1897; Paris, 1900; Glasgow, 1901; Monaco, 1902; Rouen et Havre, 1903; Boston, 1904; Lucerne, 1905; Milan, 1906; Munich, 1907; London, 1908; Stockholm, 1910; Geneva, 1912; The Hague, 1913, and San Francisco, 1915.

There was an American Conference of International Arbitration held in Washington, April, 1896, and another in the same city, January, 1904. The Pan-American congresses, first proposed by Bolivar in 1824, have been many. As a result of the one held upon the initiative of Secretary James G. Blaine, in Washington, in the winter of 1889-90, the Bureau of American Republics, now the Pan-American Union, was organized. A Pan-American Congress was held in Mexico City, 1901-1902; in Rio de Janeiro, 1906; in Buenos Aires, 1910; in Santiago, Chile, 1923. We now have recurring Pan-American Financial, Scientific, and International Law conferences.

The Interparliamentary Union

The Interparliamentary Union, with a membership of over three thousand parliamentarians, representing some thirty nations, was first mooted by Messrs. Fischoff and Richard in 1875. Plans for its organization were halted by the Russo-Turkish War; but, through the influence of William Randal Cremer, a preliminary meeting of parliamentarians from Great Britain and France was held in Paris in the autumn of 1888. In June, 1889, the organization was perfected at Paris, and Frederick Passy was elected president. Fifty-four French parliamentarians, thirty-one British, together with representatives from the Italian, Spanish, Danish, Hungarian, the Belgian, and the United States parliaments, were in attendance. The representative from the United States was Mr. J. R. Whiting. Germany entered the Union at the next meeting, in London, July, 1890. In 1913 the Union held its eighteenth annual Conference at The Hague. Following the war, the Interparliamentary Union has held its nineteenth conference at Stockholm in 1921; its twentieth at Vienna, 1922; its twenty-first at Copenhagen, 1923.

Arbitrations

As has been seen, the first resolution passed by any national government specifically in favor of the principle of arbitration was pushed through the House of Commons in 1873 by Henry Richard, who for forty years was secretary of the London Peace Society and who for over twenty years was a member of the English Parliament. In the last few years nearly one hundred arbitration treaties, providing that certain questions must and others may be settled by arbitration, have been passed by various nations of the world. The United States has been a party to over a score of these. Professor Manning, of our State Department, has recorded 228 arbitration treaties, including the arbitral clauses of other treaties, between or among American nations prior to 1911. In 1907 Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Salvador agreed to submit to arbitration all questions which might arise between any two of them, not possible of settlement by diplomacy. Indeed, it is to the credit of these Central American States that in their Central American Court they actually set up, albeit for a time only, the first exclusively international court of justice in the history of the world.

International Plans and Organizations

The rise of international bodies possessing more or less legislative power is impressive. The Book of Genesis tells of four kings waging war with five other kings in the Vale of Siddim. Probably antedating this Biblical example of international co-operation were the prehistoric amphictyonies—"unions of neighbors"—ending in the Amphictyonic Council of a dozen Greek tribes watching over the religious interests of the tribes, exercising genuine judicial authority, and, in its representative capacity, regulating both peace and war for fifteen centuries under the terms of a sort of intertribal treaty of arbitration. Arbitration was a familiar and successful practice throughout the known history of Greece.

The history of Greece is a history of leagues. Herodotus tells of a "league" of twelve cities, with headquarters at Helice, existing in prehistoric Greece. The better-known Achæan League began about 280 B. C. While this Achæan League

presents a picture marred by human weakness and discord, it also reveals man in his reach toward international organization, often with warlike purposes, it is true, but federal and co-operative nevertheless. For over a century it dominated Greek political life, for a time successfully resisted Rome, and when, in 146 B. C., it finally fell, all Greece fell with it. The Ætolian League, forerunner of the Achaean, is another, and perhaps better illustration of federated interstatecraft. Among the other leagues were the Thessalian, Boeotian, Athenian, Delphic, and Arcadian. Rivalries between the Peloponnesian and Delian Leagues take us back to 600 B. C. The Lycian Confederacy, comprising twenty-three cities, the large cities having three votes, the small cities two, was a juridical organization in the days of Vespasian.

Virgil's fourth Eclogue, picturing a return of the Golden Age, was Messianic in its prophecy; while in the first Georgic war is condemned; and in the first book of the Æneid, written during the first generation of our Christian Era, Jupiter is made to agree with Isaiah as to the future of war. The Helvetic Union, beginning 1308, was organized for purposes of defense and peace, and consisted of a diet with a court of judges. Dante, in his "Convivio" of the early fourteenth century, presents an argument for a universal empire based upon force; and in his *De Monarchia*, Book I, he has written a somewhat impassioned plea for a world monarchy or league of peace. Erasmus wrote in 1509, his "*Encomium Morie*"—"Praise of Folly"—in which he attacks the institution of war; and, disappointed at the failure of the plan to hold a peace congress at Cambray, he wrote, in 1517, his "*Querela Pacis*"—"The Complaint of Peace"—which is fresh and convincing material for the peace workers even of today.

Mutual protection and advancement of trade brought nearly a hundred towns of northern Europe together in the Hanseatic League of Peace of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The dominating influence of this powerful organization for so many years was second only in importance to the very fact of its existence at all.

In fine, the "international mind" was brooding back there in the Vale of Sid-

dim; in the temples of Apollo and Demeter; in Helice and the groves of Ægium; in Ætolia; and in the Hansa of four, five, and six centuries ago. It has persisted increasingly through the centuries.

Other Workers and Their Plans

The workers and plans for world peace throughout the past have been innumerable. Pierre Dubois, of France, proposed in 1305-07 a plan for establishing peace between the Catholic princes of Europe for the purpose of occupying and retaining the Holy Land. His plan included judges for the rendering, in cases of controversy, of just decisions according to the laws and customs of the member kingdoms. He proposed a Council with the power to appoint skilled and trustworthy arbitrators. The final court of appeals should be the Pope. And he proposed that all prelates and soldiers should swear to uphold, by force if need be, the decisions of the judges or arbitrators.

In 1460-63 the King of Bohemia, George von Podebrad, proposed an alliance or confederation of Bohemia, France, and Venice as an agency for resisting the Turks and for maintaining peace between the Christian powers.

Emeric Crucé published his "The New Cyneas" in 1623, a discourse on a union of the nations for the establishment of universal peace, backed by arms.

It is probable that Crucé's book led Hugo Grotius, of Holland, to write his "Laws of War and Peace" in 1625, in which he proposed congresses of Christian powers in which controversies might be decided by disinterested parties, "and in which measures may be taken to compel the parties to accept peace on equitable terms."

The Great Design of Henry IV, of France, written by his friend, the Duke of Sully, dated 1638, is one of the major peace plans of history.

In 1693-94 William Penn brought forth his "Plan for the Peace of Europe," which he called "an essay toward the present and the future peace of Europe, by the establishment of an European dyet, parliament, or estates."

Charles-Irenee Castel de Saint-Pierre prepared, in 1712 or 1713, a plan for the

establishment of perpetual peace in Europe.

In 1736 Cardinal Jules Alberoni, of Italy, offered a scheme for reducing the Turkish Empire and for setting up a perpetual diet "for establishing the public tranquillity."

Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote in 1756 and published in 1761 what he called an "Epitomy of Abbé de Saint-Pierre's Project for Perpetual Peace." Rousseau also wrote a treatise, more particularly his own, which he called "Judgment on Perpetual Peace," a commentary on the plan of Abbé de Saint-Pierre.

Between 1786 and 1789 Jeremy Bentham, of England, wrote a "Plan for an Universal and Perpetual Peace," an outgrowth of his belief that "the happiest of mankind are sufferers by war; and the wisest, nay even the least wise, are wise enough to ascribe the chief of their sufferings to that cause." Bentham set for himself the task of promoting three objects—simplicity of government, national frugality, and peace.

Karl C. F. Krause, of Germany, published in 1814 a proposal for a European league of States, proposing a league court and a council for mediation and arbitration.

Immanuel Kant, the German philosopher, brought out his "Eternal Peace" in 1795, in which he sets forth six "preliminary articles," as follows:

1. "No conclusion of peace shall be held to be valid as such when it has been made with the secret reservation of the material for a future war."
2. "No State having an existence by itself—whether it be small or large—shall be acquired by another State by inheritance, exchange, purchase or donation."
3. "Standing armies shall be entirely abolished in the course of time."
4. "No national debt shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the State."
5. "No State shall intermeddle by force with the constitution or government of another State."
6. "No State at war with another shall adopt such modes of hostility as would necessarily render mutual confidence impossible in a future peace; such as the employment of assassins or poison, the viola-

tion of a capitulation, the instigation of treason and such like."

He also set forth certain definitive articles as follows: The civil constitution in every State shall be republican; the laws of nations shall be founded on a federation of free States.

William Ladd's essay on "A Congress and High Court of Nations" is referred to elsewhere in these columns.

Plans have multiplied greatly in recent times, as, for example, the one set forth by James Lorimer in his two volumes, "Institutes of the Law of Nations," which appeared in 1884; the League to Enforce Peace, organized in Philadelphia in 1915; the proposals of the American Institute of International Law; the French Association for the Society of Nations.

One wishing to study the practical aspects of the problems involved will be interested to study the Swiss Confederation, the Union of Utrecht, the beginnings of the United States of America, the German Articles of Confederation, the Holy Alliance, the Constitution of the Netherlands, of the German Empire, and of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Central American Union, the Pan American Union, the League of Nations, the Little Entente, French policies in her colonies and throughout Europe, are a few of the more modern concrete expressions of the will to end war.

Other Congresses

Reference has already been made to all of the European powers, save Turkey, meeting in the "Congress of Vienna" in 1815. There have since been many other international congresses. National independence came to Greece as the result of a protocol signed by the great powers in congress assembled at London in 1830. The Treaty of London in 1831, ratified by six powers within a year, established the independence of Holland and Belgium. It was a congress of the powers at Paris in 1856 that made the close of the Crimean War possible. It was a congress of representatives from sixteen nations at Geneva, in 1864, that established the Red Cross Society. It was a congress of the powers in London, in 1867, that neutralized the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. It

was a congress of national representatives at St. Petersburg, in 1868, that restricted the nature of bullets in times of war. It was an international congress at Brussels, in 1874, that placed definite restrictions upon the practices of war. A congress of nations at Berne in 1874 established the international postal convention, out of which was created in 1906 our Universal Postal Union. The Congress of Berlin, meeting at the home of Bismarck in 1878, fixed the map of eastern Europe and closed the Russo-Turkish War. Indeed, since 1875 the number of international meetings has increased greatly. There are today approximately 1,000 international organizations. During the year 1912 there were approximately one hundred and thirty international conferences. And more impressive, perhaps, than any of these international conferences already mentioned have been the Geneva Tribunal, which settled the Alabama claims in 1872; the Paris Tribunal, which settled the seals controversy in 1893; The Hague Tribunal, which settled the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries dispute with Great Britain, lasting through three generations, in 1910; and the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armament, 1922.

Peace Foundations

The will to end war has found expression in permanent institutions and foundations. The World Peace Foundation of Boston, for example, is a corporation with an endowment of nearly \$1,000,000, left by Edwin Ginn. This foundation, begun in 1910, states in its by-laws that its purpose is to educate the people of all nations to the full knowledge of the waste and destruction of war, its evil effects on present social conditions and the well being of future generations, and to promote international justice and the brotherhood of men; and, generally, by every practical means to promote peace and good will among all mankind.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie was a veritable embodiment of the will to end war. He founded the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, December 14, 1910, and created a board of trustees, to whom he transferred \$10,000,000, the revenue of which is administered for hastening the abolition of international war. February 10, 1914, he established the Church Peace

Union, setting aside for its purposes \$2,000,000. He placed at the disposal of the Dutch Government \$1,500,000 for a Palace of Peace at The Hague as a fitting place for a library of international law and a court of arbitration. The construction of the palace was begun in 1907; it was completed in 1913 and dedicated August 28 of that year. Mr. Carnegie provided \$100,000 for the construction of a building for the Central American Court of Justice, which building was located at Cartago. When this structure was destroyed by earthquake, in 1910, he provided another \$100,000 for the construction of a new building, which was located at San José, Costa Rica. The Pan-American Union Building, located in Washington, represents also the generosity of Mr. Carnegie. At the laying of the cornerstone of this building, May 11, 1908, Mr. Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, delivered an address in which he said:

"The public spirit and enthusiasm for the good of humanity, which have inspired an American citizen, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, in his administration of a great fortune, have led him to devote the adequate sum of three-quarters of a million dollars to the construction of this building. . . .

"The graceful courtesy of the twenty republics who have agreed upon the capital of the United States for the home of this International Union, the deep appreciation of that courtesy shown by the American Government and this representative American citizen, and the work to be done within the walls that are to rise on this site cannot fail to be powerful influences towards the creation of a spirit that will solve all disputed questions of the future and preserve the peace of the Western World."

The building was dedicated April 26, 1910, and is in itself an expression of the will to maintain peace between the American republics. The important fact is, not that Mr. Carnegie saw fit to give these munificent sums, but that he was himself an expression of the common will to end war.

There are institutions and foundations abroad, such as the Bureau Internationale de la Paix; the Nobel Foundation, with its generous annual prize for the most effective work in behalf of international peace; the peace societies and publications of Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Italy,

and practically all of the other countries of Europe and of the Far East.

The will to end war is an international fact.

The Two Hague Conferences

The chief encouragements in the modern growth toward a practical solution of the problem of war have been the international conferences at The Hague, the first beginning May 18, 1899, and the second June 15, 1907.

The First Hague Conference

The Czar's rescript of August 12-24, 1898, inaugurated an era of discussion. This letter, resulting in the First Hague Conference, was an expression of the gradually growing will to end war. Hugo Grotius' classic, entitled "The Rights of War and Peace," a work which began our system of international law in the early seventeenth century; such books as "Lay Down Your Arms," written by Bertha von Suttner in 1889, and the work of the Polish Jew, Jean de Bloch, entitled "The Future of War," appearing just before the Czar's call to the nations in the interest of "a real and durable peace," were a few of the evidences of that public sentiment which made the Czar's letter possible.

The First Conference at The Hague is one of the great facts of history. Among its contributions to the nations was the establishment of an international tribunal for the arbitration of international disputes. The article which established this tribunal is called "the Magna Charta of international law." Since its opening, in April, 1901, the tribunal has settled to the satisfaction of all parties a score of international disputes, a number of which might easily have led to war. These cases have been as follows:

First. The Pius Fund Case, involving issues between the United States and Mexico, 1902.

Second. The Venezuela Preferential Case, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy *vs.* Venezuela *et al.*, involving eleven nations, 1904.

Third. The Japanese House Tax Case, being an issue between Japan and the three powers, Great Britain, France, and Germany, 1905.

Fourth. The Muscat Dhows Case, covering issues lying between Great Britain and France, 1905.

Fifth. The Casablanca Case, France *vs.* Germany, 1909.

Sixth. The Grisbadarna, or Maritime Boundary Case, Norway *vs.* Sweden, 1909.

Seventh. The North Atlantic Coast Fisheries dispute, between the United States and Great Britain, 1910.

Eighth. The Orinoco Steamship Company issue, between the United States and Venezuela, 1910.

Ninth. The Savarkar Case, France *vs.* Great Britain, 1911.

Tenth. The Russian Indemnity, or Interest Arrears Case, Russia *vs.* Turkey, 1912.

Eleventh. The Canevaro Claim, Italy *vs.* Peru, 1912.

Twelfth. The Manouba, or Seizure of French Ship Case, France *vs.* Italy, 1913.

Thirteenth. The Carthage, or Seizure of French Ship Case, France *vs.* Italy, 1913.

Fourteenth. The Tavignano, Kamouna, Gaulois Cases, France *vs.* Italy, 1913, submitted to a Commission of Inquiry and settled out of court.

Fifteenth. The Isle of Timor Case, Netherlands *vs.* Portugal, 1914.

Sixteenth. Religious Property Case, Spain, France, Great Britain, *vs.* Portugal, 1920.

Seventeenth. French Claims *vs.* Peru, decided October 11, 1921.

Eighteenth. Germany *vs.* Holland, decided February 26, 1922.

Nineteenth. Norway *vs.* the United States, decided October 13, 1922.

Practically one hundred treaties, over a score of which have been signed by the United States, were passed pledging signatory powers to use this court, while practically one hundred and fifty standing international treaties have been ratified, largely because of the influence of the conference.

The First Hague Conference provided further for an International Commission of Inquiry, which shall investigate questions of fact prior to the beginnings of hostilities. It was this organization which settled the acute Dogger Bank dispute between England and Russia during the Russo-Japanese War. It was the immediate forerunner of the original Wilson Administration peace plan, the work of Mr. Bryan, a plan which is already en-

acted into the terms of thirty international treaties.

The First Hague Conference provided for mediation in case of hostilities; it inspired the Temple of Peace, dedicated, as already said, August 28, 1913, at a cost of one and one-half million dollars; it made possible a Second Conference; it revised the code of warfare in sixty articles designed for the improvement of the practices of war. The First Hague Conference aimed to supplant the old-time rule, that "In the midst of warfare, laws are silent," with "In the midst of warfare, laws shall rule." While it failed in this last respect, it was, as a whole, an expression of a rational attempt to lessen the probabilities and horrors of war by the methods of a world governed under self-imposed laws.

The twenty-six nations of the world, invited because they were represented at St. Petersburg, including twenty European, four Asiatic, and two American Powers, were represented by one hundred delegates at that conference. As pointed out by Mr. Choate and others, it was there for the first time, in that First Hague Conference, that nations unanimously agreed that respect for law, rather than for mere compromise and diplomacy, must be the next great step in international adjustments. Following that conference, and largely because of it, the center of gravity in international politics was changed for a time from an emphasis upon war to an emphasis upon peace. War, not peace, became anathema. So strong was the opposition to the war party within Germany in 1914 that her warriors precipitated a war for fear of their overthrow. And the war having begun, the people would have nothing to do with the business except it be a war to end war.

The First Hague Conference was an expression of the will to end war; more, it is proper to think of it as being in itself the beginning of the legislative branch of our international order that is to be.

The Second Hague Conference

The Second Hague Conference, suggested by the Interparliamentary Union meeting at St. Louis, in 1904, and initiated by the United States Government, had its first meeting at The Hague, June 15, 1907, and lasted until the 18th of the

following October. At this conference forty-four of the world sovereignties, practically all of them, were represented by 174 delegates, picked men, including 15 ambassadors and 51 ministers. This conference, like the first, aimed to promote agencies calculated to regulate or canalize the devastations of war. For example, it passed many measures for the protection of neutral States and neutral citizens; it provided that a distinct declaration of war must hereafter be made before hostilities can be begun; it agreed upon an International Prize Court, with power to try cases by international law, a real international court aimed as a blow to piracy. The conference defined towns situated near fortified coasts to be unfortified towns, and, furthermore, that towns with submarine mines in their ports are not because of that to be subject to bombardment; it provided for the restriction of floating mines in war time where dangerous to neutral commerce. It composed a complete code of rules for the guidance of future international procedure—a decided step away from mere diplomacy toward an effective international court. The nations completely reversed one so-called principle of international law, by agreeing never to resort again to arms for the collection of contract debts due from one nation to the citizens of another without first employing every possible means of arbitration. The nations modified somewhat their old theories of sovereignty and revealed a sympathetic belief in the humanitarian political ideal of a free opportunity for each, man or nation, to achieve happiness in the service of a free and an advancing democracy.

The question of the reduction of armaments was not upon the program of the conference and could not, therefore, come officially before the convention; but, to the terror of the militarists, this whole question became the object of careful study. Thirty-five of the nations, representing practically nine-tenths of the people of the world, voted, strangely enough, for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration.

The recurring Hague Conference may yet be found to constitute in themselves the beginning of a legislative body. As we have seen, the judicial department has already begun to emerge, first in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, second in

the proposed International Prize Court, the first to function in time of peace, the latter to function in times of war. Besides, there is the International Court of Arbitral Justice now established.

In the light of what is taking place now at The Hague, we may well pause upon this International Court of Arbitral Justice. The Second Hague Conference recognized with Mr. Root that the great need of our age is the substitution of judicial action between the nations for certain aspects of our present diplomatic procedure. Our American delegates at the Second Hague Conference stood, therefore, for this High Court of International Justice, this International Supreme Court, with the thought that it should meet periodically as does our Supreme Court. This matter was so left that any two nations could meet at any time, organize the Court, open its doors, and begin the business of an International Supreme Court. It became the policy, however, of the nations to wait until a sufficient number of leading Powers could agree upon the method of selecting the judges. Secretary Knox conceived that the proposed International Court of Prize might be expanded into such an international court. The perfection of this Court is one of the most important problems before the world, because in the name of that justice which only can beget peace it is the most important single feature of any effective will to end war.

Steps for the adoption of an international executive branch of government need not now be taken; indeed, they cannot now be taken. The power of international public opinion, as an executive force to be applied against States, is, except in the case of war, the only force so far acceptable to the Powers.

The Second Hague Conference was important. The measures mentioned are sufficient to make it of interest to thoughtful men. It ranks as the first congress of practically all of the nations of the world. During its sessions the most delicate subjects were discussed by the various representatives of the nations, often with spirit and feeling, but always with that order and good will characteristic of enlightened men. The record of it stands there on the pages of history, an attestation of the victory of the thoroughly open discussion. It

reveals the possibilities in a juridical union, self-perpetuating, and gives to the world its reasonable hope in the ultimate government of nations under law. It is a witness to no quackery, but rather it is an illustration of the true grandeur of sincerity at its best. It reveals man seeing with a clearer and clearer vision that under every normal condition loyalty to truth and justice is a more excellent patriotism than a blind obeisance to tribe, or place, or party. It encourages us to believe that the relations existing between nations are destined to become as the relations existing between men everywhere under law. It strengthens us in the faith that true patriotism, in time of peace, calls for deeds of daily service in an honorable, sympathetic, and sacrificial citizenship, more than it calls for seeking the bubble reputation at the cannon's mouth; that man will yet cease to bound his morals by the limits of man-created political entities, and achieve the goal of his will to end war.

The League of Nations

The Covenant of the League of Nations, forming part 1 of the Treaty of Peace with Germany, "Done at Versailles, the twenty-eighth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen," is an expression of the will to end war. For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to discuss the question whether or not this covenant be sane in principle, consonant with the teachings of history, or even a step toward peace. The fact is that it is an expression of the will among men that the methods of war shall give way to the modes of peace. This will appear from the wording of the first paragraph of the covenant, which reads:

"The High Contracting Parties,

"In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security

"by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

"by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations,

"by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and

"by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another,

"agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations."

There it is, the will to end war.

ASSURANCES OF OUR VICTORY

Throughout recorded history there has been a society of nations. If the League of Nations fail, surely the "solidarity uniting the members of the society of civilized nations" will survive. If from time to time we be most ignorant of what we are most assured, this is not true of us as we look now upon the society of nations surely struggling once more into consciousness. We know now that a governed world must supplant the anarchy of international hate with its unbridled destructions. We now know that the trained intelligence of the world must find its chart and compass again, and that by their aid the ship of justice must be headed once more on its proper and inevitable course.

The ultimate victory of justice as between nations is the goal. Men everywhere, particularly, we may be pardoned for saying, every friend of the American Peace Society, may well take heart. Facts, not hopes only, come to make our assurance doubly sure. In the summer of 1920, an Advisory Committee, made up of ten of the world's leading jurists, assembled at The Hague, and unanimously agreed upon four things. These four things were:

A.

A draft scheme for the establishment, in addition to the Court of Arbitration organized at The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, and in addition to the special tribunals of arbitration to which States are always at liberty to submit their disputes for settlement, a *Permanent Court of International Justice*, to which parties shall have direct access.

B.

The *continuation of The Hague Conferences*. The exact wording of their recommendation with reference to this reads:

1. That a new conference of the nations, in continuation of the first two conferences at The Hague, be held as soon as practicable, for the following purposes:

1. To restate the established rules of international law, especially, and in the first instance in the fields affected by the events of the recent war.

2. To formulate and agree upon the amendments and additions, if any, to the rules of international law shown to be necessary or useful by the events of the war and the changes in the conditions of international life and intercourse which have followed the war.

3. To endeavor to reconcile divergent views and secure general agreement upon the rules which have been in dispute heretofore.

4. To consider the subjects not now adequately regulated by international law but as to which the interests of international justice require that rules of law shall be declared and accepted.

II. That the Institute of International Law, the American Institute of International Law, the Union Juridique Internationale, the International Law Association, and the Iberian Institute of Comparative Law be invited to prepare, with such conference or collaboration *inter esse* as they may deem useful, projects for the work of the conference, to be submitted beforehand to the several governments and laid before the conference for its consideration and such action as it may find suitable.

III. That the conference be named Conference for the Promotion and Extension of International Law.

IV. That this conference be followed by further successive conferences at stated intervals, to continue the work left unfinished.

C.

A recommendation that the Council and the Assembly of the League of Nations examine the advisability of establishing in the future also another kind of a *High Court of International Justice*, conceived in these terms:

1. A High Court of International Justice is hereby established.

2. This court shall be composed of one member for each State, to be chosen by the group of delegates of each State represented in the court of arbitration.

3. The High Court of Justice shall be competent to try crimes against international public order and the universal law of nations, which shall be referred to it by the Assembly or by the Council of the League of Nations.

4. The court shall have power to define the nature of the crime, to fix the penalty,

and to prescribe the appropriate means of carrying out the judgment. It shall formulate its own rules of procedure.

D.

That the *Academy of International Law* founded at The Hague in 1913, whose operation has, owing to circumstances, been interrupted, shall as soon as possible resume its activity alongside of the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the Permanent Court of International Justice, in the Peace Palace at The Hague.

The League of Nations has seen fit thus far to adopt only the first of these proposals and that only with important modifications. The second, in the light of what has been said heretofore, is a most important suggestion. The third is of less immediate and practical interest. The Academy of International Law opened upon its own initiative in the summer of 1923. Taken together, these proposals are assurances of victory indeed, victory for the constructive peace workers of a century.

A NOTABLE DOCUMENT

A most notable document is the recommendation, submitted by the Advisory Committee of Jurists meeting at The Hague from June 16 to July 24, 1920, of the proposed Permanent Court of International Justice. A London correspondent cabled that able critics in London regarded "it as competent in all its details and as representing the most perfect flower from such worth-while seed as the Treaty of Versailles contained." We may believe that this is not an overstatement of the fact.

Acceptable to All

It will be noted that the project contemplates a real International Court of Justice to which no informed person can object. The recommendations of the commission were not adopted by the League as drafted, but the members of the Court are acting as judges, administering rules of law accepted by the nations. The Court is always ready and open for cases. Passionless decisions are thus made possible, in accordance with the known facts and the acknowledged principles of international law, and that irrespective of political policy. The sanction of the Court, like the sanction of the Supreme Court of

the United States in issues between States, is not shrapnel and poison gas, but rather that sanction of sanctions; namely, the Court's own moral worth. Nations submitting their cases to such a Court can neither lose vestige of their national sovereignty nor run the risks peculiar to mere diplomatic settlements. The project represents a careful, balanced adjustment of the interests peculiar to the big Powers on the one hand, and the little States on the other. It contemplates the creation of nothing out of mere air; it represents the natural evolution of judicial processes from out a known and creditable past. It makes possible for the States of the world what history has demonstrated to be indispensable; namely, a government of laws and not of men. None versed in the course of justice between States can object to such a tried and established method.

League Must Be Changed

Yet the plan will embarrass the present League of Nations. While the project is the immediate result of the action of the Council of the League of Nations, acting under Article XIV of the Covenant, it is quite inconsonant with that political organ contemplating as it does a superstate backed by an impossible scheme for the physical enforcement of the weak by the strong. We are told that diplomats abroad consider the proposed Court as differing essentially from the basic idea underlying the Council of the League of Nations. This it happily does. Undoubtedly the Covenant of the League of Nations will have to be modified to meet the spirit of this proposal. It will be changed. Its modification will be acceptable in Downing Street, at the Quai d'Orsay, and at the other capitals. We believe it to be generally recognized among the friends of the Covenant in this country and abroad that Article X of the Covenant, for example, must be expunged, if the League is to survive. Not only Article X, but Articles XI and XVI of the Covenant have also been found to be specially impossible of application in concrete cases. They will be changed. It appears that the European friends of the original Covenant are for the most part aware at last that these articles are not only impossible, but that they are in every way needless in any ef-

factive international organization—antagonistic, indeed, to the basic principles of peaceable settlement. But the whole situation has been immeasurably relieved by this unanimous agreement of this committee of jurists—triumph that it is in the accommodation of the various schools of international law and practice, and free, as it is, of the complications thrust before us by various articles of the Covenant, ambiguous if not dangerous. Every informed supporter of the League now knows that it can't function under its Covenant. We are now assured that the League is simply an agency for conference. Perhaps the League will yet become the continuation of The Hague Conferences. It is difficult to see why not.

Court Should Not Be a Mere Agent of the League

It ought not to be necessary utterly to "scrap the League of Nations." But be that as it may, the encouraging fact is that the Court is not dependent for its existence upon that organization. It is true that the Court came into being upon the action of the Council and of the Assembly of the League of Nations. Its development may follow upon the continuance of those bodies, but not necessarily so; for should the League cease to exist, the Court may be continued. This will be clear when we consider certain facts. There must be conferences of all the nations, as recommended by the Advisory Council of Jurists, a continuation of The Hague conferences. It would be easily possible for the first of such conferences to invest the body of diplomatic representatives accredited by the nations to The Hague—a group referred to, both in 1899 and 1907, in the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, as the "Administration Council," with all the essential functions of the Assembly of the League of Nations, so far as the election and payment of the judges is concerned. An Executive Committee of that Administrative Council, to be chosen for the purpose, might easily function as the present Council of the League of Nations, with all the powers of that Council in the continuance of a Court. Thus the judges may be selected, and the project continued, whether the League of Nations survive or

perish. In other words, the International Court of Justice, with headquarters at The Hague, can thrive unto the healing of the nations, irrespective of the conflict of ideas over the creation of the Treaty of Versailles.

Based Upon Wisdom

It is important that every intelligent person should study with care the sixty-two articles of this original project, the first thirty dealing with the organization, the next six with the competence, and the final twenty-six with the methods of the Permanent Court of International Justice. From the very first article it is apparent that the field of peaceful settlement of international disputes is to be materially enlarged. Under the plan, we are to have a new agency for the protection of the nations, but an agency based on principles ancient and tried. It is not to be a substitute for other and well-known methods of settlement; but, under it, States are to be able at last to adjust their differences, not by threats and force and bloodshed, but in accord with the principles of justice commonly called rules of law. Parties in dispute are to have direct access to this permanent organization. Adequately qualified judges are provided for in Article II. In Article XVI their independence from governmental influences is assured. In addition to being independent persons of high moral character, their competence is assured by the stipulation that they shall be eligible for appointment to the highest judicial offices, jurisconsults of known ability in international law.

Thus it will appear that the framers of this project have based their recommendations upon wisdom. They clearly realized that the success of the Court must depend almost entirely upon the character of the judges; hence the provisions that such judges shall be professionally qualified. No league to enforce peace here; no threat of economic blockade and national extinction; no blanket authority to a small group of men to "take any action that may be deemed wise and effective"; no contemplation of "an act of war against the other members of the League." Because it is based upon wisdom the project constitutes the most encouraging single hope since the Armistice of 1918.

Locating the Court at The Hague is another evidence of wisdom. The articles of the project, read and approved one by one, were unanimously adopted as a whole July 22, 1920, in that fair capital of Holland. Since the Court of Arbitration set up in 1899 is already located at The Hague; since the Academy of International Law and Political Science was organized in 1913, and opened in 1923, at The Hague and is to be continued there; since The Hague Conferences should be reconvened unto the advancement of international law, meeting regularly and at stated periods in the same city, it appears peculiarly appropriate that this Permanent Court of International Justice should take its place at the head of the judicial table of the society of nations in that sturdy land, sacred to the memory of Hugo Grotius.

Its American Origin

The project is an American project. Hence it will be an inspiration to every American versed in the history of his own country. We may well recall that the United States of America represents the first Union of free, independent, sovereign States—a Union which survives and remains adequate to its purpose. Our fruitful experience has taught us that this is true primarily because the judicial power of the United States is "based in one Supreme Court," extending "to controversies between two or more States." We have already said that this project is but the natural evolution in the realm of world justice. This fact is here quite apparent. Following the example of our Supreme Court, the project for the Permanent Court of International Justice—adopted at The Hague, 1907, in Article XVII of its Convention—provided that "the judicial court of arbitration is competent to deal with all cases submitted to it." The first article under the chapter dealing with the competency of the existing Court, Article XXXI, provides that "The Court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine suits between States." Thus the evolution is natural and real, especially agreeable to American tradition.

The Court has a wide jurisdiction. It can deal with issues relative to the interpretation of treaties, to any points of inter-

national law, to matters of fact constituting the violation of an international engagement, to questions of reparation arising from the breach of international obligations, and to the interpretations of all sentences passed by the Court. Indeed, by the provisions of Article XXXIV the Court is competent to take cognizance of disputes of any kind whatsoever which are submitted to it by a general or special agreement of the parties.

Furthermore, had this plan been adopted without change by the League, in case of dispute as to whether the differences come within the category defined, "the Court shall decide." The Court then would have been a Court, not of arbitration, but of justice, the parties being bound to submit to the Court within the limits of its jurisdiction. Unfortunately the League lacked sufficient faith in its own child, and this provision was cut out. But little by little, as law is provided, the jurisdiction of the Court can be enlarged. True, the Court suffers from the fact that it is the agent of the League of Nations. But if the League becomes in fact, what it has to be in practice—a continuation of The Hague Conferences—the way out of this difficulty, as already pointed out, is clear. Thus the way seems about to open before the nations for the realization of that truth phrased by one of the greatest of Americans, "No question is ever settled until it is settled right."

There is work to be done. We may well believe that there is to be an endless series of periodic conferences to carry on the work begun at The Hague in 1899, conferences for the promotion and extension of international law. As with our United States, so with the nations, a competent judicial body is essential for the interpretation of that law. The nations, the United States included, will, therefore, study this original project for a Permanent Court of International Justice. The nations are in the way to apply the principles of self-imposed law, whether the methods of settlement be by arbitrators or by magistrates. Mirabeau's day, "when right shall be the sovereign of the world," is nearer at hand. It is, we are firmly convinced, about to break.

CONCLUSION

The nations may safely pin their faith to some form of an international legislature and of an international judiciary. They may not expect a universal empire, but they may strive for at least this much of an international organization, destined yet, as regards international disputes incapable of adjustment by diplomacy or arbitration, to perfect a juridical union of the civilized nations. It is for such that men are giving their lives to the peace movement. It is for such that the believers in liberalism and democracy, with their principles of life, liberty, equality, fraternity, and happiness, struggle and wait. It is

for such that we have peace societies, Hague conferences, institutes of international law, an Interparliamentary Union, and the longing for a more effective society of nations. It is by such means, we think, that wars will be made less probable.

The burdens and miseries of the world's senseless slaughters will be lifted as the collective judgments of human groups become increasingly clear. The permeating principle of life pursues its constructive upward course, and an advancing age must welcome each constructive attempt to supplant with the methods of law and justice the unnecessary and hideous devastations of war.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

THE HUGHES-HANIHARA LETTERS

The Japanese Government has filed with the American Government a vigorous protest against the passage by the House of the immigration bill with provisions for further drastic restrictions of Japanese immigration. Mansanao Hanihara, the Japanese Ambassador, handed the note to Secretary Hughes April 10.

The fact that Secretary Hughes so speedily agreed with the Japanese contention, thus directly repudiating the section of the House bill which has aroused Japan, has not been overlooked, and sharp reactions are taking place on the floors of both houses for and against his action.

Text of Japanese Protest

The text of the Japanese note is as follows:

JAPANESE EMBASSY,
WASHINGTON, April 10, 1924.

SIR: In view of certain statements in the report of the House Committee on Immigration—"Report No. 350, March 24, 1924"—regarding the so-called "gentlemen's agreement," some of which appear to be misleading, I may be allowed to state to you the purpose and substance of that agreement as it is understood and performed by my government, which understanding and practice are, I believe, in accord with those of your government on the subject.

The gentlemen's agreement is an understanding with the United States Government

by which the Japanese Government voluntarily undertook to adopt and enforce certain administrative measures designed to check the emigration to the United States of Japanese laborers.

In return, the Japanese Government confidently trusts that the United States Government will recommend, if necessary, to the Congress to refrain from resorting to a measure that would seriously wound the proper susceptibilities of the Japanese nation.

One object of the gentlemen's agreement is, as is pointed out above, to stop the emigration to the United States of all Japanese laborers other than those excepted in the agreement, which is embodied in a series of long and detailed correspondence between the two governments, publication of which is not believed to serve any good purpose, but the essential terms and practice of which may be summed up as follows:

(1) The Japanese Government will not issue passports good for the continental United States to laborers, skilled or unskilled, except those previously domiciled in the United States, or parents, wives, or children under 20 years of age of such persons. The form of the passport is so designed as to omit no safeguard against forgery, and its issuance is governed by various rules of detail in order to prevent fraud. The Japanese Government accepted the definition of "laborer" as given in the United States Executive Order of April 8, 1907.

(2) Passports are to be issued by a limited number of specially authorized officials only, under close supervision of the Foreign Office, which has the supreme control of the matter

and is equipped with the necessary staff for the administration of it.

These officials shall make thorough investigation when application for passports is made by students, merchants, tourists, or the like, to ascertain whether the applicant is likely to become a laborer, and shall enforce the requirement that such person shall either be supplied with adequate means to insure the permanence of his status as such or that surety be given therefor. In case of any doubt as to whether such applicant is or is not entitled to a passport, the matter shall be referred to the Foreign Office for decision.

Passports to laborers previously domiciled in the United States will be issued only upon production of certificate from Japanese consular officers in the United States, and passports to the parents, wives, and children of such laborers will be issued only upon production of such consular certificate and of duly certified copy of official registry of members of such laborer's family in Japan. Utmost circumspection is exercised to guard against fraud.

No More "Picture Brides"

(3) Issuance of passports to so-called "picture brides" has been stopped by the Japanese Government since March 1, 1920, although it had not been prohibited under the terms of the gentlemen's agreement.

(4) Monthly statistics covering incoming and outgoing Japanese are exchanged between the American and Japanese governments.

(5) Although the gentlemen's agreement is not applicable to the Hawaiian Islands, measures restricting issuance of passports for the islands are being enforced in substantially the same manner as those for the continental United States.

(6) The Japanese Government are further exercising strict control over emigration of Japanese laborers to foreign territories contiguous to the United States in order to prevent their surreptitious entry into the United States.

A more condensed substance of these terms is published in the annual report of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration for 1908, 1909, and 1910, on pages 125-6, 121 and 124-5 respectively.

As I stated above, the Japanese Government have been most faithfully observing the gentlemen's agreement in every detail of its terms, which fact is, I believe, well known to the United States Government. I may be permitted, in this connection, to call your attention to the official figures published in the annual reports of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration showing the increase or decrease of Japanese population in the continental United States by immigration and emigration. According to these reports, in the years 1908-1923 the total numbers of Japanese admitted to and departed from the continental United States were respectively 120,317 and 111,636.

In other words, the excess of those admitted over those departed was in fifteen years only 8,681; that is to say, the annual average of 578. It is important to note that in these 8,681 are included not only those who are covered by the terms of the gentlemen's agreement, but all other classes of Japanese such as merchants, students, tourists, government officials, &c.

These figures, collected by the United States immigration authorities, seem to me to show conclusively the successful operation of the gentlemen's agreement; besides this, there is, of course, the increase through birth of the Japanese population in the United States. This has nothing to do with either the gentlemen's agreement or the immigration laws.

Says Japan Might Alter Agreement

I may add in this connection that if the proposition were whether it would not be desirable to amend or modify some of the terms of the agreement, the question would be different, and I personally believe that my government would not be unwilling to discuss the matter with your government, if such were its wishes.

Further, if I may speak frankly, at the risk of repeating what, under instructions from my government, I have represented to you on former occasions, the mere fact that a certain clause, obviously aimed against Japanese as a nation, is introduced in the proposed immigration bill, in apparent disregard of the most sincere and friendly endeavors on the part of the Japanese Government to meet the needs and wishes of the American Government and people, is mortifying enough to the government and people of Japan.

They are, however, exercising the utmost forbearance at this moment, and in so doing they confidently rely upon the high sense of justice and fair play of the American Government and people, which, when properly approached, will readily understand why no such discriminatory provision as above referred to should be allowed to become a part of the law of the land.

It is needless to add that it is not the intention of the Japanese Government to question the sovereign right of any country to regulate immigration to its own territories; nor is it their desire to send their nationals to the countries where they are not wanted. On the contrary, the Japanese Government showed from the very beginning of this problem their perfect willingness to co-operate with the United States Government to effectively prevent by all honorable means the entrance into the United States of such Japanese nationals as are not desired by the United States, and have given ample evidence thereof, the facts of which are well known to your government.

To Japan, the question is not one of expediency, but of principle. To her the mere fact that a few hundreds or thousands of her

nationals will or will not be admitted into the domains of other countries is immaterial, so long as no question of national susceptibilities is involved. The important question is where Japan as a nation is or is not entitled to the proper respect and consideration of other nations.

In other words, the Japanese government asks of the United States Government simply that proper consideration ordinarily given by one nation to the self-respect of another, which, after all, forms the basis of amicable international intercourse throughout the civilized world.

It is indeed impossible for my government and people, and I believe it would be impossible also for your government and for those of your people who had made a careful study of the subject, to understand why it should be necessary for your country to enact as the law of the land such a clause as section 12 (b), of the House Immigration Bill.

As is justly pointed out in your letter of February 8, 1924, to the chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, it is idle to insist that the provision is not aimed at the Japanese, for the proposed measure (section 25) continues in force your existing legislation regulating Chinese immigration and the barred-zone provisions of your immigration laws which prohibit immigration from certain other portions of Asia, to say nothing about the public statements of the sponsors and supporters of that particular provision as to its aim. In other words, the manifest object of the said section 12 (b) is to single out Japanese as a nation, stigmatizing them as unworthy and undesirable in the eyes of the American people. And yet the actual result of that particular provision, if the proposed bill becomes the law as intended, would be to exclude only 146 Japanese per year.

On the other hand, the gentlemen's agreement is in fact accomplishing all that can be accomplished by the proposed Japanese exclusion clause except for those 146. It is indeed difficult to believe that it can be the intention of the people of your great country, who always stand for high principles of justice and fair play in the intercourse of nations, to resort—in order to secure the annual exclusion of 146 Japanese—to a measure which would not only seriously offend the just pride of a friendly nation, that has been always earnest and diligent in its efforts to preserve the friendship of your people, but would also seem to involve the question of the good faith and therefore of the honor of their government, or at least of its executive branch.

Relying upon the confidence you have been good enough to show me at all times, I have stated, or rather repeated, all this to you very candidly and in a most friendly spirit, for I realize, as I believe you do, the grave consequences which the enactment of the measure retaining that particular provision would inevitably bring upon the otherwise happy

and mutually advantageous relations between our two countries.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

M. HANIHARA.

Reply of Secretary Hughes

Secretary Hughes made this reply to the Japanese note:

APRIL 10, 1924.

EXCELLENCY:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the note of April 10, in which, referring to the recent report of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives (report No. 350, March 24, 1924), you took occasion to state your government's understanding of the purport of the so-called "gentlemen's agreement" and your government's practice and purposes with respect to emigration from Japan to this country.

I am happy to take note of your statement concerning the substance of the so-called "gentlemen's agreement," resulting from the correspondence which took place between our two governments in 1907-8, as modified by the additional undertaking of the Japanese Government with regard to the so-called "picture brides," which became effective four years ago. Your statement of the essential points constituting the "gentlemen's agreement" corresponds with my own understanding of that arrangement.

Inasmuch as your note is directed toward clearing away any possible misapprehension as to the nature and purpose of the "gentlemen's agreement," I am taking occasion to communicate copies of it, as also of my present reply, to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the two houses of Congress.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

The Japanese Ambassador specifically disclaimed any intent to convey a veiled threat in the use of the phrase "grave consequences" in a second letter to Secretary Hughes. It is understood that the Ambassador made his explanation with the approval of the Tokyo Foreign Office, which had given its explicit indorsement to the wording of the letter.

Ambassador Hanihara's letter under date of April 17, said:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

In reading the *Congressional Record* of April 14, 1924, I find that the letter I addressed to you on April 10, a copy of which you sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, was made a subject of discussion in the Senate. In the *Record* it is reported that some of the Senators expressed the opinion, which was apparently accepted by many other members of that body, that my letter contained "a veiled

threat." As it appears from the *Record* that it is the phrase "grave consequences," which I used in the concluding part of my letter, that some of the Senators construed as "a veiled threat," I may be permitted to quote here full text of the sentence which contained the words in question.

"Relying upon the confidences you have been good enough to show me at all times, I have stated, or rather repeated, all this to you very candidly and in a most friendly spirit, for I realize, as I believe you do, the grave consequences which the enactment of the measure retaining that particular provision would inevitably bring upon the otherwise happy and mutually advantageous relations between our two countries."

Frankly, I must say I am unable to understand how the two words, read in their context, could be construed as meaning anything like a threat. I simply tried to emphasize the most unfortunate and deplorable effect upon our traditional friendship which might result from the adoption of a particular clause in the proposed measure. It would seriously impair the good and mutually helpful relationship and disturb the spirit of mutual regard and confidence which characterizes our intercourse of the last three-quarters of a century and which was considerably strengthened by the Washington conference, as well as by the most magnanimous sympathy shown by your people in the recent calamity in my country. Whereas there is otherwise every promise of hearty co-operation between Japan and the United States, which is believed to be essential to the welfare not only of themselves, but of the rest of the world, it would create, or at least tend to create, an unhappy atmosphere of ill-feeling and misgiving over the relations between our two countries.

Reiterates Statement

As the representative of my country, whose supreme duty is to maintain, and if possible to draw still closer, the bond of friendship so happily existing between our two peoples, I honestly believe such effects, as I have described, to be "grave consequences." In using these words, which I did quite ingenuously, I had no thought of being in any way disagreeable or discourteous, and still less of conveying a "veiled threat." On the contrary, it was in a spirit of the most sincere respect, confidence, and candor that I used these words, which spirit I hope is manifest throughout my entire letter, for it was in that spirit that I wrote you. I never suspected that these words, used as I used them, would ever afford an occasion for such comment or interpretation as have been given them.

You know, I am sure, that nothing could be further from my thought than to give cause for offense to your people or their government, and I have not the slightest doubt that you have no such misunderstanding as to either the spirit in which I wrote the letter in question to you or the meaning I intended for the phrase that I used therein.

In view, however, of what has transpired in the course of the public discussion in the Senate, I feel constrained to write you, as a matter of record, that I did not use the phrase in question in such a sense as has been attributed to it.

I am, my dear Mr. Secretary, yours very truly,

M. HANIHARA.

The reply written by Secretary Hughes to the Ambassador said:

I am gratified to receive your letter of the seventeenth instant, with your frank and friendly explanation of the intent of your recent note in relation to the pending immigration bill. It gives me pleasure to be able to assure you that, reading the words "grave consequences" in the light of their context, and knowing the spirit of friendship and understanding you have always manifested in our long association, I had no doubt that these words were to be taken in the sense you have stated, and I was quite sure that it was far from your thought to express or imply any threat. I am happy to add that I have deeply appreciated your constant desire to promote the most cordial relations between the peoples of the two countries.

With high esteem, I am, my dear Mr. Hanihara, very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

News in Brief

The principal events in the Allied attempt to obtain reparations from Germany to date follow:

November 11, 1918.—Armistice signed, with an undertaking by Germany to make reparation for war damages.

June 28, 1919.—Treaty of peace signed at Versailles, Germany agreeing to pay reparations.

July 2-4, 1920.—Allied conference at Brussels allots France 52 per cent of total reparations, England 22 per cent, the rest to be divided among smaller powers.

January 24-29, 1921.—Allied delegates meeting at Paris decide Germany must pay in 42 annuities.

March 1-7, 1921.—Germans offer conditionally to pay 30,000,000,000 gold marks, with materials and labor for war reconstruction, but Allied conference in London rejects the offer.

April 24, 1921.—Germany approaches United States with offer to take over part of the Allied debt to America in part settlement of reparations. Washington holds offer unacceptable.

April 27, 1921.—Reparation Commission formally decides Germany must pay 132,000,000,000 gold marks in annuities of 2,000,000,000 and a 26 per cent tax on exports.

May 5, 1921.—Allies send Germany an ultimatum demanding acceptance of Reparation Commission findings.

May 11, 1921.—Germany replies to ultimatum by accepting terms.

July 12, 1921.—Germany asks moratorium for two and one-half years.

August 31, 1922.—Reparation Commission grants six-month moratorium.

December 29, 1922.—Hughes delivers speech at New Haven suggesting impartial commission report on reparations.

December 30, 1922.—France rejects Hughes' proposal.

January 9, 1923.—Germany formally declared in default on coal deliveries by Reparation Commission. France prepares to enter Ruhr.

January 10, 1923.—American troops recalled from the Rhineland.

January 11, 1923.—France and Belgium commence occupation of the Ruhr.

January 14, 1923.—Germany announces suspension of reparation payments to France and Belgium.

May 2, 1923.—Germany again offers 30,000,000,000 gold marks in settlement of reparation claims.

May 13, 1923.—Allies reject new German offer.

August 12, 1923.—Great Britain suggests impartial inquiry into reparation question, but France and Belgium refuse.

September 26, 1923.—President Ebert decrees abandonment of passive resistance in the Ruhr.

October 13, 1923.—Great Britain formally proposes an international economic conference to the United States.

October 15, 1923.—Hughes accepts British proposal, provided Allied debts to United States are not discussed.

October 26, 1923.—France accepts British proposal, but with reservations deemed unacceptable by United States.

December 1, 1923.—Poincaré withdraws reservations.

December 11, 1923.—Coolidge consents to appointment of American experts in reparation inquiry.

December 15, 1923.—Reparation Commission invites Charles G. Dawes and Owen Young to serve as experts and they accept.

January 14, 1924.—First committee of experts holds its first meeting and immediately sets to work. Second committee starts work a few days later.

April 9, 1924.—Both committees report to Reparation Commission.

THE NEW RADIO CIRCUIT between Paris and Saigon (the southern capital of French Indochina) was formally opened to the service of the public on January 17, 1924. The French station at Saigon is at the present time the most powerful radio unit in the Far East, and its opening to general communication marks the completion of another link in the French colonial radio communication system.

HONGKONG, CHINA, is enjoying a building boom. Because of this and the increasing cost of labor, even the native contractors are beginning to show an interest in the use of construction machinery. Pile-drivers and concrete-working equipment are now in demand. Hitherto the ample supply of cheap native labor has retarded the introduction of modern construction methods.

A PRIVATE BILL WAS INTRODUCED into the Swedish Parliament on January 15 by Mr. Sigfrid Hansson, editor of the organ of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions, for the institution of a sickness and old-age pension fund for Swedish authors. It is proposed that the government be requested to provide for the transfer of an author's copyright, on expiration of the legal period of protection, to State ownership, the State then to proceed to exploit the copyright commercially, fees received being utilized for the purpose of instituting a sickness and old-age pension fund for the benefit of Swedish authors.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION adopted at Berne in 1906, providing that the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches should be prohibited, was ratified up to the time of the war, by only ten countries. Great stimulus was given to the adherence of other countries to this convention by the recommendation adopted by the International Labor Conference at Washington in 1919,

which recommended all members of the organization which had not already done so to adhere to this convention. This recommendation has been followed by thirteen countries. It is of especial interest to note that among these thirteen countries are included China, India, and Japan.

HUNGARY HAS ENACTED during the past few months a number of acts of parliament and administrative decrees affecting labor. These include increases in compensation to war invalids, widows, and orphans and the elimination of bonuses to civil servants, substituting a fixed salary scale therefor; the establishment of government subsidies for certain agricultural and distributive co-operative societies; reduction in taxation on houses built between January 1, 1924, and November 1, 1926; regulating State mortgages on newly built dwelling houses; a further 20 per cent reduction in the civil service staff; and the amendment of social insurance laws to take account of the decreased value of Hungarian currency.

INTERESTING EVIDENCE OF THE CHANGES in industrial and social conditions which are being realized in China is afforded by the issue of draft regulations by the Chinese Government authorizing the organization of workers into trade unions. The authorities, however, may order the dissolution of a trade union if it passes or carries into effect a resolution directed against the present form of government; likely to disturb the public peace; likely to endanger the normal flow of life of the community, or likely to obstruct communication or inflict injury on the nation or society.

THE AMERICAN DEBT COMMISSION has published communications with the mission from Yugoslavia in which the United States laid down the definite policy that it will permit of no action by foreign debtor nations that would make the position of this government "less favorable" with respect to obligations due it. The commission said it "regretted" the government of the kingdom did not find it possible to proceed with a funding discussion at this time, but accepted the statements of the Yugoslav Government's financial condition as warranting the hope that a proposal for funding would be submitted at an early date.

A PERSIAN REPUBLIC was on the point of being proclaimed New Year's day (March 21); but at the last moment the Shah clergy raised objections. A Royalist demonstration followed. The prime minister, after visiting the Ulemas at Kum, issued a proclamation declaring that the establishment of a republic in Persia would be contrary to the Moslem religion. It is reported that the proclamation prohibits all further mention of the subject under payment of penalties. In the meantime Persia complains to the League of Nations that Great Britain and Russia are negotiating a continuance of spheres of influence under the old agreement of 1907.

THE GERMAN TAXATION OFFICES were instructed April 3 to issue no more certificates of tax payments to Germans asking for passports to journey abroad. It is understood that this complete prohibition is to be covered by an administrative order. A fee of approximately one hundred dollars will be exacted for permission to leave Germany, except in certain carefully defined cases.

WE ARE INFORMED that since the Turkish national government came into power at Angora no Armenian has been massacred. Armenian business men in Constantinople are, it is reported, working in perfect harmony with their Moslem fellow-citizens. The Armenian Patriarch recently expressed the loyalty of his flock to the government of the Turkish Republic, and the Turkish President replied in a cordial message, expressing the hope that all races shall continue to work harmoniously together for the good of their common country.

IT APPEARS that it is now impossible to establish any Armenian national home in Turkey. The Armenian national delegation has therefore appealed to the government, members of the League of Nations, to facilitate the formation in their respective countries of national committees for the purpose of raising money to establish Armenian refugees as permanent settlers on lands at present available in Transcaucasia.

THE ECONOMIC COMMISSARIAT of the Russian Soviet Government reports that 5,241 industrial enterprises are now leased to private capitalists. This represents 22 per cent of the program launched in 1921. The leased enterprises are all small, having on

the average sixteen workers each. Thirty per cent of the industries are leased to former owners, 22 per cent to other private persons, and the remainder to State bodies, co-operatives, and labor groups. Of the leased enterprises, 1,770 belong to the food industry, 1,555 to the leather industry, 602 to metal, and 226 to textile industries.

THE CURRENCY REFORM recently inaugurated in Russia is expected to produce tremendous economic changes in that country. Confidence in the financial reform is already shown in the decreased prices of commodities at home and in the appreciation of the chervonetz in the foreign exchange markets. The Soviet Government, taking a leaf from the financial troubles of Germany, is making strenuous efforts to maintain the level of real wages, so that the stabilized prices may mean a real decrease in the cost of living.

A MOVEMENT IS AFOOT IN SOUTH AFRICA tending toward the reorganization of the administration of native affairs. Hitherto, the Prime Minister has been also minister of native affairs. It is said that General Smuts, who now holds that position, has so many calls upon his attention by the department itself that native matters fall upon a minister whose proper portfolio is that of Mines and Industries. Since the natives of South Africa are, as a whole, ignorant of the law, as made at the parliament at Cape Town, and since they need a firmer and more sympathetic administration than is possible under the present arrangement, it is urged that a separate ministry of native affairs be created.

AN ALL-RUSSIAN CONFERENCE of geologists met in Moscow on January 10. Its main task was to prepare a plan of research work for 1924.

THE FIRST DIRECT TRAIN from Moscow to Vladivostok began to run on January 24. The journey occupies twelve days.

GENERAL WEYGAND, the High Commissioner of Syria, is reported to have made arrangements for receiving in Syria and the Lebanon 10,000 Syrian Orthodox, who, by order of the Turkish Government, are to leave the vilayets of Adana, Diarbekir, Urfa, and Aintab. Most of these refugees will be settled in the Lebanon.

A TERRIBLE ANNIHILATING FORCE is reported as having been discovered in France just previous to the armistice. It is appropriately called the "demon ray," and could have destroyed, it is believed, the whole German army, as well as entire populations against whom it might have been directed. The invention, which was abandoned at the time of the armistice, may, it is thought, now be secretly reconstructed as a counter-weapon to the Matthews ray.

LAND TENANCY IN THE IRISH FREE STATE was abolished by the land purchase act passed in 1923. Tenants now become proprietors, paying annual installments to the State. The installments are from 25 to 35 per cent less than the rents, the purchase to be completed in 70 years. Landlords are to be paid for their property in 4½ per cent Free State stock, of which £25,000,000 will need to be issued.

THE WORLD'S IDLE STEAM SHIPPING declined approximately 2,200,000 gross tons during 1923, in nearly equal amounts during each half of the year. The improvement in the latter part of the year is particularly impressive, because rates have declined. The steady decrease in idle tonnage in the face of low rates is, of course, a reflection of the increasing volume of world ocean-borne trade. Almost half the decrease in idle tonnage during 1923 was accounted for by American ships.

THE NEW GERMAN CABINET has decided to repeal the maximum rent law, acting under the special powers conferred by the passage of the new "authorization act." This drastic action is a necessary part of the attempt to reform conditions in Germany. It has long been evident that no permanent improvement in conditions could be achieved until this law limiting a landlord's return from rented property was changed, and a provision adopted some months ago, whereby repairs were shifted from the landlords to the tenants of a property, was recognized as merely a palliative. The property-owning class has been threatened with extinction, with no relief in sight. It is now proposed to raise rents gradually until they shall equal 100 per cent of pre-war gold rates in October, 1924.

THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN is one of the almost innum-

erable organizations intended to further international understanding. It has recently purchased Crosby Hall, in London, for a club house. The American Association of University Women is giving \$5,000 to fit out a room in the building. Crosby Hall is designed to be a beautiful, historic background for quiet study, stimulating fellowship with other students and the leisurely atmosphere necessary to research.

AN INSTRUMENT KNOWN AS THE "SUN COMPASS" has been constructed in Norway to the design of Capt. Roald Amundsen, for use on his transpolar flight. It will supplant the ordinary compass, which is unreliable in the region of the pole.

BULGARIA ON APRIL 24 extended amnesty to all communist and agrarian refugees except leaders and organizers of last September's revolt.

RADIUM DEPOSITS OF GREAT PROMISE have been discovered in Durrmaul, west of Marienbad, on the east slopes of the Bayrischer Wald, in Czechoslovakia. Pitchblende deposits were found at a short distance beneath the surface on old copper-mining properties which have long been idle. A joint stock company, with headquarters at Marienbad, has been organized, with a stock capital of 11,000,000 Czech crowns, for the purpose of working these deposits, which are controlled by private interests, although there are reports that financial support has been received from the Land Credit Bank (Boden-Kredit-Anstalt) of Vienna.

THE OUTPUT OF GOLD IN AUSTRALIA for 1923 showed a decrease of nearly 50,000 fine ounces from the 1922 production. This was due principally to the working out of the richer reefs and to higher operating costs having made it unprofitable to crush the lower grade ore, which, under more moderate operating costs, accounted for considerable yields. The industry in Western Australia, which produces about two-thirds of the gold output of Australia, was hampered by increased wages, but since the wage award has been modified the outlook for 1924 is more encouraging.

ONE OF THE LARGEST SHIPMENTS OF QUININE ever made was that sent by the American Red Cross to Greece on February 9. An initial shipment of five tons went on the

steamship *Themistocles* to relieve the threatened epidemic of malaria. The American chargé d'affaires at Athens cabled the State Department asking for the medicine. He quoted the Greek minister of Public Assistance as saying that the deaths reported from exposure in Greece today are because of weakened resistance due to malaria and not to malnutrition. It is estimated that twenty tons of quinine will be needed in Greece before the end of spring.

ACCORDING TO PRESS REPORTS FROM SHANGHAI, 50,000 of the new Chinese dollars bearing the effigy of Tsao Kun, now president of China, have been sent to Nanking for distribution throughout Kiangsu Province. Several Shanghai organizations are reported to have protested against their use in that city. The "Yuan" dollar bears the image of Yuan Shikai, first president of the Chinese republic, and coins of this character are officially called Yuan rather than dollars. The use of the yuan has become widespread in China inasmuch as the national budget, all official accounts other than the customs returns, and all new Chinese banking accounts are now based on this new dollar instead of the Kuping tael. Vast quantities of Yuan dollars are in circulation today, even in the most interior provinces, and in most of the larger places they have been displacing the older dollars. In Tientsin and other North China ports the Mexican dollar does not circulate at all. The Chinese attribute this popularity of the yuan among the population to some sort of feeling of patriotism or pride in a national dollar. The real reason for the wide use of this dollar is the unhampered working of Gresham's law, whereby cheap money drives more valuable money out of circulation. The Mexican dollar, the Japanese silver yen, the American "trade dollar," and the various provincial dollars have greater silver content and silver of purer quality than the yuan and are gradually going out of circulation. Shanghai is about the only large city in China where Mexican dollars are still fairly widely used, due to the prevalence of "old custom" of the port. In recent examination of the cash in possession of several large firms in Shanghai, however, it was found that the number of Yuan dollars was equal to or in most cases in excess of the Mexican. With the mass of the Chinese people the principal coins in use are the copper ten cash or cent pieces and the old brass cash. For large

transactions the Shanghai or other local taels are used. There are no tael coins, however, as the tael as a coin is purely fictitious and is actually a measure of weight, used also as a measure of value. Bullion in the shape of "sycee shoes"—*i. e.*, fine silver, of approximately fifty taels (Chinese ounces) in weight—back up tael transactions.

THE NEW NATIONAL PARK OF TASMANIA is an eldorado for scientists as well as for sight-seers. No other State in the Australian Commonwealth has set apart so large a proportion of its territory for playgrounds as has Tasmania. For some time there has been a national park of over 38,000 acres on the island and a game reserve of about 30,000 acres on the east coast. Now 250 square miles have been set apart and called "The Cradle Mountain-Lake St. Clair Reserve." The whole area of the island is only 26,215 square miles. This new reserve is covered with mountains, lakes, and unexplored forests. Comparatively recent glacial action is to be observed recorded on some of the rocks. Not only will geologists find a rich wonderland here, but biologists may observe abundant and unusual flora and fauna. Automobile roads do not yet reach the reserve, but are every year creeping closer from both north and south.

BELGIUM HAS MADE LITTLE PROGRESS in the construction of the type of cottage or villa such as is familiar in Great Britain or the United States. The average Belgian business employee does not earn, even after some years' service, over 20,000 francs (\$1,000) annually, and the amount of his credit and also the proportion of earnings put into a house are much lower than in the United States. Furthermore, since European cities have existed for centuries, the populated and built-up areas are concentrated and the opening up of new residential blocks are rare. Municipal transportation is rarely adequate, and the small wage-earner is thus obliged to content himself with a flat, as cheap as possible and as near as may be his place of business. Wooden houses of any sort are a great rarity, and even stucco construction on metal lath is unknown. The average frontage for a residential lot in any Belgian city is 5 to 9 meters and the depth not over 25 or 30, of which 20 to 25 is occupied by the house. In other words, anything like the yard which every American wants around his home is

next to unknown, except in villa quarters frequented by the well-to-do.

A DRIVE AGAINST ILLITERACY is on in Russia. Lunarchasky, People's Commissary for Education, made a most disquieting report at the recent All Russian Congress of Soviets. At present, the total number of illiterates in the R. S. F. S. R., between the ages of 18 and 55, is about 18,000,000. In every thousand males there are 270 illiterates, and in every thousand females 629. Illiteracy is least among people from 20 to 29 years old. There is a very serious number of illiterates below 20 years of age. While conditions have greatly improved in the towns during the last two years, the country districts have remained much the same. As long ago as December, 1919, a movement was set on foot to educate the people of Russia. About five millions were reached by that campaign, and from two to three million people learned to read and write. The famine of 1921, however, gave a serious setback to the educational work, as state funds had to be deflected to relief work. A special illiteracy congress in 1923 decided that in 1927, the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, there must be no illiteracy in the Soviet Union between the ages of 18 and 35. The problem is to be attacked along three lines: First, members of trade unions; second, young army recruits; third, and most difficult, the peasant population of the villages. The campaign and its publicity are to be conducted by a special commission set up for the purpose.

WORKS IN THE NEW NIGER COLONY (French West Africa) are going on apace. A few months ago the vast territories, partly desert, located between the Niger and Lake Tchad, were made a French colony. In consequence the civil administration set about making the most of it. Plows were imported and the natives taught to use them. A program of agricultural hydraulics is in course of execution. As water is scarce, dams are constructed in the valley, so as to form a reservoir. In case cultivation might be extended, wells are dug in pastures and near caravan routes. The natives are being taught to develop their cotton, rice, and arachid plantations. The cotton is woven by the natives, and this industry is competing successfully with imported English cotton goods. But the real wealth of the colony lies in stock-raising,

which is being improved. A sheepfold has been established in Niamey for acclimating merinos and other fine wool sheep.

THE GOVERNMENT OF FRENCH GUINEA (West Africa) has just published a report by Agronomical Engineer Chillon on banana planting in this colony. It contains an outline of all aspects of the subject, from planting to export. The conclusions drawn are most encouraging for the future of this industry. With a capital from 250,000 to 300,000 francs maximum for plowing, for necessary farm animals, for buildings, material and tools, Mr. Chillon declares it possible to work a banana plantation of 20 hectares, which, if cultivated intensively, will produce, according to the nature of the soil and quality of fertilizer employed, from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 kilos (about four million pounds) of bananas per year. The question of transportation solved, the profits are easily figured, as a crate of 40 kilos sells for at least 120 francs in Bordeaux or Marseilles, and costs for packing and transport from Kindia to France do not exceed 31 francs per crate.

THE NEW CAPITAL OF AUSTRALIA is Canberra, New South Wales. The cabinet met there for the first time officially on January 30. For the first time in the history of the world a whole continent is now controlled by a government in a capital belonging to itself. The Minister of Works hopes to push on the construction of the capital, so that the present Parliament may meet there before the present house expires, at the end of 1925. The central administration of all departments will necessarily remain in Melbourne for several years, but eventually the government will be entirely centered in Canberra, the "bush" capital. No land of the federal territory is to be alienated. The land ordinance provides for 99-year leases, with periodic reappraisements. The port of Canberra, on Jervis Bay, is also federal territory. Canberra is to be absolutely dry, and no licenses for the manufacture or sale of liquor are to be granted under any circumstances. The historic first meeting of the cabinet in the new capital, January 30, took place in Yarralumia House, formerly a sheep station.

THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT has established, with German aid, a regular air mail service between Constantinople and Angora.

BOOK REVIEWS

MASTERS AND MEN. By *Philip Guedalla*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Pp. 171.

He says it so charmingly that what he says is of quite secondary importance. A news reporter would boil down the four to eight pages of any of these essays to a sentence or two and omit nothing of the outline. But how dull it would instantly become! The thing we enjoy is the mind across which the thoughts move like pantomimes across a stage. The airy back-drop, the rich stage setting, the elusiveness and subtlety of the lighting, lend to the scenes a sort of magic.

Mr. Guedalla is a whimsical and delighted observer of the world of men and books. He whittles his ironic wit to a fine point and with it spears a fly. Trivial things become important under the play of his persiflage; pompous things become trivial. He is not bitter in his malice, nor troubled at the absurdities of the great; on the contrary, he is engagingly good-humored, as he "hits them off." Mr. Guedalla makes a game of criticism. He lingers over his aphorisms and plays with his phrases. Indeed, is it not recorded of him in "Who's Who," that his recreations are "reviewing and European travel"?

Of the essays which contain a real message to thoughtful persons, we choose "The Egoists," "Ministers of State," and "William Pitt" as, perhaps, the best.

The author does not hesitate to gibe at those solemn statesmen who stand about "in attitudes that look well on a marble monument." At another time he pays the tribute of his wit to that pleasing habit of ancient universities to refuse to strike didactic attitudes. "Their tone," he says, "their charming human products, their engaging angle of view, . . . must all impress the really serious observer as lamentably (or is it laudably?) devoid of any avowed educational purpose."

He slyly alludes to the "war years and the obscurer scuffles which constitute a peace." But most delicious of all, because so descriptive of himself, is his characterization of a

writer in those Victorian years when "editors could still afford a sense of style." Of this writer he says: "Having launched his wicked paradox, he tilted his hat and, seeing an epigram in the distance, strolled jauntily off up a side issue, as an essayist should." The book is a network of "side issues" refreshing to follow.

AFRICAN QUESTIONS AT THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE. By *George Louis Beers*. Macmillan Co., New York. Pp. 628. Price, \$6.00.

The author of this book was prepared for his work by a long and careful study of American and British colonial questions. During the Peace Conference at Paris he was chief of the Colonial Section of the American delegation.

Whether or not the international principles upon which he founded his theories of colonial mandates were sound, the book stands as an accurate account of the colonial discussions at the Paris Conference of 1918-1919.

Mr. Beers died in 1920, and his papers, almost ready for the press at that time, have been edited and annotated by his friend and assistant, Louis Herbert Gray.

ORDINANCE POWER OF THE JAPANESE EMPEROR. By *Tomo Nakano*, Ph. D. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. Pp. 269. Price, \$2.50.

Here is a valuable book on constitutional jurisprudence as exemplified in the Japanese constitutional monarchy.

Dr. Nakano calls the introduction of the constitution of Japan an evolution rather than a revolution, since it emanated from the emperor himself, who had hitherto enjoyed unlimited power. This indicates the reason for the many unusual powers retained by the Japanese Emperor. The author has treated his subject with a scholarly regard for facts and in a remarkably democratic spirit.

TURKEY, THE GREAT POWERS, AND THE BAGDAD RAILWAY. By *Edward E. Earl*. Macmillan Co., New York. Pp. 364. Price, \$2.25.

Any American who wishes intelligently to follow his country's activity in the Near East, or who desires to know why the Chester Concessions may be either a promise or a menace, will read this book with intense interest. Professor Earl, of Columbia, writes

with remarkable clarity on an involved and tangled matter, the history of the "Berlin to Bagdad" plan. He shows how, in the economic and political ramifications of the subject, it contributed largely to the outbreak of the "Great War." The romantic story of the railway, merged as it is with the history of Turkey since 1876, he narrates in brisk and readable English. Remarkably full bibliographies follow each chapter, and a well-arranged index completes the value of this book as a work of reference.

PRIMITIVE ORDEAL AND MODERN LAW. By *H. Goitein*. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London. Pp. 302.

Like so many books published in England, this thick, well-bound volume is light to hold. This quality, together with the large, clear type, makes reading its pages a pleasure. The chapters are well outlined, and at the back of the book is not only an index, but ten pages of classified bibliography with explanatory comment.

The author has not allowed the technicality of his theme to put him out of touch with the general reader of intelligence. He does not "talk down," nor does he presuppose too much special knowledge, either of psychology or of law.

The unique thing in this history of the rise of law lies in its psychological explanation of the various steps in the long climb. The author takes the modern conception of the mind as a network of "complexes," each of which has a core of primary instinct. The considerations of human decency, taste, or expediency, which restrain and guide the instinct, form the "complex." Instinct, however, is always the dynamic energy of each complex.

Primitive man, impelled by an instinct greater than himself, instantly killed, if possible, another man who wronged him. Then arose feuds and tribal melées, with great danger of tribal extinction. As a refuge from the destructive energy of his vindictive passions, man started afresh and devised the "ordeal." Here, by tests of water, fire, poison, lot, combat, divinations of various kinds, somebody was made a victim for the wrong committed, and the conflict which had risen in the "unconscious" of the observer was relieved. At the same time, that instinct which bade man protect his group was satisfied. The group assumed no risk, but found ex-

citement and satisfaction observing the death-fantasy in the drama of the "ordeal." The death-fantasy endangered no one but the accused. Thus two primal instincts were harmonized.

Gradually intelligence grew and shed a fitful light upon man's social perplexities. The judge and the oath emerged; then the power of generalization which formulated usage—"Our fathers did so." While human demand for the punishment of the guilty was no less, man's safety was further guarded by the era of codification. After long years, society evolved the jury system, which balanced the expression of past public opinion, as exemplified in the judge and the code, by present public opinion, as expressed in a jury of average persons.

In his consideration of constitutional law the author takes cognizance of present criticisms of it. "When the tone of society is healthy and vigorous," he says, "there is usually a sub-acid impatience felt for tradition." He admits that at times the law seems unable to grow and must be replaced. However, morality does grow and is dynamic in social progress. In the light of the moral ideal, the rule of law is frequently recast and the customs of people profoundly change.

It is a pity not to speak of the many curious customs in ordeals and other forms of early judgments of which the book treats, but for our purposes the value of the book lies in its prophecy, built up, as it is, on historical and scientific arguments.

There can be, thinks Mr. Goitein, no reason why the deep urge within us which calls for the finding and correcting of offenders should not be ultimately reconciled with that other deep instinct which demands the safeguarding of our own. Humanity is beginning to realize its kinship. Reason, once emerged, can, of course, do no more than direct the surge of elemental passion. It dares attempt no more, "nor," says the author, "will it ever." But those instincts will become more balanced as world public opinion becomes more unified and more aware of itself.

We who have been saying for so long, "It ought to be," may be glad to hear a psychologist of the new school say that there is nothing in human mentality to prevent, but everything to further, the belief that human morality will support world law; that all necessary emotional outlets for outraged sense of right can be amply supplied by the world drama of international justice.

HISTORY OF ICELAND. By *Knut Gjerset*. Macmillan, New York. Pp. 482. Price, \$4.00.

One who loves to delve in the romance of early North American history will at once feel a strong attraction to this well-told narrative of the Icelandic past. Looming out of the fogs of our own earliest history stands the figure of an eager, spirited young Viking, Leif, the son of Eric the Red. We know that he explored the coast of our northeastern regions when, on a voyage from Iceland and Greenland, he found a land of grapes and tried to establish a colony there. Leif Ericson's brilliant personality serves as the point of contact, through which we naturally slip back into early Iceland, the story of which is delightfully and fully told by Dr. Gjerset.

The same restless, venturesome spirit which characterized Leif and his father, Eric, who discovered and settled Greenland, is found in those wandering Vikings from Norway who began the colonization of Iceland. Some of these stopped for a generation or two in the Hebrides and other islands lying off the north coast of Britain. There, by intermarriage between Norse chieftains and Irish kings and princesses, the future Icelanders picked up a large admixture of Celtic blood, which perhaps explains the fine school of early poetry, so Celtic in its feeling, that developed in Iceland very soon after the period of colonization.

From 870 to 930 Norse and Norse-Irish immigration poured into the picturesque island, where, in comparative isolation, the strong racial tide of development went on undisturbed by the outer world.

The simple descriptive names that dot the story are like an echo of some old saga, where in truth many of them are preserved. There is Thorwald Kodransson, the "Far-traveller," who was instrumental in bringing Christianity to his people; there is "Helga, the Fair," heroine of the saga of Gunlaug; and away back at the beginning of Icelandic history that strong and just woman chieftain, "Aud, the Deep-minded."

The adventures of these early families pass before us like a pageant. The struggle for self-government is especially well told. First, the family groups, with their chieftains in absolute control, met together in larger assemblies, called Thing; then came the union of these in the Allthing. Nominal dependence, first upon Norway, then upon Denmark, became real dependence, most irksome to the impatient Iclander. Dr. Gjerset tells quite

in detail, albeit simply, the long struggle for autonomy until, in 1918, Iceland became a Danish Crown colony, recognized by the government as an independent State.

For the benefit of the eye in reading, one could wish that the long unbroken paragraphs might have been split up into smaller sections; yet, in spite of solid pages, the story runs freely.

The author has succeeded remarkably well in making it a history with a core of social interest. Economic, literary, and religious currents are traced, along with the political sweep of events.

The rugged Arctic land, itself, is real to the imagination, with its geysers, the wild grandeur of its northern lights, the lurid fires of its active volcanoes playing upon snow-topped mountains in the long winter night. We are astonished, if we did not know, at the mild climate of the southern and western districts, which are bathed by the Gulf Stream. There the clear sky, blue fjords, and tranquil, serene beauty of summer-time are painted in words that do not seem to exaggerate.

On the whole, this study of an eddy of the well-known Scandinavian race-history serves to illuminate several interesting periods of European and western history. Iceland becomes something more than its fine old sagas—a civilization akin to all the democracies of today.

MODERN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION: A Text-book for Secondary Schools. By *Roscoe Lewis Ashley*. Macmillan, New York. Pp. 730.

The main purpose of this book, and also of its predecessor, "Early European Civilization," is the explanation of the present through the study of the past. The author has succeeded admirably in his effort to follow the development of Europe along social and economic lines. He subordinates to this plan the material which is purely political or military, making on the whole a well-balanced and valuable book for young students.

EUROPE SINCE 1918. By *Herbert Adams Gibbons*. Century Co., New York. Pp. 622. Price, \$3.00.

"We must know how things actually are in order that we may help effectively to make them what they ought to be." With these words Herbert Adams Gibbons closes the introduction to his book and plunges into the maelstrom of recent European political history.

If any observer can be absolutely unbiased; if it be possible accurately to trace the tangled course of events in Europe from 1918 to the present year, Dr. Gibbons is well prepared to do that important work. After his university training in this country and ordination into the ministry, he became a newspaper correspondent in the Near East. With increasing interest in international political history, he gave lectures on that subject in Robert College, Constantinople, in Princeton and elsewhere. During the war he was war correspondent and has contributed articles on European affairs to leading American periodicals. Dr. Gibbons claims that he never had any ax to grind; that he is not "pro-anything." The book itself is evidence enough that he is a close and thoughtful observer.

Nevertheless, it is not an academic book. That the writer has a clear and wholesome philosophy, is clear. The book, however, is strictly objective, the language simple and spirited; there are quotable sentences. The chapters run through the conditions in Europe at the time of the Armistice; the making of the Treaty of Versailles; "The Tragedy of Paris"; the treaties of St. Germain and Trianon; the Balkan settlement; the status of Russia, Poland, Italy, Central Europe; the Ottoman Empire and the Eastern question. There is a chapter on the significance of the Washington Conference, and others summarizing later conferences, the Ruhr question, and the interallied debts.

In the conclusion of his valuable survey, Mr. Gibbons opines that the influence of the League of Nations, or even of the World Court, in untangling Europe will be negligible as compared with the individual policies of France and Great Britain. As things now stand, he believes that earnest men should, instead of devoting their time to war-prevention machinery, consider much more effectively those great present causes of war—"inequality in trade, colonization and investment opportunities among powers of equal size, strength, standard of living, and productive capacity."

The book should help those whom Mr. Gibbons wished to reach, "so that sentimentality will not obscure common sense in forming their opinion on the important problem of America's place in the world and America's duty toward the world." True, it is impossible to define common sense; but we all know it when we see it.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership IN The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional	\$25.00
Contributing	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual			\$2.00

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$..... PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A.....
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name

Address

.....

.....

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 6

June, 1924

Our Country and the World Court

The European Elections

Can Russia Pay?

Germans Explain Germany

Peace Publications

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	323
EDITORIALS	
How Shall We Enter the World Court?—Immanuel Kant's Bicentenary—The French Elections—The German Elections—Meaning of the British Empire Exhibition—Editorial Notes.....	325-334
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
United States and the World Court, the Two Views—France and Germany at the Polls—The British Budget—The Latest Census in India	334-344
GENERAL ARTICLES	
On the State of Union.....	344
By David Jayne Hill	
The Twenty-second Conference of the Interparliamentary Union....	346
By Arthur Deerin Call	
Professor Quidde's Arrest.....	348
By Hans Wehberg	
Russia and the World.....	350
By Leo Pasvolsky	
Foreign Trade of Soviet Russia for 1923.....	355
By L. J. Lewery	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
President Coolidge on World Peace.....	357
Germany and The Hague Peace Conferences.....	360
Hungarian Financial Reconstruction.....	365
Mr. Hughes and Our Foreign Policy.....	369
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	373
LETTER BOX.....	378
BOOK REVIEWS.....	379
PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.....	383

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:

Annual Membership is two dollars;

Sustaining Membership, five dollars;

Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Senator from Illinois, Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN, 1341 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., 1155 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, California. Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, Ex-President Fairmont Seminary, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 W. 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS

HENRY C. MORRIS

PAUL SLEMAN

THEODORE STANFIELD

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D.

Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., Richmond, Indiana.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

GEO. H. JUDD, Washington, D. C.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective; and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

JUNE, 1924

NUMBER
6

EDITORIALS

HOW SHALL WE ENTER THE WORLD COURT?

THAT the United States are to enter a World Court of International Justice is inevitable. This entrance cannot be postponed for long. It has been the aspiration of our people for years. The trials of the war have increased this aspiration. The fact that there is a World Court in operation has dramatized the reality and precipitated anew a vast amount of discussion.

There are two schools of thought upon the manner of our participation in such a court. One school is made up of men and women who are of the opinion that the International Court of Justice set up by the League of Nations under Article 14 of its covenant, made up of judges elected by the Assembly and by the Council of the League of Nations, with salaries determined by the Assembly of the League of Nations upon proposal of the Council—a court the expenses of which are borne by the League of Nations in such manner as shall be decided by the Assembly upon the proposal of the Council, a court empowered to give advisory opinions to the League of Nations—is, therefore, an agent of the League of Nations. Since the United States is not a member of the League of Nations and since the United States has definitely voted to stay out of the League of Nations, it is argued by these persons that

the United States cannot consistently adhere to the protocol of the court.

These persons are not content merely to assume a negative position upon this important matter. They have constructive proposals to make. Various plans have been introduced in the Senate for paving the way for a court which our country could join. The latest and perhaps most formidable of these proposals appeared in the form of a joint resolution submitted to the Senate by Senator Lodge, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and leader of the Republican majority in the Senate, under date of May 8. The resolution has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, where it will be subject to hearings. This plan, now known as the "Lodge plan," will have to pass both the Senate and the House and be submitted to the President for signature or disapproval before it can become effective. The resolution proposes that the President be requested to call, on the behalf of the Government of the United States, a third Hague Conference, and to recommend to such conference a statute for the establishment of a World Court of International Justice. This plan, undergoing modifications, is before the Senate. The Court is a practical project.

There is an active group of organizations, primarily friendly to the League of Nations, which is utterly opposed to the

Lodge plan on the ground that it is an effort to draw a red herring across the trail that leads to the acceptance of the court established by the League of Nations. Mr. Harding, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Coolidge have recommended that we join the existing court. These proposals have received enthusiastic support, particularly of all friends of the League of Nations. The Senate, through a special committee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has been conducting hearings upon the matter. Enthusiastic promoters of the existing court have appeared before this committee in considerable numbers. These friends are now afraid that the proposal will not be brought before the Senate, or, if the committee lays it before the Senate, that unacceptable reservations may appear attached to it. These persons point out that the Lodge plan is impossible, for the reason that forty-seven nations in the court now established will not forsake it to join a new and unnecessary one. The arguments of these protagonists of the present court appear elsewhere in these columns.

Our own view is that the friends of a court do not improve their case by injudicious statements or by extravagances familiar to the special pleader. In our judgment, the following paragraph is calculated to do the court more harm than good:

"There is no more chance for the World Court plan of Senator Lodge to succeed than there was for Mr. Harding's Association of Nations, and for the same reason. . . . Senator Lodge has the intelligence to know this. The only possible achievements before it are confusion, delay, and defeat of our joining in any world court whatever. That would satisfy Mr. Lodge, but it would infuriate the American people and disrupt the Republican Party. Is that what he is after?"

The signers of this paragraph could not have read Mr. Lodge's proposal to the Senate, nor Mr. Chandler P. Anderson's

explanation of the plan submitted also by Mr. Lodge to the Senate committee. The aim of the Lodge plan is to organize the world for peace through the development and enforcement of law, as approved by past experience, and the timely submission of international disputes to the great court of public opinion, "the decisions of which constitute the real sanction for the enforcement of law." Under the Lodge plan the United States could resume its former position of leadership in the development of international law, the most important work of the Hague conferences could be continued, and the work of the world be advanced once more with the co-operation of the United States. The Lodge plan does not propose to set up another international court. It shows the way for transforming the present League court into a World Court of Justice as a part of The Hague organization. It is a plan proposed by an arch-opponent of the League of Nations, a member of the United States Senate, an "Irreconcilable," for the establishment of an International Court of Justice to which the United States may adhere. Disinterested friends of an International Court of Justice would naturally be expected to welcome such a suggestion from such a source.

If our unbiased interest be to set up an International Court of Justice with the co-operation of the United States, irrespective of the League of Nations, why slam the door in the face of the Chairman of the committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, one whom we have loved long since and lost awhile, one who has returned to us bearing good gifts? Why not rather welcome him with open arms and together go about the business of helping the Senate to fix up our common project? The violence of the opposition to the Lodge plan seems to come almost entirely from the advocates of the League

of Nations, who assure us constantly that the court is in no sense dependent upon the League. Is it foreordained that the expressions of ill temper among us friends of peace must go on forever befogging our issues, alienating men whom we need in our business, and hamstringing the cause of peace? The details of the controversy are not all one-sided (see our department, *World Problems in Review*.) The main issue is crystal clear. We friends of the court are faced with a new and encouraging fact—Henry Cabot Lodge wants the United States to join such a court, and goes on to offer us a plan for going about it. Incidentally, Mr. Lodge has a vote in the Senate, and without the Senate we can't get anywhere. It is not the best of tactics to go on throwing stones at the men we are trying to get to help us. Why not try working for a while with the Senate? It is not so bad. In the name of peace, we peace workers have heaved bricks at each other and at our supposed enemies, particularly the Senate, until our influence is about *nil*. Neither the Senate nor the people of the United States can be driven into the League of Nations or its court. The American people will go where their idealisms, based upon their self-interests, lead. To direct these things is a matter of education, and persuasion, and co-operation rather than of hysteria, and compulsion, and hold-ups.

IMMANUEL KANT'S BICENTENARY

IMMANUEL KANT, known to the peace workers of the world as the author of "Eternal Peace: a Philosophical Essay," was born in Königsberg April 22, 1724. The bicentenary of his birth has just been celebrated in his native city. With marked simplicity, all the more impressive for that reason, a monument to Kant was unveiled in the cathedral close.

Well-known German philosophers delivered addresses there in his honor. Professor Adolf von Harnack declared there that Kant is still alive, as is no other philosopher. Processions of representatives from various universities walked through the streets, headed by the students' corps with banners. The celebrations reached their climax in the demonstrations at the Albertine University, where for a generation Kant taught logic and metaphysics. Laurel wreaths were placed around the tablet at the city's castle, in Kant's house, and at the entrance to the university. The tribute in Königsberg was international. Similar tributes have been paid in many parts of the world.

Not all of our modern philosophers accept Kant without reservation—John Dewey, for example, does not. Indeed, Heine complained that he was a destroyer of theism. J. Henry Newman rather boasted that he had never read a word of Kant. Back in 1876 Taine said to Renan that Kant had been relegated to the rear, as "an overdone philosopher." Macaulay, after reading an English translation of Kant, remarked that the only thing he had been able to understand in it was a Latin translation from Persius. Nietzsche called him "a calamity of a cobweb spinner." Our philosophers of today, paying their respects to him, are not altogether free from a similarly critical slant.

Yet in his "categorical imperative" Kant dignified in terms of reason the principle of the golden rule, and taught with conviction that man's only unqualified good is *good-will*—the only jewel that shines by its own light. Kant conceived *good-will* as good not because of what it performs or effects; not because of its usefulness, but because "it is a good in itself. . . . Its usefulness or fruitfulness can neither add to nor take away anything from this value." Thus Kant separated science, with its utilities, from moral freedom, with its faith. He saw a

life-realm beyond and above the concrete realities of science. He is not, therefore, altogether acceptable to the pragmatists, the utilitarians of our day.

However, universities everywhere have claimed a share in the attempt to honor this son of a poor saddler. His universal influence sprang from a universal spirit. His studies of the writings by David Hume, the Scottish philosopher—indeed, Kant claimed a certain Scottish ancestry—his familiarity with the great works of all time, enabled him in turn to influence not only his own, but succeeding generations. Coleridge, Hamilton, Mansel, Herbert Spencer, Thomas Hill Green, Edward Caird, Bernard Bosanquet, Hastings Rashdall, are some of the English thinkers who confessed to having been molded by Kant. His influence upon American thought appears in the writings of nearly all our prepragmatic philosophers. In the breadth and variety of his effect upon Anglo-Saxon thinkers, perhaps no other writer of our modern world can be said to rival him. His was a universal genius. Probably no other writer has contributed more to the architecture of universal mind. As a result of Kant's labors, man became again the center of his own universe, for our cosmos, through his efforts, was seen to consist of an all-pervading reason. With him our humanity was led to venerate with equal awe "the starry sky above and the moral law within." It was the universality of this Prussian seer that led him to champion the independence of the American colonies, the idealisms of the French Revolution, the natural principles at the heart of a true political order.

It was in the year 1784 that he wrote "The natural principle of the political order," in which he set forth nine propositions developing his belief in the possibility of a "universal cosmo-political institution. In this essay one senses the spirit of a true prophet, for seeing, as did

Isaiah of old, the substitution of law and order for war and destruction. His other essays, treating of political rights, of the principle of progress, of eternal peace, of public law, are evolutions of his views as set forth in this fundamental thesis. Kant is best known by his three great critiques—one on pure reason, another on practical reason, and a third on the power of judgment. But these smaller works, relating to the problems of international right thinking and right behavior, are quite as important.

It is encouraging just now that thinking people stop in the midst of their perplexing problems, two hundred years after the birth of this most substantial spirit, to dwell upon the manner of man he was and upon the gifts he made to his own, to our, and to future generations.

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS

IT WOULD appear that the French election of May 11 leaves the European situation somewhat improved.

M. Poincaré's work as Premier of France is ended. This work has been herculean. It has shown that France has a will to live and to play a leading rôle upon the stage of the world. Whether or not this work has been for the benefit of France, on the whole and in the long run, only history can say. Most of disinterested observers will probably agree, however, that the policies so ably defended by M. Poincaré were inevitable, if not salutary, under the circumstances peculiar to the time.

We suspect that Monsieur Poincaré's downfall was due more to internal political and financial conditions than to any genuine desire among the French people for any radical change in the foreign policies of France. From the returns, it seems to be true that the defeated nationalists received more votes than their opponents, but that they were defeated

because of the system of proportionate representation peculiar to the French election law. As pointed out by Edwin L. James, Paris correspondent of the *New York Times*, if we consider the national bloc without the Royalists and the left without the Communists, the situation in the Chamber of Deputies is that the left bloc, which had united its tickets, has thirty more votes in the new chamber than the national bloc, which failed to unite on common tickets. Mr. James says:

"On election day 8,695,000 voters cast ballots. Each voter had as many votes as there were deputies to be elected in his district. For consideration on the National bloc tickets 30,419,847 votes were cast, while 28,139,831 votes were cast for the Left bloc. But under the system of counting, the split National bloc tickets had 247 successful candidates, while the Left bloc won 277 deputies. . . .

"Considering, then, the two big blocs, there is one for whose candidates 30,000,000 votes were cast, holding 247 seats in the chamber, and the other, for whose candidates 28,000,000 votes were cast, holding 277 seats. This result is giving rise to widespread demands for a change in the election laws."

If these be substantially the facts, it is clear that there has been no pronounced condemnation of M. Poincaré. M. Herriot, mayor of Lyons, may become Premier, but his backers among the socialists can't count too much upon the support of public opinion. Indeed, there already appear so many militant demands from the victorious radical Socialist and Republican Socialist groups that their leaders fear the failure of their program. This condition strengthens President Millerand's determination to remain in office, and, backed by his support in the Senate, the deputies may find themselves faced with the dissolution of the chamber and a new election. This, of course, is speculation, but it is a possibility.

In the light of these facts, it is difficult

to believe that there has been any decided change in the French view of foreign relations. Indeed, Monsieur Herriot is quoted in *Le Matin* as saying that there is no reason why the recovery of the French debts cannot be associated with the restoration of Europe and the peace of the world. This language does not differ from that frequently used by M. Poincaré.

The encouraging thing in the situation is that with new men in power, free of the personal enemies who were fighting Poincaré, the possibilities for compromise between France and England, and more particularly between France and Germany, are increased. It is not reasonable to expect any considerable overflow of affection across the Rhineland, but self-interest demands more of a political and economic rapprochement between France and her immediate neighbors. Before this can be accomplished there must be no little accommodation on all sides. This accommodation is more possible because of the new political alignment following the recent elections in France.

THE GERMAN ELECTIONS

IT IS more difficult to estimate the developments due to the elections in Germany than in the case of France. The new ministry has not yet been formed. Party programs are still in the air. Some sixteen parties, each with its representatives, show how unco-ordinated the political situation of the Reichstag is. There has been a marked swing to the Nationalist forces, but it does not appear that the members of the extreme right will be able to control the situation either within Germany or in matters of foreign policies.

The general impression is that the political situation in Germany is more chaotic than before the elections. The Minister of the Interior has issued a blanket order forbidding all open-air assemblages, de-

fending his order on the ground that affairs have been taking the same course as in 1922, which ended in the assassination of Rathenau.

Of course, the important question is, Will the new German Government support the Dawes plan? The Dawes plan calls for a mortgage upon the State railroads. Under the German constitution, the State cannot alienate any of its property without a change in the constitution. This would require a two-thirds majority vote. It is a serious question whether or not this majority can be expected. It is a relief to hear that this aspect of the situation may be met by the technicality that this provision of the Dawes report need not be called an alienation of State property but simply a temporary transfer. If this interpretation be accepted, the difficulty may be surmountable. We have faith that the government will be strong enough to control the efforts of the left wing of the Nationalists and racialists who seem inclined to defy by force the election returns and to embarrass all efforts to fulfill the terms of the Dawes report. A further hope is that, because of the extremes resorted to by the extreme right and the extreme left, the moderates and liberals will be able to form a coalition government able to carry on and to honor and to keep Germany's international engagements. The more liberal situation in Paris should make this all the easier for Berlin.

Now is the time for examining and settling differences with all prospects of military force far in the background.

Of course, the situation in Germany presents difficulties seemingly insurmountable. The 68,000,000 people on an area two-thirds the area of Texas must be fed, sheltered, and clothed. Her external debt, whatever the amount agreed upon, will be large, and she will have to make more sacrifices before she can take her place acceptably with the other nations.

It will be necessary for her to export much more than she imports. Where she is to find her markets, no one is as yet able to say. And yet the principal difficulty facing the German nation, now as since 1914, is to win the confidence of her sister nations. This is a matter of German character.

MEANING OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION

APRIL saw the opening in London of the British Empire Exhibition, one of the largest and most grandiose displays of the kind ever organized.

Originally suggested by the late Lord Strathcona, the fundamental aim of the exhibition, which is to last into October, is to provide an object-lesson in the power and resources of the British Empire, with the hope of stimulating trade and development within its boundaries. But there is another reason.

First, let us get the picture. In the huge grounds at Wembley, about twenty minutes from the heart of London, are laid out immense avenues flanked by Palaces of Industry, Agriculture, Engineering, etc., designed in the classical style. Some idea of the extent of these may be gathered from the fact that hardly less imposing are the exhibits representing the great business concerns of Britain and the dominions, such as Armstrong, Ltd., Vickers, Morrall, and others. The electrical section covers 3½ acres.

The dominions and crown colonies are represented by characteristic buildings, many of which include copies of famous landmarks. There is, for instance, a West African walled city, a Burmese temple, specimens of typical Malayan and Indian architecture, and so on, each containing material to feed the most voraciously romantic imagination. Sarawak, which is an independent State within the Empire, ruled for the last 85

years by successive Rajas Brooke, has a little building all its own, containing Kayan dancing masks, Dyak gongs, blow-pipes, and hornbill feather robes, and, above all, an amazing selection of natural-history specimens, from the gorgeous Argus pheasant, which meets visitors at the door, to the orang-utans, the proboscis monkey, the enormous boa-constrictor, and the hamadryad, or king cobra, measuring over 14 feet and known to be, in all its combination of size, ferocity, and venomousness, the most dangerous of the world's snakes.

Bermuda is responsible for a reproduction of Tom Moore's house, in which the visitor may find himself in the poet's own room, looking out through the windows, not on Wembley and gray English skies, but on the blue waters and white coral rock of Bermuda itself. Each of the two big windows is filled with a large diorama, one of Hamilton Harbor and one of Tuckerstown Golf Course, cleverly painted and with built-up foregrounds which are most deceptive. Large oil paintings, representing important incidents in Bermudan history, hang upon the walls, and typical American tourists recovering from a dry spell complete the scene.

Burma provides a game which threatens to replace mah jong in the popular fancy. Chinlon is played with a ball resembling a small football, constructed of strips of bamboo, with which a skillful player does incredible things. If the ball is tossed to a Burmese expert he lets it rebound from his chest and catches it on his instep; thence he flicks it up to his right shoulder, and from there to his head. From his head he drops it to his left heel, only to toss it up to his right elbow, to pass it on to his right knee, his toe, his chin, and to every part of his anatomy where it does not seem possible for a ball to lodge. Then he keeps two balls going at once. As an indoor game,

providing both interest and exercise, chinlon appears to be unparalleled.

Next to the severely classical main building housing the New Zealand exhibit is one of the very few Maori community huts left in the world. The interior of this somewhat barnlike building is built entirely of the famous totara wood, every bit of whose surface is entirely covered with elaborate Maori carvings, mostly of the Maori gods, whose eyes are inset with paua shell. This shell is lacquered on the interior with a curious pale sea-green and, fitted into the eyes of the god or goddess concave side outward, affords the most uncanny appearance.

Besides all these curious and fascinating exhibits, brought from every corner of the globe, the great stadium at Wembley affords a daily program of athletic events. The final match for the Association Football Cup, known in British parlance as the "Cup Tie," brought over a hundred thousand visitors from London and the provinces. Track meets, a rodeo, and a grand scouts jamboree are also on the program.

A series of conference halls will form the setting for numerous international meetings throughout the summer. Enumeration of all the wonders of this unusual exhibition would be an impossible task in this space.

The real meaning of the exhibition should not, however, be overlooked. Great Britain is faced with two urgent and interlocking problems. Not only has the population of the Island Kingdom reached the saturation point, so that unemployment cannot be remedied without a definite and marked lessening of the pressure of numbers, but the Empire must be drawn together and its resources developed, if only to provide opportunities for immigration to the various dominions and colonies. The recent elections showed very clearly that the people of Great Britain were not quite ready to

grasp the full implications of the situation or to approve of any drastic changes in the policy of the mother country any more than the dominions and colonies, during the imperial conference last autumn, found themselves able, except in principle, to agree upon a plan adequate to the occasion. Under these circumstances, the educational value of the British Empire Exhibition and its possible bearing upon the future cannot be overrated. It may take time, but, as Kipling has remarked, the English rarely make mistakes when they think, and they never think when they hurry.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE has a rational conception of patriotism, which is as wholesome as it is gratifying. In his bonus veto message of May 15 the President said:

"The gratitude of the nation to these veterans cannot be expressed in dollars and cents. No way exists by which we can either equalize the burdens or give adequate financial reward to those who served the nation in both civil and military capacities in time of war.

"The respect and honor of their country will rightfully be theirs for evermore. But patriotism can neither be bought nor sold. It is not hire and salary. It is not material, but spiritual. It is one of the finest and highest of human virtues.

"To attempt to pay money for it is to offer it an unworthy indignity, which cheapens, debases, and destroys it. Those who would really honor patriotism should strive to match it with an equal courage, with an equal fidelity to the welfare of their country and an equal faith in the cause of righteousness. . . .

"We must either abandon our theory of patriotism or abandon this bill. Patriotism which is bought and paid for is not patriotism."

PROFESSOR SIEDENTOPF, of the famous Zeiss works in Jena, according to a copyrighted statement in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* of May 17, has discovered a new instrument, which

may be called the microscope of microscopes. Until now, we understand it has only been possible to enlarge diminutive objects to approximately 5,000 times their size. Now Zeiss has ground an ultra-microscope which enlarges 10,000 times, and which, by using an azimuth screen, can be used to enlarge objects 125,000 times. It is, therefore, five times stronger than any microscope heretofore discovered.

Not being scientists, this information produces an effect like adding a cipher or two on the end of a nation's war debt. And yet it reminds us again that there is not only an infinity of the macrocosm, there is also an equally interesting infinity of the microcosm. The zest of living lies, perhaps primarily, in our developing knowledge of both.

JACQUES Anatole Thibault France, French author, officer of the Legion of Honor, and member of the French Academy, is one of the best modern expressions of French civilization. Out of his eighty years he has written a letter to the organ of the liberal socialists, expressing his joy at the result of the elections on May 11. He says:

"I salute this great victory. France has manifested her desire for peace. I do not, as I have often said, believe that war is an eternal human necessity. I wish, I hope, I foresee a future of peace and concord among peoples equal in culture.

"Let us bring about this peace which is so greatly desired. Let us beware of the ancient adage. In reality, if one wishes peace it is necessary to prepare for peace.

"Such is our desire, such is our thought, such must be our work. Let us work for universal peace. Is it not a task worthy of the greatest souls, of the greatest courage? The Rome of the Cæsars attempted it when she was queen of the universe. Let Europe of today accomplish it."

IT IS reported that Premier Mussolini and Dr. Edouard Benes, Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, have agreed upon a compact for co-operation between Czechoslovakia and Italy with a view of maintaining peace and of promoting a normal and stable economic condition in Central Europe. Dr. Benes seems to be not only one of the most active, but one of the most effective, persons in Europe. He considers this treaty which he has just drawn up with Italy as the climax of his "political work of pacification, equilibrium and friendship." This view was expressed by this very active gentleman just before he left for Milan to meet Premier Theunis and Foreign Minister Hymans, of Belgium, for a conference on allied procedure in connection with the Dawes reparation plan.

WE NOW learn that Dr. Benes has been conferring with Dr. Nintchitch, the Serbian Foreign Minister, with the result that there is a possibility that Bulgaria will be admitted to the Little Entente. Evidently, Dr. Benes visualizes a Balkan peace, and that with more of a soft-pedaling of coercion and military force. If Bulgaria enters the Little Entente, it must be with the advice and consent of Serbia, which is already a member. If Serbia agrees, it is reasonable to conclude that the troubles between these two countries have been adjusted. It would not be just to give the credit for this last negotiation wholly to Dr. Benes. The Serbian Minister has also achieved notable results toward the maintenance of peace between Bulgaria and Serbia on more than one occasion. But there is no doubt of Dr. Benes' influence, not only at Prague, but in Belgrade, Bucharest, Sofia, not to mention the capitals of the larger nations. Of course, back of this virile man is that other scholar in politics, the President of Czechoslovakia, Thomas Gar-

rigue Masaryk, who has many friends in the United States.

READERS of the article on Esperanto, appearing in our last issue, will be interested to know that the French Academy has recently adopted a number of English words, particularly from English sporting phraseology. Among the words adopted are: bookmaker (notwithstanding that bookmaking is illegal in France), boy scout, bridge (a card game), camping, challenge, club (in the sense of a golf club), cup, champion (both in the sporting sense), court (such as tennis court), and cricket. It is reported that for various reasons other terms, like "crack" and "canter," were rejected.

IN order to ascertain the importance of the new constructions of every kind put up by the Ruhr industrialists since the armistice, the M. I. C. U. M. (Interallied Mission of Control on Plants and Mines) has made an investigation, the results of which are highly impressive and significant.

Figures given below summarize briefly the most interesting information collected, and at the same time they give an idea of the enormous amount of capital which was invested in that way by the German industrialists, so as to be safely protected against exchange fluctuations and kept out of reach of the Commission of Reparations, such investments being made without any real pressing economic necessity.

Thirty-five new plants have been built in the Ruhr (counting the most important only);

Eleven electric power-houses;

Ten new mines have been completely equipped;

Twenty-five new pits are being established and a great many have been dug deeper and supplied with more modern equipment;

Eight new plants for by-products distillation;

Twenty-two new batteries of modern coke-ovens, with a total of 1,660 coke-ovens, have replaced the old ones;

Nineteen blast-furnaces have been rebuilt to replace old ones;

Seventeen workers' settlements have been built, one of them with no less than 3,000 dwelling-houses.

Exceptionally powerful air-compressors, with a capacity of 485,000 cubic meters (about 17,000,000 cubic feet) an hour, are now in operation. This shows the development of machinery as well as the importance in the use of compressed air in the Ruhr coal-mines equipment.

Ventilation in the mines has been improved by new fans, with a capacity of 61,000 cubic meters (about 2,000,000 cubic feet) a minute.

The new turbines installed represent a total power of 100,000 kilowatts.

In 25 plants the equipment has been completely renovated.

On the waterways we find five new harbors for the handling of coal and for the private use of plants.

The Rhein-Herne Canal was opened to traffic in 1920 and a double lock is being built at Ruhrort.

A canal to regulate the flow of the Ruhr is being dug between Ruhrort and Mulheim.

On the Wesel-Datteln Canal work is carried on rapidly.

The port of Dusseldorf has been enlarged.

Concerning railroad work, it is pointed out that a bridge was built over the Rhine below Ruhrort, and that a large railroad depot is being established in the vicinity of that bridge. The Dusseldorf railway station and the Freintrap depot are being enlarged.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD COURT

ONE VIEW

A DEMAND for action on the World Court by the Senate before the adjournment of the present Congress was made in a letter addressed to Senator Lodge and his Republican associates of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by a group of prominent men, under date of May 17, 1924. By his own plan for adherence to the court, Senator Lodge seems to have intensified the discussion relative to the entrance of the United States.

The letter sent to Senator Lodge and his Republican associates on the Senate committee reads:

NEW YORK, *May 17, 1924.*

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,

Chairman, and Other Republican

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There are three unfair ways and possibly one fair way by which your

committee may defeat the proposal made to it by President Harding, renewed in the message of President Coolidge, and repeated in his recital of administration policies in his recent address before the Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Its defeat may be accomplished by refusal or neglect to bring it before the Senate, or it may be defeated by reporting it out with reservations, which can have no other result than to kill it by making impossible the Democratic Senate support necessary to the two-thirds majority required to ratify, or which, if the measure so reported could receive the required votes, would insure its rejection by the other nations adhering to the court. Thus you might attempt to lay the blame for its defeat upon the Democratic Senators or upon the nations rejecting the impossible proposal.

A simpler and easier way to defeat it would be to hold it back upon one excuse after another, until so near the close of the Senate session that its passage could not be effected. The last method would be the most unfair and reprehensible of all.

Permit us to say that all these methods to

prepare explanation and excuse for what the intelligent and observing part of the public believe to be the long-since determined purpose of a majority of your committee to defeat this administration's proposal have been carefully considered by the advocates and friends of our adhesion to the International Court. It seems apparent that few intelligent and thoughtful persons will be deceived by the adoption of any of these methods. But you will be held responsible for intentional defeat of the measure if it is accomplished in any such manner.

We retain our confidence in the President and rely upon him to insist that the proposal, as made by his predecessor to the Senate and resubmitted by him, have a fair hearing and vote in the Senate in time to make it effective, if that be the will of two-thirds of the Senate members.

We prefer to believe that, heeding the unmistakable voice of a great majority of the American people and the mandate of the party to the carrying out of whose wishes you have been entrusted, you will give that opportunity. That is the one fair way to defeat it if you are able. To withhold it would be a manifest betrayal of the people and of the administration, whose head is the undoubted choice of your party as its candidate for the next presidential term.

Points to Unanimity of Opinion

There can be no doubt as to the sentiment and will of the American people. That it is adhesion to the court has been made plain by a wonderful unanimity of expression and appeal by great representative bodies with which you are not unfamiliar.

An attempt has been made to limit the importance of these appeals by the flippant remark that they come from "hold-over peace societies." But it can hardly be said with a straight face that the following are hold-over peace societies: The Federal Council of Churches (representing 125,000 churches, with a membership of more than 20,000,000), the great Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Catholic, Jewish, and other denominational religious bodies that have united in the same appeal, the American Federation of Labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Bar Association, the National League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, United Society of Christian En-

deavor, General Federation of Women's Clubs, American Federation of Teachers, National Board of Young Women's Christian Association, Legislative Department of the National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers' Association, National Association of Credit Men, and many more that could be mentioned.

These are representative of the best of American citizenry and alike of the Republican and Democratic parties. All and each of them have made recent enthusiastic expressions in favor of affiliation in the International Court of Justice upon the terms proposed in the message to the Senate by President Harding.

The demand of the people is for action now. To drag it along until too near the time for the Senate to adjourn to permit bringing it to a vote will not meet their demand. They want it decided by this Senate and will know whom to hold responsible if it fails. There can be no valid reason for longer delay. Shall we not have it?

There is no more chance for the World Court plan of Senator Lodge to succeed than there was for Mr. Harding's Association of Nations, and for the same reason. The forty-seven nations in the court now established will not forsake it to join a new and unnecessary one, which this plan would erect, and the Senate would not ratify it. Senator Lodge has the intelligence to know this. The only possible achievements before it are confusion, delay and defeat of our joining in any world court whatever. That would satisfy Mr. Lodge, but would infuriate the American people and disrupt the Republican party. Is that what he is after?—Charles H. Levermore, of New York; John W. Davis, former Ambassador to Great Britain; Frank Crane, of New York; Samuel Colcord, of New York; General John F. O'Ryan, of New York; George R. Van de Water, of New York; R. J. Caldwell, of New York; Henry A. Stimson, of New York; Clarence H. Kelsey, of New York; Robert Watson, of Massachusetts; Joseph Walker, of Massachusetts; Ernest D. Burton, president of the University of Chicago; C. H. Ramakamp, president of Illinois College; Arnold Bennett Hall, of the University of Wisconsin; William Allen White, of Kansas; Lyman J. Gage, of California, Secretary of the Treasury under McKinley.

Text of the Statement

Following is the statement in behalf of the organization which appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in support of the Hughes-Harding-Coolidge plan of American participation in the League's World Court:

The introduction by Senator Lodge, May 8, of a resolution to create a new World Court throws into bold relief the fact that American public opinion overwhelmingly demands the prompt adherence by our government to the protocol of signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice on the conditions formulated by Secretary Hughes, vigorously championed by President Harding, and approved by President Coolidge. The hearings on April 30 and May 1 before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations indisputably prove our people's support of the existing court.

More than fifty State and national organizations were interested in the hearings. Seldom, if ever, has any great public question received so nearly a unanimous endorsement as has this suggested adherence of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice on the basis suggested by the Secretary of State and urged by President Harding in February, 1923, and by President Coolidge in his first message to Congress. The widespread and profound character of this popular demand was officially voiced on behalf of all of the organizations whose representatives appeared before the subcommittee and categorically appealed for immediate action by the Senate to enable the administration to adhere to the Permanent Court.

The precise relation between the Permanent Court and the League of Nations was clearly explained.

The only argument against the United States's adherence to the court which has impressed any considerable number of people, that the court may in some way be made a tool of the League of Nations, was completely refuted.

Replies to Objections to Court

The opponents of the court have urged:

First, that it is the creature of the League; second, that the judges are chosen by the League; third, that the court's expenses are paid by the League; fourth, that the court serves as private attorney of the League, because, in the discretion of the court, it may give advisory opinions.

All of these points were decisively answered in the course of the hearings:

"1. The court is in no sense the creature of the League. The statute of the court was originally drawn by a committee of jurists, of which Elihu Root was a member, and was given its final form as a result of mature deliberations in the Council and Assembly of the League. But the statute was not pro-

mulgated by the Assembly and does not draw its force from any act of the Assembly. It rests upon an independent, distinct, and separate treaty, called the protocol of signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The protocol has been signed by forty-seven powers. The United States can adhere to it without in any way becoming tied up with the League of Nations and without assuming any League obligations.

"2. The judges are elected by the Council and Assembly, voting separately. This is the only arrangement ever worked out to overcome the hitherto-insoluble problem of giving due weight to the voice of the great powers while at the same time recognizing the equal sovereign rights of the smaller powers. The special interests of the great powers were recognized in the composition of the Council of the League: members of the League, great and small, have equal voice in the Assembly. The United States could co-operate with these two bodies for the one purpose of electing judges, without in any way being drawn into further co-operation. As the election may not be held oftener than once in nine years, except when a vacancy is to be filled, it is not an onerous obligation for the United States to assume.

Says Budget is Separate

"3. The budget of the court forms a separate part of the budget of the League. When a dollar is paid to the League of Nations, 12 cents of it is put aside for the expenses of the court, and can be used for no other purpose. But the United States could pay its contribution directly to the registrar of the court at The Hague. It need not pass through Geneva. This connection between the court and the League is merely administrative, and does not in any way subordinate the judges to the influence of the League. One might as well argue that the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States are not independent of Congress, because the funds for their salaries must be voted by Congress.

"4. It is true that, in addition to cases directly submitted by the nations for adjudication, the court may give advisory opinions to the Council and Assembly of the League. But this jurisdiction is not new to American lawyers, and a similar jurisdiction is possessed by our State supreme courts in about ten States. The Massachusetts Supreme Court has had such jurisdiction since 1780, and has given about 140 opinions to the governor and legislature of the Commonwealth.

"The International Court has shown, by its refusal to render an advisory opinion in the case of Finland against Russia, that this function would be exercised in an independent judicial way, while in several cases where the court has exercised it, as in the Tunis-Morocco dispute between Great Britain and France, such action has led directly to a settlement. It is clearly absurd, therefore, to speak of the court as the private attorney of the League of Nations.

"We submit that the Permanent Court of International Justice represents the logical development of an essentially American movement under way for a generation. It is built on the foundation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration established in 1899 and on the work of the two Hague conferences. It is precisely this for which the United States was contending when the second Hague conference met in 1907. The court is now firmly established. It has begun its work. It has functioned for more than two years. Forty-seven peoples of the world are giving it their cordial support. Whether the United States acts or not, the court will go on.

"Nevertheless, the United States, the most powerful country in the world, one which has most eloquently argued for the settlement of international disputes by judicial means, and whose citizens have contributed in a unique way to the creation of this court, should not, in its own interest, stand aloof.

"It is apparent from the almost universal support given President Harding's proposal to join the Permanent Court that favorable action by the Senate would meet with widespread approval throughout the country. Why, then, should there be further delay?

"We submit that the organized churches, organized labor, organized women voters, organized members of the bar, organized university women, organized merchants, organized business and professional women, organized women's clubs, and organized teachers represent a vast majority of the voters of the United States and are expecting approval of the Harding-Hughes-Coolidge-Root Permanent Court plan before the recess adjournment.

"In conclusion, we beg to quote from the address made by Secretary of State Hughes before the American Society of International Law at Washington, December 27, 1923:

"It is not too much to say that there will be no world court if this court cannot be made one, and whether or not it is to be, in the fullest sense, a world court depends upon our own action."

THE OPPOSITE VIEW

PERHAPS the most convincing expression of the opposite view of these contentions has been set forth by Dr. David Jayne Hill, our former Ambassador to Germany, in two articles which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post*, one October 27, 1923, and the other, November 3, 1923. The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* takes the liberty to extract from these two articles the following:

The League's Court

Though the United States by a long series of arbitration treaties, by the conventions of The Hague, and by its efforts to establish an

international court of justice, which it was the first nation in the world officially to propose, is fully committed to the principle of the judicial settlement of disputes, its relation to the so-called Permanent Court of International Justice established by the League of Nations cannot be properly considered without taking into account the connection of that court with the League.

It is established beyond controversy:

(1) That the court derives its authority primarily from the covenant of the League and from legislation by the Council and Assembly of the League, by which its judges are chosen, paid, and constituted a court;

(2) That the statute of the court does not embody the most important recommendations of the committee of jurists consulted by the League;

(3) That all the nations thus far participating in the court do so, without exception, explicitly in the terms of the protocol, as members of the League;

(4) That the covenant of the League, embodying a wholly new system of international relations, is the fundamental law for this court when the Council or Assembly seeks its opinion; and

(5) That the United States can have no part in the election of judges, unless its representatives sit for that purpose with the Council and the Assembly—that is, with the League.

It is therefore at least problematical if the Government of the United States can consistently participate in the so-called Permanent Court of International Justice, so long as it retains its present exclusive relations to the League and its covenant.

The Relation of the Court to Peace

So far as any plan to co-operate with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world is concerned, it is clear that the League's court has but slight relation to the peace of the world. The reasons for this are:

(1) That the statute of the court does not bind the governments to submit any case unless they choose to do so;

(2) That not even all the justiciable cases—that is, cases that can be settled by law—can be brought before the court by the State whose rights are violated;

(3) That there is, therefore, no sure redress through the court against the illegal

conduct of a State that prefers to decide a dispute for itself by its superior force;

(4) That the condition of international law is at present so incomplete that it does not afford the necessary clear rules of action by which many important differences can be judicially adjudicated;

(5) That the League of Nations has rejected the American proposal, sustained by its own Committee of Jurists, for the revision and improvement of international law;

(6) That, if strictly legal cases cannot be brought to trial by a nation that is wronged, there is little prospect that cases where great national interests are involved, which might lead to war, will be submitted to the court.

It may therefore be concluded that the pretension that the League's court is in any way more of a law court than the Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration, in which the United States is a member, or that it offers any greater security of peace, is entirely illusory. To this must be added that the covenant of the League, which is a fundamental law for the League's court, in Article XX is accepted as "abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof," thus substituting this compact for the rules of international law not in harmony with it and making the covenant the determining standard.

The Hague Conferences

The two conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 were designed to remedy the uncertainty of international rules of action by the gradual embodiment of definite principles of the law of nations in formal treaties, which, after their ratification, would bind the ratifying governments to observe their provisions. Thus there was begun the formation of a *corpus juris* which in time might result in a system of voluntarily accepted rules of action, in the light of which a government could know in advance what would be judged internationally legal and a court could find a solid basis for declaring the law.

Unhappily, the temper of the war period caused the equitable development of law and judicial adjudication to be disregarded, and the enforcement of peace by the combination of armed power was conceived of as a substitute for law and court decisions. There is in the covenant of the League of Nations no provision for the improvement of international law and not even any clear mention

of it as a binding rule. The recommendation of the Committee of Jurists that conferences be held for the clarification and extension of international law, to which reference has been made as originally an American proposal, was rejected by the Council and Assembly of the League in legislating upon the statute of the court. It is impossible to escape the inference that, in place of the method of improving international law by the conference of jurists, it is intended that the court shall be guided by the quasi-legislation of the Council and the Assembly, which are merely political bodies. When it is asserted that such quasi-legislation does not become effective unless the members of the League accept it, it requires to be recalled that, after all, the Council and the Assembly, as closed and exclusive bodies, are not competent to make international law, which is the business of the whole society of sovereign States.

A Supergovernment

At this point a fundamental principle of vast consequence comes into view: A court which judges without defined and accepted law, merely in accordance with its own sense of fitness or the decrees of a political body, is in its very nature a supergovernment, for it does not merely declare the law, which is the proper business of a court, but makes the law by its own unregulated action.

On the other hand, a court which bases its decisions upon definite rules of action, voluntarily agreed upon or accepted by the litigants, has none of the qualities of a supergovernment. In adhering to such a court there is no surrender or transfer of a nation's sovereignty, which by its own acceptance of a rule of action has simply expressed the sovereign will to observe the law thus agreed upon.

The problem of enforcement is closely bound up with this distinction. To enforce upon a people a law that it has not accepted, but which is merely the decree of an arbitrary body—especially a court composed almost exclusively of foreigners, representing various forms of jurisprudence—would inevitably require a strong executive and even armed force; but a judicial declaration of a clear law that has been voluntarily accepted and ratified by its own lawmaking body possesses a different character. The enforcement of such a law is an obligation undertaken by all parties in the voluntary establishment of

the law itself. Each nation in this case, whether plaintiff or defendant, is judged by its own law and not by an arbitrary or unknown rule.

The Problem of Execution

In the last analysis, it is the problem of execution which constitutes the chief difficulty in any compact for the preservation of peace, whatever its nature may be. Will the signatories of a treaty keep faith? That is the capital question.

If they will, it is better to eliminate the forcible execution of a treaty and trust to the national honor; for, if the national honor can be relied upon, force is superfluous and may as well be dispensed with.

If, on the other hand, national honor cannot be relied upon and military force must be depended upon to enforce international obligations, treaties are mere scraps of paper, and covenants also, unless there exists somewhere some military force that can, in case of default, be made effective.

It is important in this connection to keep ourselves reminded that a nation that will not obey a law or keep a contract it has freely accepted will not take the trouble to make war in another's interest, where its own interest is not directly involved. A compact to enforce peace has, therefore, no more value from the point of view of honor than a compact to keep the peace. It has the additional handicap, when it comes to the question of action, that going to war where no national interest is directly affected is an expensive and unpopular undertaking and is likely to be postponed as much as possible for shifty reasons.

We are, then, forced back to this, that nations that are not ready voluntarily to accept and obey just laws cannot be depended upon for any guaranties of peace. Basing their action solely upon national interest, as they conceive it, and not upon uniform principles of justice, national interest will eventually control and all pledges will be evaded. Each nation, or at most each group of nations, will enforce its own peace, but will not sacrifice its own aims for world peace.

From this we are entitled to conclude that the only hope for the peace of the world lies in the growth of the juristic sense and the disposition to be governed by law. This marks out the only end for which an intelligent internationalism can work—the aboli-

tion of war through the establishment of law and obedience to it.

While awaiting this consummation, a wise nation will look well to its own defense, leaving the unwise nations to learn, through the bitter experience from which wisdom proceeds, that justice is the supreme interest of mankind.

Treaties of Arbitration

It is singular that those who insist upon adherence by the United States to the so-called permanent Court of International Justice not only overlook the fact that the Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration established by The Hague conventions, as a result of an initiative by the American Government, is a law court to the extent that the development of international law permits any international court to be, but the equally important fact that the United States is bound by a greater number of treaties of arbitration than any other great power, and through them is pledged to submit to international settlement a wider and more inclusive class of cases than the statute of the League's court requires. So far as co-operation with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world has relation to the pacific settlement of international disputes, it may be said with confidence that the United States is surpassed by no one of the great powers in its present commitment to make use of the existing machinery of peace. The covenant of the League of Nations is not more inclusive of differences to be arbitrated than the treaties of the United States with other nations, and it does not bind the members to resort to the League's court. The terms of the covenant are: "For the consideration of any such dispute the court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them." (Article 13, paragraph 3.) . . .

Our Best Co-operation

As for our co-operation with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world, we can offer it most effectively not by promises but by procedure. We should apply in our foreign relations the principles that have made us great as a nation. These are: (1) The recognition of inherent rights in States as well as in individuals; (2) the establishment of respect for these rights in the form of voluntarily accepted law; (3)

the equality of all before the law; (4) a court, accessible to all, on equal terms, where rights may be defended against an aggressor; (5) reliance upon the growth of public opinion for the enforcement of court decisions.

From this statement it would appear that the principal avenue of approach for co-operation with other nations would be along the line of development of world law. This was in a fair condition of progress when, in 1914, it was interrupted, as we have seen, by an effort to solve the problem of world peace through a political combination, supported by a wholly imaginary armed power. We have learned that no nation has felt prepared actually to use its armed forces—the employment of which was contemplated and pledged in the covenant of the League of Nations—except for the defense of its own interests or the interests of those with whom it was united by a particular alliance; and we have seen the conception on which the League of Nations was founded transformed by the proposal that only those nations which are by their situation in space peculiarly subject to the danger of invasion should be expected to give mutual guaranties. This proposal, which is still under discussion, is a complete surrender of the idea that the United States, for example, is responsible for the peace of Europe. It is the distinct assertion of a doctrine of limited responsibility and reciprocal guaranties.

As the United States is not in a position of danger from immediate neighbors and is itself no menace to any of them, its responsibility for world peace would seem to be limited to (1) just conduct in foreign relations; (2) insistence that foreign intervention be excluded from this hemisphere; (3) continuation of the leadership which its past has thrust upon it in further developing world law; and (4) the free expression of American opinion regarding questions of international ethics. If public opinion is to exert any influence, it must be expressed without fear. But only a strong nation will have the courage to express with freedom its moral convictions.

World Law

This last duty may well take the form of an effort to induce the League of Nations to permit the League's court to be transformed into a world court and to obtain the continuation of The Hague conferences with

special reference to the perfecting of international law as a system to be applied by the world court as it is developed. Compulsory jurisdiction might perhaps well be suspended until the rules of law are more clearly defined, but with the understanding that all strictly justiciable questions are to be adjudicated. The world would thus have as much peace as it is prepared for and as the great powers would permit.

"As much peace as the world is prepared for and as the great powers would permit"—for there are many possibilities of war in the treaties of peace and in the policies of the great powers as well as in the animosities of the small ones.

Participation in Council

There is much room, therefore, for future conciliation. How far the United States should participate in any council dealing with European peace is a serious problem. Undoubtedly this Government should be represented wherever its interests are under discussion, and it would be an act of folly to oppose this through any prejudice against any consultative body, whatever it might be. It would be humiliating to think that the United States could not be represented by a spokesman wherever the interests of this country are to be decided, so long as those interests are real. The discussion of purely European matters, however, involves great dangers. To give advice is to assume responsibility, and to assume responsibility is to create an obligation. After the Conference of Paris, there should be no need of further enlightenment on this subject.

American interests are everywhere where trade and commerce penetrate. Where there are responsible governments, these interests can be protected through ordinary diplomatic intercourse, except in cases where international combinations are forming and agreements are being drawn. There not the unofficial, but the official, observer should be on hand, but with a carefully limited latitude of action. When it comes to the weaker nations—the nations that are not dealt with, but dealt about—there also the United States should always be on the spot in the person of a discreet but responsible representative.

Such are some of the considerations that must be taken into account when it is proposed to form a plan for the co-operation of the United States with other nations to

achieve and preserve the peace of the world. No purely subjective scheme will have any value. If a plan is to become practicable, it must be of a nature to receive general support, not only by the people and Government of the United States, but in other countries also. What should be aimed at is a union of wills for peace. Nor should it be overlooked that no nation is disposed to act against its own interest and that national interests are not only different but often conflicting. Not only so, nations are composite personalities, very unequal in their characteristics and aspirations, as well as in their ideals and their power to realize them. There is only one respect in which sovereign States are equal—that is in the realm of right and law. There magnitude and power are extraneous. The central problem is, therefore, to extend that realm and to define it. That is the work of conferences; for law in its modern sense is not a rule of action imposed by a superior upon an inferior, but a system of freely accepted rules to which justice requires a pledge of obedience.

One other consideration should not pass without notice. Co-operation is essentially multilateral and reciprocal. It can occur, therefore, only where there is a general willingness to co-operate and when the conditions are favorable for co-operation. No plan, even if inherently practicable and officially adopted, can become effective until the nations are ready to act upon it. Co-operation, therefore, is not merely a form of procedure by the United States alone; it is of necessity action in association with other nations that are prepared and disposed to act in an honorable and effectual manner for the good of all.

FRANCE AND GERMANY AT THE POLLS

1. The German Elections

THE results of the German elections, which were held in the week of May 1, were not sufficiently decisive to give much real indication of a united feeling on the part of the people. The parties were returned as follows:

Social Democrats, 100; German Nationalists, 96; Catholic Center, 65; Communists, 62; German People's Party, 44; Freedom Party, 32; Democrats, 28; Ba-

varian People's Party, 16; Economic Party, 6; German Socialists, 4; Thuringian Land Union, 3; Hanoverians, 5; Bavarian peasants, 10; Land Union of Wurttemberg, Baden, and Hesse, 6.

The loss of support by the Social Democrats and the gains made by the three extremist groups, namely, the German Nationalist, the Communist, and the Freedom Party, present the most significant feature of the situation. Of these three groups the Freedom Party received most of its support in Thuringia and Franconia, where a wave of extreme reaction has been noticeable. The German Nationalists were returned principally from the north, and, to a much lesser degree, received a certain support in other parts of Germany, except Thuringia and Franconia. Perhaps the most ominous indication was presented by the Communist Party, which made gains in every part of the country, in some places increasing their gains tenfold. The losses of the German People's Party, which had formerly been under the influence of the late Herr Stinnes, were extremely heavy everywhere.

Among the well-known personages elected may be noted Count Westarp, Herr Hergt, Herr Streseman, Dr. Leicht, Herr Hermann Mueller, Frau Clara Zetkin (the famous Communist leader), Herr Remele, Herr Koenen, Admiral von Tirpitz, and General Ludendorff.

On the whole, European opinion, as reflected outside of Germany, appears to view the results with a certain pessimism. The *London Times* points out that the election was fought on the question of the Dawes report, and that by no possible stretch of the imagination could the German people be said to have shown any definite desire to endorse a policy based on its execution. Under the requirements of the report, several changes in the constitution, each involving a two-thirds majority of the Reichstag, are necessitated, and an early defeat of any government on these issues is foreseen. Such a defeat would entail a new election.

2. The French Returns

Heavy, though not unexpected, gains were made by the left during the French elections in the first part of May. The

final disposition of the parties, with the exception of a few delayed counts, was as follows: Bloc National, 208; Radicals, 186; Socialists, 111; Communists, 24; Republican Socialists, 20; Conservatives, 19.

On the basis of these figures the French Chamber will be divided as follows: Opposition, 341; Poincaré parties, 227; Opposition majority, 114.

The Radical Party, led by Edouard Herriot and the former Prime Minister, Joseph Caillaux, which was defeated in 1920 by the Bloc National, again becomes the strongest group in the chamber, while the Socialists, with 111 deputies, have broken their 1914 record of 101 members. A noteworthy indication of the state of feeling among the French electorate was furnished by the outstanding figures defeated or returned. Prominent among the former were General de Castelnau, Andre Lefevre (former Minister of War and prophet of German *revanche*), Prince Joachim Murat, Gaston Vidal (former under secretary for physical education), Leon Daudet (leader of the Camelots du Roi), Sadi Lecointe, M. D'Aubigny, and Charles de Lasteyrie (Ministry of Finance, etc.) Those returned included Marcel Cachin (the Communist leader), Andre Marty (Communist, imprisoned for surrendering his ship to the Bolshevists in the Black Sea), M. Malvy (former Minister of the Interior, who was banished during the war for five years), Jean Longuet (grandson of Karl Marx), MM. Painleve and Leygues, MM. Reibel and Colrat, M. Franklin Bouillon, M. Louis Klotz (former Finance Minister), M. Andre Fallieres, M. Louis Dubois, and M. Raoul Peret. Of the Poincaré Cabinet, the Ruhr Ministers, MM. Andre Maginot and Jules le Trocquer, were returned, together with M. Lefebvre du Prey, Minister of Justice, and M. Louis Marin, Minister for the Liberated Regions. It is notable that M. Aristide Briand carried his whole list with him into the chamber.

3. General Conclusions

On the whole, therefore, it may be deduced that, while the German results display a marked tendency toward extremism on the part of the people, the French, on the contrary, indicate a distinct

desire for moderation and peace. While the Ruhr policy initiated by M. Poincaré cannot, regardless of who may head the next government, undergo any marked alteration at the moment, there seems to be little doubt that the Dawes report will have a definite chance of acceptance by the French, and that the possibility of close and amicable relations with the British Government in matters of international policy are much enhanced. Whether, with the disappearance of a hated figure-head from the French scene, the German people will incline toward a sweet reasonableness remains to be seen.

THE BRITISH BUDGET

IMMEDIATELY upon the assembly of Parliament, at the end of April, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Philip Snowden, presented his first budget. The chancellor's speech took up an hour and three quarters and was generally considered to have been one of the ablest of its kind delivered in the House of Commons.

The proposals formulated into three groups—an attempt to realize the Radical conception of a free breakfast table, the declaration of war upon imperial preference, and an appeal to the business community via the abolition of the corporation profits tax. Briefly stated, the principal changes advocated were:

Corporation profits tax: To be repealed as regards profits arising after June 30, 1924.

Inhabited house duty: To be repealed from the beginning of the year of assessment, 1924-25.

Customs and excise, duties reduced: Tea from 8*d.* to 4*d.* per pound; cocoa and coffee, from 28*s.* to 14*s.* per cwt.; chicory, 26*s.* 6*d.* to 13*s.* 3*d.* per cwt.; sugar (over 98° polarization), 25*s.* 8*d.* to 11*s.* 8*d.* per cwt.; dried fruits, 10*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.* per cwt.

Entertainments duty repealed on tickets up to the value of 6*d.* and reduced on tickets from 7*d.* to 1*s.* 3*d.*

Import duty on films, clocks and watches, motor cars, motor cycles and accessories, musical instruments and accessories, to be repealed on August 1.

Table water duties to be repealed.

Motor vehicle duties: Reduced rates for

yearly licenses taken out after February 1 and for quarterly licenses.

Telephone rates: From July 1 next, local calls reduced from $1\frac{1}{4}d.$ to $1d.$ (5 miles), and from $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ to $2d.$ (5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles). Discount of 5 per cent on calls in excess of 2,000 per annum abolished. Further reductions in long-distance calls and removal charges.

The final balance-sheet for 1924-25, after the alterations proposed by the chancellor, is as follows:

Estimated Revenue

	In pounds sterling.
Customs	101,800,000
Excise	135,900,000
Total customs and excise.....	237,700,000
Motor vehicle duties.....	15,600,000
Estate, etc., duties.....	56,000,000
Stamps	21,000,000
Land tax, house duty, and mineral rights duty.....	1,250,000
Income tax.....	265,000,000
Supertax	61,000,000
Excess-profits duty.....	8,000,000
Corporation profits tax.....	20,000,000
Total inland revenue.....	432,250,000
Total receipts from taxes...	685,550,000
Post-office	53,500,000
Crown lands.....	900,000
Interest on sundry loans.....	12,250,000
Miscellaneous:	
Ordinary receipts.....	11,850,000
Special receipts.....	30,000,000
Total receipts from non-tax revenue	108,500,000
Total revenue.....	794,050,000

Estimated Expenditure

Consolidated Fund Services:	
National debt services.....	350,000,000
Payments for Northern Ireland residuary share, etc.....	3,500,000
Road fund.....	15,000,000
Payments of local taxation accounts, etc.....	13,150,000
Land settlement.....	750,000
Other consolidated fund services	2,440,000
Total consolidated fund services	384,840,000

Supply Services:

Army	45,000,000
Navy	55,800,000
Air force.....	14,511,000
Civil services.....	227,573,000
Customs and excise and inland revenue departments.....	11,221,000
Post-office services.....	51,081,000
Total supply services.....	405,186,000
Total expenditure.....	790,026,000
Expenditure chargeable against capital	8,577,000

Referring to the question of debt, Mr. Snowden estimated, in the course of his speech, the reduction of internal debt since December, 1919, at four hundred million sterling, the total reduction within the last six years being over six hundred and fifty million sterling, or more than the British pre-war debt.

The most controversial proposal was undoubtedly that covering the abolition of the McKenna duties. The attack upon imperial preference was also considered by certain circles of British opinion to be a serious blow to British progress.

THE LATEST CENSUS IN INDIA

THE total population of India in 1921, according to the decennial census taken in that year, compilation of which has just been completed, was 318,943,000, of which 247,003,000 belonged to British India and 71,940,000 to the Indian native States. In British India there were 126,872,000 males and 120,131,000 females. Due mainly to the stimulus of the war in developing India's industries, the urban population increased from 29,748,000 in 1911 to 32,475,000 in 1921, or 10.2 per cent. With the exception of the large seaports, however, and a few industrial centers, the Indian cities are generally small compared with Western cities, the average population approximating 14,000 for all India, while the population of the villages averages 417.

The outstanding feature of the 1921 census was the small increase of 1.2 per cent shown in the actual population as compared with more than 7 per cent for 1911. The main cause for the difference was the influenza epidemic of 1918-19, in

which more than 12,000,000 of the Indians perished.

In 1921 the number of literates in India had advanced by 22 per cent, to 22,600,000—a noteworthy fact when compared with the increase of only 1.2 per cent in the population for the 10-year period. Excluding children under 5 years, 8.2 per cent of the population are able to write and read the reply to a simple letter. No social difficulties have ever prevented the Indian men from securing an education, but, with the exception of Burma, Indian women have been hampered in this respect. Foreign standards and ideals have been influencing the men of the communities, however, to the extent that, from 10 years upwards, 23 females per 1,000 were reported in 1921 as being able to read and write, or 10 per cent more than 10 years earlier.

Another important social change resulting from foreign contacts is the reduction in the number of child marriages. The 1881 census showed that 4.8 per cent of the females in India between the ages of 10 and 15 were unmarried, compared with 6 per cent in 1921, while the ratio of the unmarried between 5 and 10 years had advanced from 8.7 per cent in 1911 to slightly over 9 per cent in 1921.

Minor languages and dialects, of which there are nearly 100 in the country, are being displaced by the stronger and more developed tongues. Moreover, as the necessity for some common medium of intercourse becomes more evident in Indian circles, tribal languages are giving way to a form of bilingualism in north and central India especially, where there is a common element in the main languages.

ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

By DAVID JAYNE HILL

DR. HILL, President of the National Association for Constitutional Government, speaking in Washington at the recent annual meeting of that organization, expressed himself as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION,
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It seems appropriate that at this our annual meeting we should at least briefly take into consideration the state of the Union. In order to give others an opportunity to express their views, I shall confine my own remarks to narrow limits.

Whatever our personal opinions or party attachments may be, I think we shall all be in accord in the statement that the situation of our country in regard to the execution of law, the security of our constitutional guarantees, and public confidence in the integrity and trustworthiness of government is one of extreme gravity. Never, in a time of profound peace, has there been such cause for disquietude.

In order to measure the character and the extent of this disquietude, it is desirable to recall some of the principles intended to be embodied in our political institutions and to inquire how far these

principles are still respected and how far they have been obscured or apparently rejected.

It is, I believe, beyond dispute that the founders of our government intended it to be one of specifically delegated powers, and that there are, therefore, certain limits to its legitimate activity. It is with surprise and distrust, therefore, that we perceive in the assumptions of the Federal Government a claim to the prerogative of complete sovereignty—displayed, for example, in the practice of taking and expending the money of the people for any purpose that may seem good in the eyes of Congress, with little or no regard for the limitations under which this power has been delegated.

It is equally clear that there was designed to be a division of powers, not only between the branches of the Federal Government, but between that Government and the States, to which and to the people all powers not delegated to the Federal Government were reserved. It is symptomatic of a revolutionary process when this definition of the spheres of action is obliterated by encroachments between the branches of government and by a disposition to expand and extend the powers of

the Federal Government over matters reserved to the States, and even to penetrate to the inmost personal affairs of the individual citizens.

When account is taken of the vast extent of territory and wide diversity of social and economic conditions in the United States, it should be evident to every thoughtful mind that laws made in Washington affecting the diversified life of the people in these various and unequal circumstances will not produce equal benefits or receive equal respect in all parts of the Union, and that there is grave danger of a mental revolt against the authority of all law when efforts are made to enforce enactments that do not receive the support of the citizens. To this must be added the obvious injustice of taxing heavily the citizens of one part of the country that has never received federal aid for the benefit of other and remote parts made the beneficiaries of special public appropriations.

The possible consequences of such policies as are here described are aggravated by the method by which such appropriations are secured. Among the evils that have arisen in our political development is the tendency to substitute direct for representative government—a procedure which must eventually have the effect, if, indeed, it is not intended to do so, of destroying responsible representative government altogether.

The distinction between representative and direct government should be kept clearly in mind. The representative system involves the choice of competent persons to exercise the delegated powers of government, upon the assumption that they will represent, not the interests of classes and sections of the country, but the country as a whole, in the sense that their powers shall be employed under the Constitution for the accomplishment of the ends of government as set forth in the preamble of the Constitution, which they solemnly swear to uphold. It is implied that these officers shall be chosen for this purpose by the electors because they possess the personal competency to fill the offices to which they are elected and will on this ground enjoy the confidence of the electorate.

Direct government, on the contrary, rejects representative government in the

sense here defined, and in its place approaches the elected officers of government with pleas, mandates, and menaces, directing them to take this or that action, not because these officers think it wise or just, but because if they fail to act as directed by the groups that thus approach them, these groups will be opposed to them and will favor others who will carry out their will.

Briefly stated, direct government is an expression of will rather than of reason on the part of a group, or bloc, of interested persons, who demand that their will be executed. Such groups, or blocs, are usually minorities—sometimes comparatively small minorities—but appear potent and command attention by their persistence, their vociferation, and their implied, if not open, threats. Legislation under this influence is virtually always minority legislation, so far as the electorate is concerned; and yet it may seem majority legislation when a majority of the representatives of the people holding the powers of government are swayed or intimidated by such groups, or blocs.

It must, of course, be conceded that the temptation to yield to the demands of these blocs is very strong, for they often hold the balance of power in the communities where the representatives of the people derive their title to office, and can therefore prevent re-election. This would not be the case if the entire electorate would interest itself in the questions at issue; but, unfortunately, the blocs always represent an interest, material or sentimental, and this unites them and gives them their strength.

It requires but little reflection to perceive what would happen if this system of direct action should supersede the representative system. All responsibility for public action would then disappear; for these minority blocs, by collusion and trading, would make the law and ultimately destroy the Constitution. Each would favor the project of another, or several others, in exchange for support, and we should have that form of government by transaction which has made the parliamentary system odious in other countries and has so often compelled a resort to a dictatorship to break it up and abolish it. Surely, it would be a dismal prospect for

our country if we should be compelled to pass through such a series of disasters.

I have touched but superficially upon some of the tendencies that are in action at the present time. There are others that fill us with alternate dismay and disgust. What clear-headed, self-respecting, and independent gentleman (I use the word in Sir Philip Sydney's meaning, of one "possessing high thoughts seated in a heart of courtesy") could desire to accept a public office in the United States, except from a sense of public duty and in a spirit of sacrifice?

I leave to others here such comments as they may be moved to make. As to our association, I believe no member of it can fail to realize its great field of usefulness or be wholly oblivious of what it has already accomplished in its quiet, educational way, or feel anything short of pride in his or her connection with it. Certainly, we who for more than ten years have devoted our thought and our time to it, without other reward than the realization of its growth and results, are happy in the reflection that we have had this privilege, and have no regret except that its work and influence have not been more extended than they have been. We thank all our colleagues and associates for their loyal aid. We have never given direct government the sanction of our example. We have never gone to Congress to favor or to oppose any bill. We have never represented or supported any private interest. We have never taken any one's money except for the educational work we have undertaken.

We have before us a vast field of activity—a field greater than our strength and our resources enable us adequately to till. Twenty-eight States have made instruction regarding the Constitution compulsory in the schools. What kind of instruction is it to be? Will it be simply an analysis of the framework of government, a mere mechanical instruction, or will it be vital and inspiring? Will it convey and impress what the Constitution of the United States has done for the growth and prosperity of our country, what it means to us today, and, above all, what the undermining and destruction of it would mean for the future? Will it take up and explain the value of the guarantees

of immunity, the security of person and property, the function of the judiciary in applying the Constitution as a fundamental law? Will it expose the fallacies and the consequences of the attacks on the Supreme Court, the keystone of the whole system of constitutional government?

In order that the teachers who will impart this instruction may be well informed on these subjects, I could wish that every one of them should receive gratuitously our literature and a free copy every year of the *Constitutional Review*. I can think of no way in which our work could be more usefully extended. Can any of our members suggest means by which such a result could be accomplished?

THE TWENTY-SECOND CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

THE Interparliamentary Council announces that the Twenty-second Conference of the Interparliamentary Union is to be held at Berne and Geneva, Switzerland, from Friday, 22d, to Thursday, 28th of August, 1924. This conference has been made possible upon the invitation of the Swiss group of the Union, extended at Basle on April 5. It is announced that the sittings on Friday, 22d; Saturday, 23d; Monday, 25th, and Tuesday, 26th of August, will take place at Berne, in the hall of the Conseil National, in the Palais Fédéral. Wednesday will be devoted to an excursion from Berne to Geneva and to a visit to the General Secretariat of the League of Nations and to the International Labor Office. On Thursday, August 28, the last sittings of the conference will be held in the Salle de la Réformation, the seat of the annual assemblies of the League of Nations.

The inaugural meeting will take place on Friday, August 22, at 10 o'clock.

The provisional program is announced as follows:

1. Election of the President and of the Bureau of the Conference.

2. Amendment to Articles 3 and 10 of the statutes of the Union. Draft regulations for the Interparliamentary Conferences.

Rapporteur: M. Henri La Fontaine, Vice-President of the Belgian Senate, president of the Belgian group, in the name of the drafting committee.

3. Report from the bureau on the activity of the Council since the last conference and annual administrative report from the secretary general.

a. Financial situation of the Union.

Rapporteur: Baron Adelswærd, Senator, former Minister of Finance, president of the Swedish group and of the Interparliamentary Council.

b. General debate on the report of the bureau, in accordance with Article 8 of the draft regulations for interparliamentary conferences.

M. Theodore E. Burton, Member of the Congress of the United States of America, member of the executive committee, will be asked to present the report and open the general debate.

4. Parliamentary control of foreign policy.

Rapporteurs on behalf of the permanent committee for the study of juridical questions: M. J. L. Mowinckel, deputy, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Commerce, president of the Norwegian group, and Prof. Walther Schücking, member of the Reichstag, president of the German group.

M. Mowinckel will deal with the political aspect of the question, M. Schücking with its juridical aspect.

5. Colonial mandates and the League of Nations.

Rapporteur: M. Marius Moutet, deputy (France), in the name of the permanent committee for the study of ethnic and colonial questions.

6. Economic and financial questions.

Reports from the permanent study committee.

a. The committee, at its meeting at Basle, appointed a subcommittee of six members to follow the development of the *problem of reparations* and to nominate two rapporteurs, one to be proposed by the British group, and to represent the point of view of the creditor nations, the other to be Baron Joseph Sztrenyi (Hungary), former Minister of Com-

merce, who will represent the debtor nations.

b. The economic solidarity of the world and international traffic.

Rapporteur: Baron Joseph Sztrenyi (Hungary).

7. Problems of social policy.

a. Immigration.

Rapporteur: M. Fernand Merlin, senator, vice-president of the French group, member of the executive committee.

b. Emigration.

Rapporteur: A member to be nominated by the Swiss group.

8. Reduction of armaments.

Owing to unforeseen circumstances, the special committee instituted in accordance with a decision of the Copenhagen Conference has not yet met. It will be convened in the course of the spring to draw up the proposals to be submitted to the conference and will then nominate one or several rapporteurs.

9. Communication of the names of the delegates of the groups to the Interparliamentary Council from the XXIIId to the XXIIIId Conference.

According to Article 12 of the statutes of the Union, two delegates to the Council are nominated by each group at least a month before the opening of the conference. Such nominations are communicated to the Interparliamentary Bureau and by the latter to the conference.

10. Election of a member of the executive committee to take the place of Mr. Theodore E. Burton (United States of America), the retiring member.

According to Article 16 of the statutes, the retiring member is not eligible for reelection and his place must be taken by a member belonging to another group.

Whereas up to the present the Interparliamentary conferences have had an average duration of three days only, this year's meeting will extend over seven whole days, five of which will be devoted to the questions entered in the agenda. This increase in the duration of the conference seemed necessary to the Council in order that the important questions put before the members might be dealt with as thoroughly as possible. On the other hand, it became necessary to prepare a fixed time-table of the debates, for the information of those members who would be unable to stay for the whole conference.

By consulting the time-table given below, every member will be able to ascertain on which days the discussions in which he is most interested will take place.

The program at Berne will be as follows:

Friday, August 22—Morning—Opening of the conference; revision of the statutes; regulations for Interparliamentary conferences; financial situation of the Union.

Afternoon—Report from the bureau and general debate.

Saturday, August 23—Continuation and conclusion of the general debate.

Monday, August 25—Parliamentary control of foreign policy; colonial mandates.

Tuesday, August 26—Economic questions; problems of social policy.

Wednesday, August 27—Excursion to Geneva; visit to international institutions.

The program at Geneva, Thursday, August 28, will deal with the reduction

of armaments. This will be the final session of the conference.

All of the other groups of the Union will welcome this gracious invitation from their brethren of the Swiss Parliament, especially in light of the economic depression, which is particularly severe in Switzerland at the present. We understand that the following members of the American group are planning to attend the conference: Senator Wm. B. McKinley, of Illinois, president of the group; Senator Joe Robinson, of Arkansas; Senator George H. Moses, of New Hampshire; Senator W. H. King, of Utah; Senator G. W. Norris, of Nebraska; Senator W. L. Jones, of Washington; Representatives Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Andrew J. Montague, of Virginia; Tom Connally, of Texas; John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts; J. Charles Linthicum, of Maryland; Henry Allen Cooper, of Wisconsin; and W. H. Temple, of Pennsylvania. Executive Secretary Arthur Deerin Call is planning also to be present.

PROFESSOR QUIDDE'S ARREST

By Dr. HANS WEHBERG

THE Germany of Emperor William had no understanding of the peace movement. As a consequence of Hegel's idea of power, many adhered to the principle of maintaining peace by a powerful army, having no confidence in the progress of the arbitration movement. The attitude of Germany at The Hague peace conferences is well known. As has been stated by Professor Schücking in the Reichstag, Germany during the pre-war period refused the offer of not less than thirteen States to enter into arbitration treaties.

Now, recently, the news was spread all over the world that Professor Quidde, the leader of the German peace movement, had been arrested. This might well lead to the belief that the peace movement in Germany is exposed to worse persecution now than it was before the war. There-

fore it seems advisable to report the details of Professor Quidde's arrest.

The German Peace Society, with Professor Quidde at its head, has been waging for some time a determined fight against the recruiting of volunteers into unlawful military organizations which are forbidden under the Versailles Treaty. The German pacifists do not believe that these organizations may lead to war, for Germany has no weapons. But the German Peace Society wishes that Germany may unconditionally adhere to its obligations, as stipulated in the international treaties, and is convinced that such unlawful actions might furnish France with the pretext for further measures that would endanger the consolidation of Europe and especially the entrance of Germany into the League of Nations. The German pacifists do not think that the German

Government supports these unlawful organizations. They wish, however, that the government should be opposed to the formation of these unlawful organizations more energetically than before.

For this purpose Professor Quidde, in the name of the German Central Peace Union (Friedenskartell), the union of all German peace organizations, had written to the chief of the German army, von Seeckt, asking him for information concerning the attitude of the highest military power toward this question. On January 9, 1924, von Seeckt answered, as follows:

"The views of international pacifism are *per se* difficult to understand for a nation that is internationally ill-treated as the German. However, if there are Germans who, after the experience of the Ruhr invasion and at a time when France daily violates the Versailles Treaty, advocates the execution of this treaty in the interest of the French, then this must be called the climax of national worthlessness. Furthermore, I wish to notify you that, in case of a public discussion of the questions mentioned in your letter, I shall proceed against you with all the means of military dictatorship, entirely independent of a civil suit for high treason."

Thereupon, on March 10, 1924, Professor Quidde, in the *World on Monday* (edited by Helmuth von Gerlach), published an article entitled "The Danger of the Hour," which expressed these fears of the pacifists and asked the German Reichstag quickly to intercede in the matter. This article was very much discussed, but Professor Quidde was not prosecuted from Berlin, where it had been published. But on March 16, 1924, he was arrested during a sojourn in Munich and thrown into prison. Bavaria's competence was based upon the fact that Professor Quidde had sent the article from Munich to some friends abroad. The public prosecution asserted that Professor Quidde had aided and abetted a foreign power by calling the attention of Germany's enemies in the treaty to alleged violations of the peace treaty. The accusation was based upon a special Bavarian ordinance, according to which the giving of aid to a foreign power was punishable by death or life imprisonment.

Hence it is clear that the legal proceedings against Professor Quidde were started by Bavaria exclusively, and that the German Government, as such, can in no way be held responsible for the arrest.

Quidde's arrest created a great sensation everywhere in Germany—nay, everywhere in Europe. The nationalistic circles in Germany hailed the proceedings against Professor Quidde and demanded that there should be enough courage to punish the high treason of the German pacifists. The German Peace Society immediately asked the German Government for Professor Quidde's release. Quidde's release is principally due to the work of Professor Schücking, a close personal friend of Quidde. He wrote in the *Berliner Tageblatt* as follows:

"The affair has an immense international importance. The whole world will say that it showed the spirit extant in Germany, inasmuch as an attempt was being made to have the leader of the German peace movement, who was backed by twenty-one organizations, disappear behind prison walls. France will derive from it new demands for guarantees and increased military control. Prominent members of the English Cabinet, with whom Quidde kept in friendly relations, will turn their backs on Germany; in short, the effect will be a catastrophe. It must be considered what a prominent position Quidde occupies in the international world.

"Of course, the proceedings were started by the Munich authorities, who, due to the present military dictatorship in Bavaria, are competent in affairs of high treason. It seems necessary that this fact should be established in Germany, as well as abroad, by a declaration of the entire national government. But that is not sufficient; every legal step must be taken to show the Munich authorities how greatly they damage the interests of the country by their procedure against such an honorable man, in order that the proceedings be stopped immediately. . . .

"It is most distressing to be obliged to say that there is no silliness that is not committed in Germany, and that the German people are being weakened more and more, not by the prosecution of an inexorable enemy, but by their own foolishness."

As a matter of fact, Professor Quidde was released from prison, after a 6-day imprisonment, on March 22, the day of

his 66th anniversary. Three days later the case was handed to the Supreme Court in Leipzig. By eliminating the Bavarian courts, the great danger which was threatening Professor Quidde has been removed. Let us hope that the proceedings will soon be stopped altogether.

As a consequence of Quidde's arrest, it is easy to make the statement that Germany is still hostile to the peace movement. But, to be just, one must consider how strongly the German people feel to have been deceived by the severe Peace of Versailles. As soon as a practicable reparation plan is devised; as soon as others, as well as Germany, are disarmed and the promise of "general" disarmament kept, then the sentiment in Germany will change, and the German people who—unfortunately too late—saw in Wilson the prophet of a better time, will co-operate in the development of international law and in safeguarding peace.

We are justified in this hope when we consider how much German pacifism has gained in strength in spite of the unfav-

orable conditions after the World War. Since the end of the war the membership of the German Peace Society has increased from 6,000 to 19,000, that of the local branch from 50 to 157. Formerly there were two exclusively pacifistic journals, the *Völkerfrieden* (edited by Umfrid) and the *Friedenswarte* (edited by Alfred H. Freid). Today there are, besides the *Friedenswarte*, two great pacifistic weeklies, *Die Menschheit* and *Der Pazifist*, besides a number of smaller periodicals. For the first time an attempt is going to be made this year to invite a world peace congress to Berlin. Thus the German pacifism is extremely active. Whether it will be able to show great success depends upon the political situation. The next German elections, on May 5, 1924, will probably bring an increase in nationalistic circles. But we hope that after that, under the impression of favorable reparation negotiations, the German people will definitely get rid of the nationalistic elements.

RUSSIA AND THE WORLD*

By LEO PASVOLSKY

1. The Russian Situation

THE outstanding factor of the present situation in Russia is that country's international trade and financial position. A decade of war and communistic experimentation has reduced Russia to a sorry plight. Agriculture, industry, trade, and finance have all suffered in this welter of disorganization, and the hope of recovery lies along the lines of reviving all of these phases of the country's economic life. It may be considered as axiomatic that the speed of this recovery will depend upon the availability of foreign assistance. Hence the special emphasis that exists today upon Russia's relations with the rest of the world.

The present situation in Russia is not unlike the conditions which confronted her thirty years ago, on the threshold of her development as a modern economic

power. In the early nineties of the past century the threat of international bankruptcy hung over Russia. A series of disastrous crops, coupled with a fall in the world prices of Russia's principal exports, cereals, played havoc with the Russian trade balance, which had been quite favorable for some years theretofore. As a result of this, Russia found it extremely difficult to meet payments on her foreign obligations, accumulated through generations' past borrowings.

This problem of foreign payments was the most acute and immediate of the problems then confronting Russia, but it was only one of several important and difficult problems. The budgetary system of the country was far from satisfactory. The currency of Russia had not yet been put on a sound gold basis, although preparation for the establishment of a gold standard had been going on for many years before that. Her industrial development had just begun, and both transportation

* Address before the annual conference of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Philadelphia, May 16, 1924.

and the manufacturing industries were woefully insufficient for the needs of the country. Lack of transportation also retarded very considerably the agricultural development of Russia.

With these four inextricably related problems confronting them, the Russian statesmen of the time were forced to a realization that the only thing which would save Russia from international bankruptcy and from prolonged internal difficulties was an economic development along modern lines. It was out of the adverse conditions created by the situation which rose before Russia in the early nineties that really grew the Russian industrial revolution. All four of the problems enumerated above required immediate and close attention, and it was perfectly clear that without financial assistance from abroad no solution of them could be undertaken. Russia went to foreign money markets, and she succeeded, during the years that intervened between the crisis of the early nineties and the outbreak of the war, in laying the foundations of an economic development. The gold standard was introduced in 1897. Industry and agriculture were expanded quite markedly. The budget was balanced, though not until shortly before the war. But the problem of foreign payments proved to be the most difficult of solution. Throughout the twenty-year period immediately preceding the war, it was only on rare occasions that the Russian balance of payments could be handled without recourse to new foreign borrowings.

The war and the revolution have shattered even these inadequate foundations, which had been laid with tremendous difficulties and with the aid of enormous loans from abroad during the two decades prior to the war. Today Russia faces once more the four intimately related problems which confronted her thirty years ago, only now the solution of these problems is vastly more difficult than it ever was before. The gold reserves, accumulated with great difficulty and maintained with utmost zeal, have been practically dissipated during the stormy years of the past decade. In order to establish a sound currency backed by a sufficient metallic reserve, it becomes again necessary for Russia to seek gold outside the country.

The industrial equipment of the country and its system of transportation are in a state of such disorganization that their rehabilitation in the near future is inconceivable without large imports for reconstruction purposes. The budgetary situation must necessarily depend upon the solution of the currency problem and upon the rehabilitation of the economic apparatus of the country, and the problem of foreign payments is rendered infinitely more difficult than ever in Russian history by the fact that the war has nearly doubled Russia's foreign obligations, and if interest payments on these obligations are to be met, the foreign trade of Russia must undergo an expansion considerably beyond its pre-war dimensions.

The Russian situation, then, in its economic aspects is a problem which requires internal rehabilitation through assistance from abroad. The purely economic aspects of the present Russian situation are, however, rendered vastly more difficult and complicated by the political factors which characterize Russia today. It is not a part of my purpose to deal with these political factors, though I realize that a return to political sanity is Russia's first requirement. But it is safe to assume that at some time or other there will be re-established in Russia the principles which govern sound business intercourse among men and nations. My present object consists in pointing out what is involved in Russian recovery from the point of view of that country's economic rehabilitation. This problem of Russia's rehabilitation is of primary interest on both sides of the Atlantic, though, as we shall see below, the countries of Europe are much more intimately concerned with it than the United States.

2. The Problem of Russia's Economic Rehabilitation

Just before the war, Russian agricultural production was sufficient to provide a subsistence minimum for the Russian population and to allow from 12 to 15 per cent of the total production to be placed across the frontiers in the form of exports. With regard to manufactured goods, Russia was not self-sufficient, but she was able, just before the war, to supply herself with about five-sixths of her total requirements, the other one-sixth being imported

from abroad. She also had to import from abroad considerable amounts of raw materials and semi-manufactured goods. In this manner it was possible for Russia to maintain a standard of living for her population which was represented by a per capita national income of about \$50—the lowest standard of living of any modern power.

Russia's immediate problem is to restore the country at least to its pre-war scale of economic operations in order that at least this low standard of living may become re-established. Unaided from abroad, Russia may be able to restore very slowly and with very great difficulty some of her lost productivity, but it is scarcely conceivable that she should be able in the near future to return even to the low scale of production that she had before the war. It is only by means of assistance from abroad that Russia may again become re-established as an economic power.

Russia's problem of economic recovery consists primarily in her ability to command sufficient foreign credits to make the purchases which are necessary for her economic rehabilitation. She has to purchase abroad large quantities of gold in order to re-establish her monetary system. She has to purchase large amounts of machinery and raw materials in order to rebuild her industrial system and her transportation. Her exports for years to come, in view of the deficient state of her national production, are likely to be much too small to provide the means necessary for these purchases. The remainder of these means she has to acquire by way of foreign loans.

Thus Russia stands in need of large purchases in the world markets, and on the face of it the situation means that there are opportunities for making large sales to Russia. But this situation is only apparent. There hangs over the resumption of Russia's credit relation with the rest of the world the crushing heritage of huge past obligations—for the moment repudiated by the existing régime in Russia, but existing in the minds of her creditors, nevertheless. Russia's principal creditors happen to be also among the principal purchasers of her exports and sellers of her imports. They find themselves today in the position of being anxious to sell goods to Russia in order to

provide work for their own industries, and at the same time of desiring to collect from Russia the debts which that country had contracted in past generations.

Russia can normally purchase goods in the world markets and pay her international debts only if she has large enough exports to provide her with the necessary means of payment. She can export goods only if her national production is rehabilitated. She can rehabilitate her national production only if she has outside assistance for reconstruction. But what are the probabilities of her paying capacity, even if she succeeds by means of foreign loans in restoring her pre-war scale of economic operations?

A study of the problem we have made at the Institute of Economics shows that, restored to her pre-war scale of operations, Russia can have an export capacity of about 1,725 million gold rubles annually. But, in order to maintain production at a level which will permit the re-establishment in Russia of at least the low standard of living existing before the war and of putting across the frontiers the above amount of exports, it is necessary for Russia to have normal annual (visible and invisible) imports equal to at least 1,620 million gold rubles. This would leave a balance of trade in favor of Russia of a little over 100 million rubles a year; and this favorable balance of about 100 million rubles is a truly cardinal fact in any appraisal of the Russian situation. These 100 million rubles are all that Russia has to show as a probable paying capacity, following her reconstruction. These 100 million rubles are the sole actual international revenue against which the interest payments on her past obligations, as well as on her reconstruction loans, can be drawn. We estimate that the interest payments on war and pre-war obligations, public and private, amount to at least 720 million rubles. The significance of these two figures—100 million rubles as a probable paying capacity and 720 million rubles as the already-existing claim on Russia's international revenues—cannot be overestimated.

A favorable balance of trade amounting to about 100 million rubles is sufficient to provide interest payments on reconstruction loans amounting to not more than

1,400,000,000 gold rubles. If we assume that reconstruction loans of that amount can be obtained, and that they would be sufficient to restore Russia to her pre-war scale of economic operations and give her a favorable balance of 100 million rubles, then it is clear that only an expansion of Russia's production and exports beyond the pre-war scale will enable Russia to meet any payments on any of her existing foreign obligations. Such an expansion involves more than merely increased productivity in Russia. It means also finding markets for her increasing exportable surplus. These markets lie necessarily in the countries of Europe to the west of Russia's frontier.

It would be idle to speculate on the possibilities of Russia's development as an industrial power with an exportable surplus of finished products. Russia will for generations to come remain essentially a country with agricultural exportable surplus. These foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials which are Russia's contribution to the world trade were needed before the war only in the countries of western, and particularly central, Europe. They are needed now, and will be needed for generations to come, only in these same countries. Before the war these countries purchased fully 90 per cent of Russia's total exports.

This means that if Russia's paying capacity is to increase through the expansion of exports the purchasing power of western, and particularly central, Europe must be not only restored to its pre-war dimensions, but must expand beyond them, or, as an alternative, that their purchases of these same agricultural products must be curtailed in other parts of the world.

3. The Dilemma of the European Powers

Without attempting to peer too much into the future, it is quite apparent that, even as far as the present situation is concerned, the European powers face a serious dilemma in their dealings with Russia. They are most anxious to sell goods to Russia, for they consider a resumption of Russian trade one of the necessary elements in their own post-war recovery. For this purpose they are willing to grant new credits to Russia in order that the trade may be financed up to the time when Russia's own exports will be sufficient to

pay for the purchases; but they are not willing or able to forget the fact that Russia already owes them billions of rubles, and that these billions still continue to figure in their calculations of their own national wealth and international resources.

The European powers are, therefore, faced with a veritable dilemma in their attempts to deal with Russia. Assuming that the present or any régime in Russia should recognize fully and without equivocation the legality and binding power of all of Russia's existing foreign obligations, that in itself would be nothing more than an empty gesture, so far as the actual payment of these obligations is concerned. Without being restored at least to her pre-war scale of operations, Russia cannot have any paying capacity abroad. Her restoration is impossible without reconstruction loans, and interest on these loans has not the slightest chance of being paid if the payments on existing obligations are to have an equal claim against Russia's international revenues. Moreover, without Russian reconstruction, Russia cannot return for many years to come as a purchaser on a large scale in the world markets.

As a business proposition, Russian reconstruction loans may be considered reasonably safe only if payments on them will be given clear precedence over all existing obligations. This is the situation which confronts the European powers in their dealings with Russia.

4. The Relation of the United States to the Russian Dilemma

It may be asserted that, since the vast bulk of Russia's pre-war indebtedness is due to the countries of Europe; since Russia's debts to the United States are comparatively very small; since the United States is far and away the richest country in the world, may it not be possible that, by dealing with the United States direct, Russia may be reconstructed, may be able to rehabilitate her economic system, and then, in the remote future, resume her relations with the rest of Europe.

There is no gainsaying the fact that, if the providing of reconstruction credits were the only consideration involved, the above assertion might be true. The United States can supply Russia with everything

that country needs in the way of reconstruction materials; and if Russian reconstruction were merely a matter of philanthropy, or at least a matter of providing financial resources with the same magnificent disregard of paying possibilities which prevailed during the war, the problem would be simple enough; but as a business proposition, as a problem in sound finance, this scheme, unfortunately, does not hold water.

Russia can acquire a paying capacity, let us repeat once more, only by developing an export surplus. The largest amount the United States ever bought from Russia in the whole history of the trade relations of the two countries was in 1912, when she imported from her 9 million dollars' worth of furs and other minor products. There is nothing in the world to indicate that among the commodities which Russia is likely to have for export in the next generations there will be anything more that the United States might want to buy. When America bought from Russia 9 million dollars' worth of goods, she took care of exactly 1 per cent of Russia's total export trade.

A situation in which Russia would continue selling the vast bulk of her exports to Europe and of buying the vast bulk of her imports in the United States is nothing more than a dream. The countries of Europe can have sufficient purchasing power to buy Russian exports only if they have an opportunity for selling their own products. In the long run, international trade is so organized that the triangular arrangements of payment constitute comparatively but a small part of the whole transaction. As a matter of practical possibilities, if Russia sells most of her exports to Europe it would be inevitable that she should buy most of her imports from Europe.

The United States may, and undoubtedly will, sell to Russia, directly or indirectly, much more than she will buy from her. That was the situation which obtained before the war; but even then the United States never contributed more than 10 per cent of the total Russian imports, and on that small scale the accounts between the two countries could be adjusted by the triangular method. On a

much larger scale that would be impossible.

There still remains, of course, the question of American investment in Russia; and here the situation is governed by exactly the same factors as those which govern Russian-American trade relations. If American investments in Russia are to be safe, as regards the regular payment of interest and dividends, it is necessary that Russia should have a commensurate export surplus, whether in the United States or in other countries to which she may sell her products; and since Russia's exports in the future are likely to be, as they have been in the past, sales to European countries rather than to the United States, this means again that the appraisal of Russia's credit possibilities depends almost exclusively upon the possibilities of her coming to an understanding with her European creditors. The United States is thus not in a position to offer any solution to the Russian dilemma which confronts the European powers.

5. The Russian Problem is a Part of the World Situation

The international implications of the Russian situation are such that the problems presented by it cannot be solved by the resumption of Russia's relations with any one nation or with any group of nations. On the assumption that the formal political and diplomatic handicaps which now encumber any negotiations between Russia and the rest of the world will be solved to the satisfaction of the world powers, there still remains the necessity on the part of the United States as well as of the European powers of visualizing clearly the factors which underlie the problem of Russian recovery. Aside from its political factors, the Russian situation is not unique in the present-day world. The only thing that is unique about it is that Russia is in a worse plight economically than any other nation, large or small. But the principles that govern the possibilities of her recovery are exactly the same as those which obtain in the case of Germany and of a dozen other nations more or less impoverished by the war.

Dominated by the incubus of international debts, that grew to terrifying proportions during the war, the problem of recovery for each of the stricken countries,

by its very nature, extends beyond each particular country's frontiers. It involves political and economic adjustments and often renunciations and compromises. The whole world is in a tight corner, and Russia, for all the swagger of her present leaders, is in the narrowest portion of it. No one country can wedge out of the corner alone.

America's relation to the Russian situation, therefore, is not so much a problem in Russian-American relations as it is a part of the problem of America's relation to world reconstruction. As such, it is important and significant; apart from that, gauged by practical possibilities, it is almost negligible for both countries.

FOREIGN TRADE OF SOVIET RUSSIA FOR 1923

By L. J. LEWERY,

Assistant Chief, Eastern European Division,
Department of Commerce

THE last three months of the calendar year 1923, with their large exports of grain, definitely turned the balance of Soviet Russia's foreign trade in its own favor. Although the final results for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1923, appeared doubtful and controversial, owing to the present Russian system of valuing all commodities imported and exported at 1913 prices, the heavy increase in exports during the last quarter of the calendar year, together with a systematic restriction of imports, left a substantial favorable balance of trade beyond question, whether valued at pre-war or at current prices.

The valuation of all imports and exports in gold rubles at pre-war market prices had been rendered necessary because the rapidly depreciating Soviet currency furnished no stable medium for calculation and comparison.

Imports for the calendar year 1923, figured at the 1913 prices, were valued at 144,100,000 rubles, against exports of 205,800,000 rubles, giving a favorable balance of 59,700,000 rubles. On the basis of approximate current prices instead of 1913 prices, exports total 307,300,000 rubles and imports 200,100,000 rubles, making the favorable balance on a

current-price basis equal roughly to 107,200,000 rubles.

In addition to commercial imports, famine relief supplies to the value of 34,400,000 rubles were imported during the calendar year, as against similar imports of 183,800,000 rubles during the calendar year 1922.

Favorable Trade Balance Follows Grain Export Resumption

The main cause of the favorable trade balance in 1923 was the resumption of grain exports, which had practically stopped since the outbreak of the World War and which the satisfactory crops of 1922 and 1923 made possible. Total export sales of grain and fodder of the 1923 crop, concluded prior to January 1, 1924, amounted to 1,598,766 long tons, of which 1,160,570 tons were shipped by January 1, 1924, and 152,250 tons were loading at ports on that date. Of the above grand total, 813,460 tons were rye, 382,110 tons wheat, 136,452 tons barley, and 48,643 tons oats, the rest being represented by oil cake, corn, and other cereals. Exports of rye represented an increase of 20 per cent over their pre-war average, while those of wheat amounted to but 9 per cent of pre-war average. Sales were distributed among fifteen European countries, the chief purchaser being Germany, 471,266 tons; Netherlands, 285,544 tons; France, 180,743 tons; Finland, 100,178 tons; Denmark, 99,691 tons; and Italy, 93,566 tons. Export sales to the United Kingdom amounted to only 32,739 tons.

Shifts in Trade Values, Composition, and Markets

Compared with the calendar year 1922, the value of exports (calculated at 1913 prices) increased more than 2½ times and more than tenfold in comparison with 1921, while imports fell off by one-half and by one-third respectively. Imports also underwent a change in composition. Whereas over one-third of the imports of 1922 consisted of foodstuffs (exclusive of contributed famine relief supplies), imports of foodstuffs in 1923 amounted to but 7.4 per cent of total. In 1922 imports of raw materials and semi-manufactured products represented only 14.6 per cent of the total, whereas in 1923 this group accounted for 44.2 per cent of the total.

At the same time exports showed a corresponding shift for the group of food-stuffs from 5.3 per cent in 1922 to 56.8 per cent in 1923; for raw materials and semi-finished goods, from 90.8 per cent to 42.4 per cent of total. The general distribution of Russian exports in 1923 by groups of commodities is thus found to be closely approaching that of 1913, when foodstuffs accounted for 52.2 per cent of total exports and raw materials and semi-finished goods accounted for 36.9 per cent, these two groups comprising the bulk of Russian exports.

This similarity is extended further to the two principal markets of Russian foreign trade, Germany and the United Kingdom. In 1913 these two countries accounted for 60.1 per cent of Russian total imports and 47.4 per cent of total exports; in 1923 their share was 60 and 44.2 per cent respectively.

The total foreign trade of Russia in 1923, calculated at 1913 prices, amounted to but 12.1 per cent of total exports and imports for 1913.

Government Monopoly of Foreign Trade Firmly Maintained

The government monopoly of foreign trade was firmly maintained during the year. According to data for the operating year 1922-23 Soviet State institutions, including government organizations and mixed companies controlled by the Soviet Government, accounted for 96.7 per cent of all exports and for 97.3 per cent of all imports; the rest represented the part played by purely private initiative in the foreign trade of Soviet Russia.

Trade with United States in 1923

The tracing of imports from the United States, except as to cotton, presents many difficulties, because most of the purchases, even when concluded directly in the United States by official and semi-official agencies of the Soviet Government in New York, were financed in England or Germany.

In the total summaries imports from the United States are valued at 18,696,000 gold rubles at 1913 prices, of which 16,447,000 was accounted for by raw cotton, representing a quantity of 124,000 bales. Deducting the value of cotton from the total value of imports from the United

States would leave a balance of 2,249,000 rubles, or a little over \$1,000,000 for all the rest of the imports, according to Russian customs statistics, which is admitted to be considerably understated.

Russia's imports from the United States in 1923, according to customs figures, computed at 1913 prices, represent 12.9 per cent of total imports, and the exports to the United States 0.4 per cent of total exports, while the entire trade with the United States amounted to 5.6 per cent of trade with all countries, as against 3.9 per cent in 1913.

War-time Trade with United States

In 1913 Russian imports from the United States amounted to 79,000,000 rubles, or 5.8 per cent of total Russian imports; exports to the United States reached only 14,000,000 rubles, or 0.9 per cent of total Russian exports; the total trade with the United States represented 3.9 per cent of Russian trade with all countries. During the war, commencing with the second year, Russian-American trade was considerably stimulated, but after the war it lapsed almost completely, until 1921, when imports from the United States were valued at 39,794,000 gold rubles. In 1922 imports from the United States amounted to 38,937,000 gold rubles and in 1923 to 18,696,000. Since the war the character of Russian imports from the United States had changed radically, partly on account of changed economic conditions and partly because of crop failure and famine. In 1918 the bulk of imports was raw materials and finished goods, in 1921 it was manufactured articles, and in 1922 it was foodstuffs. In 1923 foodstuff imports amounted to only 176,000 gold rubles and manufactured articles to 1,826,000, but raw materials and semi-finished goods rose from 122,000 gold rubles in 1922 to 16,694,000 gold rubles in 1923.

It has been reported to the Commerce Department, Eastern European Division, that shipments of machinery and technical equipment alone by one of the semi-official Soviet agencies in New York amounted to \$1,694,000; of metals, \$120,000; of chemicals and dyes, \$103,000. Its sales of Russian merchandise imported into the United States in 1923 consisted chiefly of furs, amounting to \$550,000.

Another agency imported \$4,082,000 worth of Russian furs, besides \$573,600 worth of bristles, horsehair, and other hair products, and \$71,450 worth of caviar and fish products, out of its total imports from Russia during the year of \$4,827,320. This firm's shipments to Russia included textiles to the value of \$365,600, out of \$393,650 for the year. At least one purchase of 10,000 tons of Russian

mineral oil by an American company was reported as shipped from London. Over 500 light American tractors, together with agricultural equipment in connection with same (plows, disk harrows, etc.) were shipped by another firm to the value of about \$500,000, while about \$250,000 worth of Russian furs were imported by it during the year.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE ON WORLD PEACE

ADDRESS TO NEWSPAPER MEN

Addressing newspaper editors and publishers in New York, April 22, the President dwelt upon service as the hope for promoting righteousness. Turning to our foreign relations, he said:

Fundamentally, America is sound. It has both the power and disposition to maintain itself in a healthy economic and moral condition. But it cannot do this by turning all its thoughts in on itself, or by making its material prosperity its supreme choice. Selfishness is only another name for suicide. A nation that is morally dead will soon be financially dead. The progress of the world rests on courage, honor, and faith. If America wishes to maintain its prosperity, it must maintain its ideals.

When we turn to our foreign relations, we see the working out of the same laws. If there is one ideal of national existence to which America has adhered more consistently than to any other, it has been that of peace. Whatever other faults may be charged to our country, it has never been quarrelsome, belligerent, or bent on military aggrandizement. After all, the main support of peace is understanding. It is a matter of accurate information by one government and one people about other governments and other peoples. There is likewise involved the same law of service.

If our country is to stand for anything in the world, if it is to represent any forward movement in human progress, these achievements will be measured in no small degree by what it is able to do for others.

America's Influence upon the World

Up to a little more than twenty-five years ago, America gave almost its entire attention to self-development. In that it achieved an unequaled success. The service which it rendered to others was to a considerable degree one of example. It revealed the ability of the people to take charge of their own affairs. It demonstrated the soundness and strength of self-government under free institutions, while affording a refuge for the oppressed of other lands. The great influence which the mere existence of American institutions exercised upon the rest of the world would be difficult to overestimate.

At the end of a long period of steady accomplishments of this nature came the war with Spain, which left our country a world power, with world responsibilities. It is not too much to say that in meeting and bringing to a successful conclusion that conflict our country performed a world service.

This was followed by a period of most remarkable industrial development. There were great consolidations of properties, enormous investments of capital, and a stupendous increase of production, all accomplished by a growth of population reaching many millions. This was our condition at the outbreak of the World War.

Our World Service

For a long time we sought to avoid this conflict, on the assumption that it did not concern us. On that subject we were lacking in accurate information. We found, at last, that while it was also the grave concern of others, it did concern us intimately and perilously.

We took our part in the war at length, in the defense of free institutions. We believe, while acknowledging that we were only one

of the contributing elements, that our participation was a decisive factor. The result was a demonstration of the strength of self-governing people and a victory for free institutions. Our action at this time was distinctly a world service. America made its sacrifice for what it believed was the cause of righteousness.

The sacrifices made on these occasions, which resulted in a benefit to others, resulted likewise in a benefit to ourselves. Even the evil effects which always arise from war and its aftermath have only tempered, not obliterated, these results. A flow of material resources set in toward our country which is still going on. The general standards of living were raised. In the resulting plenty many of the old hardships of existence were removed. Our country came into a position where it had a greatly increased opportunity for world leadership. In moral power it took a higher rank.

Presence at Treaty Table Softened Terms of Peace

There can be little doubt that our presence at the treaty table softened the terms and diminished the exactions of the victorious nations, where joint covenants of defensive alliance were in part substituted for the usual territorial transfers. Our country refused to adhere to the covenant of the League of Nations with a decisive rejection which I regard as final.

Following this came a continuing effort to collect reparations, which the economic chaos of Germany after a time caused to be suspended. This resulted in the French seizure of the Ruhr, with Allied conferences, plans and discussions for renewing payment of reparations under some settled method of permanent adjustment.

Although indirectly interested by reason of our commerce, and more especially because of the debts due to us, in having a European settlement, our government felt that the fundamental questions involved in all these discussions were the direct political concern of Europe. Our policy relative to the debts due to us from European countries was well known, and we refused to submit them to these discussions.

Hughes' Proposal for Reparation Settlement

This never meant that America was not willing to lend its assistance to the solution of the European problem in any way that did not involve us in their purely political controversies whenever opportunity presented a plan that promised to be just and effective. But we realize that all effort was useless until all parties came to a state of mind where they saw the need to make concessions and accept friendly counsel.

In December of the year of 1922 our Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, set out the American proposal in an address which he delivered at New Haven. That proposal has now become historic.

He recognized that settlement of the reparations question was probably impossible if approached after the method of a political problem. It was not so much a question to be dealt with by public officers or diplomatic agencies, which must necessarily reflect to a very marked degree the political state of mind of the various countries, but was represented as one which could be solved by the application of pure business talent and experienced private enterprise. To such an effort of business men, unhampered by every unnecessary political consideration, Mr. Hughes expressed the belief that competent American citizens in private life would be ready to lend their assistance.

This position was consistently maintained. Its correctness was finally demonstrated when Mr. Dawes, Mr. Young, and Mr. Robinson were invited by the Reparation Commission for that purpose, and consented to serve.

Thinks Dawes Report Will Solve Problem

The finding of the experts, which is known as the Dawes report, has recently been made and published. It shows a great deal of research and investigation and a broad comprehension of the requirements of the situation. It has been favorably received by the Reparation Commission. It is gratifying to understand that the Allies are looking upon it with full sympathy, and Germany has expressed a willingness to co-operate in the execution of the plan.

There appears to be every reason to hope that the report offers a basis for a practical solution of the reparations problem. I trust that it may commend itself to all the European governments interested as a method by which, through mutual concessions, they can arrive at a stable adjustment of the intricate and vexatious problems of reparations, and that such an outcome will provide for the restoration of Germany and the largest possible payment to the other countries.

If this result is secured, the credit which will be due to the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, to President Harding for adopting it and supporting it, and to the three Americans and their assistants, by whose wisdom and discretion it was formulated and rendered so acceptable, will be sufficient to warrant the lasting approbation of two continents. A situation at once both intricate and difficult has been met in a most masterful way. Our countrymen are justified in looking at the result with great pride. Nothing of more importance to Europe has occurred since the armistice.

Hopes U. S. Capital Will Join in Loan

Part of the plan contemplates that a considerable loan should at once be made to Germany for immediate pressing needs, including the financing of a bank. I trust that private American capital will be willing to participate in advancing this loan. Sound business reasons exist why we should participate in the financing of works of peace in

Europe, though we have repeatedly asserted that we were not in favor of advancing funds for any military purposes. It would benefit our trade and commerce, and we especially hope that it will provide a larger market for our agricultural production.

It is notorious that foreign gold has been flowing into our country in great abundance. It is altogether probable that some of it can be used more to our financial advantage in Europe than it can be in the United States.

Besides this, there is the humanitarian requirement, which carries such a strong appeal, and the knowledge that out of our abundance it is our duty to help where help will be used for meeting just requirements and the promotion of a peaceful purpose. We have determined to maintain, and can maintain, our own political independence, but our economic independence will be strengthened and increased when the economic stability of Europe is restored.

Looks to Further Move in World Disarmament

We hope further that such a condition will be the beginning of a secure and enduring peace. Certainly it would remove many of the present sources of disagreement and misunderstanding among the European nations.

When this adjustment is finally made, and has had sufficient time of operation to become a settled European policy, it would lay the foundation for a further effort at disarmament in accordance with the theory of the Washington Conference. Although that gathering was able to limit capital battleships, it had to leave the question of submarines, aircraft, and land forces unsolved. The main reason for this was the unsettled and almost threatening condition that still existed in Europe. A final adjustment for the liquidation of reparations ought to be the beginning of a new era of peace and good will.

In the event that such a condition develops, it becomes pertinent to examine what can be done by our own country, in co-operation with others, further to rid ourselves and the rest of the world of the menace and burden of competitive armaments and more effectively insure the settlement of differences between nations, not by a recourse to arms, but by a recourse to reason; not by action leading to war, but by action leading to justice. Our past experience should warn us not to be overconfident in the face of so many failures, but it also justifies the hope that something may be done where already there has been some success, and at least we can demonstrate that we have done all that we can.

Backs U. S. Entrance into World Court

As a result of American initiative, there is already in existence The Hague Tribunal, which is equipped to function wherever arbitration seems desirable, and based in part on that, and in part on the League, there is the International Court of Justice, which is already functioning.

A proposal was sent to the last Senate by President Harding for our adherence to the covenant establishing this court, which I submitted to the favorable consideration of the present Senate in my annual message. Other plans for a World Court have been broached, but up to the present time this has seemed to me the most practical one. But these proposals for arbitration and courts are not put forward by those who are well informed with the idea that they could be relied upon as an adequate means for entirely preventing war. They are rather a method of securing adjustment of claims and differences, and for the enforcement of treaties, when the usual channels of diplomatic negotiation fail to solve the difficulty.

Proposals have also been made for the codification of international law. Undoubtedly something might be accomplished in this direction, although a very large body of such law consists in undertaking to establish rules of warfare and determining the rights of neutrals. One of the difficulties to be encountered would be the necessity of securing the consent of all the nations, but no doubt the agreement of the major powers would go very far in producing that result.

Favors Calling Another International Conference

I do not claim to be able to announce any formula that will guarantee the peace of the world. There are certain definite things, however, that I believe can be done, which certainly ought to be tried, that might relieve the people of the earth of much of the burden of military armaments and diminish the probability of military operations. I believe that among these are frequent international conferences suited to particular needs. The Washington Conference did a great deal to restore harmony and good will among the nations. Another purpose of a conference is the further limitation of competitive armaments. Much remains to be accomplished in that direction.

It would appear to be impractical to attempt action under present conditions, but with a certain and definite settlement of German reparations firmly established, I should favor the calling of a similar conference to achieve such limitations of armaments and initiate plans for a codification of international law, should preliminary inquiries disclose that such a proposal would meet with a sympathetic response. But the main hope of success lies in first securing a composed state of the public mind in Europe.

It is my firm belief that America is in a position to take the lead in this direction. It is undoubtedly too much to suppose that we hold very much of the affectionate regard of other nations. At the same time we do hold their respect. Our position is such that we are trusted and our business institutions and government considered to be worthy of confidence.

Neither Alliances For Nor Against Any Other Nation

If there is disappointment in some directions that we do not enter alliances with them, it is more than overbalanced by the knowledge that there is no danger that we shall enter alliances against them. It must be known to every people that we are seeking no acquisition of territory and maintaining no military establishment with unfriendly and hostile intent. Like our political institutions, all of this is a powerful example throughout the world. Very many of the nations have been the recipients of our favor, and have had the advantage of our help in some time of extremity. We have no traditional enemies. We have come to a position of great power and great responsibility.

Our first duty is to ourselves. American standards must be maintained, American institutions must be preserved. The freedom of the people politically, economically, intellectually, morally, and spiritually must continue to be advanced.

This is not a matter of a day or a year. It may be of generations, it may be an era. It is for us here and now to keep in the right direction, to remain constant to the right ideals. We need a faith that is broad enough to let the people make their own mistakes. Let them come unto knowledge and understanding by their own experience. Little progress can be made by merely attempting to repress what is evil; our great hope lies in developing what is good.

Our Guarantees of Peace and Progress

One newspaper is better than many criminal laws. One schoolmaster is better than a legion of bailiffs. One clergyman is better than an army with banners. These are our guarantees of internal peace and progress.

On what nations are at home depends what they will be abroad. If the spirit of freedom rules in their domestic affairs, it will rule in their foreign affairs.

The world knows that we do not seek to rule by force of arms; our strength is in our moral power.

We increase the desire for peace everywhere by being peaceful. We maintain a military force for our defense, but our offensive lies in the justice of our cause. We are against war because it is destructive. We are for peace because it is constructive. We seek concord with all nations through mutual understanding.

People's Will to Peace Above All Treaties

We believe in treaties and covenants and international law as a permanent record for a reliable determination of action. All these are evidences of a right intention.

But something more than these is required, to maintain the peace of the world. In its final determination, it must come from the heart of the people. Unless it abide there, we cannot build for it any artificial lodging

place. If the will of the world be evil, there is no artifice by which we can protect the nations from evil results.

Governments can do much for the betterment of the world. They are the instruments through which humanity acts in international relations. Because they cannot do everything, they must not neglect to do what they can.

But the final establishment of peace, the complete maintenance of good will toward men, will be found only in the righteousness of the people of the earth. Wars will cease when they will that they shall cease. Peace will reign when they will that it shall reign.

GERMANY AND THE HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCES

Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Investigation

The first subcommittee of the German Parliamentary Committee on Investigation of the Reichstag, charged with the investigation of the events leading to the World War, during the last months has carefully examined the attitude of the German government at The Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907.

Personnel

Professor Dr. Zorn and Cabinet Councilor Emeritus, Dr. Kriege, were examined as witnesses. As is well known, Dr. Zorn was the scientific adviser of the German delegations at both conferences and played a very important rôle at the first. During the Second Conference Dr. Kriege, the director of the legal department of the State Department, was the technical adviser of Baron von Marschall, the head of the delegation, and is considered by the public to be primarily responsible for the attitude of the German delegation in 1907. Dr. Hans Wehberg, Prof. Dr. Zorn, Cabinet councilor (retired) Dr. Kriege, Count Max Montgelas, and Dr. Friedrich Thimme, were the experts of the committee and issued statements and reports.

The experts had free access to all the documents of the Foreign Office. The material furnished by these experts will be put before the public in the official report of the committee on investigation during 1924. The parliamentary members of the committee are Dr. Gradnauer, chairman; Count von Westarp, Dr. Piper (Mecklenburg), Dr. Spahn, Dr. Schücking, Mrs. Schuch, Mr. Dittmann. Dr. Eugen Fischer is the secretary of the committee.

The Task

The committee has thoroughly investigated the attitude of the German Government toward disarmament and the Court of Arbitration—both in the foreground of the proceedings at The Hague Conferences—and has given its judgment in the following decision, which was adopted during the session of December 22, 1923.

I

The Accusation at Versailles

In the investigation of the historical events preceding the war, the subcommittee could not pass over the remarks which were made by the Allied and associate Powers in their note of June 16, 1919, at the peace conference in Versailles. This note contains a number of remarks referring to the attitude of the German Government at The Hague without expressly mentioning The Hague Conferences. The principal reference is found in the publication of the documents to the Peace Treaty, published by H. Krautz and Rödiger, 1st volume, pages 105 and 106, as follows:

The Prussian spirit was not satisfied that Germany should occupy a high and influential position in the councils of equal nations, a position which was justly hers and which was assured. It could be satisfied only by the acquisition of the highest and autocratic power. At a moment when the Western nations seriously endeavored to restrict armament, to replace rivalry in international affairs by friendship, and to lay the foundation to a new era; when all nations were to co-operate in a friendly spirit in the settlement of international affairs, the rules of Germany have continued to sow mistrust and hatred among all their neighbors; have allied themselves with all the elements of unrest in all countries; have increased Germany's armament and fortified its military and naval power. They mobilized all the auxiliary powers at their command—the universities, the press, the churches, the whole political machine—to preach their gospel of hatred and violence, so that at the given moment the German people could answer their call. The result was that during the last years of the 19th and during the 20th century the policy of Germany was working toward the one end, to assure for herself the position of supreme ruler and dictator.

It is said that Germany prepared to protect herself against a Russian attack. However, it is significant that immediately after Russia's defeat by Japan in the Far East, while she was prostrated by internal revolution, the German Government doubled its efforts to increase armament and to try to dominate over its neighbors with threats of war.

The collapse of Russia did not mean for them a restriction of armament and a co-operation with the Western Powers toward world peace; they saw in it the opportunity of spreading their own power.

II

The Statement Contrary to History

The committee on investigation is convinced that this statement of the Entente note does not correspond to the historical truth. The antithesis that Germany, driven by hatred and the desire for autocratic power, had planned to bring her neighbors under her tyrannical government by threats of war, while the Western Powers had earnestly endeavored to restrict armament and to create a new era of international friendship, does not adequately describe either the German policy nor the policy of the Western Powers prior to 1914.

No State and no government in particular can be blamed for the new dangers that ever since the last decade of the last century were threatening international politics. They were caused by the general economic and national tendencies of the European States. In addition to the former bones of contention—namely, Alsace-Lorraine, the Italian and Rumanian Irredenta, division of Turkey, and the development of the Balkans—there was the growing rivalry in the markets of the world and the desire of all nations for colonies and foreign spheres of interest, creating their new conflicts and a general straining of the relations between the world Powers. In the face of this critical development there were two opinions: either the nations had to safeguard themselves against the threatening dangers by increased armament and favorable alliances, thus rendering the competition in armament more and more violent and augmenting suspicion and danger, or a new way had to be found to abate international contention, to diminish armament, and to leave the settlement of international conflict to international arbitration and growing organizations of international law.

The real and essential contrast during the pre-war era, therefore, was not that of a belligerent Germany and the other peace-loving powers, but that of the existence of all nations as military powers and economic forces desirous of expansion on the one hand, and the peace movement and the action of certain alliances and parties on the other. The other world Powers as well as Germany have always adhered to the thought of na-

tional supremacy and to the claim of settling vital questions by force of arms. Not one of them was willing to renounce armed power and to submit to a general legal authority invested with executive power. Even though the imperialistic Powers—some more, some less—made concessions to the ideas of disarmament and general arbitration, yet they never disputed the principle of war.

Thus the American Senate stated in August, 1911:

There are certain questions at the present stage of human development which, if thus forced forward for arbitration, would be rejected by the country affected, without regard to whether in so doing they broke the general arbitration treaty or not.

Therefore, if in the questions of disarmament and arbitration certain world Powers seemed to make greater concessions than Germany to the ideal of the peace movement, this probably was done to satisfy the need of a resolution which looked like the fulfilment of the international desire. Practicable plans for the amelioration of the dangerous state of international affairs were not proposed at that time by any of the governments in question. Neither has any of them ever taken into serious consideration the abandonment of armed power and of the right to decide vital questions by force of arms.

The Committee on Investigation, in its judgment on the attitude of Germany toward disarmament and arbitration, necessarily had to take into consideration this fundamental conception by the nations of their nature and their policy.

III

Germany and Disarmament

In 1899, at the First Hague Peace Conference, the German Government, in accordance with almost all conference Powers, refused to establish disarmament by treaty; at the Second Conference, in 1907, it was opposed to the repeated discussion of the question. The peace movement, which takes its ideals as criterion in judging, condemns this attitude. It will be explained later to what extent the Committee on Investigation agrees with the objections that were raised by the Pacifists.

The committee must dispute the justice of the reproaches made by the governments in whose names the note of June 16, 1919, was issued. The proposals made by Russia at The Hague in 1899 were of such a nature that Germany's presumptive enemies, with

their own armament, would have had the advantage over Germany and her allies.

The question of the restriction of armament had been earnestly examined by the German Government and the military officials. Neither had there been a proposal by the other side, nor could a principle be found during the consultations in the German War Department that would have guaranteed a solution of the problem—*i. e.*, a controllable restricted armament doing justice to the vital interests of all nations. Furthermore, it is the opinion of the Committee on Investigation that this goal could have been reached only if the question of restricted armament had not been isolated, but had been discussed in connection with a collective guarantee of property and an effective international executive power.

When, after the refusal of 1899, the question was to be brought up again, the German Government was compelled either to vote against every proposal coming from the enemy group of Powers or to stay out of the whole discussion from the very beginning. By adhering to the second mode of procedure, they hoped to choose the smaller of two evils. Considering the geographic position of the country in the midst of other nations, with the disadvantage of wide-open boundaries; considering the experience of earlier German history, and, finally, considering the Franco-Russian entente, which in 1899 was superior numerically and had been further strengthened since 1907 by England, and which was drawing Italy into its train, the German Government could not consent to disarmament plans which must lead to the one-sided weakening of the German policy. It considered the disarmament plans under discussion to be very dangerous, principally because the colonial troops were not to be included in the disarmament; so that it would have been rather easy for Russia as well as for France to accomplish a far-reaching military supremacy under the pretext of training colonial troops.

The German Government also took into consideration that the Russian Government, which primarily had brought the disarmament idea into European discussion, was at that very moment preparing for war against Japan, while England planned disarmament only in such a way that the two-power strength of her navy, and with that her supreme power on sea, was to be maintained in any event.

It was easy, therefore, to understand the suspicious attitude of the German Government toward the question of disarmament; yet the Committee on Investigation does not fail to appreciate that in the interest of the peace movement it would have been desirable to avoid even the appearance as though the German Government was opposed to the idea of disarmament *per se*. To this end it might have expressed its regret that no practical plan had been evolved for the restriction of armament which would have been desirable to the German Government. Furthermore, the German Government could have pointed out that with the system of mutual increase of armament a final armed encounter would be inevitable. Then it would have been impossible that the speech of Colonel von Schwarhoff at the Conference in 1899 would have been interpreted as though the Germans did not even wish to restrict armament, and did not consider armament and war to be means of defense, but the purpose and quintessence of political activity. This would have refuted the anti-German propaganda asserting that war was threatening from Germany and embittering the opinion of the world against Germany.

It must be considered a regrettable omission on the part of the German Government during the First Hague Conference that it did not profit by this opportunity emphatically to point out that Germany's and Austria-Hungary's armament was in no way ahead of that of France and Russia. This was also true for the year 1907.

However, when the note of the Entente makes the accusation that Germany increased her preparations after Russia had been defeated in the Japanese War, and had intended to impose a tyrannical government upon her neighbors under threat of war, then it must be pointed out that no opportunity was more favorable to wage a war and to carry out Germany's alleged plans of sovereignty than the time of the Boer War or the Russo-Japanese War and the internal revolution which followed the war in Russia. The assertion of the note, that while Russia was prostrate on account of her defeat in the Far East, Germany had doubled her attempts to increase her armament, is pure invention. From 1905 to 1907 Germany increased her army only 7,000 men—*i. e.*, from 622,000 to 629,000—and Austria-Hungary did not increase hers at all. The German Government did not use its favorable position to make

humiliating demands of other nations; on the contrary, at the end of the first Morocco controversy, at the conference of Algeiras, it preferred to accept a political defeat instead of attempting by war threats to turn the result in her favor.

Therefore the right to make accusations, as has been done in the above-mentioned note of June 16, 1919, must be denied the Powers in whose names the note has been issued, especially France, which was represented by Clemenceau. These Powers were not in doubt about the fundamental tendencies of the German policy.

IV

Concerning the attitude of the German Government toward the problem of international arbitration the following must be said:

In 1899 the German Government, at first, resisted the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration, but later dropped its opposition and co-operated in its foundation. In 1907, the German Government was opposed to the plan of a general treaty of arbitration. To be sure, this plan exempted the questions of interests and honors from obligatory arbitration, and thus offered no guarantee that more serious conflicts would be settled by arbitration. The German Government was not alone in this refusal. Eight States, among them the world Powers Austria-Hungary and Turkey, as well as the neutral States Belgium and Switzerland, joined this refusal, and three other States, among them the world Powers Japan and Italy, refused to vote.

At that time the German Government remembered a particularly bad experience with the British Government. In 1904 the general arbitration treaty (with the honor clause) between Germany and Great Britain was to be applied, upon motion by Germany, to the settlement of the reparation claims of the Germans who had been damaged during the Boer War. The British Government refused to appoint the court of arbitration, and this refusal was felt by Germany to be a breach of treaty. The relations between the two countries were considerably strained on account of this difference of opinion. Germany was afraid of the same bad result from an arbitration treaty with the United States, on account of the so-called Senate clause and the constitutional attitude of the individual American States.

The German Government preferred to derive the real benefit which courts of arbitration might bring in the policy of sovereign armed nations from special agreements by inserting the arbitration clause for certain departments of international law into the treaties with individual nations, as well as in collective or world treaties. It has concluded numerous treaties with the arbitration clause, among them some of far-reaching political importance, like the treaties with France about Morocco and Equatorial Africa, and has never been opposed to a motion for a decision by arbitration made by the other party.

Furthermore, in 1907 it proposed at The Hague a treaty for a prize court, which was accepted in its essential points by the conference, with the consent of the British delegation, but was rejected by the House of Lords. At The Hague, in 1907, the German delegation conceived a plan of a thorough and really binding arbitration treaty and intended to submit it a few months after the close of the conference. This plan was to make the great majority of those matters discussed in connection with the world arbitration treaty at The Hague—and not included in the honor reservation—as well as a number of other matters, subject to arbitration without restriction. Since, however, the motion for another session was not accepted, the German Government reserved this plan for the Third Hague Conference.

Furthermore, the London Declaration of articles of naval war of 1909, which was supposed to render the articles on commercial maritime war more liberal, and to protect the neutral maritime commerce against the arbitrariness of the belligerents, was favorably accepted and energetically promoted by the German Government, while the British Government in the beginning delayed and then after the declaration of war refused to give its consent.

Finally, it must be mentioned that Germany offered the United States a general arbitration treaty without any restriction, without the interest and honor clause. She was the first great Power to make such a far-reaching offer in the field of arbitration to another great Power. The American Government has never given a real answer.

The ratification of a so-called Bryan treaty, which proposed to submit all conflicts of juristic as well as politic nature to a mixed commission for investigation, but did not give

any legal force to the judgment of the commission, and which on the other hand, prohibited all hostility as long as the commission was in session, failed out of regard for the German national defense. The German Government thought that after the ratification of such a treaty with the United States of America it could not very well refuse the ratification of analogous treaties with the European States or of an analogous world treaty without injuring her friendly relations with the other States.

Furthermore, it thought that the clause concerning suspension of hostilities would counteract the military advantages which would come to Germany from the quicker mobilization, especially against Russia, if arbitration should fail.

In view of the importance of maintaining friendly relations between Germany and the United States, it remains doubtful whether the German Government would not have done better by accepting the American suggestion for the ratification of a Bryan treaty and shelving its doubts against the ratification of analogous treaties with European neighbors. However, the Committee on Investigation thinks it best to leave the question open, on account of the difficulty of judging it diplomatically.

In recapitulation, it must be said that the German Government, in its own way, has rendered valuable services to the arbitration idea. But, as in the question of disarmament, so in the treatment of international compromise and arbitration, it would have been better if the interested official and private forces had avoided creating the unjustified suspicion that the German Government was diametrically opposed to arbitration. Then they would have deprived all evil-minded circles abroad of any opportunity of rendering German intentions suspected. For this purpose it would have been best if the German Government had expressed its willingness more openly and had assumed leadership in this field, as it had been planned for the future.

However, just as in the question of disarmament, the authors of the note of June 16, 1919, have no right to accuse the German Government on account of its attitude toward arbitration. If other countries showed a more favorable attitude toward arbitration than Germany, they made reservations which rendered that which they granted theoretically and demonstrably rather doubtful for

practical use. It is an unfounded accusation that the execution of a war plan for ultimate world dominion was the reason for the attitude of the German Government at The Hague Peace Conferences. If the German Government had pursued such a sinister plan, it could have covered it up the more safely by accepting the proposals for disarmament and world arbitration.

For the correctness of the text of the report,

(Signed) DR. EUGENE FISCHER,
Secretary of the First Subcommittee.
Berlin, January 4, 1924.

HUNGARIAN FINANCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Official Communiqué of the Reparations Commission

The Reparation Commission met on February 21, at 6 o'clock, with Marquis Salvago Raggi, vice-chairman, in the chair.

The Commission decided to send the attached letter and two appendices (appendices 1, 2, 3) to the Hungarian Government.

This letter was handed to the Hungarian Minister, Baron Koranyi, who was received by the Commission in a further meeting, which it held at 6.45, and who handed in reply a letter, copy of which is attached. (See Appendix 4.)

The Hungarian Minister having then retired, the Commission, after discussion, took two decisions, the text of which is in conformity with the drafts contained in appendices 2 and 3.

1. *The Reparation Commission to the Hungarian Government (Appendix 1):*

The Reparation Commission, in accordance with the intention expressed in its decision of the 17th October last, has given most careful and sympathetic consideration to the plan for the financial reconstruction of Hungary, prepared by the Financial Committee and approved by the Council of the League of Nations, and consisting of the Protocols Nos. I and II and the report of that committee.

It will be within the knowledge of the Hungarian Government that it was on the invitation of the Commission itself that this plan was drawn up, and the Commission is earnestly desirous of taking any measures within its powers which, in the general interests alike of Hungary and of her creditors, may further the execution of that plan.

Without entering into any discussion of the details of the plan, the Commission observes that if the projected reconstruction loan and any short-term preliminary loan are to be issued successfully in the manner contemplated by the plan, it will be necessary that two decisions should be taken by the Commission at an early date.

One of these decisions is directed to raising the existing lien for reparations upon certain revenues of the Hungarian Government mentioned in the report of the Financial Committee, with a view to permitting the constitution of a first charge upon the resources thus exempted in favor of the holders of the new loan or loans. The other decision fixes, during the period of 20 years over which the amortization of the projected reconstruction loan is to extend, the payments and deliveries to be made by Hungary in respect of her obligations under the Treaty of Trianon in such a manner as to enable Hungary more readily to support the whole of her external financial obligations.

Drafts of the decisions are enclosed.

In connection with this second decision, the Commission further observes that it is not practicable, within the short period now remaining unexpired before the date contemplated for the issue of the loan, to take the steps prescribed by the Treaty of Trianon for fixing the reparation liability of Hungary, assigning to her a part of the general reparation debt, and drawing up a schedule of payments. The consent of the Hungarian Government to this decision will therefore be necessary.

The Hungarian obligations resulting from the decision will, of course, be subject to the conditions laid down in the plan of the League of Nations, and in this connection the Reparation Commission has to call the attention of the Hungarian Government to the fact that it interprets Articles 2 and 7 of Protocol II, which forms part of that plan, as meaning that the Council of the League of Nations, in conformity with the reconstruction scheme, will re-establish the control of Hungarian finances if, and when, the non-payment of any reparation annuity prescribed by the Commission is established. The Commission understands that this interpretation is that of the Council of the League; it proposes to take its decisions on this basis and desires before doing so to be assured that Hungary concurs in this interpretation.

In these circumstances it rests with the Hungarian Government to intimate, at the earliest possible moment, its willingness to accept the decisions of the Commission as drafted, and also the interpretation above indicated as the basis of those decisions.

On receipt of such an intimation the Commission will be prepared to take two decisions contemplated, and the way will thus be open to the Hungarian Government to procure the financial assistance which is recognized in the plan of the League of Nations as being essential in the interests of the reconstruction of Hungary.

(Signed) JOHN BRADBURY.
(Signed) SALVAGO RAGGI.

2. *Decision Excepting Specified Assets in View of Hungarian Loans (Appendix 2) :*

The Reparation Commission, considering the present state of Hungarian finances; taking note of the plan of the League of Nations for the reconstruction of Hungary transmitted to the Reparation Commission by the Hungarian Committee of the Council of the League as the plan asked for in the resolution of the Commission of the 17th October, 1923, as the said plan is set forth in the draft Protocols Nos. I and II and the report of the Financial Committee of the League, dated the 20th December, 1923; and considering that under the said plan it is proposed that Hungary should raise a reconstruction loan the net proceeds of which should not exceed 250,000,000 gold crowns, and which is to be repaid in a period of 20 years, and also possibly short-term loans which are to be repaid out of the yield of the principal reconstruction loan as soon as the latter has been issued, hereby, in exercise of the power conferred by Article 180 of the Treaty of Trianon to make exceptions to the first charge created by that treaty on the assets and revenues of Hungary for the cost of reparation and other costs, excepts from the charge created by the said Article 180 for the cost of reparation by Hungary and any other costs arising under the Treaty of Trianon or any treaties or agreements supplementary thereto or any arrangements concluded by Hungary with the Allied and associated powers during the armistice signed on the 3rd of November, 1918, and from any and every other charge to which the powers of the Commission extend, and so that this exception shall take effect for a period of 20 years from the date of this decision: 1, the gross

receipts of the customs; 2, the gross receipts from the tobacco monopoly; 3, the net receipts of the salt monopoly; 4, the gross receipts of the sugar tax; 5, such of the other revenues and receipts of the Hungarian Government, other than the State railways and the revenues thereof, as may from time to time be duly required under the conditions mentioned in the said plan for the service of the reconstruction long-term loan to Hungary therein referred to.

And whereas this release is intended to permit of the repayment of the said reconstruction loan within the period for which the said release takes effect, the Reparation Commission agrees that if at the end of the said period any part of the said reconstruction loan or the interest thereon has not been completely discharged, such part of the loan or interest shall, until completely discharged, have priority in respect of the revenues and receipts above excepted over the said first charge for the cost of reparations and other costs under Article 180 of the said Treaty.

And the Reparation Commission makes this exception and temporary waiver of priority on certain Hungarian assets upon the express conditions that, without prejudice to the rights of the holders of the Hungarian relief bonds, (1) no portion of the revenues and receipts so excepted be applied in priority to the said first charge for the costs of reparations and other charges to any purpose other than the service of the said projected loans, and (2) that the said short-term loans, if any, shall (if not already otherwise repaid) be discharged out of the proceeds of the said reconstruction loan;

Provided always, and it is hereby declared, that if the said Protocols Nos. I and II shall not have been signed by or on behalf of all the governments named therein respectively on or before the 31st March, 1924, or if before the 31st December, 1924, the League of Nations, taking into consideration the figure reached by the subscriptions to the said principal reconstruction loan, has not notified the Reparation Commission that it undertakes the responsibility to complete the reconstruction plan contained in the said protocols, this decision shall be void and of no effect, but so that any short-term loans, to be repaid out of the yield of the principal loan, which may have been issued after the signature of the protocols of the plan of the League of Nations and in conformity with those protocols shall be repaid in priority to reparations.

The Reparation Commission takes this decision upon the understanding that the Council of the League of Nations will declare before the 31st of March next that it interprets Articles 2 and 7 of the said Protocol II as meaning that it will be in conformity with the said plan of reconstruction re-establish the control of Hungarian finances if and when it finds that any payment or delivery prescribed by the Schedule to Decision No. 2797 of the Reparation Commission which fixes the reparation payments of Hungary has not been made and this Decision shall take effect only if the Council has made such a declaration before that date.

2.2.24.

3. *Decision as to Amount of Treaty Charges to be Imposed upon Hungary for a Period of Twenty Years (Appendix 3) :*

The Reparation Commission, considering the present state of Hungarian finances; taking note of the plan of the League of Nations for the financial reconstruction of Hungary transmitted to the Reparation Commission by the Hungarian Committee of the Council of the League as the plan asked for in the resolution of the Commission of the 17th October, 1923, and consisting of the Protocols Nos. I and II and the report of the Financial Committee of the League dated the 20th December, 1923; considering, also, that it is essential in the interests of Hungary and the States creditors of Hungary on reparation account that the projected loan to Hungary for financial reconstruction, as contemplated by the said plan, be adequately subscribed, but that it is not practicable, before the date proposed for the issue of any such loan, to determine the amount of the damage for which compensation is to be made by Hungary, to assign to her a part of the debt, and draw up such a schedule of payments for securing and discharging the part so assigned pursuant to Article 163 of the Treaty of Trianon; recognizing further that subscriptions to the said projected loan will be made upon the understanding that the recommendations as to the external obligations of Hungary, reparations, and the powers of the Commissioner General contained in the said plan receive the approval of the Reparation Commission, and therefore that the burden to be imposed on Hungary on account of reparation and other charges under the Treaty of Trianon (other than such burdens, if any, as

may arise under the said treaty in respect of the obligations of Hungary or her nationals which existed before the treaty) shall not, for a period of twenty years from the date of this decision, exceed the amounts mentioned in the annex hereto and shall be subject to the conditions contained in the said plan; and taking note of the engagement of the Hungarian Government, dated February 21st, 1924, consenting and agreeing to make the payment of the said amounts on the date prescribed, decides that the payments and deliveries to be made by Hungary from the 1st January, 1924, to the 31st December, 1943, in respect of her liability to make reparation shall, in pursuance of the said plan and subject to the conditions contained therein, to those set out in the annex hereto, but so that if during the said period of twenty years Hungary shall with the approval of the Reparation Commission make any payment or delivery under the said treaty (not being a payment or delivery in respect of obligations of Hungary or her nationals which existed before the war, as, for example, the obligations contained in Articles 186 and 231 and any such obligations as are contained in Article 232) otherwise than on account of reparation, such payment or the value of any such delivery shall not exceed the figure fixed by the schedule for the period in which it takes place and shall be deducted from the obligations of Hungary fixed in the schedule for that period.

And, further, if the payments fixed in the schedule for the years 1927 to 1943, added to the value of the deliveries or payments made in the years 1924, 1925, and 1926, do not amount to 200,000,000 gold crowns, the deficiency shall be paid or delivered during 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943 in addition to the payments or deliveries fixed for those years, one-fourth of the deficiency being allotted to each year; and, similarly, if those payments added to that value exceed 200,000,000 gold crowns, the excess shall in like manner be deducted from the payments or deliveries fixed for the same last years :

Provided, also, and it is hereby declared, that if the said Protocols I and II shall not have been duly signed by or on behalf of all the governments named therein respectively on or before the 31st of March, 1924, or if before the 31st of December, 1924, the League of Nations, taking into consideration the figure reached by the subscriptions to the said principal reconstruction loan, has not notified

the Reparation Commission that it undertakes the responsibility to complete the reconstruction plan contained in the said protocols, this decision shall be void and of no effect.

The Reparation Commission takes this decision upon the understanding that the Council of the League of Nations will declare before the 31st March next that it interprets Articles 2 and 7 of the said Protocol II as meaning that it will, in conformity with the said plan of reconstruction, re-establish the control of Hungarian finances if and when it finds that any payment or delivery prescribed by the schedule to this decision has not been made pursuant to this decision, and this decision shall take effect only if the Council has made such a declaration before that date.

2.2.24.

The Annex Above Referred To

Period.	Payments or deliveries. Value expressed in gold crowns.	
From 1 January, 1924..	Such deliveries in kind or payments as may from time to time be authorized by the Reparation Commission to an amount corresponding to the value of 800 of coal per working day.	
30 June, 1927.....	2,500,000	
31 December, 1927.....	2,500,000	5,000,000
30 June, 1928.....	2,500,000	
31 December, 1928.....	2,500,000	5,000,000
30 June, 1929.....	3,000,000	
31 December, 1929.....	3,000,000	6,000,000
30 June, 1930.....	3,500,000	
31 December, 1930.....	3,500,000	7,000,000
30 June, 1931.....	4,000,000	
31 December, 1931.....	4,000,000	8,000,000
30 June, 1932.....	4,500,000	
31 December, 1932.....	4,500,000	9,000,000
30 June, 1933.....	5,000,000	
31 December, 1933.....	5,000,000	10,000,000
30 June, 1934.....	5,500,000	
31 December, 1934.....	5,500,000	11,000,000
30 June, 1935.....	6,000,000	
31 December, 1935.....	6,000,000	12,000,000
30 June, 1936.....	6,500,000	
31 December, 1936.....	6,500,000	13,000,000
30 June, 1937.....	6,500,000	
31 December, 1937.....	6,500,000	13,000,000

30 June, 1938.....	6,500,000	
31 December, 1938.....	6,500,000	13,000,000
30 June, 1939.....	6,500,000	
31 December, 1939.....	6,500,000	13,000,000
30 June, 1940.....	6,500,000	
31 December, 1940.....	6,500,000	13,000,000
30 June, 1941.....	6,500,000	
31 December, 1941.....	6,500,000	13,000,000
30 June, 1942.....	7,000,000	
31 December, 1942.....	7,000,000	14,000,000
30 June, 1943.....	7,000,000	
31 December, 1943.....	7,000,000	14,000,000

2.2.24.

4. Hungary's Acceptance of the Decision (Appendix 4):

PARIS, 21st February, 1924.

To His Excellency, M. LOUIS BARTHOU,
Chairman of the Reparation Commission.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the letter of the Reparation Commission dated 21 February, together with the draft decisions attached, which the Reparation Commission intends to take.

Having received plenary powers from my government for this purpose, I have the honor to declare that the Hungarian Government is prepared to accept the decisions as communicated to me by Your Excellency's letter.

I have also the honor to agree both to the terms of the decisions and to the interpretation adopted by the Reparation Commission in its above-mentioned note concerning Articles 2 and 7 of Protocol II. I beg to take this opportunity of expressing both to Your Excellency and to your colleagues and collaborators the sincere thanks of my government for the much valued interest and sympathy which the Reparation Commission has accorded to the cause of my country.

I have the honor to be,

(Signed) KORANYI,
Minister for Hungary.

Under date of May 8 an official communique stated that, according to latest reports which have reached the Minister of Finance in London, the share capital of 30,000,000 pounds of the National Bank in Budapest had been fully subscribed.

MR. HUGHES AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Our Secretary of State, speaking in New York on April 15, devoted the major share of what is called a Republican keynote speech to our foreign policies. After referring to our tariff, financial, and taxation problems, Mr. Hughes said:

International Organization

It is not intended to revive an old dispute, but it is believed that dispassionate history will record the serious mistake of making a permanent plan for international organization, or for a society of nations, a part of a treaty embodying the terms of peace laid down by the victors in the Great War, and of introducing into that plan political commitments which were opposed to the genius of our institutions. It soon became apparent that the United States would not participate in such a plan without adequate reservations. Even then the opportunities for compromise were rejected by the former Administration and the treaty failed of approval. When President Harding took office it was manifest that it would be worse than futile to reopen that debate, on any pretext or proposal, and he followed the only course in which there was promise of achievement, and this promise was abundantly realized.

The technical state of war was speedily ended. Treaties with enemy powers, safeguarding our own rights without derogating from the rights of our former associates in the war, were concluded and approved by the Senate. In addition, a claims agreement was made with Germany and a unique tribute was paid to the American sense of justice by placing the deciding vote in the hands of one of our own citizens.

The American people cherish their independence. They were unwilling to enter into ambiguous commitments which in one breath were sought to be explained away as having little significance and in another were strenuously demanded as being of vital importance. They refused to assume by any form of words an obligation to take part in the never-ending conflicts of rival ambitions in Europe, but none the less they earnestly desire peace and seek in every way consistent with their traditions to promote it.

Harding Accomplished It

President Harding incarnated this desire and purpose. The exigency and opportunity lay at hand, and perhaps there has never been a more important contribution to the cause of peace than that which was made under the auspices of this government through the Washington Conference. I have observed here and there the effort to depreciate the work of the conference, but such an endeavor will not prosper in the face of world knowledge and appreciation,

and merely serves to betray a narrow vision or a partisan extremity.

The conference was limited to a few nations and in its aims; but for that very reason it succeeded. The powers possessing great navies met to discuss the limitation of armament. They, with four other powers especially interested, considered Far Eastern and Pacific questions. For the first time, a limitation of the naval strength of the great powers was agreed upon. By common consent the best measure of that strength was found in the capital battleships of the rival navies. The agreement put an end to the competitive programs in these ships, saving to tax-burdened peoples, including our own, hundreds of millions of dollars.

The agreement was fair to all, as is abundantly shown by the complaints of the dissatisfied in each country. The United States had the privilege of leadership and it made its sacrifices, but these were proportionate and were relatively fair. There are two sorts of critics who constitute the chief obstacles to progress, whatever labels they may wear. They are those who want nothing done and those who are only content with the impossible.

The most important result of the Washington conference was the establishment of a new understanding in the Far East. The darkening clouds were dispelled. Distrust yielded to mutual confidence. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was brought to an end, and provision for the future was made by an agreement which did no violence to American tradition, but in its very simplicity and adaptability contained the highest promise of continued accord. Peace in the Pacific, so far as this generation can see ahead, is undoubtedly assured.

Explicitly Expressed

The American policy of the "Open Door" was taken out of diplomatic notes and made the subject of a formal treaty, with more explicit terms than that in which it had ever been expressed. When the treaties relating to China go into effect, and we trust that will be in the near future, there will be afforded practical methods of helpfulness in the very difficult situation that is now presented. Our policies in the Far East have been defined and a sound basis of co-operation has been laid. It should be added that these treaties disposed of the ambiguous Lansing-Ishii agreement, which was subsequently formally canceled.

The Washington conference established a precedent of controlling importance. It is safe to say that all who may in the future labor for further limitations of armaments will emulate the example and evoke the happy spirit of co-operation which animated that conference. While the greater part of the proposals of this government were adopted, there were other portions which could not be progressed. This unfinished business will be taken up as soon as there appears to be a reasonable prospect of suc-

cess. As President Harding said, we want "less of armament and none of war."

There is sound reason for gratification in the increasing good-will and mutual helpfulness which have characterized during the last few years the development of the relations between the United States and her sister republics of the American continent. This hemisphere should be the exemplar of peace and friendly co-operation. Whatever contribution we can make elsewhere to the progress of civilization, here is our first duty and immediate opportunity to present an example of unity of ideals and unity of purpose, of a common determination to settle all differences by the orderly processes of conference, mediation, and arbitration.

Aims as to Latin America

You may recall that it was just three years ago, at the unveiling of the Statue of Bolívar in this city, that President Harding set forth the attitude and aims of the Administration with respect to our relations with Latin America. And there has been no deviation from the principles he then declared. The record of these years has been an inspiring one, not only because of the definite results achieved, but mainly by reason of the new spirit of confidence and friendliness which pervades our inter-American relations.

The Administration has enjoyed the privilege of having advanced toward settlement a question which for forty years has disturbed the relations between two of our sister republics, Chile and Peru. This controversy has hung like a cloud over the international relations of Latin America, and it is a great satisfaction to be able to announce that the proceedings are now being concluded for its final submission to the arbitration of the President of the United States.

The troublesome difficulties which for many years have disturbed our relations with Mexico have yielded to a friendly adjustment. We have been able to resume our normal intercourse, and two conventions have been entered into for the arbitral determination of claims. More important than any formal arrangements of this sort is the better understanding and friendly accord which have been reached, holding promise for the first time in many years of a mutually beneficial co-operation upon a sound basis.

I am glad to be able to add that the efforts to secure an independent and stable government in Santo Domingo, so as to permit the ending of our occupation, have met with gratifying success. Elections have been had to establish a provisional Dominican Government, and it is expected that the plan for a permanent government will soon be carried into effect.

In short, during the last three years we have been able to convince the governments and the peoples of the American Continent, not only by our declarations but by outstanding example, that ours is a government respectful of their rights, as well as regardful of our own, and that we are always willing

to join with them in the furtherance of those larger purposes of international right and fair dealing upon which, in the last analysis, the peace and progress of the entire continent must depend.

To Prevent American Conflicts

In addition to the special conventions concluded at the recent Pan-American Conference at Santiago, a treaty was signed to prevent conflicts between the American States. This treaty, signed by the representatives of sixteen American States, provides for the submission of all controversies which may arise between two or more of the contracting powers and which it has been impossible to settle through diplomatic channels, or to submit to arbitration in accordance with existing treaties, shall be submitted for investigation, and report to the Commission of Inquiry.

Contracting parties undertake not to begin mobilization or to engage in any hostile acts or preparation for hostilities until the commission has rendered its support. Any one of the governments directly interested in the investigation of the facts giving rise to the controversy may apply for the convocation of the commission. The representatives of the American republics have thus sought in an entirely practicable way, by a general agreement, to assure the maintenance of peace in this hemisphere. To this important treaty the Senate of the United States has given its prompt approval.

The determinative principles of our foreign policy are those of independence and co-operation. Independence—that does not mean and never has meant isolation. Co-operation—that does not mean and never has meant alliances or political entanglements. If there are those among us who wish to involve this country in the political controversies of Europe, who desire our part in the great war, in defense of our own security and of the cause of liberty itself, to be made the occasion or the basis of participation in the intrigues and rivalries of European politics; if there are those among us who think that that sort of participation is the only means of co-operation in the interest of peace and humanitarian ends, they are, I am sure, in a hopeless minority.

Isolation Decried

If there are those who think that, with our vast resources, our increasing relative power, our varied contacts and complex intimacies, cultural and commercial, we can withdraw into ourselves, and that, deaf alike to the appeals of interest and the calls of humanity, we can lead an isolated national life, they are the victims of an unfortunate delusion. There is the just middle course of national safety, of national honor, of national interest, of national duty. It is the course of an appropriate co-operation, congenial to our traditions and institutions.

The only room for debate is as to the means

of that co-operation. In seeking the wise and available course it is a serious mistake to sacrifice substance for form, to make everything turn on the question of formal organization and our relation to it. The question of formal organization has been fully discussed and it would serve no useful purpose to reopen the controversy. The provisions of the covenant of the League, to which there was decisive objection here, remain unaltered. The participation in political questions abroad, to which we were invited, is still opposed by preponderant sentiment. It would be idle to project a bitter and paralyzing dispute over forms of association when the substantial objects of a suitable co-operation can be otherwise achieved.

The real question is as to the subjects in relation to which we should, and we can, effectively co-operate. It is frequently overlooked that, even if we had a representative at Geneva he would not speak when our government desired him to be silent. His presence there would not permit him to participate in discussions or action when our government did not wish such participation.

What our government would desire in each case would depend upon the subject-matter, our traditional attitude and our conception of national interest. It would depend upon sentiment here, not upon sentiment abroad. Moreover, if the Congress undertook to authorize such a representation, the Congress itself most probably would reserve the authority to give instructions, and you can well imagine what the debate would be and what the instructions would be in cases where European political questions were involved and matters foreign to our interests were concerned.

Co-operation in Effect

The truth is that we co-operate now where the subject-matter is such that we would be able to co-operate at all. Indeed we co-operate with a facility and elasticity which might be impaired or lost in the event of association in a formal organization if this led to restrictions imposed through a fear of the possible abuses of opportunity which such an association would afford.

It may be observed that there is nothing obscure or reprehensible, nothing derogatory to our influence, dignity or prestige, in the form of our co-operation. It is simply adjusted to an inescapable fact. Of course, as the United States has decided not to become a member of the League of Nations, this government cannot act as though it were a member. This government cannot appoint its representatives as members of the League's Council, Assembly, or committees. And this fact is properly recognized when we appoint so-called "observers" or unofficial representatives, who have appropriate contact with such committees in matters affecting our interests or the humanitarian concerns which appeal to us.

They are unofficial simply in the sense that

they are and cannot properly become members of the League organization or committees. But, so far as our government is concerned, they represent it just as completely as those designated by the President always have represented our government in the conferences and negotiations which he properly authorizes in the conduct of our foreign relations. Of course, such representatives cannot enter into any agreements with other governments until they are approved in accordance with the requirements of our Constitution. There is nothing new in that.

No Difficulty Presented

There is no more difficulty in dealing with the organization of the League in this way for the purpose of protecting our interests or furthering our policies than there would be in dealing with the British Empire. Because several nations have formed an organization of which we are not a part is no reason why we cannot co-operate in all matters affecting our proper concern. We simply adjust our forms of contact and negotiation to the existing conditions.

The matter of real importance is with respect to the subjects we take up. We do not take up subjects which involve political entanglements. We do not take up subjects which would draw us into matters not approved by American sentiment. When we do take up a subject, it is because this government desires it to be taken up, and the same would be true under any form of action.

For example, the United States is a party to The Hague Convention of 1912, directed to the control of production and distribution of opium and derivative drugs. This is a matter in which we are deeply interested and in which we have had the privilege of leadership. Under the Covenant of the League of Nations it was sought to transfer the administration of that convention to the League. Measures to carry out more adequately the purposes of the treaty were needed. It was important that we should take the matter up most actively, and this we did by dealing with the League committee. This government did not appoint members of that committee, but it appointed its own representatives to present its views and to urge the reforms which were deemed to be imperative.

Mr. Porter, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, headed this representation and made a determined fight for the proposals of this government to put an end to the excessive production of opium and the evils of the distribution and consumption of narcotic drugs. Similarly, we have had the representatives of this government in collaboration with the committees of the League in relation to anthrax, public health, anti-toxic serums, traffic in women and children, relief work, and the control of the traffic in arms.

Deemed Inadvisable

When an invitation to a conference is not accepted by this government, or when we

take part only under prescribed limitations, it is simply because the competent authorities of this government, who are concerned with the particular matter, do not think it advisable either to take part at all or to have a broader participation by reason of the particular circumstances or objects of that conference. When we do not approve a convention arrived at by the other powers, it is simply because its terms are not congenial to the policies of this government or the requirements of our constitution.

In short, we have, as we have always had, our full competence in obtaining information and in negotiating agreements. The President designates representatives for that purpose. Our record as a government in the co-operation we have maintained during the past three years in matters not involving political entanglements or injurious commitments is one which should afford gratification to all our people irrespective of party. This substantial co-operation in giving effect to our dominant national desire to be helpful in all matters engaging our interests and our humanitarian purposes we propose to continue.

The United States is recognized throughout the world as possessing and exercising an influence second to none in promoting international peace. We favor international conferences whenever there is a reasonable prospect of forwarding in this manner conciliatory measures or of reaching useful agreements. We have always advocated the judicial settlement of international disputes, and to this end both President Harding and President Coolidge recommended, upon appropriate conditions, the support of the Permanent Court of International Justice. In the meantime, we are promoting the use of the processes of arbitration.

Fifty Agreements Signed

Our activity in the field of international accord is shown by the fact that in the past three years we have signed fifty treaties and international agreements, exclusive of postal conventions. Five of these required no action by the Senate. Of the remaining number, forty have been submitted to the Senate, and of these thirty-seven have already received the Senate's approval. These agreements embrace treaties of peace, the Washington Conference treaties, the Santiago Conference treaties, claims conventions, treaties protecting the United States from discriminatory measures in mandated territories, reinforcing the policy of the "open door," extensions of arbitration conventions, treaties to facilitate trade and commerce, and extradition treaties. There is also that unique and most important treaty with Great Britain to facilitate search and seizure, so that we may stop rum-running off our coasts. Similar treaties with other governments are in course of negotiation.

Even more important than formal governmental relations is the co-operation between

peoples. The contribution of the American people throughout the world in relief, in investment, in the substantial aid proffered by American experience and disinterestedness, is a source of the deepest satisfaction. No appeal of the starving and distressed is made in vain to the American heart. The suffering in every land are voicing gratitude for American benevolence. Aid to self-help is even better than charity, and great productive enterprises in every part of the world find support in American capital. Billions of American money have been put into investments abroad to aid economic recovery. Whoever says that America stands aloof and withholds her support from a stricken world is guilty of reckless slander.

Political Entanglements Avoided

We do stand aloof from political entanglements, but not otherwise. American aid, American advice, American impartiality in dealing with difficult problems, are sought and given. This most valuable contribution is aided rather than hindered by the fact that it is not governmental. Our government is one of restraints, wisely imposed, to place checks upon official discretion and to protect the different departments of government from encroachment upon each other. Governmental action generally requires the co-ordinated effort of different branches of government. It must issue from the field of political controversy and is subject to the conflicts of opposing groups. It generally involves the rigidity of statutory enactments. Private action may be more direct, more flexible.

There has just been dramatic illustration of this. American brains, American experience, American competency of the highest order, have been given to the solution of the most urgent European problems. A practicable adjustment of the questions pertaining to reparations is the essential foundation of the economic recovery for which the world is waiting. Central Europe has been in an economic chaos and has suffered the resulting evils of mistrust, of industrial distress.

Nor has the injury due to the inability to find a settlement been limited to Europe. Our farmers have suffered through the decreased consuming power and the lack of markets. With a sound basis for economic recuperation abroad, there will be new hope and the promise of the dawn of a new era of general prosperity and peace. Had this government attempted to make its contribution we should still be in controversy, and be held, as Europe has been held, in the grip of politics and racial antagonisms. The world needed the unfettered service of men of affairs to deal with the vital problems of industry and finance upon their merits. It is none the less an American contribution because it has been made by such men in the only practicable way.

News in Brief

THE YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION of Los Angeles gave Maj. F. L. Martin a message to be delivered to each of the twenty-two nations crossed by the United States Army aviators as they go around the world. The message reads as follows:

The Government of the United States is sending the American air fleet to establish an airway around the globe which shall be a highway of peace. Twenty-two countries have given friendly co-operation for this flight. The starting point and likewise the return point is southern California. Therefore the directors of the Young Women's Christian Association of Los Angeles seize the opportunity to send from America greetings and a message of friendship and peace to the women of all nations.

We pray God, our common Father, that this airway may be a band of friendship encircling the world, binding all nations of the earth in permanent bonds of peace. And, since truth and justice are the only permanent foundation for the peace of the world, we voice the plea that all women, everywhere, use their influence to the end that the principles of truth and justice may prevail and govern all our relationships, both as individuals and as governments.

OUR PRESENT DAILY NEWS OUTPUT to South America, says Mr. Martin, general manager of the Associated Press, is 5,000 words of abbreviated cable. It is printed in English, Spanish, Portuguese, German, and Italian. Before the war leading papers of South America took their world news from Europe. Most of this news now comes through New York. One cause of this change is a desire on the part of the southern continent for a better understanding of the United States. Such a result, Mr. Martin thinks, is sure to follow. South American newspapers, as a rule, avoid publishing details of crime and scandal; they print more foreign news than any papers in New York.

THE UNITED STATES ADMITS into this country all student immigrants who wish to attend recognized institutions of higher education who can furnish evidence of such intention

and who are "otherwise admissible." Their numbers are not affected by other immigrant restrictions.

THE TEACHING OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING through the schools was indorsed as an important step toward world peace by the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, in convention in Chicago the last week in February.

THE EIGHTH PRAGUE SAMPLE FAIR was held at Prague, Czechoslovakia, March 16 to 23, 1924. The increasing activity of Czechoslovakia in international commercial affairs and the growing liberality of the foreign commercial policy of the country should lend importance to this fair. Prague is located in the center of Europe, with direct railway connections with many of the surrounding countries, making it an excellent place for such an exhibition.

THE SIXTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING of the National Education Association will take place in Washington, D. C., June 29-July 4, this summer.

AMBASSADOR CYRUS E. WOODS has resigned his post as representative of the United States at Tokio. Though it is known that the Ambassador was keenly disappointed in the action of the American Congress in passing the immigration measure excluding the Japanese, his resignation is entirely for family reasons. Mr. Woods said, when his resignation had become known:

"I leave Japan with genuine regret, especially since it is necessary for me to give up my work here at a difficult and critical period in the history of the relations between Japan and my country.

"I consider that in this crisis, the government and people of Japan have acted with dignity and self-restraint, which promises well, better indeed than might have been expected, for the continuation of friendship between Japan and America."

THE WAR OFFICE, OF TOKYO, JAPAN, announced in May that 4,000 workmen employed in the arsenals and clothing factories would be discharged on May 31, as part of the program of army reduction, which was inaugurated in 1922.

MANY YOUNG JAPANESE COUPLES are emigrating to Brazil. About 200 persons sailed from Kobe to that country on April 15. The Kalgai Kogyo Company has been collecting South American emigrants in co-operation with the Home office in order to relieve the unemployment problem as well as to aid quake sufferers. Emigration to south America is favored in Japan, especially among farmers, and the Home office is dispatching Mr. Tomita, secretary of the Social Affairs bureau, to South America to investigate conditions and to consult with the Brazilian government.

The Tokyo Nichi Nichi also declared an enterprise of sending 200 farmers' families to Brazil, by the Canada Maru, sailing from Kobe on May 29.

ON APRIL 1, 1924, THERE WERE IDLE, in British ports, approximately 587,000 gross tons of shipping. This represents a sharp decline from the laid-up British tonnage on January 1, when there were 909,000 tons idle, and is only about one-third the figure for January 1, 1922.

BEGINNING APRIL 1, AND USING JUNKER AIRPLANES, an aviation line is to begin service between London and Belgrade. Stops have been planned at Straubing on the Danube, the transfer station from regular air-planes to water-planes, and the junction point of the lines from Geneva to Prague and from London to Vienna and the Balkans.

AN ATTEMPT WILL BE MADE THIS YEAR to handle the entire mail traffic between Switzerland and Holland by means of air service on the projected line from Rotterdam to Brussels, Strasbourg and Basle.

THE AIR-MAIL LINE FROM TOULOUSE TO ORAN (Algiers) via Alicante, Spain, was inaugurated in March. This line is an extension of the French air-mail lines which operate a service from France and Spain to Northern Africa.

GEN. HENRY T. ALLEN, ex-commander of the American Army of Occupation on the Rhine, is assisting the American Friends Service Committee in their effort to feed the starving German children. He makes the following statement: "The Dawes report leaves no doubt of the present financial and

economic crisis in Germany. Hunger is the inevitable companion of the inflation of their money and of the millions of unemployed. The children have had no part in either phase of this calamity. Outside help is imperative."

A MEMORANDUM DRAWN UP BY THE LEADERS of the German parties in South Tyrol was handed to the President of the League of Nations Union by the deputies of German South Tyrol—Graf Toggenburg, Dr. Reuth-Nicolussi, Dr. Tinzl, and Dr. von Walther. The memorandum touches the interests of the population of South Tyrol, which for nearly 600 years previous to the Treaty of St. Germain had been connected with Austria. The German leaders claim that Fascisti have exhibited intolerance and needless severity toward Germans in the Tyrol; that many unnecessary expulsions, involving economic ruin, have taken place. They complain of grievous restrictions in the securing of passports; the abolition of land and parish autonomy; the use of Italian as the official tongue and its introduction as the language of the schools—in fact, the suppression of anything tending to preserve the German cultural ideas of history. The German-speaking territory is estimated in the memorandum of protest as about two-fifths of the whole annexed territory.

THE ITALIAN CABINET HAS APPROVED a decree creating a new ministry of communications, which is to include railways, merchant marine, posts, telephones, and telegraphs. The International Customs Convention, concluded at Geneva in November, 1923, has been approved for Italy and the colonies. The unfavorable balance of Italian trade has been reduced; prices continue to rise, but unemployment has declined decidedly in the past year.

TRADE CENTERS IN INDIA REPORT a slight improvement in general business. The demand for government securities has increased since the publication of the balanced budget for 1924-5.

COMMERCE REPORTS published by the U. S. Department of Commerce, state that the new budget of Great Britain is distinctly not a class legislation. It provides relief all along the line for workers, industry, and all social

groups. Some of the principal provisions in the proposed budget are the repeal, on August 1, of the McKenna duties on motor cars, motor-cycles and accessories, clocks, watches, and on cinematograph films. "Breakfast-table" duties are reduced about one-half. If the existing taxation had remained unchanged, there would have been a surplus of, probably, £33,000,000 instead of £4,024,000, as at present planned. The chancellor had the option of recommending the above taxation relief or maintaining it, in large measure, as it now exists and making heavy appropriations for social legislation. The decision of the labor government to make taxation decreases assured the support of the Liberal Party.

AFTER THE SIGNING OF THE ARMISTICE, the American Red Cross, wishing to leave in France a worthy memorial of its work, decided to establish a child welfare center. Having been put into touch with the Dean of the Paris Faculty of Medicine, the Red Cross agreed to offer a gift of one million francs for the purpose, on condition that France, on her side, obtain an equal sum. By means of public subscriptions and private gifts the million has been collected,

THE SURVIVAL OF THE JUNIOR RED CROSS in the United States after the war, says Arthur W. Dunn, and its rapid development in thirty-five or forty other nations, would not have been possible but for the confidence of the school authorities of the several nations in its fundamental values in the process of education. These values may differ to a considerable extent in different countries. Underlying all of them, however, is the emphasis it gives in the educational process to the ideal of service as the impelling motive in social life. In direct relation to this, it may be said that the unique contribution to education of the Junior Red Cross movement consists in the practical means which it affords to the schools of all lands to extend the application of this service ideal to embrace the whole world community.

INDIA NOW CONSUMES ABOUT 700,000 tons of steel a year, most of which is supplied by home production. The Tata Iron and Steel Company, the largest in India, now has 5 blast furnaces with a daily capacity of 2,050 long tons of pig iron. The opening of a large

new blooming mill and a sheet bar and billet mill at Jamshedpur late in 1923 was significant of the steady progress of this firm in the realization of its huge expansion program, which includes the erection of new rail and merchant mills. The company is already turning out high-grade steel castings. For the year ending March 31, 1923, the Tata Iron and Steel Company produced 438,800 tons of iron ore, 242,083 tons of pig iron, 1,158 tons of ferromanganese, 70,350 tons of rails and fishplates, 42,120 tons of structural steel, and 1,883 tons of plates. The Tinplate Company of India, Ltd., a subsidiary of this firm, opened up at the beginning of 1923 and now has a capacity of from 30,000 tons to 33,000 tons of black plates annually. During 1923 the plant hot-rolled 213,940 boxes of sheared and acceptable black plate. The Bengal Iron Company, Ltd., is said to have been producing more than 150,000 tons of pig iron annually, while the Indian Iron and Steel Company had under construction a plant which was estimated to have a capacity of 110,000 tons of pig iron annually. The United Steel Corporation of Asia, Ltd., recently organized by prominent British firms, will erect a modern steel plant manufacturing all basic steel products. The Mysore Distillation and Iron Works at Bhadravati has a capacity of 20,000 tons of pig iron.

IMPORTS OF COTTON CLOTH INTO THE UNITED STATES during the first three months of 1924 totaled 55,887,096 square yards, valued at \$11,776,624, of which the United Kingdom supplied 45,656,958 square yards, worth \$9,119,469. During the corresponding period of 1923 the total receipts of cotton cloth from all countries were 60,255,982 square yards, with a value of \$14,225,496, of which the United Kingdom's share was 46,857,361 square yards, valued at \$10,591,129.

THE LATEST REPORT OF THE TOKYO Metropolitan Police Board, transmitted to the Capital Restoration Bureau, on reconstruction gives the number of houses destroyed in the September fires as 293,488 and the number of temporary structures replacing them as 144,797. Thus, roughly, 50 per cent of the burned buildings have been restored.

POLAND HAS HAD BY LAW AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY and a forty-six-hour week in industry for the last four years. A suggestion that

these limits should be extended, in view of the present economic conditions in Poland. was put forward in the name of employers at the first meeting of the new Economic Council held recently in Warsaw. The Prime Minister, far from giving any support to the proposal, declared his belief that the maintenance of the eight-hour day was essential to industrial progress. The determination of the Polish Government to preserve the present law intact acquires special interest, first, from the present industrial and economic difficulties in the country, and secondly, from the proximity of Germany. Further, the declaration of the Prime Minister is the more notable by reason of the fact that Poland has not yet ratified the Washington International Labor Conference Convention on hours of labor, and is therefore under no legal international obligation to maintain the existing law unaltered.

CHILD LABOR CONDITIONS IN CHINA are somewhat similar to those in Persia. Modern machinery has reduced the skill needed for operation so that women and children, who are cheaper than men, may be employed. It is estimated that in the cotton mills in China 40 per cent of the employees are women, 40 per cent children and only 20 per cent men. In the silk industry in Central and South China nearly all the workers are women and girls. The estimate for all branches of industry in China show 20 per cent boys and girls under 14 years of age.

The first attempt at State regulation was recently made when the Board of Agriculture and Commerce published 28 articles governing the conditions of employment. Among the main features may be mentioned the prohibition of child labor under 10 years for boys and 12 years for girls; and the institution of less strenuous working conditions of junior workers, boys 10 to 17 and girls 12 to 18. Furthermore, employers are forbidden to employ junior workers at night, *i. e.*, from 8 o'clock p. m. to 4 o'clock a. m.

IN FRANCE AND IN CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES a system is now in operation whereby supplementary grants, generally known as family allowances, are given to married workers with children in addition to their ordinary wages, according to Professor Picard in the International Labor Review. The rate of

the allowance differs in different districts. Some funds have a regressive scale under which the workers get less for the second child than for the first and less for the third than for the second. Others have a progressive scale which increases the amount payable per child with the increase in the number of children, and some pay a uniform rate for all children. Some funds pay various bonuses in addition to the ordinary allowances, such as maternity and nursing bonuses, and sometimes even a bonus to a workman's wife who is solely occupied in taking care of the family.

THE TERCENTENARY OF THE COMING OF THE HUGENOTS and Walloons to America is to be celebrated this year. Dr. McFarland, chairman of the executive committee on the celebration, makes this statement: "In connection with the Tercentenary, the following facts must be remembered:

"First, the primary intent of the celebration is to recognize the part the Huguenots and Walloons played in the settlement of America.

"Second, these settlements began with the Huguenot colonists sent by Coligny to Florida.

"Third, the first permanent settlement of New York was in 1624 and was composed mainly of Huguenots and Walloons.

"Fourth, the celebration is not exclusively a New York affair, but is a national event, with commemoration exercises at various points in practically every state along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York.

"Fifth, William the Silent and the ship 'Nieu Nederland' emphasize the great part played by the Dutch in the settlement of New York.

"Sixth, the celebration is not religious, but historical."

FRENCH PRODUCTION OF PIG IRON ROSE from 590,340 metric tons in February to 639,000 tons in March, bringing the total for the first quarter to 1,815,000 tons. Output of raw steel in March amounted to 573,000 metric tons, as compared with 554,632 tons in February and 541,022 tons in January. There were 136 blast furnaces active in France on April 1, 39 furnaces were ready to operate and 45 furnaces were being constructed or under repair.

THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT OF TODAY can, according to Mr. Carlton Beals, exercise the right of eminent domain and condemn property at the value set by the owner in declaring his taxes, plus 10 per cent. Since most large landed estates have hitherto been very lightly taxed, and since the De la Huerta-Obregon Government made prompt use of this right, there either resulted a substantial increase in the amount of taxes paid or the acquisition of property by the government at very low prices. The Obregon Government has, also, in accordance with the constitution, expropriated all lands within the federal zones—*i. e.*, bordering upon frontiers or seacoasts which were illegally held by foreigners. These lands are properly paid for in interest-bearing bonds which have increased in value—a procedure which is also followed in Rumania and other Baltic countries. Mr. Beals estimated that by May, 1923, a total area of 2,500,000 acres would be thus expropriated. The land program of Mexico provides for the distribution of unused agricultural lands among the people, on the principle that every Mexican citizen is entitled to a plot of ground sufficient in size to sustain himself and his family.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF THE UNITED STATES have decided to maintain, through the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, permanent relations with the Russian, Greek, Syrian, Armenian, and other churches of eastern Europe and Asia. A permanent committee has been announced, with Bishop Brent, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Rev. Montgomery, former president of the America-Armenia Society, as officers. Dr. Montgomery states that this advance in religious co-operation has been greatly furthered by the British administrative control in Palestine, for the seat of the Orthodox Patriarchate is at Jerusalem, and since the assumption of the British mandate there has been the focus of a sustained effort toward Eastern and Western church understanding, the impetus for which hitherto has come largely from England.

The immediate object of the present summer's negotiations, Dr. Montgomery announces, is to encourage Eastern churches to send deputations to the United States on a church-unity mission, as well as to further co-operation among the different branches of the Eastern church. This is an important

step toward a world association of churches, he declares, which has proceeded steadily in both Europe and America during the last fifteen years and is just being resumed after the war.

PARIS OBSERVED THE WEEK BEGINNING MAY 4, as "Latin-America Week." Demonstrations sponsored by President Millerand and Prime Minister Poincaré took place during the week, at which South American diplomats made addresses. Henry de Jouvenel, Minister of Education, in an eloquent speech, said: "Europe discovered America, but so long ago that it has had time to forget. It is time to discover America again, not by navigators, but by the man in the street." M. de Jouvenel advocated a union of the Latin peoples.

THE USE OF LIGNITE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR PIT COAL has increased in Germany very rapidly in the past ten years, especially since the war. Up to the outbreak of the war the output of lignite was less than half that of pit coal, the pit coal output in 1913 being 190,000,000 tons, as against 87,000,000 tons of lignite. The war soon brought about a change in this state of things. In consequence of the number of miners called to the colors, the output of pit coal sank in 1914 to 161,000,000 tons and in 1915 to 147,000,000 tons. This decreased output alarmed the government, and in 1916 and 1917 miners were specially exempted from service at the front, with the result that the output rose to 168,000,000 tons, only to sink again in the following year to 161,000,000 tons.

In the case of lignite the output had in the meantime been increased by the employment of prisoners of war and in 1918 amounted to 100,000,000 tons. By 1922 the output of lignite had reached 137,000,000 tons, the pit coal output for the same year being only 130,000,000 tons, the lignite output for the first time in Germany's economic history overtopping that of pit coal.

In 1923, owing to the occupation of the Ruhr, and to the absence of the coal supplies from the Saar region, the Palatinate and Polish Upper Silesia, the pit coal output in Germany amounted to only 55,000,000 tons, as compared with 115,000,000 tons of lignite. Germany, in the past ten years, may be regarded as having gradually changed from a pit coal region to a lignite region.

COAL OUTPUT IN THE RUHR DISTRICT is fast approaching the volume of pre-war times. The figures for the week from March 16 to 22 show an output for the Ruhr of 1,895,000 tons of coal and 375,500 tons of coke, the occupied region alone being responsible for 1,714,053 tons of coal and 339,547 tons of coke. In the occupied area during the week in question the daily output amounted to 315,934 tons, as against 369,743 tons in 1913, the daily coke production to 53,644 tons, as against 62,718 tons in 1913.

WORK FOR WORLD PEACE was emphasized by the National Young Women's Christian Association in its eighth annual convention, held in New York early in May. The international aspect of the Association's work was symbolized by flags of many nations carried in a parade, by a service held in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, and by speakers at other meetings.

ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN BULGARIA, together with the fact that many bankers and merchants in that State are Jews, is held responsible by a Minister of the Council for the recent anti-Jewish outbreaks. The government intends, he says, to take the anti-Jewish movement at its inception and assure the same rights of equality to Jews which all other races enjoy. An anti-Jewish agitation is something new in the history of the Bulgarian State. Jewish citizens have an exact equality in patriotism and in participation in the political life of the State. The government is firmly determined there shall be no room for anti-Semitism in Bulgaria.

THREE RESOLUTIONS DEALING WITH INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION were passed by Congress on April 22. The first appropriated sums not to exceed \$2,500 per annum to maintain membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague. The second authorized the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the Seventh Pan-American Sanitary Conference, to be held in Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924. The third provided for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications, to be held in Mexico City in 1924.

LETTER BOX

DR. HALE TWENTY YEARS AHEAD

DEAR SIR:

The executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches, which in its twenty-nine denominations has over twenty million Protestants of the country, has just issued a general appeal to the churches for service in the field now most imperatively claiming attention. Among its recommendations in line of international duty, it urges that every church should create a special committee on International Good Will. This is a noble and necessary recommendation. In urging it the Federal Council is only twenty years behind Edward Everett Hale. Half a dozen years before he died, in 1909, Dr. Hale declared that no modern church, in view of the international needs and problems of the time, was a properly organized Christian church, or was doing its duty, which did not have among its regular committees one on International Justice. Suiting his action to his word, as he always did, he created such a committee in his church, the South Congregational Church of Boston. I believe this was the first such committee in the world.

A little later, probably inspired by Dr. Hale's word, Mrs. Frank W. Williams, of the first Unitarian Church of Buffalo, prompted the organization of such committees in a dozen or twenty churches in Buffalo, and I have no doubt these organizations are still continuing their good work. There is no other city in the country whose churches were so early or so well organized for this service as the churches of Buffalo, through Mrs. Williams' remarkable campaign. If the Federal Council succeeds in bringing the other cities of the country up to Buffalo, it will do well.

This was not the only peace movement in which Dr. Hale was twenty years ahead of the time. The chief campaign of the Federal Council of Churches this winter is for the World Court. At the first Mohonk Conference for International Arbitration in 1895, the feature of the conference was a great speech by Dr. Hale demanding the establish-

ment of a permanent International Tribunal. He came to the conference the next year and the next with what he called "the same old speech." These three memorable addresses are all included in the volume of Dr. Hale's Mohonk addresses published by the World Peace Foundation.

Dr. Hale was not talking in 1895 about a court of arbitration such as was established by the first Hague Conference four years later. He was talking about an International Court of Justice like that which Elihu Root recently helped organize at The Hague, which President Harding in his last words urged the United States to join, and which President Coolidge in his recent message to Congress endorsed as the only practicable plan. Dr. Hale said that the United States, by virtue of its own organization and spirit and tradition, would be the first nation to adhere to such a court. He could hardly believe it, were he to come back and learn that it would be almost the last, and that half of our politicians in Washington today were engaged in schemes on petty technical grounds to thwart President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes in their effort to have the nation do its duty in the matter. Only some solemn word like that of William Vaughn Moody's "An Ode in Time of Hesitation,"* or William Gannett's equally inspired "America at the Peace Congress," could do justice to the situation.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

RAVENSBORNE, KESTON, KENT,
February 24, 1924.

DEAR SIR:

Very many thanks for reminding me that my annual subscription for 1924-25 is now due. I have much pleasure in enclosing a cheque for same and also payment for Miss Julia E. Johnsen's book on the Permanent Court of International Justice, which please send to me to the above address, together with a list of the books on international peace which are on sale at your offices.

May I take this opportunity of saying how much I appreciate the alterations and improvements of the current issues of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*?

Yours cordially,

J. W. WHEELER-BENNETT, JR.

BOOK REVIEWS

MEXICO: AN INTERPRETATION. By *Carlton Beals*. B. W. Huebsch, New York. Pp. 280. Price, \$2.50.

PRESIDENT OREGON, a World Reformer. By *Dr. E. J. Dillon*. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston. Pp. 350. Price, \$3.00.

The Mexico of today has become a significant factor in New World freedom. The President of the Students' Federation of Peru said, recently, that Mexico is the standard-bearer of Latin America in the matter of democracy. Our own recent establishment of friendly relations with President Obregon's government and the sending of Mr. Warren as Ambassador to Mexico has stimulated public interest in that seething but interesting country.

Mr. Beals' book is of a general historical character, furnishing an excellent preliminary to a more detailed study of the subject. He gives an extraordinarily good résumé of the past of the Indian races, which even today comprise 85 per cent or more of the population of Mexico. He pictures the veneer of language and customs overlaid by Spain and follows the gradual merging of the two ethnic types, Indian and Iberian. Nevertheless, Mexico is not yet completely an entity. Composed of groups as widely divergent in traditions and customs as the various European countries, it will be only after long struggle that anything like a unified whole can emerge.

Both Mr. Beals and Dr. Dillon see in President Obregon the leader who is destined to bring together in coherence the separate parts of the Mexican nation. He is the head of the Liberal-Democratic Party and he has the support of organized labor, which is the one thoroughly national organization. Both authors condemn strongly the American capitalist as he is seen in Mexico; but Dr. Dillon goes even further than Mr. Beals in scoring the American politician's dealings with that country. His attitude is less detached; he writes with a sneer. His

* Published in the *Atlantic*.

chapter on the "Expansion of the United States" covers history which has, he claims, not been written. Supporters of the Monroe Doctrine who are also peace lovers will find this portion of the book stimulating, if not provocative.

The man Obregon is described for us most humanly. Dr. Dillon calls him personally "buoyant, entertaining, and instructive; never obtrusive, dogmatic, or tedious." The story of Obregon leaving his peaceful home in Sonora, drawn only by the call of loyalty to a moral ideal, is reminiscent of Washington's voluntary exile from his lovely home on the Potomac. It seems also to be true of Obregon that he will lead his decimated country up to cohesion and freedom.

The intricate maze of political affairs in Mexico since Obregon came into prominence is threaded with marvelous sureness. Dr. Dillon is a strong partisan and ably defends the President from charges of iconoclasm and cruelty. He sees in Obregon a world pioneer—one of those leaders whose words beget deeds; whose work, wherever it has been done, freshly vitalizes human relations; whose aim is to build up a world organism on the basis of morality for the highest good of humanity.

Both books would have been doubly useful had they included maps in their historical chapters.

EDUCATION FOR MORAL GROWTH. By *Henry Neumann*. D. Appleton & Co., New York. Pp. 383. Price, \$2.00.

It is an ancient moot question whether or not morals can be taught. Outlines of ethics may be memorized, standards of conduct discussed and evolved by students, but can we, after all, learn upright behavior from lessons?

"Can rules or tutors educate
The demigod whom we await?"

Dr. Neumann divides his book in three parts. Part I deals with the "Ethical Implications of Democracy." Assuming that the ethical basis of self-government rests on the moral value of the practice of responsibility, he deals, here, with ideals of American culture.

In part II he traces the forces that have contributed to the shaping of the ideals, from the Puritan culture down through the successive demands for classical, for scientific, and for vocational education.

In part III he discusses the agencies that

are to give the ethical motive effect, especially the schools. Here Dr. Neuman declares himself squarely as an advocate of direct moral instruction. These chapters will go far to persuade any reader that such a thing is possible. Perhaps his own paraphrase of the words "moral instruction" as "the best methods of encouraging moral thoughtfulness" will sufficiently disarm those who began the book assuming the impossibility of such instruction.

The author's intelligent accord with the international point of view is revealed in his chapter on the "Spirit of Nationalism." Education, he claims, ought not to overemphasize our own achievements in history. We should love our country not only because it is our country, but because it is "our home in humanity."

THE ORGANIZATION OF A BRITANNIC PARTNERSHIP. By *R. A. Eastwood, LL. D.* Longman's, Green & Co., New York. Pp. 148. Price, \$2.50.

Dr. Eastman, lecturer in law at the University of Manchester, makes in this book a study of the constitutional relations between the United Kingdom and the dominions. He follows very briefly the historical method, beginning with those early colonizers, the Greeks. In the case of the English colonies, however, relative independence from the first has served to allow self-expression. This was particularly true with the American colonies. To follow the legislative causes of the American Revolution from the English standpoint is most interesting to the American reader. He lays the final break, however, to "the natural and inevitable growth of self-governing institutions among free and vigorous peoples." Since that revolt of the American colonies British custom has introduced in other colonies the principle of the responsibility of the government to the colonial legislature.

Now, Dr. Eastman thinks, there should be further reorganization in relations between the home country and the dominions. Treaty-making power, other foreign policies, defense, and many other subjects make co-operation necessary. He recommends, not an imperial federation with an inflexible constitution, but an organization which can grow and evolve as need arises. An imperial conference of premiers, resident dominion ministers, and a court of appeals for

the empire would, he thinks, meet the situation as it now exists.

The book is written in the modern brisk manner and is, therefore, easy to read and understand. Its attitude toward the Constitution is typically English and therefore interesting to an American.

MY BOOK-HOUSE. Six volumes. Compiled by *Olive Beaupré Miller*. The Book-House for Children, Publishers, Chicago.

Under ordinary circumstances we are not fond of collections and selections, however classified or chosen. Such things may be, and often are, good literary tools, but as literature they usually resemble nothing so much as lukewarm cambric tea. These six volumes, however, are in a class by themselves. Mrs. Miller is too good a reader, too good a teacher, and too good a mother to produce savorless books. She has wandered, with the experience of a seasoned traveler and with the fresh zestfulness of youth, through all the lands of story, old and new. She has picked up, here and there, the truest, most living and beautiful of the tales. Greece, Scandinavia, Persia, India, and the Orient, as well as Britain and the New World, contribute to the rich fund of juvenile story, verse, and history which she brings us.

Certain of the old well-known tales are rejected because of their unethical slant, but of the things she has chosen none are mutilated or medicated; all are organic wholes, each a unity in itself.

The volumes, beautifully and strongly bound and artistically printed, run as follows: Volume 1, "In the Nursery"; 2, "Up One Pair of Stairs"; 3, "Through Fairy Halls"; 4, "The Treasure Chest"; 5, "From the Tower Window"; and 6, a book which is in itself a liberal education for teachers and parents, "The Latch Key."

The scope of the whole work is well indicated in the table of contents of this last volume. First is a quotation from Dryden:

"What the child admired
The youth endeavored and the man acquired."

Then follows the table:

Sketches from the Lives of the Authors.

The Interesting History of Old Mother Goose.

The Origin of the Folk Tales.

What is a Myth?

Epic Poetry and the World's Great Epics.
How to Judge Stories for Children.

Index to Authors, Titles, and Principal Characters.

Geographical Index.

Historical Index.

Special Subjects Index.

Introduction to Index According to Ethical Theme.

Index According to Ethical Theme.

Mrs. Miller's theory in regard to good books for children is so well argued that one is tempted to quote at length. The following few sentences, however, will serve to indicate the basis upon which she has herself made choices:

"I am not belittling scientific reading; it is absolutely necessary, and many a finely written history or biography may and often does accomplish the same thing as fiction; but I am bringing out, as clearly as possible, that the value of the best fiction has been underrated; the best and most intelligent use has not been made of it in the child's development. The best fiction certainly will mold your child's ideals and standards, his views of life, his judgments on life, as surely as it widens his mental horizon, shows him other points of view than his own, quickens his imagination and his joyous appreciation of beauty, livens his sense of humor, deepens his emotions, and at every turn fires his spirit into life."

THE CLOUD THAT LIFTED AND THE POWER OF THE DEAD. By *Maurice Maeterlinck*. Century Co., New York. Pp. 354. Price, \$2.00.

Here are two new plays by the master magician; and with what provocative titles! Intuitively we look for tremulous excursions into twilight lands. Melisande and the Bluebird have shown us mystic sadness and lightly tenuous parable, as none but Maeterlinck could unveil them.

So we begin expectantly. As we read, we miss none of the exquisite art, the mastery of technique, to which the Belgian author has accustomed us. The character drama in the first play moves on darkly within its theme of jealousy. Its sinister elements are developed to a keen climax.

The second play is a parable, which takes place in a dream. It points a moral as to the impelling force of a righteous ancestry. The psychology is, no doubt, quite perfect, the love story very pretty, the teaching quite veracious; yet, with the more occult plays in

mind, this is all a bit obvious. Perfect, still, in detail, these seem the work of a genre artist. Perversely, mayhap, we still long for the breadth of draughtsmanship, the subtlety of coloring, wrought by the Maeterlinck of old.

THE WRATH TO COME. By *E. Phillips Oppenheim*. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. Pp. 355. Price, \$2.00.

This book is not to be taken seriously, either as a prophecy or a warning. Mr. Oppenheim has simply seized upon the possibilities of an imaginable political situation, with its mysterious secret service, as a basis for his story of danger and adventure. As is usual in this type of book, the insensate plotters, the wily Orientals, are all on the other side, the noble, disinterested statesmen all on our side. The methods of both sorts are clever and subterranean.

It is an agreeably stimulating story for a dull afternoon.

RACE AND NATIONAL SOLIDARITY. By *Charles Conant Josey*. Scribner's Sons. New York. Pp. 227. Price, \$2.50.

Again the psychologist comes to the fore. Again international tendencies are inspected with, let us confess, distinctly startling results. Professor Josey, of Dartmouth, draws his arrow to the head and speeds it straight to the bull's-eye.

The need of white race dominance is the conclusion which the author reaches, through frank, coolly reasoned steps. He divides the dangers which confront us today into two groups—the struggle between classes, an internal danger, and the expansion of oriental ambition, which is an external one. He examines "internationalism" in an analytical spirit, and we are somewhat stunned at his conclusions. Of course, the internationalism of which he speaks is that which Elihu Root says has for its avowed purpose "the destruction of national governments." "International law," says Mr. Root, "is, of course, based upon the existence of nations." Professor Josey, however, goes much further and denies the validity of the principle of equality between nations. The white race, he argues, is best fitted to dominate, and in the interests of the evolution of humanity should dominate. "We no longer think that God is pleased at human sacrifices. Why should we think he is pleased at the sacrifice of a race and culture?"

There is truth in Professor Josey's arguments for that solidarity which comes from race or national consciousness. But why thus stress it, particularly at this time? It is sufficiently emphasized by nature and habit. Then, too, are folk good judges as to their own superiority? One is reminded of the naïveté of that young schoolgirl who said, "The girls think I always want my own way. It isn't because it is *my* way, but because *my* way is the *best* way."

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED

LABOUR IN THE COAL MINING INDUSTRY. By *G. D. H. Cole*. Pp. 274. Oxford University Press.

LABOUR SUPPLY AND REGULATION. By *Humbert Wolfe*. Pp. 422. Oxford University Press.

WAR FINANCES IN THE NETHERLANDS. By *M. J. Van Der Flier*. Pp. 150. Oxford University Press.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AFTER THE WAR. By *Ottfried Nippold*. Pp. 241. Clarendon Press.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION. By *Pitman B. Potter*. 647 p. Appendices and index.

THE CONTROL OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS. By *Quincy Wright, Ph. D.* 412 p. Appendix and index. The Macmillan Co., New York.

AMERICANS IN EASTERN ASIA. By *Tyler Dennett*. 725 p. Bibliography, note, appendix, and index. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$5.00.

WAR ARMAMENT LOANS OF JAPAN. By *Ushisaburo Kobayashi*. Pp. 255. Oxford University Press.

LOSSES OF LIFE CAUSED BY WAR. By *S. Dumas and K. O. Vedel-Petersen*. Pp. 191. Clarendon Press.

CONFERENCE ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS. International Law Documents. Naval War College. Pp. 392. Government Printing Office.

THE RENOVATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW. By *D. Josephus Jitta*. Pp. 196. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE NEW INTERNATIONAL LAW. By *J. E. Harley*. Pp. 127. Oxford University Press.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

Limited numbers of the following pamphlets are available at the headquarters of the American Peace Society, the price quoted being for the cost of printing and postage only:

PAMPHLETS

		Published.			Published.
Ethical and General Literature:				Emerson, Ralph Waldo:	
Butler, Nicholas Murray:				"War." Address before the American Peace Society in 1838. Reprinted	1924 \$0.15
The International Mind.....	1912	\$0.05		Estournelle de Constant:	
Call, Arthur D.:				The Limitation of Armaments (Report at Interparliamentary Union Meeting, London)	1906 .10
Cumber and Entanglements.....	1917	.10		Levermore, Charles H.:	
Carnegie, Andrew:				Synopsis of Plans for International Organization	1919 .05
A League of Peace.....	1905	.10		Penn, William:	
Crosby, Ernest H.:				Peace of Europe. First published in 1693, republished in.....	1912 .10
War From the Christian Point of View	1905	.05		Scott, James Brown:	
Franklin on War and Peace.....		.10		The Development of Modern Diplomacy	1921 .10
Gladden, Washington:				Trueblood, Benjamin F.:	
Is War a Moral Necessity?.....	1915	.10		International Arbitration at the Opening of the 20th Century....	.10
Green, Thomas E.:				William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government.....	.10
The Burden of the Nations and The Forces that Failed.....	1914	.10		Trueblood, Lyra:	
Morgan, Walter A.:				18th of May, History of its Observance05
Great Preaching in England and America	1924	.10		Tryon, James L.:	
Stanfield, Theodore:				A Century of Anglo-American Peace	1914 .05
The Divided States of Europe and the United States of America... ..	1921	.10		New England a Factor in the Peace Movement	1914 .05
Tolstol, Count Leon:				Washington's Anti-Militarism05
The Beginning of the End.....	1898	.10		Worcester, Noah:	
Wales, Julia G.:				Solemn Review of the Custom of War. First published Christmas, 1814, republished in.....	1904 .10
"The Conscientious Objector".....	1918	.10			
Christ of the Andes (Illustration), 7th edition	1914	.05		Biographical:	
Palace of Peace at The Hague (Illustrated)	1914	.05		Beals, Charles E.:	
				Benjamin F. Trueblood, Prophet of Peace	1916 .10
Peace and Children:				Call, Arthur D.:	
Darby, W. Evans:				James Brown Scott. Sketch of his services to the cause of international justice	1918 .10
Military Drill in Schools.....	1911	.05		Hemmenway, John:	
Military Training for Schoolboys: Symposium from educators.....	1916	.05		William Ladd, The Apostle of Peace	1891 .10
Walsh, Rev. Walter:					
Moral Damage of War to the School Child	1911	.05		Japan and the Orient:	
Oordt, Bleuland v.:				Deforest, J. H.:	
Children Building Peace Palace; post-card (sepla).....		.05		Conditions of Peace Between the East and the West.....	1908 .05
				Is Japan a Menace to the United States?	1908 .05
Historical Peace Literature:					
Kant, Immanuel:					
Perpetual Peace. First published in 1795, republished in.....	1897	.25			
Call, Arthur D.:					
Federal Convention, May-September, 1787. Published 1922, republished	1924	.25			
The Will to End War.....	1920	.15			
Dealey, James Quale:					
Contributions of the Monroe Doctrine to International Peace....	1923	.10			

	Published.		Published.
Green, Thomas:		Root, Elihu:	
War with Japan?.....	1916 \$0.10	"The Great War" and International Law	1921 .10
Kawakami, Isamu:		Scott, James Brown:	
Disarmament, The Voice of the Japanese People	1921 .10	Organization of International Jus- tice	1917 .10
Sakatani, Baron:		Public Opinion <i>versus</i> Force.....	1915 .05
Why War Between Japan and the United States is Impossible....	1921 .10	Snow, Alpheus H.:	
Tolstoi, Count Leon:		International Reorganization	1917 .10
Letter on the Russo-Japanese War	1904 .10	International Legislation and Ad- ministration	1917 .10
International Relations:		League of Nations According to American Idea	1920 .10
Call, Arthur D.:		Stanfield, Theodore:	
Coercion of States	1920 .05	A Coercive League.....	1920 .05
Three Facts in American Foreign Policy	1921 .10	Trueblood, Benj. F.:	
Governed World, A. Three Docu- ments	1921 .10	A Periodic Congress of Nations...	1907 .05
Pepper, George Wharton:		Tryon, James L.:	
America and the League of Nations	1921 .10	The Hague Peace System in Opera- tion	1911 .10
Ralston, Jackson H.:			
Should any National Dispute be Reserved from Arbitration?.....	1908 \$0.05		

BOOKS

A limited number of the following books are on hand and can be had at the following reduced prices:

	Published.		Published.
American Foreign Policy. State- ments of Presidents and Secre- taries of State. Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. 132 pages	1920 \$0.90	Ladd, William:	
Angell, Norman:		Essay on a Congress of Nations. Introduction by James Brown Scott. 162 pages. Essay first published in 1840, republished in 1916	\$1.00
Arms and Industry. 248 pages...	1914 .90	La Fontaine, Henri:	
Problems of the War,—The Peace. (paper). 99 pages.....	1914-18 .15	The Great Solution. 177 pages...	1916 .70
Bacon, Corinne:		Lynch, Frederick:	
Selected Articles on National De- fense. 243 pages.....	1916 .90	The Peace Problem, 127 pages....	1911 .75
Balou, Adin:		Through Europe on the Eve of War. 152 pages.....	1914 .25
Christian Non-resistance. 278 pages. First published 1846, and republished	1910 .50	Scott, James Brown:	
Crane, William Leighton:		Grotius on the Freedom of the Seas. (Grotius, first published in 1608.) 83 pages.....	1916 .90
The Passing of War. 298 pages. January	1914 .50	Peace Through Justice. 102 pages	1917 .70
Crosby, Ernest:		Second Pan-American Congress. The Final Act. Commentary by James Brown Scott. 516 pages.....	1916 1.00
Garrison, the Non-resistant. 141 pages	1905 .40	Von Suttner, Berthe:	
Dymond, Jonathan:		Lay Down Your Arms (a novel). 435 pages	1914 1.00
Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with Christianity (paper). 182 pages. (1892 edition).....	1834 .50	White, Andrew D.:	
Estournelle de Constant:		The First Hague Conference. 123 pages	1905 .50
Report on International Commission to Inquire into the Causes of the Balkan Wars. 419 pages.....	1914 .90	Reports:	
Grabam, John William:		13th Universal Peace Congress, Bos- ton. Cloth	1904 .50
Evolution and Empire (paper). 230 pages. April.....	1914 .40	Paper	1904 .30
Janson, Gustaf:		New England Arbitration and Peace Congress, Hartford	1910 .50
The Pride of War (novel). 350 pages	1912 .90	First National Arbitration and Peace Congress, New York	1907 .50
Jordan, David Starr:		Second National Peace Congress, Chi- cago	1909 .50
The Human Harvest. 122 pages..	1907 .50	Third American Peace Congress, Bal- timore	1911 .50
Johnsen, Julia (Compiler):		Fourth American Peace Congress, St. Louis	1913 .50
Permanent Court of International Justice. Reprints of selected articles	1923 .90	Fifth American Peace Congress, San Francisco	1915 .50
		Twenty-first Annual Conference on International Arbitration. Lake Mohonk	1915 .30

The Will to End War

By Arthur Deerin Call

This pamphlet of 39 pages tells of the cost of war—reasons for the will to end war—beginnings of the modern peace movement—the organizations of peace societies, periodicals, congresses—international plans and organizations—the two Hague conferences—the League of Nations and World Court.

The original statute of the International Court and the statute as finally adopted are both included.

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Order from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Any Book on International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership IN The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional	\$25.00
Contributing	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual	\$2.00		

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$..... PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A.....
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name

Address

.....

.....

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 7

July, 1924

Ninety-sixth Annual Report of
the American Peace Society

Immanuel Kant and Foreign Policies

The Fall of Governments

International Documents

News from Abroad

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	387
EDITORIALS	
The American Peace Society—Ninety-six Years—International Education—The Longest Way Around—New Hope in Europe—Dictatorship in Italy—Editorial Notes.....	389-394
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
Political Revolution in France—Germany and the Experts—New Government in Japan—Defeat of General Smuts—England and Russia—Denmark	394-402
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY—NINETY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT	
President's Report.....	403
Secretary's Report.....	406
Treasurer's Report.....	412
Annual address—"Immanuel Kant".....	414
By Professor William Ernest Hocking	
GENERAL ARTICLES	
Business Ethics.....	424
By Herbert Hoover	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
Japanese Immigration.....	430
Allies and the Experts' Reports.....	434
MacDonald and Poincaré Letters.....	437
British Bankers and Russian Credit.....	440
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	442
BOOK REVIEWS.....	446

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Senator from Illinois, Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. PHILIP NORTH MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN, 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., 1155 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, California. Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, Ex-President Fairmont Seminary, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 W. 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON
ARTHUR DEERIN CALL
Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN
Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY
Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE
Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS
HENRY C. MORRIS
PAUL SLEMAN
THEODORE STANFIELD
JAY T. STOCKING, D. D.
Hon HENRY W. TEMPLE

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.
Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.
Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.
GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., Richmond, Indiana.
Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.
Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.
GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.
Rt. Rev. Bishop J. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.
Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
GEORGE A. FINCH, Washington, D. C.
EVERETT O. FISKE, Esq., Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hon. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.
CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.
Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.
GEO. H. JUDD, Washington, D. C.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.
JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.
L. H. PILLSBURY, Deity, N. H.
Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.
Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.
Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.
EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.
*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.
Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective: and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

JULY, 1924

NUMBER
7

EDITORIALS

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

MAY 1 the American Peace Society entered upon another fiscal year. It congratulates itself upon the return of the Honorable Theodore E. Burton as its President. It welcomes the addition of Senator William B. McKinley, the Honorable David Jayne Hill, and Dr. James Brown Scott to its Board of Directors. Its plan to have a Director from each of the States of our Union has taken tangible shape, the Honorable Jackson H. Ralston being Director from California, Honorable Theodore E. Burton from Ohio, Honorable P. P. Claxton from Oklahoma, Honorable William B. McKinley from Illinois, Honorable Andrew J. Montague from Virginia, Professor Arthur Ramsay from North Carolina, Paul Sleman, Esquire, from Maryland, Theodore Stanfield from New York, Dr. J. T. Stocking from New Jersey, the Honorable Henry Temple from Pennsylvania.

The Board of Directors announces that Arthur Deerin Call, Secretary of the American Peace Society and Editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, is to sail for Europe August 6. Mr. Call, as Executive Secretary of the American Group of the Inter-parliamentary Union, will attend the twenty-second international conference of the Union at Berne, August 22-28. He will be in Geneva through the sessions of the League of Nations in September. He will attend a congress of European peace workers, under the auspices of the Bureau

International de la Paix, during the month of October. Through the autumn he will contribute a series of articles for the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, giving an account of his findings abroad.

NINETY-SIX YEARS

THE record of the ninety-sixth annual meeting of the American Peace Society, held May 23, can be read elsewhere in these columns by any who may be interested. The outstanding fact of the report is that for ninety-six years the American Peace Society has been industriously seeking some practical means by which the nations may lessen the losses of war.

One result of this effort is the conviction that there is no mystic plan for the solution of our world's greatest problem. It is of importance to know something of the schemes and efforts for the abolition of war, of what men have thought and said about it; it is a duty to study the foreign policies of nations, past and present; it is well to understand as best we may the religious appeals, the words of the statesmen, the writings of the poets and other dreamers. It has been the business of the American Peace Society to do these things. In the light of the record of these years, however, we confess to being skeptical of any ready-made, mechanical device calculated in and of itself to maintain a permanent peace between the

nations. It was inevitable from the outset that the Bok peace award should fail to produce a plan acceptable to governments. The peaceful settlement of international disputes is so much a process, a growth, a biological—not to say a spiritual—thing, that it transcends formal plan or machine.

There is a pathos in the struggles of history to shake off the shackles of war, in the so-called "plans" to maintain the peace. The differences between them are bewildering. One scheme would end war with a poem, another with a prayer, another with a song, others with an emblem, a flag, a button, a stamp, or a banal diatribe against the militarists. Some of the plans draw upon the fourth dimensional world, upon a thought wave, upon hypnotism, upon a phrase, such as "the outlawry of war," "the will to peace," "education for peace"—phrases quite inadequate because devoid of content. All we have to do, say some, is to remember that God is love, and to follow the Golden Rule. Some would do away with conscription; others would conscript everything. Some would provide for a referendum in case of threatening war; others insist that all dangers will cease when we take away the profits from the conduct of war. The more one examines these and the other plans, the more one is convinced that they are too glib, often too sentimental, and therefore too superficial. In the main they appear as attempts to apply what one thinks one knows to what one does not know. The plans are too mechanical and chimerical.

And yet the will to end war is a fact—a palpable and a persisting fact. Peace is promoted and often established in the political, the economic, the scientific, the artistic, even the spiritual world. Perhaps it should be said that peace between nations is variously achieved—politically, economically, scientifically, artistically, and spiritually, for it is impossible to

divide the activities of States into compartments such as these. The American Peace Society believes it profitable to preach political democracy, the equality of nations before the law, the beneficent doctrine of candor and co-operation in foreign relations, and the fundamental principle of the brotherhood of mankind. But here again we are in danger of consoling ourselves with the incantation of empty phrases.

Yet there is a language with a hopeful content. The British Under Secretary for Air is quoted as saying recently, "I hold that the whole business (of war) is a wicked waste of the national substance, but I know that it is forced upon the world by the disease of international fear." This we believe to be the fact. Therefore the practical question facing us is, How may this fear be overcome? The answer to this questions is, perhaps, simpler than is commonly supposed. We already have agencies for the settlement of international disputes in business, in politics, even in the arts and in the religions. In proportion as these are strengthened, therefore, the fear of international conflicts is lessened. But man's main device for overcoming his fear in the case of a serious controversy is expressed in terms of law and judicial settlement. He has learned to prefer these methods to practices of the fist or sword. Out of its ninety-six years, therefore, the American Peace Society continues to call upon the nations to minimize their fears by providing a substitute for war in terms of law and justice. These words have an encouraging content, for they mean such substantial things as The Hague conferences for the determination of law, and The Hague courts for the arbitration and the judicial settlement of disputes incapable of settlement otherwise. There is less fear among the nations because such means are available in case of controversies too difficult for diplo-

matic adjustment. There being less fear, the chances for war are less. Thus the conclusion is inescapable. We can abolish the war method of settlement only in proportion as we furnish effective substitutes for that method. Those effective substitutes are not hidden in the phrases of some mystic plan. They are at hand, if we but will to develop and to use them.

EDUCATING OURSELVES INTERNATIONALLY

LEADERS of thought in America recognize increasingly their responsibility for the education of America in world affairs.

We now have the Institute of Politics, meeting each summer at Williams College, where this summer M. Benes, well-known Minister of Foreign Affairs for Czechoslovakia, Sir Arthur Salter, and other distinguished authorities are to continue the processes of international education, so ably begun in the summer of 1921 under the leadership of President Garfield.

A number of American students are planning to attend the Academy of International Law, which is to open for its second season in the Palace of Peace, at The Hague, July 14, and to continue until the 12th of September. Dr. Jesse S. Reeves, of the University of Michigan, and Professor Philip Marshall Brown, of Princeton, are to deliver courses of lectures at the Academy.

The Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation, at the University of Chicago, announced June 15 the creation of a forum for the discussion of international affairs. The first institute will begin on June 24 and continue until July 18. The list of lecturers includes Sir Valentine Chirol, formerly of the British Foreign Office; Dr. Charles de Visscher, Professor of International Law at the University of Ghent, and Dr. Herbert Kraus,

Professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Königsberg.

On April 29 a group of educators and business men, meeting in New York city, launched a movement for the establishment at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, of a graduate school for the study of international relations. It was the sense of the meeting that the school be dedicated to the memory of Walter Hines Page, our war-time Ambassador to Great Britain. The proposal has met with wide and generous approval. If the plans materialize as expected, we shall soon have in Baltimore a school of international relations covering three years of study, including possibly a year of foreign travel and contacts.

These developments stir the imagination and create hope. We have witnessed for a number of years the multiplication in our universities of courses in international law, foreign service, and diplomacy. Because of these courses, in a large measure, we have come to feel the need for a deeper research and a wider understanding of the great fundamental facts of international relations. Future progress toward the substitution of law and justice for war lies in the direction of a clearer knowledge of history, of law, of diplomatic practice, and of results achieved. This is a scientific matter capable of advancement only by the slow processes of education. That these promises are developing on such a scale here in America as well as abroad is a stimulating evidence of a new patience and a better wisdom in our midst.

Our will to practice the processes of education in world matters is a fine thing. Mark Twain once observed that, "In the United States, by the grace of God, we have those three unspeakably precious things—freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and the prudence never to practice either of them." But we insist upon the processes of education.

THE LONGEST WAY AROUND

INTERNATIONAL achievement, like any fundamental achievement, is at the end of no short road. Worthy accomplishment is at the end of a long and often circuitous course. One who would help toward the accomplishment of peace must fight the temptation to do the cheap and easy thing, as one would fight the devil. Hard things are never easy, nor complicated things simple. Some one has recently pointed out that it is the duty of the scholar "to snub fools, mock sentimentality, and discourage absurd ambition. He must remember that the truth about any subject should bewilder or enrage many of those who hear it. If he can popularize in this nobly unpopular spirit, then let him serve the nation with all his might. For his words will take root, not in thousands or hundreds, but in a few dozen minds, and these minds in turn will quietly fertilize others, until America is a happier and a saner place to live in."

Fortunately, in the realm of international endeavor all is not quackery. Before us at the moment is a new book from the pen of John Bassett Moore, judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Its title is "International Law and Some Current Illusions." Note some of the sentences from this distinct contribution:

"None render a higher or more solemn service than do those who point out infractions of the established law and warn their fellowmen of the consequences of its impairment."

"There is need all along the line of a recurrence to fundamental principles; and, when I speak of recurring to principles, I include the task of endeavoring to comprehend both the reasons on which they rest and the great facts of human experience from which they are derived."

"The great source of law is human experience, . . . the mature, condensed expression of the cumulative results of long observation of human activities and needs. As an element in legal discussion,

philosophy, when it parts company with this source of wisdom, is only too prone to be but the expression of moods that reflect the turbulence or the tranquillity of the time. . . . It may be superfluous to remark that the subject of organizing the world for the purpose of making and enforcing law is as difficult and perplexing as it is ambitious. Being highly speculative, it readily lends itself to the formulation of proposals."

"The essential features of any appropriate international organization would be somewhat as follows: (1) it would set law above violence; (2) it would provide a more efficient means than now exists for the making and declaration of law; (3) it would provide more fully than has heretofore been done for the investigation and determination of disputes by means of tribunals possessing advisory or judicial powers, as the case might be."

THE NEW HOPE IN EUROPE

THERE is a new hope that the Franco-German tension is about to be relieved, at least in a measure. This is not due to any marked change of French or German policy, for no utterance of the new government in Paris or in Berlin indicates any noteworthy change in the doctrines of Poincaré or of the German Foreign Office. The hope lies in the fact that new men, having come into power, are approaching each other in a new spirit. The possibilities of a mutual accommodation are being made use of. There is, therefore, a brighter atmosphere of hope.

While the German Nationalists are still skeptical, professing to be frightened by the appointment of General Nollet French Minister of War, Foreign Minister Stresemann finds in the utterances of President Doumergue and of Premier Herriot a distinct change for the better. The German Democrats and Socialists welcome the improved tone in the French policies. French amnesty for prisoners in the occupied region has made a good impression in Germany. Too, there seems to be a

finer cordiality between Paris, Brussels, and London, a cordiality noted by Monsieur Herriot, by M. Paul Huymans, the Belgian Foreign Minister, and by Mr. Macdonald. Under these circumstances the future of the Dawes report has brightened.

DICTATORSHIP IN ITALY

IN THE history of politics there is nothing more familiar than the brevity of dictatorships. The dictator survives so long as the people believe in his integrity and patriotism, and no longer.

Signor Mussolini, Italian Premier, dictator of Italy for two years, is suddenly faced with a crisis in his career. As head of the Fascisti revolutionaries, he has continued in power because the Italian people have welcomed his efforts to crush the governmental inefficiencies and corruptions of a generation. The people have believed in the purity and unselfishness of his motives and in the righteousness of his course. This is particularly true of the youth of the land. But Mussolini's dictatorship is no exception to the rule; it is due to continue as long as it is approved by the public, and no longer.

This public approval may be withdrawn at any moment. Recent events are hastening this withdrawal. The Fascisti have devastated the home of the former premier, all but killed deputies for refusing to become Fascisti, assaulted village priests, and burned Socialists' homes and workmen's clubs. These events are typical and frequent. Because Signor Matteotti, member of the Chamber of Deputies, claimed to have facts and figures tending to prove the corruption of the Under Secretary of Home Affairs, he was abducted in broad daylight, in the center of Rome, and murdered. Mussolini then adjourned the Deputies. There is a wide suspicion of a gigantic scandal just under-

neath the surface of the political life in Rome.

If Signor Mussolini insists upon a pitiless publicity and acts with honesty and courage, resolved to end the violence and intrigue of which Matteotti's murder was the climax, his domination may continue for a time.

But, of course, the people of Italy know that their Premier, by his lawless acts and intemperate utterances, is at least indirectly the cause of the prevailing violence and hate. They see men justifying their acts of violence by quoting Mussolini's definition of liberty as "a rotten corpse," and they know that their government can not long endure upon such a philosophy. The way of the dictator, like the way of transgressors generally, is hard. The dictatorship in Italy must eventually give way to a people's government of justice under law. The surprise is that it has endured for so long.

WHILE the ADVOCATE OF PEACE regrets to learn that Dr. Charles H. Levermore, author of the winning Bok prize peace plan, has resigned the secretaryship of the New York Peace Society, which he has held since 1917, it is a pleasure to learn that he, accompanied by Mrs. Levermore, is able to gratify a long cherished desire to spend a year abroad. We are told that he hopes to be present in Geneva during the month of September, while the Assembly of the League of Nations is in session, and after that he will continue his studies in various capitals of Europe.

THAT the League of Nations is looked upon as an agency enabling the great Powers to control the smaller States is brought to our attention once more by the request of the British Government to the Secretary-General of the League to

place on the agenda of the coming session of the Council an item in regard to the control, by the League, of disarmament in Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria. If the League were an agency for the promotion of justice, it would be equally in order for the small States to request the League to go about the control of armaments, say, in Britain, or France, or Brazil; indeed, of the United States, if only this country happened to be a member of the League. In any event peace between States cannot be long maintained by the coercion of unwilling members. Peace between States means something quite different.

THE correspondence between Washington and Tokyo is self-explanatory. Both governments are striving to retain the good will and friendship always cherished by both countries. Whether or not Mr. Hughes' latest note will satisfy the Japanese Government or people remains

to be seen. There still remain grounds for anxiety, both here and in Japan. If public opinion on both sides of the Pacific will be content to express itself with the wisdom and restraint employed by Mr. Hughes and Mr. Hanihara, none needs to fear for the outcome.

THE congress of peace workers, to be held under the auspices of the *International Peace Bureau* in Berlin during the month of October, has aroused no little interest in Europe. A letter to us from Professor Quidde, of the University of Munich, urges the importance of the congress, and pleads for a strong American delegation. Americans wishing to attend this congress may either notify the American Peace Society, 613 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., or communicate directly with the *Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft*, Hauptgeschäftsstelle, Berlin, S. W. 68, Zimmerstrasse 87, Germany.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

POLITICAL REVOLUTION IN FRANCE

EVEN more startling than the overthrow of Premier Poincaré, as a result of the last French parliamentary elections, has been the resignation of the President of the French Republic, M. Alexandre Millerand. Forced out of his high office by the uncompromising hostility of the new majority in the Chamber of Deputies, the withdrawal of the French President marks a veritable political revolution in France.

The Presidential Crisis

On June 1, the day on which the new chamber was to convene for the first time,

M. Poincaré handed to M. Millerand the collective resignation of himself and his cabinet. In the morning of that day the Radical and Socialist-Radical groups met in conference and adopted the following resolution:

The group of deputies, members of the Republican Radical and Socialist-Radical Party, in view of the fact that M. Alexandre Millerand, President of the Republic, contrary to the spirit of the constitution, has pursued a personal policy and has openly sided with the Bloc National, a policy which has been condemned by the country, considers that M. Millerand's remaining at the Elysée would be an insult to republican feeling and would be a source of conflict between the government

and the chief of the State and a constant danger to the régime itself.

The battle for the ousting of the President of the Republic was on.

The chamber met in the afternoon of that day. Three days later M. Painlevé was elected President of the Chamber, and his colleagues of the Left Bloc began their campaign for elevating him to the Elysée Palace and the presidency of the Republic.

On June 5 M. Edouard Herriot, the acknowledged leader of the Left Bloc, was invited to the Elysée Palace and requested by President Millerand to form a cabinet. M. Herriot declined the offer on the ground that he could not form a government acceptable to the new chamber as long as M. Millerand remained head of the State. The following communique was issued by the Elysée Palace after the interview:

In conformity with the advice of the Presidents of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, the President of the Republic invited M. Herriot to present himself at the Elysée. After explaining to him in broad outline the political situation at home and abroad, M. Millerand inquired whether M. Herriot would be prepared to aid him in the formation of a new cabinet with a view to the application of the ideas for which the electors had voted at the recent general election. In the exchange of views which followed no disagreement arose with regard to the proposed program.

The Deputy for the Rhône having raised the question of the Presidency of the Republic, M. Millerand declared that he was unable to discuss a question the raising of which was forbidden by the law. The constitution fixed seven years as the duration of the presidential mandate. Called to the Elysée for seven years, the President considered it his duty towards the Republic and France to remain there until the expiration of the legal period of his mandate. M. Millerand is resolved to do all in his power to assure respect for the constitution and to avoid creating a precedent the peril of which cannot be measured. Without explaining his reason, M. Herriot simply replied that, personally, he did not believe it was possible for him to accept the mission which the President had been good enough to offer him.

Compelled to look in a different direction, President Millerand entrusted the formation of a ministry to M. François-Marsal, who had held the post of Minister of Finance in the last Poincaré cabinet. The new ministry failed to receive the confidence of the chamber at its very first appearance, and on June 11, exactly one month after the fateful elections, President Millerand resigned his office.

New President and His Cabinet

On the following day the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate met as a National Assembly to select a successor to M. Millerand. It was at this point that the hitherto triumphal march of the Left Bloc received its first serious setback. The National Assembly, contrary to the expectations of the Left leaders, rejected their candidate for the presidency. M. Painlevé failed to obtain the necessary majority, and M. Gaston Doumergue, President of the Senate, was elected President of the French Republic.

In spite of this setback, however, there was nothing left for M. Herriot to do but accept the offer of the new President to form a cabinet, which was constituted as follows:

Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Edouard Herriot; Minister of War, General Maurice Nollet; Minister of Justice, René Renoult; Minister of the Interior, Camille Chautemps; Minister of Finance, Etienne Clementel; Minister of the Navy, Jacques Dumesnil; Minister of Commerce, M. Raynaldy; Minister of Public Works, Victor Peytral; Minister of Education, François Albert; Minister of Labor and Health, Justin Godart; Minister of the Colonies, Edouard Daladier; Minister of Pensions, Edouard Bovier-Lapierre; Minister of Agriculture, H. Queuille; Minister of Liberated Regions, Victor Dalbiez. The Under Secretaries are: Posts and Telegraphs, Pierre Robert; Merchant Marine, Leon Meyer; Aviation, Laurent Eynac; Technical Instruction, Vincent de Moro-Giafferi

This cabinet was finally presented to the Chamber of Deputies, and the most dramatic political crisis in the recent history of the Third Republic was at an end.

The Policy of the Herriot Government

The overthrow of Premier Poincaré and the forced resignation of President Millerand do not signify a sharp turn in the major aspects of France's State policies. The new rulers of the Republic are concerned particularly at the present juncture with putting a new spirit, rather than a new substance, into the policies of their country.

In internal policies the measures which they propose to advocate may be summarized as follows:

Abolition of the "decree laws."

Restoration of the match monopoly.

A general amnesty (except for persons convicted of treason and persons who have evaded military service).

Reinstatement of railway workers dismissed during strikes.

Abolition of the embassy to the Vatican.

Strict application of the Separation Act in regard to religious associations.

Reduction of the period of military service by the establishment of a new system.

In the matter of finance an inventory must be made of the whole financial situation as left by the late government in regard to both the budget and the treasury. This inventory must be made before the new government produces its first budget. The principle of a balance of the budget is reaffirmed. The income tax must be the basis of any really democratic fiscal system. Direct taxes should be revised so as to lessen the burden on the consumer, and the turn-over tax should be reduced. Administrative reforms should be carried out in order to reduce expenditure.

Other measures in domestic policy included: Revocation of the Berard Education Decree (which favored classical education); the defense of the eight-hour day for workpeople; the grant to State servants of the right to form trade unions.

In foreign affairs, the aim of the new government is, in M. Herriot's own words, "a general organization of world peace, under which France would resume her traditional rôle of good will and magnanimity." Specifically, this means earnest effort along the following six lines:

1. Settlement of the reparation problem in accordance with the plans drawn up by the Committees of Experts, provided

that Germany accepts these plans unreservedly.

2. Close rapprochement and collaboration with Great Britain.

3. Recognition of the Soviet Government in Russia.

4. Opposition to Italy's pretensions to a control of the Mediterranean, as advocated by Premier Mussolini.

5. Continued friendship with the new States of Central Europe in and out of the Little Entente, with the view, however, mainly to helping their stabilization.

6. Strengthening of the League of Nations, including, perhaps, a substantial reformation of that institution.

On June 19 Premier Herriot appeared before the chamber with a declaration substantially embodying the more important elements of this program and obtained that body's confidence by a very large vote.

GERMANY AND THE EXPERTS' REPORTS

FOR a whole month following the last elections to the German Reichstag the political situation of Germany was dominated by a ministerial crisis. In this crisis the center of the whole picture was occupied by the attitude of the various political groups in Germany toward the problem of an acceptance or rejection of the Experts' Reports.

Resignation and Return of the Marx Cabinet

The elections of May 4 resulted in the following composition of the Reichstag:

	Number of seats in the new Reichstag.
Social Democrats.....	100
German Nationalists.....	95
Center (Catholic).....	65
Communists.....	62
German People's Party.....	45
Freedom Party.....	32
Democrats.....	28
Bavarian People's Party.....	16
Bavarian Peasants' Party.....	10
Land Union.....	10
German Social Party.....	4
Hanoverians.....	5
Total.....	472

Though faced with the fact of the substantial strengthening of both extremes at the expense of the Center, Chancellor Marx decided at first to remain in power until May 28, on which day the new Reichstag was to convene for the first time, in the meantime making strenuous efforts to effect some sort of a combination with the powerful parties of the Right, which would constitute a basis for a new government. His efforts in this direction failed, however, and on May 26 the chancellor tendered his resignation.

The president of the Reich requested the resigning cabinet to carry on the government pending the convocation of the Reichstag, and the resignation actually did not take effect until some days after it had been tendered. The Reichstag met on May 28 and demonstrated its spirit by electing as its presiding officer Herr Max Wallraff, former burgomaster of Cologne and a prominent member of the Nationalist Party.

The negotiations for a new coalition ministry continued for a whole week after the convocation of the Reichstag and merely resulted in a resumption of power by Dr. Marx. On June 4 Chancellor Marx presented his cabinet to the new Reichstag. It was constituted exactly as had been the last Marx cabinet, with which the chancellor had dissolved the Reichstag two months earlier.

The Attitude of the German Industrialists

The success or failure of the plans worked out in the Experts' Reports depends not only upon the attitude of the German Government, but in equal measure upon that of the German industrialists. And just as the government is divided in its attitude on the reports, so are the German industrialists.

A group of German industrialists, organized into the Association of German Industries, have taken a favorable view of the reports. The Association does not, however, by any means comprise all of German industrialists. Soon after the association made its pronouncement, a meeting was held at the Esplanade Hotel in Berlin. This meeting, attended by nearly 500 leaders of German industries, adopted a resolution in which it condemned unqualifiedly the Reports of the

Experts' Committees. It is their opinion that German industries will go to pieces if the reports are permitted to become the basis of future reparation payments.

Moreover, there has developed a considerable change of views in the association itself, many of its influential members revising their original views as to the need of adhering to the reports. The industrialists opposed to the reports, who had organized themselves at the Esplanade meeting into a Union of German Industrialists, count upon a possible split in the Association of German Industries for the purpose of minimizing the effect of that body's support of the Marx-Stresemann Government.

The Position of the Marx Cabinet

In his first speech before the Reichstag as head of the new cabinet, Chancellor Marx stressed again the necessity for Germany to adopt unreservedly the plans worked out by the Experts' Committees. The economic situation of the country was presented by the Chancellor in very dark tints. It was, he said, in a bad way, if not a desperate way, and unless some alleviation was found for the credit stringency it must collapse altogether. In these circumstances the government could perceive only one way out of the darkness, and that was the trail blazed by the Experts' Report. It had sought by its note of May 17 to find a practical solution along those lines. In accordance with that decision it had continued the steps thus initiated, and all through the recent cabinet negotiations it had not allowed the preparations to be relaxed for a moment. The organization committees for the Gold Note Bank, the railways, and the industrial debentures had already begun work. It would be their business to fill up any gap in the text of the Experts' Report and to clear away such textual differences as had been found to exist. When these committees had come to an agreement the government would lay before the proper authority the draft laws based on these three groups of material. Questions relating to claims upon the customs and excise would have to be discussed with the other side. There were also questions to be settled bearing upon the sphere of action of the agents for the payment of reparations. The report,

in the opinion of the experts, could only be accepted as a whole, and the government would do all in its power to hasten the work in hand. It counted on the speedy co-operation of the Reichstag.

The economic and financial unity of Germany, Herr Marx went on, and the sovereignty of the administration must be simultaneously restored, because without them payments could not be made; nor could the necessary increased production be achieved unless those who had been imprisoned and banished were released and allowed to return to their homes. This was an indispensable condition. Moreover, on the left bank of the Rhine the Rhineland agreement must return into force and the Ruhr must be evacuated. The experts had left these questions only because as political matters they did not come within their competence, but they had made it plain that these political questions must be settled between Germany and the Allied governments, and the German Government would regard this as one of its first tasks.

Turning to the Socialist benches, Herr Marx observed that the government would see to it that the burdens of executing the report were placed upon the shoulders of the nation in proportion to the capacity of the various sections to bear it, and he implored the Reichstag and the entire nation not to disturb the painful work of the last few months by disunion and internal warfare. Where, he asked, would help come from if Germany again lapsed to the edge of the abyss. Foreign nations must be made to see that Germany was determined to tread the path of freedom, but foreign nations must also bring proof that they were prepared to enter into an honorable understanding. Only then would the German people, after its oft-repeated disappointments and humiliations, begin to believe that a true and permanent peace was at hand.

In the ensuing debates on the question the Chancellor's position was violently attacked by speakers from both extremes.

NEW GOVERNMENT IN JAPAN

THE beginning of May marked an important election campaign, not only in Germany and France, but also in Japan.

The results of the Japanese elections have been as noteworthy as those of the French and have led to a complete change of government. The Seiyu Honto, which was the government party at the time of the elections, went to the polls with a working majority in the Lower House. It suffered a crushing defeat, yielding the parliamentary majority to a combination of three oppositionary parties, the leader of the largest of which, Viscount Takakira Kato, having been invited by the Prince Regent to form a new government.

The Kato Cabinet

The party composition of the new chamber is as follows: Kensaikai, 149; Seiyukai, 98; Kakushin Club, 30; Seiyu Honto, 112; Independents, 58; others, 17. The first three of the above parties constitute the coalition which had defeated the Seiyu Honto Government. Together they control 277 votes, or a majority of 45.

Viscount Kato, the new Premier, is the leader of the Kensaikai Party. The portfolios in his cabinet are distributed among the leaders of the three parties which constitute the victorious coalition.

The new cabinet is as follows: Prime Minister, Viscount Takakira Kato; Foreign Minister, Baron Kijuro Shidehara; Home Minister, Reijiro Wakatsuki; Minister of Finance, Yugo Hamaguchi; Minister of War, General Issei Ugaki; Minister of the Navy, Admiral Hyo Takarabe; Justice, Sennosuke Yokota; Education, Ryohei Okada; Agriculture and Commerce, Korekiyo Takahashi; Communications, Ki Inukai; Railways, Mitsugu Sengoku.

In assuming his new post, Premier Kato made the following statement:

My ministry will contribute to world peace by promoting friendly relations with all powers, in pursuance of the foreign policy hitherto carried out. My cabinet also will undertake domestic reforms in the interest of the whole nation.

It is stated by competent observers in the Far East that the people of Japan expect the following four lines of policy from the new government: (1) Universal manhood suffrage. (2) The reduction of government expenditures, the improvement of government service, and the

stabilization of the financial world, emphasizing retrenchment and the balancing of imports and exports. (3) The redemption of the Nation's morale, which is now considerably shaken. (4) A wise, strong foreign policy, rectifying the immigration insult.

In connection with the foreign policy which the Kato Government is likely to follow, the appointment of Baron Shidehara is of utmost importance. The new Minister of Foreign Affairs was formerly the Japanese Ambassador in Washington, while just prior to his appointment to the cabinet he was in charge of the Immigration Division at the Japanese Foreign Office. His first statement after assuming his new office was as follows:

With the ministry's change I am called to assume the direction of foreign affairs. I am encouraged by the thought that, following the path of peace, justice, and honor, Japan faces the future without fear or misgiving.

The world is being gradually awakened to a broader vision of international solidarity. The principle of "live and let live" is gaining wider recognition. The days of aggression and conquest are over. No policy of self-assertion without due regard to the rightful position of others will stand the test of time. It is bound in the end to yield to the adverse verdict of an enlightened public opinion.

It is predicted that Baron Shidehara's presence in the Kato cabinet will allay the fears of those foreign observers who have looked askance at Viscount Kato's elevation to the premiership. The new premier is not considered particularly friendly to the United States and is strongly disliked in China as the author of the famous twenty-one demands.

The Japanese Exclusion Incident

The exchange of notes between the governments of Japan and the United States (the text of which appears in the *International Documents* section of this issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*) marks the last phase of the incident concerned with the passage of the Japanese Exclusion Act. The tone of Secretary Hughes's note indicates that the Government of the United States now considers the whole incident closed so far as diplomatic negotiations are concerned.

THE OVERTHROW OF GENERAL SMUTS

WHILE the complete returns of the parliamentary elections held in the Union of South Africa on June 17 are not at hand at the time of this writing, the already known results indicate clearly a defeat for General Smuts, the present Premier of the Union. The elections were preceded by an exceedingly bitter campaign, in which General Smuts came in for so much adverse criticism that the whole question seemed to be revolving around the watchwords, "For Smuts" and "Against Smuts!"

The Reason for Present Elections

The present elections in South Africa came as a result of a dissolution of the Parliament by the Governor-General at the request of Premier Smuts. The four-year period for which the Parliament had been elected in 1922 will not expire until 1926, and it was only a rather extraordinary sequence of circumstances that forced General Smuts to go to the people at this particular time.

The elections of 1922 had also been forced by General Smuts. But during that campaign the issue on which the struggle was carried on was that of a policy of secession from the British Empire, advocated by the Nationalist Party, under the leadership of General Hertzog. At that time there were four political parties in the Union. General Smuts's Party, the South African, was the largest, but it could rule only in coalition with the Unionist Party. Then came the Nationalist Party, at that time dominated by the separatist elements, and the Labor Party, swayed by its extreme radical wing.

Skillfully seizing upon the dangers presented by separatism and radicalism, General Smuts succeeded in effecting a merger of his own party with the Unionist Party, and then promptly ordered a new election. In the triangular struggle at the polls which followed, the South African Party received a clear majority of seats in the Parliament, its membership exceeding the combined membership of the two opposition parties by 22.

This majority seemed to insure General Smuts a working arrangement in the legislature for the full term of four years.

But during the past two years the continuing economic depression in the Union has led to a great deal of popular dissatisfaction with the Smuts government. An extraordinary number of deaths and some other causes rendered necessary a very large number of by-elections to fill vacancies, the results of which almost invariably went against the South African Party. As a result of this, the original majority of 22 dwindled down to a bare 4, and when another by-election reduced it to 3, General Smuts decided that the time had come to appeal once more to the electorate of the country.

Nationalist-Labor Alliance

Perhaps the most important element that has contributed to the gradual attrition of General Smuts's majority in the Parliament has been a temporary coalition of the two oppositionary parties, which had been sharply separated two years ago. In effecting this alliance the two parties had to make certain very important concessions.

The Labor Party, which has always been strongly anti-separatist, but leaned toward radicalism, has finally succeeded in ridding itself of the more objectionable extreme elements. On the other hand, the Nationalist Party has definitely jettisoned its secessionist policies, although it still contains some strong separatist elements. On the basis of these two concessions the alliance between the two parties became possible.

It was and still is frankly an offensive alliance only. Its principal aim has been the overthrow of the South African Party and of its very able, but somewhat autocratic and intolerant leader. This aim the united opposition has achieved in the elections.

In the new Parliament none of the three parties will have sufficient majority to rule alone. Under these circumstances the Labor Party will hold the balance of power.

THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN CONFERENCE

SCANTY and far between are the reports on the progress of the Anglo-Russian Conference, which is still going

on in London. The sessions of the conference take place behind closed doors, and the world learns of what is going on only from official communiques issued by the conference. The general tenor of these communiques indicates that the progress made so far is far from substantial, and that the prospects of a more or less complete and comprehensive settlement of the outstanding differences between the British and the Soviet governments are still more or less illusory.

Scope of the Conference

The conference has come as the direct result of the recognition extended to the Soviet Government of Russia by Mr. MacDonald's cabinet as one of its first official acts. The recognition itself, while in effect unconditional and complete, implied in its very terms the need of an understanding between the two governments on a large number of fundamental issues before normal relations could in fact be resumed between Russia and Great Britain.

These unsettled issues involve considerations both of political and economic nature. As far as the political aspects are concerned, the most important question is that of the treaties which were in force between the two countries prior to the overturn of the last internationally recognized government in Russia. In extending recognition to the Soviet Government, the British Cabinet stated that it assumed that all these treaties, save those that have already lapsed, would automatically resume their force. An examination of the treaty obligations between the two countries therefore becomes imperative, and a subcommittee of the conference is still at work studying this intricate question.

As for the economic aspects, the whole question of the repudiation by the Soviet Government of Russia's obligations to Great Britain and her citizens is involved. The Russian delegation has asked for a detailed presentation of the British claims against Russia and thousands of such claims have been turned in to the conference.

The Problem of Russian Credit

Vitally connected with the question of Russia's existing financial obligations is

the problem of Russian credit. It is universally understood that the real reason for the London conference, so far as Russia is concerned, is the probability of her obtaining credits in Great Britain. The Russian delegation came to London in the hope that it may induce the Labor Government of Great Britain to extend large credits to Russia on its own account, in the same manner that loans were granted during the war. The British Government has however made it perfectly clear that Russia cannot expect any government loans, but that if any credits are to be extended to Russia these must come from private banking interests.

In view of this, the memorandum of the leading British bankers, presented to Premier MacDonald on the eve of the conference (the text of which will be found in the *International Documents* section of this issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*) assumes special significance. Of equal significance is the Russian attitude to the terms laid down by the British bankers. This attitude is excellently illustrated by the following excerpts from a speech recently delivered in Moscow by Gregory Zinoviev, one of the most prominent leaders of the Soviet régime:

If this piece of paper (the Bankers' Memorandum) is to be taken seriously, then the Anglo-Soviet Conference may straightway be regarded as doomed. . . . What is demanded is, in effect, that we should change our régime. It is not a question which we would be likely to discuss seriously. We have not fought the foreign bourgeoisie for several years in order to change our government at the dictates of half a dozen bankers. We have to do with bankers ourselves. There were a good few of them in Russia. Some of them have survived and are working up to the present time in Soviet departments, usefully serving the Soviet Government and participating in the discussions on the currency reforms. Possibly in England, also, some of these brainless bankers will in good time render similar service to the British working class, but with us, needless to say, none of these questions will be discussed seriously.

However, if the memorandum represents their last word, the spring conference of 1924 may be regarded as abortive. Possibly it will, indeed, prove to be so. We have never

entertained any illusions as to the desires of Messrs. the British Bankers. . . .

The bankers demand that we should recognize for all future time the principle of private property, at all events in so far as relates to foreigners. They want us to guarantee that the capital which they may invest in Russia shall be inviolate forever. Isn't this ridiculous after the Russian revolution? They gave a goodly number of millions in loans to the Russian Tsar and the Russian bourgeoisie. And they were told by the Russian Tsar and the Russian bourgeoisie not only that there would be no propaganda of the Third International, but that the principle of private property would be held forever sacred, inviolate, &c. But what came of all that? Did these guarantees help them? It might have been thought that they would have learned sufficient from that experience not to demand from us what the Russian bourgeoisie and the Russian Tsar could not guarantee them. But, joking apart, it may be said that real guarantees for the investment of foreign capital at the present moment are only to be had in Soviet Russia, with the Soviet Government, for our government is confessed by the most intelligent foreigners to be the most stable government in the world.

Of course, we will not execute the obligations of Nicholas and Milukoff. It was to disembarass ourselves of all this that we made the revolution; but our own obligations we shall carry out. At the present moment all countries are more or less on the verge of revolution. Our country has got through the revolutionary stage, and therefore, from the standpoint of serious capitalists, the investment of capital in concessions or in any other form is safe business. Of course, they run a risk of a European revolution, but if they lose their heads they won't worry about their hair. And if a workers' government is really formed in England, why, then, of course, their businesses will be burnt and their capital "bust." This risk remains, and no guarantee, even of the Third International, can avail against it, for the proletarian revolution would surge over its head even should it ever contemplate attempting to restrain it. Apart from this, I am informed that the Third International is not only unprepared to give a guarantee that there will be no revolution, but is even ready to guarantee the contrary.

If this remains the official and unalterable attitude toward the whole matter on the part of the Soviet régime, then the resolution, recently moved in the House of Lords, that the Anglo-Soviet negotiations be immediately brought to a close, acquires a greater pertinency than the leaders of the government party in the British Parliament have been willing to accord it.

DEVELOPMENTS IN DENMARK

FOLLOWING the general elections, held in Denmark on April 11, the Liberal Left cabinet, presided over by Premier N. Neergaard, resigned on April 23, and on the same date the leader of the Social Democratic parliamentary group, M. Stauning, formed a new Social Democratic cabinet as follows:

M. T. A. M. Stauning, Premier and Minister for Industry, Trade, and Shipping; Count Carl Moltke, Minister for Foreign Affairs; M. F. H. J. Borgbjerg, Social Minister; M. C. N. Hauge, Minister for Home Affairs; M. L. Rasmussen, Minister of Defense; Rev. P. Dahl, Ecclesiastical Minister; M. J. Friis-Skotte, Minister of Public Works; Madame Nina Bang, Minister of Education; M. C. V. Bramsnæs, Minister of Finance; M. K. K. V. Steincke, Minister of Justice; M. K. M. Bording, Agricultural Minister.

Messrs. Stauning, Borgbjerg, Hauge, Rasmussen, Friis-Skotte, and Bording are all members of the Folketing (lower house). Count Moltke is a professional diplomatist and was Danish Minister in Washington from 1908 to 1912, and has since been Danish Minister in Berlin. All the other new cabinet ministers, including Madame Bang, are members of the Landsting (upper house). Madame Bang, M. A. (Copenhagen University), is the first woman to hold cabinet rank in Denmark.

Attempts to Control Currency Fluctuations

At the beginning of March the Danish Government embodied in a series of bills its proposals for the improvement and stabilization of the Danish krone. Two of the bills were passed before the dissolution of the Rigsdag, and one of these provided for the establishment of a cur-

rency central to supervise dealings in foreign currency as from March 29. The bill remains in force until March 31, 1925.

According to the act, the purpose of the currency central is to follow the development of the currency market and, if deemed necessary, to make recommendations to the Minister of Commerce as to such measures as may be considered likely to improve the value of the krone.

Immediately after the passing of the act, regulations were issued under it requiring all those in possession of foreign currency, which was not of a lower equivalent value than 5,000 Danish kroner, calculated at the rate quoted on March 31, to supply the currency central with information as to the extent of their holdings of such currency and other credits, both at home and abroad.

Dealings in foreign currency may only be made through the equalization fund, the Danish National Bank, the four leading private banks in Copenhagen, and such other banks and brokers as are authorized by the currency central.

Other Fiscal Measures Undertaken

The Danish Rigsdag has passed a government proposal extending until the end of December, 1924, the bill exempting the national bank from the obligation to redeem its notes in gold.

This prolongation has been granted on the understanding that continued efforts are made to reduce the note circulation so as to prepare for the eventual resumption of gold redemption.

While the proposal was before the Rigsdag it was pointed out in a parliamentary report that the note circulation at the end of March was about 200 million kroner below the highest point reached, which was about 600 million kroner.

The Rigsdag has also passed a new bill authorizing the Minister of Finance to mint new small coins for circulation within the country only, and designed to counteract the heavy losses incurred through the obligation to redeem Danish coin minted under the provisions of the Scandinavian Convention and accumulated in Sweden mainly as a consequence of smuggling. The convention is to be modified accordingly.

NINETY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

THE ninety-sixth annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society was held at the Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C., Friday, May 23, 1924.

Dr. George W. White presided, in the absence of President Andrew J. Montague, who was detained in the Congress.

Letters were read from absent members as follows: Congressman Burton, Dr. Claxton, H. C. Morris, Dr. Stocking, and Professor Ramsay.

It was announced that Prof. William Ernest Hocking, Alford Professor of Philosophy, Harvard University, would speak in the evening at the President's church, the First Congregational, corner of Tenth and G streets, at 8 o'clock p. m., under the auspices of the American Peace Society; that the subject of the address would be "Immanuel Kant and the Foreign Policies of Nations," and that Dr. James Brown Scott, one of the Honorary Vice-Presidents of the Society, would preside.

In the absence of Governor Montague, Rev. Walter A. Morgan read the president's report as follows:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society:

Under the provisions of the Society's Constitution, your President respectfully submits the following report for the fiscal year 1923-24:

YOUR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Your Executive Committee has held nine regular meetings and two special meetings during the year. For this period the number of employed officers has not changed. Mr. Arthur Deerin Call has continued as Secretary of the American Peace Society and as Editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, and Mr. Leo Pasvolsky as Associate Editor. Mr. W. I. Smalley has served during the year as Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treas-

urer. The names of all our officers will appear elsewhere in this official report.

Thanks to the services of Mrs. Arthur D. Call, our library books continue to be catalogued, and our many pamphlets, collected during the years, are also at last being made serviceable by the same system. If it were not for Mrs. Call, we should have to employ not only a librarian, but aid also for mailing and other duties, without which our expanding work could not go on. Mrs. Call volunteered her services in an emergency. These services, continued with no little regularity during the year, are deeply appreciated by your committee.

We regret to record that Jackson H. Ralston and his wife have left for their permanent home in Palo Alto, California. The regret consists in the fact that we are to lose from our regular meeting a faithful, informed, and most useful member. The officers of the American Peace Society gave a luncheon May 8, at the Cosmos Club, Washington, in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Ralston.

DEATH OF JAMES L. SLAYDEN

It was with profound sorrow that the officers of the American Peace Society learned of the death, February 24, 1924, of one of its Vice-Presidents, for many years a member of the Executive Committee, and President of the American Peace Society from 1917 to 1920, Honorable James L. Slayden, of San Antonio, Texas. Mr. Slayden was a member of the United States House of Representatives from 1897 to 1919, and throughout his career he showed a constant, intelligent, and devoted interest in the promotion of a better understanding between nations. His passing from the earth left not only a profound sorrow among a world-wide circle of friends, it meant a distinct loss to the cause of a righteous peace between the nations of the earth.

THE FINANCES OF THE SOCIETY

Since the last annual meeting fifty persons have contributed \$5.00 or over to the

work of the Society. These contributors were:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Dr. L. A. Bauer | James McGrath |
| A. T. Bell | Mrs. Philip N. Moore |
| Mrs. H. A. Brayton | Adelbert Moot |
| Miss B. G. Brooks | Robert S. Morison |
| David S. Carll | Henry C. Morris |
| Robert Cluett | W. H. Parsons |
| Everett O. Fisk | A. E. Pillsbury |
| Mrs. Louis H. Fitch | L. H. Pillsbury |
| W. W. Foster | Joseph Price |
| John B. Garrett | Judge Henry Rogers |
| William P. Gest | Wm. H. Schroder |
| John M. Glenn | Thomas W. Sidwell |
| Mrs. Juliet W. Hill | E. J. Siller |
| Miss Susan B. Hoag | Paul Sleman |
| Mrs. F. Holsinger | Theodore Stanfield |
| Mrs. H. G. Howard | William O. Stoddard |
| Richard C. Jenkinson | Fannie T. Sturgis |
| George M. Kober | Ada K. Terrell |
| Joseph Lee | William Thum |
| Elizabeth C. Lewis | William O. Tufts |
| A. L. Lincoln | H. S. Walter |
| Mary W. Lippincott | Mary H. Williams |
| Wm. E. Mann | Arthur Deerln Call |
| Mrs. J. A. McArthur | Leo Pasvolsky |

The report of George W. White, Treasurer of the Society, is before us. Comparing this with the Treasurer's report of last year, it will be noted that special subscriptions to the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* have increased, as has the income from reserve fund investments. Our disbursements under our Department of Home Office show a decrease of over \$1,300.00. The Department of Field Work shows an increase of about \$850.00. Disbursements by the Department of Publications fell off by \$4,874.85. The year's temporary investment purchases have been less by \$5,000, but our permanent reserve fund investments at par value have increased \$3,000.00. Cash on hand at the end of the year exceeds that of last year by about \$3,000.00.

While these facts are far from discouraging, the business of the Society, in the light of the work to be done, is on a far too limited scale. Every social agency needs more funds. The American Peace Society is no exception.

THE PERMANENT PEACE FUND

The Society has received from Thomas H. Russell, Esquire, of Russell, Moore & Russell, 27 State Street, Boston, Massa-

chusetts, a letter under date of May 15, 1924, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. CALL:

Replying to your favor of the 9th, would say that at the annual meeting of the Trustees of the Permanent Peace Fund, held yesterday, the Trustees voted, as has been our custom for many years, to turn over to the American Peace Society the net income for the year, amounting to \$6,693.32, as shown by our report to your Society for the year May 1, 1923, to May 1, 1924, which I enclose herewith. We sent you check on June 29, 1923, for \$1,000 on account, as you may remember, leaving a balance of \$5,693.32. I take pleasure in enclosing check for that amount. Will you kindly have your Treasurer sign and return the enclosed receipt?

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) THOMAS H. RUSSELL.

The report referred to in this letter is as follows:

BOSTON, MAY, 1924.

To the American Peace Society:

The Treasurer of the Trustees of the Permanent Peace Fund submits the following annual report for the period May 1, 1923, to May 1, 1924:

Gross income received by the Trustees from real estate, bonds, stocks, and all other investments	\$9,333.07
Gross expenses paid for repairs and taxes on real estate, salary of bookkeeper and agents, telephone, office rent, supplies, stationery, safe-deposit box, insurance, services of Trustees attending meetings and expenses, etc.....	2,639.75
Net income from the fund for the year	6,693.32
Paid to the American Peace Society on general account of income on June 29, 1923.....	1,000.00
Balance of net income for the year to be paid to the American Peace Society	5,693.32

Check herewith to the order of the American Peace Society in full payment for balance of income to date.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) THOMAS H. RUSSELL,
Treasurer.

THE ACTIVITIES OF OUR SECRETARY

There are certain activities that our Secretary may not wish to emphasize per-

sonally, but which should be recorded. He attended the sessions of the Academy of International Law at The Hague throughout its first semester, in July and August, 1923. He has been certified by the Academy.

As Executive Secretary of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, he attended the sessions of the Twenty-first International Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Copenhagen, Denmark, August 13-18, 1923.

While in Europe he made a special trip to Paris, upon the request of the special committee, to interview the owner relative to the purchase of the house, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, as a home for the Society. The owner, however, refused the Secretary's offer.

Besides various addresses during the year in the city of Washington, our Secretary has spoken in Stamford, Connecticut; on two different occasions in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Fort Humphreys, Virginia. He debated with Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, of Philadelphia, the question of French policy, before the Get-together Club, in Hartford, Connecticut; and the merits of the Bok Peace Plan with its author, Dr. Charles H. Levermore, before the Foreign Policy Association of Boston. He delivered the annual address under the John M. Stockdale Foundation at Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pennsylvania.

The original edition of 25,000 copies of his work on the *Federal Convention of 1787* having been exhausted, he has revised the document, and a new edition of 25,000 copies has recently appeared from the press of Rand, McNally & Company, publishers. Of this new edition, coming from the press March 20, approximately 1,500 copies have at the time of this meeting been sold. The pamphlet has been praised by our highest authorities. The orders have come from every section of our country.

He has entirely rewritten his pamphlet, *The Will to End War*, for which there is also a wide demand. He has also written and published a pamphlet on *The Interparliamentary Union*; another on *The American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting*; and a third, entitled *The Twenty-first Conference of*

the Interparliamentary Union at Copenhagen. At the annual meeting of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, upon motion of Senator Robinson, it was voted "that the American Group tender to Mr. Call its thanks for the very able and efficient manner in which he has performed the duties of Executive Secretary, and that he be requested to continue to perform them."

Mr. Call completed this year his eighteenth year of official relations with the American Peace Society, his twelfth as an employed officer, and his ninth as Secretary and Editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

THE "ADVOCATE OF PEACE"

The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* began its ninetieth year, January, 1924, in a new format. When the present Editor assumed his duties, nine years ago, the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* contained twenty-four pages, 8½ by 11 inches, without cover. Beginning with the January number, 1924, the size of the magazine was changed to 6¾ by 10 inches, its pages increased to sixty-four, and a cover consonant with magazine practice adopted.

The approval of the change has been widespread and often enthusiastic.

For the first time in its history, the magazine has been placed upon a limited number of news-stands, largely as an experiment. It is too early to judge whether or not this news-stand service will be extended. While the sales have not been large, they have been appreciable. Some news-stands sell more than others. Our editorial office is making a study to see if it is possible to explain the reasons for the differences.

While it is the function of the American Peace Society to extend the circulation of its magazine, the fact is that, since the Society loses money on every subscription, any appreciable increase in the circulation, in the absence of advertising income, would tend to bankrupt the Society. Thus far it has not seemed wise to alter our contract with the Post-Office Department and to sell space in our magazine for advertising purposes.

There can be no doubt about the increasing influence of this magazine. Its views and articles are reproduced, some-

times *in extenso*, in foreign publications, both in Europe and the Far East.

It is only the lack of funds that keeps the officers of the Society from extending widely the circulation of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

A PERMANENT HOME FOR THE SOCIETY

As reported last year, no little attention has been given to the possibility of locating the Society in suitable and permanent headquarters. Since the Society will celebrate its one-hundredth anniversary in 1928, it ought to be possible to report at that time sufficient funds to place the work of this ancient Society upon a permanent and self-sustaining basis.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has been a generous supporter of the work of this Society. Indeed, the Founder of the Endowment, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, for many years prior to 1910, when the endowment was organized, gave personally each year \$6,000 to our work. Many of the officers of the endowment have been warm and loyal friends to the American Peace Society. Among these are Honorable John W. Foster, Honorable James L. Slayden, now no longer among the living. Mrs. James L. Slayden writes that shortly before his death Mr. Slayden said to her, "I love that old Society." Fortunately there are men still connected with the endowment sufficiently familiar with our work to continue the friendship and support stood for by these who are now no more. Every officer of the American Peace Society appreciates the fact that financial aid from the Carnegie Endowment has made it possible for the American Peace Society to develop in spite of the handicaps incident to the World War and in spite of the bungling of the peace movement as a whole.

It would seem quite within reason, however, to expect that by its one-hundredth anniversary this worthy Society may be wholly self-sustaining.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ANDREW J. MONTAGUE,
President.

It was voted that the President's report be accepted, approved, placed on file, and printed in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

To the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society:

A REVIEW OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

DEAR SIRS:

In a real sense, the peace movement of America is in a sorry plight. The various peace organizations are divided against each other, sometimes, seemingly, with bitterness. There are over thirty of these organizations in the United States, supported by millions of our citizens, specifically devoted to promoting the cause of peace. Their differences are so apparent that business men are themselves thinking of taking hold of the problem. One of the most prominent of this group recently said: "The world will be spared another and more horrible war only by the intervention of hard-headed business men, who are used to making successes out of erstwhile failures." Peace propagandists are weak where one would naturally expect them to be strong, namely, in co-operation.

There is evidence that this analysis is correct. On the extreme left of the peace movement are the absolutists, and on the extreme right the militants. The Women's Peace Society of New York City subscribes to what has been called the "slacker's oath," namely, "never to aid in or sanction war, offensive or defensive, international or civil, in any way—in making or handling munitions, subscribing to war loans, working in order to set others free for war service, or helping by money or work any relief organization which supports or condones war." This oath is accepted by other women's organizations and by the War Resisters International, with headquarters in London. It is substantially the orthodox Quaker position. The other extreme is, perhaps, best illustrated by the American Defense Society and by the Navy League, primarily concerned to see that America is prepared for war. Between these extremes there are many groups with many views and programs, divergent and for the most part apparently exclusive of each other.

Mr. George T. Odell, representing the *Christian Science Monitor*, has recently made a study of the various peace organi-

zations for his newspaper. In one of his articles he refers to them as follows:

"There is no questioning the sincerity of purpose of these people, nor the slightest intention to impugn their motives, but the fact remains that, with all the good intentions in the world, they are not able to divorce themselves from the particular creeds of the organizations with which they are connected for the methods of overcoming war as an institution for settling international disputes. Those who hold convictions for the League of Nations cannot help feeling that it would be a betrayal of that cause to subordinate it for any other remedy, and the same holds true for those who believe in the World Court, the outlawry of war, or disarmament. It almost seems as if the peace movement in the United States is deadlocked on those issues."

It would be most profitable could we understand the reasons for this unhappy chaos among the peace workers. It is said that there is propaganda against the peace movement in the United States, and that it is both insidious and powerful. Mr. Odell tells us that it is not the propaganda that attacks the peace motif, "because that would have very little effect." It is, he says, directed toward splitting up the peace movement into factions and pitting one against the other, a maneuvering which is intended to dissipate the forces of the peace advocates. "It is these militarists who are responsible for much of the mutual suspicion and fear which exists in the peace movement today. By denouncing certain organizations as 'unpatriotic, passivists and reds or radicals,' they have prejudiced leaders of many peace organizations and induced them to refuse all co-operation."

An anonymous writer, writing in the *Dearborn Independent* of March 22, states that "The nations that are secretly doing most in the name of military preparation are backing the Pacifist program of American women's organizations."

None of these statements against the militarists in this country or abroad, however, are documented. Your Secretary has no first-hand information of any improper military propaganda and is not inclined to believe that it exists.

Mr. Odell seems to regret the anarchy in the peace movement, because elsewhere

he remarks: "The amount of energy that is being exerted in the peace movement is sufficient to demolish any obstacle; if it can be focused."

Some of the Societies

The list of our peace societies is naturally a fluctuating thing. The latest attempt known to your Secretary, to classify these organizations, has been made by Mrs. R. M. Boeckel, of the National Council for the Prevention of War. With the aid of this list it is possible to record:

Group I: Organizations Formed Primarily to Promote World Peace

1. American Association for International Conciliation, founded in 1907, 407 West 117th Street, New York, N. Y.
2. Association for Peace Education, founded in 1923, 1010 Fine Arts Building, Chicago Ill.
3. American School Citizenship League, founded in 1908, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston, Mass.
4. American Peace Society, founded in 1828, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
5. Association to Abolish War, founded in 1915, 7 Wellington Terrace, Brookline, Mass.
6. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, founded in 1910, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
7. Church Peace Union, founded in 1914, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
8. Committee to Outlaw War, founded in 1920, 76 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
9. Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, founded in 1908, 105 East 22d Street, New York, N. Y.
10. Fidac (Fédération Interalliée des Anciens Combattants, American Branch), founded in 1920, Burlington, Vermont.
11. Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, 311 Division Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights, N. J.
12. Fellowship of Reconciliation, 396 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
13. Foreign Policy Association, founded in 1918, 3 West 29th Street, New York, N. Y.
14. Intercollegiate Peace Association, founded in 1906, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
15. Interparliamentary Union (American Branch), founded in 1904; Arthur Deerin Call, Executive Secretary, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

16. League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, founded in 1923, 15 West 37th Street, New York, N. Y.

17. National Council for Prevention of War, founded in 1921, 532 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

18. New York Council for International Co-operation to Prevent War, founded in 1922, 27 Barrow Street, New York, N. Y.

19. Peace Association of Friends in America, founded in 1867, 615 National Road, West Richmond, Ind.

20. Peace Committee of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, founded in 1915, 304 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

21. Peace and Service Committee of (Hick-site) Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, founded in 1915, 154 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

22. Society to Eliminate Economic Causes of War, founded in 1920, Wellesley Hills, Mass.

23. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, founded in 1915, 1403 H Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

24. Women's Peace Society, founded in 1919, 505 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

25. Women's Pro-League Council (Non-partisan), 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

26. Women's Peace Union of the Western Hemisphere, founded in 1921 (U. S. Section), 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

27. Women's Committee for World Disarmament, founded in 1921, 719 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

28. World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, founded in 1914, 70 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.

29. World Peace Foundation, founded in 1910, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

30. World Peace Association, Greenville, Iowa.

31. Association for Peace Education, founded in 1923, 1010 Fine Arts Building, Chicago, Ill.

Group II: Organizations That Work for Peace Through Special Committees

1. Council of Jewish Women, founded in 1893, 305 West 98th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. (See Group I.)

3. General Federation of Women's Clubs, founded in 1890, 1734 N Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

4. National Conference on Christian Way of Life, 129 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y.

5. National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers Associations, 1201 16th Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

6. National Council of Women, founded in 1888, 3125 Lafayette Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

7. National Education Association, founded in 1857, 1201 16th Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

8. National League of Women Voters, founded in 1920, 532 17th Street N. W., Washington D. C.

9. National Reform Association, founded in 1863, 209 9th Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

10. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, founded in 1874, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill., and 35 B Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

11. National Women's Trade Union League, founded in 1903, 311 Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Group III: Organizations Engaged in Activities Calculated to Advance International Understanding

1. American Federation of Labor, founded in 1881, 9th and Massachusetts Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.

2. American Institute of International Law, founded in 1912, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

3. American Society of International Law, founded in 1906, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

5. Council of Women for Home Missions (Women's Section, Home Missions Council), 158 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

6. Institute of International Education, founded in 1919, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

7. International Association of Machinists, 9th Street and Mt. Vernon Place, Washington, D. C.

8. International Free Trade League, 38 Botolph Street, Boston, Mass.

9. International Lyceum and Chautauqua Association, 742 Marshall Field Annex Building, Chicago, Ill.

10. Junior Red Cross, American Red Cross Building, Washington, D. C.

11. National Grange, founded in 1866, Fredonia, New York.

12. National Student Volunteer Union (address for reference), 2184 South Milwaukee Street, Denver, Colo.

13. National Committee on American Japanese Relations, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

14. Pan American Union, founded in 1890, Washington, D. C.

15. Intercollegiate Cosmopolitan Club, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

16. National Student Forum, founded in 1921, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

17. Pan-Pacific Union, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

18. United Society of Christian Endeavor, World's Christian Endeavor Building, Mt. Vernon and Joy Streets, Boston, Mass.

19. United States Chamber of Commerce, founded in 1912, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

20. World Brotherhood Federation, 25 East 26th Street, New York City.

21. World's Student Christian Federation, founded in 1895, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

22. Young Men's Christian Association, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

23. Young Women's Christian Association (National Board), 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Group IV: Foreign Societies in U. S. A. Designed to Increase Knowledge and Develop Friendly Relations with Other Countries

1. Federation de l'Alliance Francaise, 32 Nassau Street, New York City.

2. The American-Scandinavian Foundation, 25 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

3. China Society of America, 19 West 44th Street, New York City.

4. English-Speaking Union of U. S., 345 Madison Avenue, New York City.

5. Japan Society, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York City.

6. Japanese Society of Boston, 200 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

7. Armenian-America Society, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

8. France-America Society, 40 Wall Street, New York City.

9. Friends of Belgium, 32 Broadway, New York City.

Italy-America Society, 26 West 44th Street, New York City.

11. Netherlands-America Foundation, 311 Sixth Avenue, New York City.

12. Poland-America Society, 40 West 40th Street, New York City.

13. Society of Friends of Roumania, 450 Madison Avenue, New York City.

14. The Translatic Society of America, 911 Liberty Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

15. Sulgrave Institution, 3903 Woolworth Building, New York City.

American Peace Society True to Its Faith

In the midst of these divergent interests the American Peace Society has tried to pursue through the year the even tenor of its way. The officers of our Society are not in perfect agreement on all points, though in essential harmony, and among the members of the organization there is every shade of opinion upon the problems of peace and war. Thus far no one has presented a reasoned attack against the "Suggestions for a Governed World" which have appeared regularly, month by month; in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. These principles were adopted unanimously at the annual meeting of our Society, May 27, 1921. The vitality of these principles consists in the fact that each of them is but an expression of American faith and practice. The American Peace Society, thus far, has preferred to abide by these principles.

An American Code of Private International Law

The American Peace Society has continued to stand upon the doctrine that justice between nations is the only enduring basis of any desirable peace. Law and judicial processes maintain peace between the forty-eight free, sovereign, independent States of America, between the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and between the groups of various other federations or groups of States.

In spite of the differences between the various peace societies, there have been developments during the year within the realm of international law calculated to promote the cause of peace.

International laws exist. They have been codified in the form of treaties, arbitral and judicial decisions, and the like; but the codification is inadequate, with the result that the standards by which the conduct of nations must be tested are still too vague and impalpable. With international law codified and ratified by the nations, it would be most difficult for them to behave inconsistently with the rights and duties to which they have voluntarily subscribed.

It is comforting, therefore, to report that the American republics, meeting in

their fifth conference at Santiago, Chile, resolved to organize a congress of jurists to meet at Rio de Janeiro during the year 1925. In the meantime a committee is studying the comparative civil law of the nations of the Western Hemisphere with the view of contributing to the formation and extension of private international law. In the domain of private international law the codification is to be developed gradually and progressively. The findings of the commission of jurists are to be submitted to the sixth international conference of American States, in order that, if approved, they may be communicated to the respective governments and incorporated in treaties or conventions. In other words, men are now at work preparing an American code of private international law as the basis of a juridical system or systems which shall be adopted. This is an important step towards the avoidance of conflicts in questions of legislation and towards the solution of problems arising because of such conflicts. Our Secretary of State has asked the American Institute of International Law to prepare the provisional code. Work upon this code is now on the way. A session of the Institute is to be held for this purpose during the coming summer in Lima, Peru.

The Academy of International Law at The Hague

As pointed out by our President, your Secretary attended the first period of the Academy of International Law at The Hague, July 14 to August 13, 1923. It was his privilege to attend the dedicatory ceremony in the Peace Palace July 12, and to attend over seventy lectures—some dealing with the development of international law; some with the theory and practice of international arbitration; some with the conduct of foreign affairs in a democracy; some with law, custom, and comity; some with the rights and fundamental duties of States; some with the freedom of the seas; some with the responsibilities of States; some with the relations between municipal and international law; some with ex-territoriality and its principal applications; some with the Pan American Union; some with international organization of the Red Cross; some with arbitration and interna-

tional justice; some with the Permanent Court of International Justice, and one with the development of the international mind. Among the lecturers were Professor Politis, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece; the Right Honorable Lord Phillimore, former Lord Justice of Appeal of Great Britain, and professors from the universities of Paris, of Leyden, of Ghent, of Berlin, of Vienna, of Geneva. There is no doubt that this first year of the Academy was eminently serviceable, and that it is destined to develop helpfully through the years that are to come.

International Events of the Year

The League of Nations, with headquarters at Geneva, while faced with a number of serious problems, particularly with the attack of Italy upon Corfu, has weathered the storms of the year and come out with what is probably a saner view of its own position in world affairs.

The winner of the Bok peace award, Dr. Charles H. Levermore, grants that "the operation of the League has therefore evolved a Council widely different from the body imagined by the makers of the Covenant. . . . In other words, the force of circumstances is gradually moving the League into position upon the foundations so well laid by the world's leaders between 1899 and 1907 in the great international councils of that period. . . . The Permanent Court has at least begun to realize the highest hope and purpose of the Second Hague Conference."

But probably the outstanding international event of the year has been the report of the Dawes and McKenna committees—one dealing with the means of balancing the German budget and with reparation payments which Germany is capable of making, and kindred matters, and the other with German capital exported abroad. These lengthy documents, occupying many pages, indicate the difficulties of the problems involved. In the main it may be said that the reports constitute a new basis, and therefore a new hope, for the lessening of the ills of Europe. The elections in France May 11 are an indication that the spirit of compromise may now more reasonably be expected.

Our Principles in the Senate

The work of the American Peace Society is, perhaps, not so new and spectacular as some may wish, but we have gone on through the year working for the extension of the benevolent influences of international conferences and in the interest of a clearer and more firmly established international law. We have continued to believe that The Hague conferences of 1899 and of 1907 were right when they stood for an independent Permanent Court of International Justice, agent of all the States. We have not forgotten that our American people approved these things at the time. We believe that they approve them now. We of the United States have always been glad to co-operate with other nations, to send our delegates to international conferences for the purpose of developing international justice under law, to stand for the familiar methods of the international conference.

At the moment, there are at least four plans before the United States Senate: (1) The proposal of President Harding and of President Coolidge, that we join the existing Permanent Court of International Justice with certain reservations; (2) a modification of that plan proposed by Senator Lenroot, which eliminates the League of Nations from the project; (3) Senator Lodge's project, providing for the creation of a World Court by all the governments, to be assembled at another conference at The Hague; (4) a composite plan, resembling Senator Lodge's proposal, now being worked out by Senator Pepper.

Senator Lodge's resolution, submitted under date of May 8, reads:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to propose, on behalf of the Government of the United States, to the nations of the world the calling of a Third Hague Conference, and to recommend to such conference the following statute for the establishment of a World Court of International Justice."

So far as the American Peace Society has a program, here it is. This is no place to analyze or to criticize Senator Lodge's statute for the World Court. The

comforting fact is that leaders in the United States Senate are actively engaged in bringing to a focus the eternal things for which this Society has stood throughout the many years.

A Suggestion

The peace movement of the United States, so far as the work of the peace societies is concerned, may be divisive, inexperienced, and futile; but the peace movement survives. With a little less impatience the peace workers might profitably turn their attention to co-operating with the Executive and the Senate, and that with profit to themselves and to the work. After all, the greatest peace society with which we are permitted officially to associate is the United States Government. The Executive is represented in all the capitals of the world with paid, usually expert, and often statesmanlike representatives, and this not only in the field of politics, but in the realm of business as well. The Secretary of State and his assistants are engaged each day in promoting justice in concrete situations between this country and the world. The United States Senate is the diplomatic council of the States in matters of foreign policy. The members of the government are American citizens. They, too, are interested to keep this country out of war and to promote the cause of peace throughout the world. They differ from the rest of us in two respects: they are better informed and they are more directly responsible than we. If our peace workers could go to the men responsible, ascertain what they think can be done, at least arrive at a mutual understanding, and join in promoting that, we might lessen the friction and increase our effectiveness. The most direct way to discipline a Senator is at the polls. When he is in office, he is the instrument with which we have to deal. Your Secretary's suggestion, respectfully offered and in the kindest spirit, is that the peace societies try the experiment of co-operating with the American Government in a friendly American way for the achievement of our great American ideal of observing good faith and justice toward all nations and of cultivating peace and harmony with all.

The Dynamic Nature of our Task

On the one hand, the nations are seen pursuing their national interests with varying degrees of patriotism, assimilating aliens within their States, completing their national boundaries, and extending their sovereignty over growing economic interests in the domains of weaker peoples. On the other, men everywhere are sensing the universality of human interests, transcending their man-made political boundaries, and demanding some form of international organization and centralized control of their common concerns. This complexity makes the task of just international behavior especially difficult, and the complexity itself is not a fixed but a changing condition. But, as Professor Gettell remarks in his recent *History of Political Thought*, "If political theory were to attain absolute truth and square completely with the facts of political life, it would be dead."

Mr. Barker, in his "Political Thought in England from Herbert Spencer to the Present Day," says of political theory: "It grows on the uncertainty of human affairs; it grows on the inadequacy of its own successive attempts to explain them."

Perhaps this is the comforting thing, amid the strife and turmoil of all our efforts to lessen the ills of war.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL,
Secretary.

It was voted that the Secretary's report be accepted, approved, placed on file, and printed in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

Dr. George W. White, Treasurer of the Society, presented his report, showing that the total receipts for the year ending April 30, 1924, including balance from the preceding year of \$222.22, to be \$42,114.92; the total disbursements to be \$38,895.47. Cash on hand April 30, 1924: National Metropolitan Bank, checking account, \$449.89; National Metropolitan Bank, savings account, \$2,743.96; petty cash on hand in office, \$25.60; total, \$3,219.45. The reserve funds as of April 30, 1924, are given below. Our Society continues to have the endorsement of the National Information Bureau, 1 Madison Avenue, New York City.

SCHEDULE "1"

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Reserve Fund Investments as at April 30, 1924

	Par value.	Price.	Market value.
\$200 American Telephone & Telegraph Convertible 6's, 1925	\$200.00	117 1/2	\$235.00
\$100 U. S. Liberty 1st, 4 1/4 Converted.....	100.00	100 3/32	100.09
\$100 U. S. Liberty 2d 4 1/4 Converted.....	100.00	100	100.00
\$100 U. S. Liberty 4th 4 1/4 Converted.....	100.00	100 4/32	100.13
\$19,000 U. S. certificate of indebtedness, 4 3/4, due March 15, 1927	19,000.00	101 27/32	19,350.31
\$4,000 U. S. certificate of indebtedness, 4 1/4, due December 15, 1924	4,000.00	100 14/32	4,017.50
17 shares American Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	1,700.00	125 1/2	2,133.50
24 shares Boston Elevated Railway Co., Com.....	2,400.00	76 1/4	1,830.00
12 shares Pullman Company.....	1,200.00	117 1/4	1,407.00
1 share Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Com.....	100.00	47	47.00
12 shares Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Com., 6 per cent Preferred.....	1,200.00	78	936.00
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	\$30,100.00		\$30,256.53

R. G. RANKIN & Co., ACCOUNTANTS AND AUDITORS

NEW YORK, May 20, 1924.

MR. GEORGE E. WHITE, *Treasurer,*
The American Peace Society,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have examined the accounts of the American Peace Society for the year ended April 30, 1924 and submit herewith the following:

EXHIBIT "A"—Cash account for the year ended April 30, 1924.

SCHEDULE "1"—Reserve Fund investments as at April 30, 1924.

In addition to the income, as shown by cash receipts in Exhibit "A" the following coupon had not been clipped and credited to the income account at the close of the period under audit.

On \$100 U. S. Liberty 4th 4¼ per cent bond coupon, due April 15, 1924..... \$2.12

The amount shown in Exhibit "A" as cash received from the Permanent Peace Fund Trustees is made up as follows:

Income from Permanent Peace Fund for the year ended April 30, 1923, as per statement of Trustees, dated May 1, 1923.....	\$5,663.63
Advanced June 26, 1923, on income for the year ended April 30, 1924.....	1,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$6,663.63

On June 30, 1923, the following checks were drawn and charged to Travel Expense under the Department of Field Work and the vouchers marked as noted.

A. D. Call, expenses, Southampton to Paris, <i>re</i> house.....	\$200.00
Leo Pasvolsky, travel in Europe.....	425.00
L. P. Branch, travel expense.....	200.00
	<hr/>
	\$825.00

On the same day there were taken up as contributions like amounts from the same persons. Examination disclosed that these travel checks were not used and had been turned back to the Peace Society. In our statement we have deducted these amounts from both contributions and travel expense to show these accounts in their true status.

We hereby certify that, in our opinion, the accompanying statement of cash, together with the statement of Reserve Fund Investments, attached hereto, accurately account for the cash receipts and disbursements of the Society for the year ended April 30, 1924, and correctly set forth the Reserve Fund Investments as at April 30, 1924.

Respectfully submitted,

R. G. RANKIN & Co.,
Members American Institute of Accountants.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

GEORGE W. WHITE,
Treasurer.

It was voted that the Treasurer's report be accepted, approved, and placed on file, subject to the inspection of any one interested to examine the finances of the Society more in detail.

THE ELECTION OF OFFICERS

It was voted that the Executive Committee, officers, and Honorary Vice-Presidents of the Society for the ensuing year be as follows (see page 386):

It was voted that Mrs. Philip North Moore, of St. Louis, Missouri; Dr. David Jayne Hill, of Washington, D. C., and Dr. James Brown Scott, of Washington, D. C., be nominated as members of the Board of Directors, for action by the Board at a special meeting to be called in connection with the meeting of the Executive Committee June 20, 1924.

It was voted that the chairman, in consultation with the Secretary, appoint a

committee of five to suggest additional names for the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, and for Vice-Presidents.

The meeting adjourned at 3 o'clock p. m.

(Signed ARTHUR DEERIN CALL,
Secretary.)

IMMANUEL KANT AND THE FOREIGN POLICIES OF NATIONS

By PROFESSOR WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING

Alford Professor of Philosophy, Howard University

(From Stenographer's Report of Ninety-sixth Annual Meeting of American Peace Society, First Congregational Church, Washington, D. C., May 23, 1924.)

PROFESSOR HOCKING. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: Two hundred years ago this evening, Immanuel Kant was a month and a day old, and I presume a more unpromising youngster few mothers of Königsberg had ever had. He was puny; he was a little crooked in his make-up; and he looked in a good many respects much as the peace movement has frequently looked to many people in the world since then. (Laughter.) Perhaps his subsequent history may be of some encouragement to us, and I am sure the nature of his thought is something that we can do well in spending an hour to consider.

Kant was seventy years old before he began to make any effective remarks about peace. His tractate *On Perpetual Peace* was written in 1795, when he was seventy-one years old. By that time his fellow-citizens in Königsberg had learned two things about this strange, fragile, punctilious old professor.

One was that he was a man of extraordinary intellectual power, and the other that he was (as we might put it) something of a Bolshevik. They did not in those days call them Bolsheviks; they called them Jacobins; and Kant had the reputation of being one of these dangerous liberals with radical leanings who sympathized in some respect with the French Revolution, and who therefore deserved the name of its extremest party.

I would like to call Kant's image a little more definitely before us by remarking on both of those points.

His fellow-townsmen had for the most part little interest in the strange,

metaphysical speculations of this man. They realized that fame was coming to him, because visitors flocked from outside to meet the man, who himself never went abroad. But they realized his intellectual power directly through his conversation. Kant was a man who gathered around his table not only thinkers, but observers, travelers, merchants, men who knew something about geography and of mankind in different parts of the world. Through his wide reading, his memory, and his imagination, he became, without ever having been outside the province, the best traveled man in Germany; and he so impressed those who conversed with him.

There is a story that on one occasion a visitor from China, after a talk with Kant, asked him how recently he had been in China, so well was he informed of conditions there. He was, in all reason, a citizen of the world—a *Weltbürger*.

Kant knew the world through the power of his imagination, but it was his humanitarianism which drew his particular interest to the revolutionary movements that were on foot during his time. He was greatly interested in the American Revolution. There is a tale to the effect that in the presence of an English acquaintance Kant once spoke so warmly in favor of the American Colonies that the loyal Englishman became highly irate and challenged Kant to a duel. Kant was not the person to indulge in duels, but he was the person to indulge in reasoning and persuasion; and he held forth calmly on the subject of the rights of the American Colonies with such effect that this Englishman, according to the story, was not only converted to the idea that the Colonies might have a defensible case, but became a lifelong friend of Kant as a consequence.

The French Revolution came much nearer home to Kant. The French Revolution had effects in his own town and neighborhood. He had already made the acquaintance of Rousseau and had become an ardent admirer of that stimulating thinker. He said of his writing, "The beauty of Rousseau's style is such that I have to read what he writes several times, so that I can forget the expression and begin to think about what the man says." Would that Kant had been able to find some further use for Rousseau's gifts of style than to forget them! (Laughter.)

But Rousseau influenced Kant much more deeply than simply on the surface. He gave a blow to Kant's pristine priggishness; for Kant in his youth, as a conscious and ambitious pursuer of truth, had felt that after all he was better than the common herd. A word or two in which he acknowledges his debt to Rousseau will show that this debt affects the fundamental articles of his faith.

He writes:

"By inclination I am myself an inquirer, feeling all of the thirst for knowledge and all of the eager unrest of striving to advance, as well as satisfaction with every kind of progress. There was a time when I thought all this could form the glory of mankind, and I despised the rabble who knew nothing. Rousseau has brought me to the right view. This blinding superiority vanished. I learned to honor man. And I would regard myself as much more useless than the common laborer did I not believe that this way of thinking could communicate a value to all others in establishing the rights of mankind."

Rousseau had thus sensitized Kant to think seriously of the French Revolution. And while the proceedings up to 1795 had filled him with horror, he was filled with something very much more than horror; for he saw here a unique exhibition of the belief of men in an idea, and their power to put this belief into very effective practice. He observed, too, a vein of enthusiasm in the onlookers. He felt in his own countrymen and those with whom he talked an almost instinctive tendency to sympathize with the revolutionists; and he felt, too, that in the armies in the State of Prussia that were being raised to join the coalition against

the French Republic there was a certain hesitation and unwillingness, a deficiency in morale, because of their doubt whether the French Revolution was not, after all, a righter sort of thing in the world than the Prussian Monarchy.

The French Revolution came home to Kant personally through the reaction of the government against it. Frederick William II was not the man that his predecessor had been. Frederick the Great had been a tolerant and thoughtful ruler, in spite of his Machiavellian statecraft. He believed in Kant. He was interested in Kant's thought. Frederick William II was a man timorous toward ideas on account of the principles that underlay his throne, and one who looked at the French Revolution with growing alarm. He did not like what happened to monarchs in France, and he thought he saw that bad philosophy was at the root of it. He thought that liberal views in religion were especially at fault here, and he began in set ways to move against those persons in the universities whose religious views were somewhat more liberal than he thought they ought to be.

So from 1792 onward Kant felt the approach of the censorship. On March 5 of that year an edict went forth to the effect that "irreverent criticism of the law of the land will hereafter be severely punished," and in October, 1794, a Royal Cabinet order came to Kant in person, urging him very courteously not to teach along lines which might be subversive of the religious foundations of the kingdom.

Kant replied in the spirit of loyal obedience; while declaring that he would not say anything contrary to his belief, he promised he would hold his religious views in silence—at least until such time as the reigning monarch should have disappeared from the scene.

But Kant also felt the Revolution in still another way. In 1795 the coalition armies had been brought to a standstill by the armies of the French Republic. Prussia felt obliged to make a separate peace. The Peace of Basle had been drawn up in April of that year; and that peace was one which, while giving the French Republic virtual recognition, also handed over to France territories on the left bank of the Rhine. This was a tentative promise, so far as the published

treaty was concerned; but there was a secret clause to this effect, that if the Empire made over to France its own territories, Prussia would do likewise, and find or take compensation in some other quarter!

Now, there was a good deal of whispering abroad in Prussia. Kant, while out of sympathy with the coalition, and vehemently critical toward England, whose gold was largely financing it, shared the indignation at this treaty on account of the surrender of territory, the secrecy of the proceeding, and the menace of future war involved in it. He wrote his tractate *On Perpetual Peace* largely as a protest against the principles of that treaty.

. . .

May I say a word or two about the character, the external character, of this extraordinary writing? Its title, *Zum ewigen Frieden*, Kant says he took from the signboard of a Dutch inn keeper, who, having adopted this device, had painted underneath it the picture of a graveyard as a satirical invitation to wayfarers. Kant adopts this motto for his own document by way of suggesting that we must aim at eternal peace through reason, or else we shall surely reach it by way of the universal graveyard of mankind.

The tractate held throughout, so far as its form is concerned, a semi-ironical vein, which appears, among other respects, in a certain imitation of the manner of diplomatic documents. Here are the "Preliminary Articles," six of them. Here are the "Definite Articles"; and here, if you please, is a "Secret Article."

Now, the "Secret Article" is a whimsical whisper between Kant and his government to this effect: "Governments ought to consult philosophers about what they are going to do." Now, this does not mean, Kant explains, that philosophers ought to be brought to the council table. It means simply that philosophers ought to be invited and encouraged to express themselves freely, because if they do express themselves freely in public, then of course all that they say is accessible to the government, and the government need not tell anybody that it is listening to the philosopher, nor inform anybody how far it intends to follow the philosopher's advice. He reassures the rulers that if

philosophers be granted this liberty, they will form no club of Jacobins, inasmuch as it is more than they can do to keep peace among themselves. Kant's "Secret Article" thus amounts to a plea for his own freedom of speech, a tacit request that he shall be allowed as a philosopher to speak his mind. This fact suggests that he felt a little uneasy about the acceptableness at court of the contents of his tractate, an uneasiness which would hardly have been allayed by the fact that the tractate was promptly translated into French and acclaimed at Paris as professing adherence to the principles of the Revolution. He had some reason to feel uneasy, as we shall recognize as we turn now to review those contents.

. . .

First of all, a treatise on peace implies some judgment about war. Kant had already expressed views on this subject. In 1784 he had published a short essay called "An idea for a general history of the world," and in that essay he had made war out to be, or rather to have been, an important factor in the development of mankind.

War, he explains, is an expression of our self-assertive nature, the "unsocial sociability of man." This self-assertive instinct leads everybody to try to take possession of the powers and opinions of everybody else. Of what worth would a man be if his will did not overflow, and if he did not feel that he could control others besides himself? Now, those whom we wish to control are precisely those with whom our social instinct leads us to unite; and since the impulse to exert control is mutual, we are led into antagonism and conflict, an unsocial sociability of relationship. And when this relationship exists between different societies we have war.

Now, this contest of wills, whether within or without a given society, has certain beneficial results. It stimulates our powers. It wakes us up. It destroys indolence. "Man wishes concord, but Nature knows better what is good for his species." It develops talents. It brings out an erect and stalwart growth of mankind, like that of the trees in the forest that are competing with each other for sunshine and air. If you plant the trees

thickly, up they go, straight, making clear wood for the builder, and putting out few lateral branches. But if you have but one, and plant it alone in the field, it grows at its will, crooked and broad, and loses shape and availability. So Nature has planted men thickly, has led them into competition with each other, and has brought them thereby into a taller and straighter growth.

Then, too, the competitive struggle begins to force man together into groups. It creates solidarity. Civil society in its origins is very largely an effect of warfare. And the existence of war, together with the need of peace, has dispersed mankind, driving them into the remote parts of the earth. The settlement of the earth's surface is largely due to the fact that warring tribes have split other tribes apart, sending the Finns up into the north of Russia, sending the Eskimos up toward the North Pole, and so forth. Thus war has taught man in what strange regions he can live and live successfully.

But war ends by making itself unnecessary and unwelcome. The last service of war is to strangle itself. Kant saw that, even in this earlier writing of his. He saw that, among other evils, the enormous cost of war was eating out the cultural life of the nation. Frederick the Great, interested and learned as he was, was too much of a warrior to support his university liberally, and Kant, together with all of the other professors of Prussia, felt the pinch when it came to the budget for the university. It is the nature of war to exhaust national energy into itself, and thus to check the growth which it first fostered. But when he wrote in 1795 on *Perpetual Peace*, he knew more of war, he was more conscious of its evils, and he wrote with a much more definite and clear-cut condemnation of the process.

It was the *methods* of warfare which struck Kant at this time with peculiar abhorrence. It was the inherent crookedness of war that impressed him. He was not thinking so much of the activities of the private soldier as of the activities of the statesmen and diplomats who bring wars to pass, and of the strategists who conduct them. Warfare is shot through with the practice of deception; and if Kant was fanatical on any point, it was on the necessity of truthfulness among

men as a foundation for all social relations. Warfare would hardly be itself without trickery, espionage, breach of faith. But this deception in the field is merely the overt continuance of the principles of a war-breeding statescraft. Kant formulates these principles with precise pedantry. (1) "*Fac et excusa*": Do a thing, take what you want, and let the *fait accompli* be the apology for the deed. (2) "*Si fecisti nega*": If you have committed an outrage, deny that you were its author, make it appear that the treachery or malice of others forced you to do as you did in self-defense. (3) "*Divide et impera*": Split your enemy and conquer his fragments severally—a maxim equally useful in the field and in the councils of state. Thus Kant states in advance the principles of the *Realpolitik* of a later day, and exhibits its internal corruption. War in its method is the offspring of the Father of Lies, and this must be symptomatic of its essence.

It is the essence of war to summon force to decide questions of justice—a task for which force has no pertinence. And it is incidental to the processes of war to treat human beings, not only of other States, but of one's own State, as mere means to those ends of war which they may neither comprehend nor care for—mere grist for the mill of death which controlling classes grind for the fancied benefit of the State. And in Kant's view, the use of humanity as a mere means to another's ends is the essence of moral wrong.

And all these evils of war, as Kant came to see it, are multiplied by the fact that it is *self-propagating*. The arrangements we call treaties of peace are not such in reality. They are truces. They leave the possibilities of future war precisely where they were; and more often than not their provisions contain in them the seeds of future war, as was sharply illustrated by the so-called Peace of Basle. No real peace can come until men devise measures not alone to stop individual wars, but to put an end to the business of warfare itself.

The time had now come, Kant felt, for a definitive rational effort in this direction. He felt himself called to take an initiative in that work; for who among men then living could more clearly see the necessity of the task, lay bare the

nature of war, arouse faith in the possibility of a conclusive peace, or set forth the necessary steps for bringing it to pass?

Now I must confess to you that if Kant's tractate had been submitted to the Bok Peace Award Committee it would not have received the prize. (Laughter.) It was not drawn up, in spite of its formal flourish, with the purpose of meeting a specific situation in a specific way. It is a document of principles. I do not think it less important on that account. On a task of such magnitude, there must be those who labor at clarifying principles, as well as those who labor at applying them. And the former workers have the important function of reaching the minds of the multitudes of thinking people, in whose insight and sentiment all enduring peace must be born. These multitudes cannot deal with the details of actual constitutions, but they are concerned with the principles on which they are founded. Let me therefore restate to you, not in their exact language, but in their purport, the principles which Kant ventured to recommend to the consideration of mankind in his day, beginning with the "Preliminary Articles."

These "Preliminary Articles" may be regarded as a series of reforms which may be undertaken while war is still with us, and which may lead to the creation of a state of public mind in which final peace-making is possible.

The first is that there shall be *no secret reservations in treaties*; for it is here that seeds of future wars lie concealed. This article seems to anticipate the first of Wilson's Fourteen Points.

Second, there shall be *no disposal of national territory as if it were the property of the sovereign*, as by trading it off, selling it off, transmitting it by bequest or gift. It must be recognized that the domain of a State is a part of the life of a nation; it is inseparable from the lives and interests of men and families and cannot be altered in its destiny without their consent.

Third, *in time we must dismiss all standing armies*—anticipating in part Wilson's Fourteenth Point and Article VIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"No more standing armies"—why? Kant had in mind not alone the invitation to war which lies in the fact of a standing army, but also the anomalous moral position of the professional soldier. The soldier who belongs to a standing army is committed in advance to fighting for whatever cause the government may adopt. He does not choose his cause. As one of our own officers once put the case: "I am a hired butcher. It is not my business to form any opinion about the thing for which I am fighting. It is my business to fight; and if I am told to fight I shall do so." Now, Kant objected to any such commitment in advance. He did believe in citizens drilling for warfare voluntarily, preparing themselves for a war of defense in case they were needed; and he recognized that disarmament must be general and gradual, not local and immediate. But he believed that disarmament must precede a genuine peace.

Fourth, *no credits shall be raised for promoting external aggressive policies*. Fiscal disarmament must accompany military disarmament—the war-chest must go.

Fifth, *no intervention* in the internal affairs of States, not even in case of civil war. Let each State wrestle with its own internal maladies; for its own cures are better than any cures imposed by force from outside.

Sixth, *no war usages shall be tolerated which diminish confidence between combatants for future peace*. Such usages are the incitement to treason, guerrilla warfare, poisoning, the breaking of treaties. Kant also mentions espionage in a very obscure sentence; and I am not quite sure whether he means that no spies are to be employed in warfare. Some of his translators think that he intended to abolish them. But in any case the usages of war, he maintains, must be such that you can still continue to believe in the humanity and worth of your opponents; for without such belief the possibility of true peace is absent, and every war should, in all logic, be a war of extermination.

So much for the "Preliminary Articles." Now for the "Definitive Articles," namely, those which contain Kant's idea of the actual establishment of peace. For peace must be instituted; it will not grow of itself.

There are three such articles. The first of them is that *the constitution of all States must be republican*. This statement sounds like one of extreme boldness, when we consider that Kant was living under the monarchy of Prussia. But Kant immediately proceeds to define what he means by "republican." He does not mean by a republic a State in which the mass of the people assume the executive function or right. He means a State in which the legislature is representative, and presumably expresses the wishes of the people. And he assumes that this parliament will so far control such public acts as war-making that it shall be the people themselves who decide upon it, and not simply the government.

It is evident that he expects by this article to bring war to a prompt close by choking off its source, on the ground that people will not vote themselves into the miseries which war brings. Kant's analysis, as we can now see, is not entirely correct here, because we have had enough experience with republics of his sort since that time to know that they also are capable of being carried away by warlike passions. We know, too, that in republics, as in other States, it is still the official body that orders the fighting; and in campaigns like that of the Dardanelles or the Argonne the private soldier still feels himself in the grasp of forces over which he can exercise no effective control. But Kant's views are correct to this extent, that republics find fewer causes for war than States which are organized in such a way that popular judgment can be relatively disregarded. And the prospects of educating the popular judgment to the control of passion are more hopeful than those of educating princes whose interest or ambition may urge toward expansion.

The second of these Definitive Articles is this:

"There must be a Federation of Free States pledged to support certain principles of public right."

Kant believes that the same logic must ultimately drive States into a legal union as impel individuals to the formation or support of individual States. If we scorn savages because they prefer the freedom of nature to the freedom that mankind have in civil society—if we call them rude and brutal because they prefer to live in

their own way—why is it, he asks, that we judge civilized States less severely when they prefer to live in this same state of nature with reference to each other?

I am going to take the liberty of putting Kant's meaning into language which Kant does not use. The chief obstacle to this Federation of Free States, in Kant's Time as in our own, was a certain conception of State freedom which we call "sovereignty," and which he sometimes refers to as "Majestät." The notion of sovereignty is commonly so interpreted as to make it appear that any submission by an independent State to a rule of justice, which as international would be independent of its own resolution, would be an abrogation of its own statehood. States hesitate to accept international usage as *law*. There is evidently no law-making body. There is evidently no international force. How, then, can international usage be law in any definite sense of the term? But Kant points out with unanswerable cogency that there is the same alternative before States as before individuals: either you secure your rights by law of some sort, or else you secure them by force. No State can take the position of letting its rights go. Then, if it will not let its rights go, and if its conception of sovereignty precludes an appeal to some source of objective justice, it must fight for them.

Per contra, if war is wrong, then this conception of sovereignty is wrong. But war, which is a contest of forces, is utterly condemned by reason as a method of settling contests of right. War is wrong, and therefore this conception of sovereignty is wrong—a doctrine that I should like to commend to certain members of the United States Senate—particularly, I regret to say, to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, whose influence on international affairs for six years past seems to me to have been an almost unmixed calamity to the nation. (Applause.)

If war is wrong, this conception of sovereignty is wrong. And not only this conception of sovereignty, but also the attitude of *laissez faire* which it fosters with reference to the international situation. For it is not merely warfare that reason must condemn; it is the condition out of which war must come. It is re-

maining in the state of nature with reference to each other that is wrong and which must be corrected. It is absolutely wrong to remain in a situation in which right can only be sustained by force.

One might think by what Kant has said, following his logic, that he would have to advocate a world State—that is to say, a world government. And, as a matter of fact, both in the treatise of 1784 and in his treatise on the metaphysics of Law of 1796, Kant does allow his argument to carry him far in that direction.

But why not accept this conclusion unreservedly? There is still something in that notion of sovereignty that resists the notion of a world State. Kant cannot bring himself to eliminate sovereignty entirely; he hesitates to put rulers in the position of being over-ruled, so that they are no longer rulers. He gives different reasons for this hesitation which show he is not quite reconciled to it. He suggests in one place that it is simply a general (and irrational) unwillingness of mankind that renders a world government Utopian. But again he alleges the psychological fact that law weakens as territory expands; so that if you undertook to make law for the entire world it would spread out too thin. Its force would fail as it bore on particular localities. He speaks, further, about the boundaries of nations—how many times States have undertaken to control other States and have failed to do so because limits of agreement in language and religion have imposed limits of political understanding—and then he suggests that probably the whole world is stronger if we do not attempt to submit all States to a single State, but leave their differences standing. The differences of States should, perhaps, be balanced against one another rather than cancelled in a universal order.

We can understand the source of Kant's perplexity. It is evident to us today, after the discussion of the 19th century, that he was touching upon the idea of *nationality*. He feels its force, but he is unable to formulate its principles. His sense for the claims of nationality is sufficiently strong, so that he discards the world State as an undesirable ideal.

What, then, is the thing that he proposes in place of the world State? A Federation of Free States. It is not to

be a fixed Federation, like the United States of America. He says explicitly that the federation must be subject to renewal from time to time, and to dissolution at the will of its members. If any party is unsatisfied, it may withdraw. It is to begin with a nucleus of States, and then it is to be open to any neighboring State to join. In his treatise of 1796 he adds: "We might call it a *continuous congress of nations*."

"A continuous congress of nations"—an extraordinary phrase, it seems to me, almost an anticipatory description of the League of Nations. But Kant does not tell us enough of its specific program to determine whether it is to be primarily a league or a court—an international court. He mentions an instance of an assembly that took place in the early part of the 18th century at The Hague, an assembly of various States-general of Europe, in which the mind of Europe reached a momentary organization, passing common judgment on the issues before that assembly, and in which each State there met realized that its case was going to be judged not solely upon the basis of its own force, but upon the basis of a common sense of justice. He regarded this event not alone as a practical illustration of his meaning, but as evidence of its feasibility. Here we may leave this second article for a moment and turn to the third of these Definitive Articles, which relates to the rights of "world citizens."

The World-citizen, or *Weltbürger*—a being whom we have already met in Kant's own person in his capacity as mental globe-trotter, and whom we think of, perhaps, as chiefly incarnate in the explorer, the traveler, and the trader—is here understood by Kant, not as a special class of person, but as every man; for all persons, he thinks, have certain claims on all the world. Starting from the fact that the earth is round, and therefore the amount of space in the world is limited, he judges that the accident of being first in any place ought not to create an absolute right of property in land, either for individuals or nations. Every one of us ought to have some right to every spot on the earth's surface.

But, comforting as this assurance must be to all of us, the important point for international order is to define explicitly

how far these rights extend. *They are limited*, says Kant, in this third article, *to the rights of hospitality.*

The rights of hospitality, as he understands them, are the rights to go visiting and to do trading without being molested, robbed, or deprived of elementary justice. I must be permitted to travel, and to make contracts. If I find something I like, I may offer to buy it. That shall not be taken as an offense. I may trade. But the rights of the world citizen, explorer, adventurer, merchant, are not to go beyond that. They are *not to include the right of appropriation or dictation.*

It is evident that these rights have been interpreted so as to be fruitful causes of war. The inhospitality of savages has been broken down, the reluctance of backward peoples has been answered by a ruthless self-assertion on the part of the alleged civilized. Kant speaks very feelingly about the kind of expansionism which was prevalent in his own day, not entirely different in principle from the expansionism that we know at present, although his instances were different. He takes his examples from America—the treatment of the Indians here by some of our explorers; from Africa, the Spice Islands, the Cape; he speaks particularly of the treachery in East India, whereby, in guise of traders, soldiers were landed and dissension sown among the native tribes; he praises the wisdom of China and Japan in resisting this kind of intrusion.

And he makes this declaration, which now, 130 years later, we are just beginning to recognize as true:

“Since now the community among the peoples of the earth has come to be so close that *a breach of right in one part is felt in all parts*, a definition of the right of world citizens has become necessary.”

. . .

This is the substance of the tractate on Perpetual Peace. A few comments may now be offered.

There is obvious criticism; I think we would all agree in making it. Kant has not met the problem of sovereignty completely, because he has not seen the full force of the interest in nationality. The analogy between the State and the individual is not as perfect and as simple as Kant assumes. The principles are the

same, since in each case free wills are dealing with free wills. Here he is right. But the situations are profoundly different, and every friend of peace will wish to face these essential differences between States and individuals in order not to minimize the obstacles which we have before us.

In the first place, a society of nations is much smaller in number than any ordinary society of individuals, and the individual differences between the members of that society are greater. Each State is unique to a degree in which individuals are hardly unique. States are geographically unique. Their vital interests are correspondingly different; no other State can have precisely England's concern in the high seas, nor America's concern in the Western Continent. Further, they have a kind of fixity of position that we individuals do not have. If we do not like neighbors, we can move away, physically leaving them; but if the United States should ever cease to like Canada as a neighbor, or if Mexico should fail to like us as a neighbor, neither can leave the place, nor induce the other to go away. We are obliged to live as neighbors. And, furthermore, there is no free play between us. If you do not like me, you can urge me, at any rate, to get farther over; but States are commonly separated by nothing but an imaginary line.

Again, “property” and “existence” mean different things in the two cases. The property of a State means both more and less than the property of the individual. It means more; for, as we have seen, it means citizenship. But it also means less; for you can transfer the property of a State to another State without any loss to the property of the individual members of that transferred territory—not the slightest.

Then, again, all questions between States are likely to reduce to questions of existence, because no one can tell quite what is going to turn up in the world situation tomorrow. Every small advantage has, therefore, an unknown importance. And, finally, self-sacrifice means something very different in the case of States from what it means in the case of individuals. A man may sacrifice himself alone, but a State cannot sacrifice

"its self" without sacrificing its members. Indeed, the State has no self apart from the selves of its members, and has no soul of its own.

These differences require us to think. They are not differences which lead us to say that the morals between States must be different in character from the morals between individuals; but they are problems which we cannot dispose of by merely referring to the Ten Commandments as a rule for States and individuals alike. To my mind, the conception of sovereignty is a provisional conception, which must remain as a check to progress in international relations until such time as these differences are fully grasped and provided for. So much, then, for what seems to me the weak point in Kant's position.

Now let us turn to its elements of greatness and permanent validity. Kant's greatness consists in his power to reach directly what is essential in any case, and to formulate the first principles for dealing with it. In the case of peace, he has shed a flood of light on the problem by cutting it away from the insoluble tangle of expediency, practicability, precedent, etc., and bringing it at once into the court of human right and duty, where it belongs.

Kant rests his case upon the ultimate moral principle, the "categorical imperative"—*i. e.*, that moral rule which commands without an "if." It is the inescapable and unquestionable duty of every man to "Treat humanity, whether in yourself or in another, always as an end in itself and never as a means only." This is a wonderful formulation; it cuts the ground at once from under many historical evils—from under slavery, from under prostitution, from under warfare as a method of national self-assertion—for all of these involve exploiting humanity as a means to other ends than its own.

Now this categorical imperative marks out the duty of the individual; but in Kant's hands it becomes the source of the principle of public right. The political order has to realize right in external matters of behavior (which alone can be controlled by law). The inner law of duty requires equal respect for the moral element in all men; the external law of

right requires their *equal freedom*. The goal of all politics is to provide that every man may be free to do "whatever is compatible with the equal freedom of others, according to a universal law." This freedom requires the supremacy of legal justice in the world, and must ultimately put an end to every appeal to force.

Now the notion of individual freedom was in the air of Kant's time. It was a part of the spirit of the great revolutions and of the enlightenment out of which they came. Was Kant, perhaps, only taking the prevalent idea of the "natural rights" of man and drawing from it the corollary of a demand for universal peace? So to interpret Kant is to miss the secret of his power. As Dean Pound has well pointed out, the idea of natural right, as disseminated by Locke, Rousseau, and others, had previously played a rôle of great social utility. The new commerce and the new industry were in extraordinary need of a conception which would enable men to separate themselves from old social ties without losing the fundamental ties of right and duty to each other; it was necessary that men should be able to regard themselves as related not by ties of feudal status or other traditional belongings, but by ties of free contract. In the changing world opened by commerce, exploration, and industry, it was less important to keep men in their old places than to give them a sanction for being moral and legal entities, *while places changed*. The human being, and not the group, was to be the unit of the new society; and he was to be a detachable unit. He must have rights that were transportable from place to place, from employer to employer, and from institution to institution. This was precisely what inherent "natural rights" permitted him; the natural-rights man inevitably carried his rights with him, like so many chemical valencies, and they enabled him to confront changing social situations with a certain moral stability. There was thus a profound economic reason for the vogue of the doctrine of natural rights.

But I must point out, at the risk of differing from Dean Pound, that neither Locke nor Rousseau nor Kant believed in human rights for reasons of these social utilities: the utilities were incidental.

They believed in rights because they were right; and the age then used them because they were useful. But Kant alone was fully conscious of this situation; he alone singled out the element of right and made it expressly paramount over utility. His view of human freedom and equality came from his metaphysical view of the nature of the universe—ultimately, no doubt, from his Pietistic inheritance—as a place where the moral order is the supreme order and the moral capacity of man his supreme trait. In such an order, right determines what is useful, not utility what is right. By the clearness with which he asserted this, Kant separated himself from the Enlightenment, and inaugurated a new era in thought.

. . .

I will pass over a number of subordinate principles of statecraft suggested by Kant which seem to me shrewd and wise, and come to the thing which I think is the most important message which Kant has for us today—that is, his *rational confidence in the outcome*. Because it is our duty to bring about this new international situation, the task is always a hopeful task.

Grotius had had visions of international peace. Rousseau had thought of these things in substance. So had Voltaire. So had the Abbé de Saint Pierre. But they had dreamed of them with vacillating hope or none. When Voltaire went to Frederick the Great and reported to him, "Rousseau has written a flaming tractate, declaring that all that is necessary to bring war to an end is that princes shall lay aside their ambitious projects and cease to be self-indulgent and self-centered." Frederick the Great put on his cynical smile and said, "Is that all?" (Laughter.)

It was a general disbelief in the possibility of peace that Rousseau faced, and Kant faced nothing less when he wrote. But Kant saw, and truly said, that history furnishes us no argument about what is possible and what is impossible. History shows, rather, that the alleged impossible is the thing that is happening from time to time. The French Revolution meant to Kant that that which no diplomat had ever believed possible was possible—that an ideal should upset an ancient State. And he finely observed the meaning of the

psychological forces there at work. It was enthusiasm that worked the miracle. And men are capable of enthusiasm about something which demands self-sacrifice. As for what promises them profit, men can be eager about it, but not enthusiastic, for enthusiasm is a fundamentally moral emotion. Here Kant's psychology is absolutely right. And the historical possibilities of this moral emotion are never exhausted.

Kant points out that this moral passion is not without a helper. Nature itself makes for the end of war. A race of devils would be driven to devise a civil order among themselves; the race of men must be impelled, if only by commercial greed, by the need of markets, by the fear of misery or of possible extinction, to devise some alternative to war. Other forces within the logic of history are working in the same direction. Sophistication of mankind gradually defeats the practises of deception; the practised morality of statesmen must gradually approximate the professible morality; and men will be brought to see that "all actions touching the rights of other men which do not allow of *publicity* are wrong." It will also be perceived that the attitude of potential hostility to neighbor States is incompatible with the legal order within the State; that selfishness in international conduct inevitably reflects itself in the behavior of citizens toward each other; so that there can be no sound State which remains selfishly aloof or passive toward the creation of international righteousness.

But no one knows how powerful these forces may be, nor what counter-forces may work against them. We cannot calculate the course of history objectively; there is no prudential way to peace. The one effective force in this direction lies in the consciousness that we ought to create peace; and *because we ought, we can*. It is absurd, says Kant, to suppose that anything can be morally right and not practical; for morality is the very essence of the practicable. The calculation of expediency loses itself in infinite complication; the fact of duty stands simple. Do justice, enact peace, make righteousness possible in the world; then all these other things will be added unto you.

Then Kant makes a suggestion. If a powerful and avowed republic were to take the lead in these things—were to make itself the nucleus of an organization of States—we should find other States assembling around it, and we should find this Federation of Free States beginning to exist. Is there a “powerful and avowed republic,” that can remain indifferent to this possibility?

“If, therefore,”—I quote from Kant’s treatise—“If, therefore, there is a duty

to further public right, and if there is a well grounded hope to approximate it, then eternal peace is no empty idea, but it is a necessary task whose accomplishment draws continually nearer.” We have no right to give world history over to the play of a statecraft based upon force. We have no right to give up the effort to bring these United States into a position where international justice must be thought out and not merely fought out. (Applause.)

BUSINESS ETHICS *

By HERBERT HOOVER

Secretary of Commerce

THE advancement of science and our increasing population require constantly new standards of conduct and breed an increasing multitude of new rules and regulations. The basic principles laid down in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are as applicable today as when they were declared, but they require a host of subsidiary clauses. The ten ways to evil in the time of Moses have increased to ten thousand now.

A whole host of rules and regulations is necessary to maintain human rights, with this amazing transformation into an industrial era. Ten people in a whole county, with a plow apiece, did not elbow each other very much. But when we put seven million people in a county, with the tools of electricity, steam, 30-floor buildings, telephones, miscellaneous noises, street cars, railways, motors, stock exchanges, and what-not, then we do jostle each other in a multitude of directions. Thereupon our lawmakers supply the demand by the ceaseless piling up of statutes in attempts to keep the traffic open; to assure fair dealing in the economic world; to eliminate its wastes; to prevent some kind of abuse or some kind of domination. Moreover, with increasing education, our senses become more offended and our moral discrimination increases; for all of which we discover new things to remedy. In

one of our States over 1,000 laws and ordinances have been added in the last eight months. It is also true that a large part of them will sleep peacefully in the statute book.

The question we need to consider is whether these rules and regulations are to be developed solely by government or whether they cannot be in some large part developed out of voluntary forces in the nation. In other words, can the abuses which give rise to government in business be eliminated by the systematic and voluntary action of commerce and industry itself? This is indeed the thought behind the whole gamut of recent slogans—“Less Government in Business,” “Less Government Regulation,” “A Square Deal,” “The Elimination of Waste,” “Better Business Ethics”—and a dozen others.

National character cannot be built by law. It is the sum of the moral fiber of its individuals. When abuses which rise from our growing system are cured by live individual conscience, by initiative in the creation of voluntary standards, then is the growth of moral perceptions fertilized in every individual character.

No one disputes the necessity for constantly new standards of conduct in relation to all these tools and inventions. Even our latest great invention—radio—has brought a host of new questions. No one disputes that much of these subsidiary additions to the Ten Commandments must be made by legislation. Our public utili-

* Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland, Ohio, May 7, 1924.

ties are wasteful and costly unless we give them a privilege more or less monopolistic. At once when we have business affected with monopoly we must have regulation by law. Much of even this phase might have been unnecessary had there been a higher degree of responsibility to the public, higher standards of business practice among those who dominated these agencies in years gone by.

There has been, however, a great extension of government regulations and control beyond the field of public utilities into the fields of production and distribution of commodities and credit. When legislation penetrates the business world it is because there is abuse somewhere. A great deal of this legislation is due rather to the inability of business hitherto so to organize as to correct abuses than to any lack of desire to have it done. Sometimes the abuses are more apparent than real; but anything is a handle for demagoguery. In the main, however, the public act only when it has lost confidence in the ability or willingness of business to correct its own abuses.

Legislative action is always clumsy; it is incapable of adjustment to shifting needs. It often enough produces new economic currents more abusive than those intended to be cured. Government too often becomes the persecutor instead of the regulator.

The vast tide of these regulations that is sweeping onward can be stopped if it is possible to devise, out of the conscience and organization of business itself; those restraints which will cure abuse; that will eliminate waste; that will prevent unnecessary hardship in the working of our economic system; that will march without larger social understanding. Indeed, it is vitally necessary that we stem this tide if we would preserve that initiative in men which builds up the character, intelligence, and progress in our people.

I am one of those who believe in the substratum of inherent honesty, the fine vein of service and kindness in our citizenship. The vast volume of goods and services that daily flow through the land would cease instantly were it not for the instinctive dependence of our people upon the moral responsibility of the men who labor in the shops and farms and the men

who direct our production and distribution.

In these times of muddled thought it is sometimes worth repeating a truism. Industry and commerce are not based upon taking advantage of other persons. Their foundations lie in the division of labor and exchange of products; for through specialization we increase the total and variety of production and secure its diffusion into consumption. By some false analogy to the "survival of the fittest" many have conceived the whole business world to be a sort of economic "dog eat dog." We often lay too much emphasis upon its competitive features, too little upon the fact that it is in essence a great co-operative effort. And, our home-made Bolshevik-minded critics to the contrary, the whole economic structure of our nation and the survival of our high general levels of comfort are dependent upon the maintenance and development of leadership in the world of industry and commerce. Any contribution to larger production, to wider diffusion of things consumable and enjoyable, is a service to the community, and the men who honestly accomplish it deserve high public esteem.

The thing we all need to consider searchingly is the practical question of the method by which the business world can develop and enforce its own standards and thus stem the tide of governmental regulation. The cure does not lie in mere opposition. It lies in the correction of abuse. It lies in an adaptability to changing human outlook.

The problem of business ethics, as a prevention of abuse is of two categories; those where the standard must be one of individual moral perceptions and those where we must have a determination of standards of conduct for a whole group in order that there may be a basis for ethics.

The standards of honesty, of a sense of mutual obligation and of service, were determined 2,000 years ago. They may require at times to be recalled. And the responsibility for them increases infinitely in high places, either in business or government, for there rests the high responsibility for leadership in fineness of moral perception. Their failure is a blow at the repute of business and at confidence in government itself.

The second field, and the one which I am primarily discussing is the great area of indirect economic wrong and unethical practices that spring up under the pressures of competition and habit. There is also the great field of economic waste through destructive competition, through strikes, booms and slumps, unemployment, through failure of our different industries to synchronize, and a hundred other causes which directly lower our productivity and employment. Waste may be abstractly unethical, but in any event it can only be remedied by economic action.

If we are to find solution of these collective issues outside of government regulation, we must meet two practical problems:

First, there must be organization in such form as can establish the standards of conduct in this vast complex of shifting invention, production, and use. There is no existing basis to check the failure of service or the sacrifice of public interest. Some one must determine such standards. They must be determined and held flexibly in tune with the intense technology of trade.

Second, there must be some sort of enforcement. There is the perpetual difficulty of a small minority who will not play the game. They too often bring disrepute upon the vast majority; they drive many others to adopt unfair competitive methods which all deplore; their abuses give rise to public indignation and clamor which breed legislative action.

I believe we now, for the first time, have the method at hand for voluntary organized determination of standards and their adoption. I would go further; I believe we are in the presence of a new era in the organization of industry and commerce, in which, if properly directed, lie forces pregnant with infinite possibilities of moral progress. I believe that we are, almost unnoticed, in the midst of a great revolution—or perhaps a better word, a transformation—in the whole super-organization of our economic life. We are passing from a period of extremely individualistic action into a period of associational activities.

Practically our entire American working world is now organized into some form

of economic association. We have trade associations and trade institutes embracing particular industries and occupations. We have chambers of commerce embracing representatives of different industries and commerce. We have the labor unions representing the different crafts. We have associations embracing all the different professions—law, engineering, medicine, banking, real estate and what-not. We have farmers' associations and we have the enormous growth of farmers' co-operatives for actual dealing in commodities. Of indirect kin to this is the great increase in ownership of industries by their employees and customers, and again we have a tremendous expansion of mutualized insurance and banking.

Although such associational organizations can trace parentage to the middle ages, yet in their present implication they are the birth of the last 50 years, and in fact their growth to enveloping numbers is of the last 25 years. We have, perhaps, 25,000 such associational activities in the economic field. Membership, directly or indirectly, now embraces the vast majority of all the individuals of our country. Action of wide import by such associations has become an important force of late in our political, economic, and social life.

It is true that these associations exist for varied purposes. Some are strong in recognition of public responsibility and large in vision. Some are selfish and narrow. But they all represent a vast ferment of economic striving and change.

Ever since the factory system was born, there has been within it a struggle to attain more stability through collective action. This effort has sought to secure more regular production, more regular employment, better wages, the elimination of waste, the maintenance of quality or service, decrease in destructive competition and unfair practices, and oftentimes to assure prices or profits. The first phase of development on the business side was "pools" in production and distribution. They were infected with imposition upon the public and their competitors. In some part they were struggles to correct abuse and waste. They were followed by an era of capital consolidations with the same objects, but also to create a situation

of unbreakable agreements. Both were against public interest, and the public intervened through the Sherman Act. Yet underneath all these efforts there was a residuum of objects which were in public interest.

Associational activities are, I believe, driving upon a new road, where the objectives can be made wholly and vitally of public interest. The legitimate trade associations and chambers of commerce, with which I am now primarily concerned, possesses certain characteristics of social importance and the widest differentiation from pools and trusts. Their membership must be open to all members in the industry or trade, or rival organizations enter the field at once. Therefore, they are not millstones for the grinding of competitors, as was the essence of the old trade combinations. Their purpose must be the advancement of the whole industry or trade, or they cannot hold together. The total interdependence of all industries and commerce compels them, in the long run, to go parallel to the general economic good. Their leaders rise in a real democracy, without bosses or political manipulation. Citizens cannot run away from their country if they do not like the political management, but members of voluntary associations can resign and the association dies.

I believe that through these forces we are slowly moving toward some sort of industrial democracy. We are upon its threshold, if these agencies can be directed solely to constructive performance in the public interest.

All this does contain some dangers, but they will come only from low ethical standards. With these agencies used as the machinery for the cultivation and spread of high standards and the elimination of abuses, I am convinced that we shall have entered the great era of self-governing industry and business which has been a dream to many thinkers. A self-governing industry can be made to render needless a vast area of governmental interference and regulation which has grown up out of righteous complaint against the abuses during the birth pains of an industrial world.

Some people have been alarmed lest this associational movement mean the destruc-

tion of our competitive system, lest it inevitably destroy the primary individualism which is the impulse of our society. This alarm is groundless. Its rightful activities do not destroy equality of opportunity or initiative. In fact, they offer new avenues of opportunity for individuals to make progress toward leadership in the community. Any one of them will die at once if it does not offer equality of opportunity to its members; or, if it restricts its membership, rival associations at once emerge. They are the safeguards of small business, and thus prevent the extinction of competition. They are the alternative to capital consolidation. They are not a growth toward socialism—that is, government in all business—they are, in fact, a growth directly away from such an idea.

Right here, for the benefit of the gloomy persons who have a frozen belief that every form of associational activity is a conspiracy to fix *prices and to restrain trade, to perpetuate* tyranny of employer or employee, we may remember that there are some crooks in every line of endeavor. The underlying purposes of the vast majority are constructive. A minority may be violating the Ten Commandments and need the application of criminal standards. I am speaking, however, of something more vital than porch-climbing.

I am, of course, well aware of the legal difficulties that surround certain types of associational work. I do not believe that the development of standards of conduct or the elimination of abuses in public interest has ever been challenged as a violation of the Sherman Act. Moreover, to establish either a physical or a moral standard directly sharpens competition.

These associational activities are the promising machinery for much of the necessary determination of ethical standards, for the elimination of useless waste and hardship from the burden of our economic engines. Moreover, we have in them not only the agencies by which standards can be set, but by co-operative action among the associations representing the different stages of production, distribution, and use we can secure a degree of enforcement far wider than mere public opinion in a single trade.

When standards are agreed upon by the

associations representing the manufacturer and distributor and by those representing the user, we have a triple force interacting for their enforcement.

Now, I do not wish any one to think my feet are not on the ground in all this, and I propose to give a few illustrations from real life of what can be effected by constructive associations and by co-operation among them.

The Department of Commerce has, at the request of the lumber industry, held a number of conferences to discuss the rules of the road in that industry and its relations to the other industries and the common good. The problem was to establish more general and more constructive standards of practice, ethics, and waste elimination.

In the toil of formulating these standards there arose a question of how thick a one-inch board should be. It sounds easy. But it quickly developed to be a question whether it should be one inch thick when it was green; after it was dried; when planed on one side, or when planed on both sides. It developed not only that a choice had to be made among these four alternatives, but also that this choice had to be based upon a proper consideration for the conservation of our forests on one hand and the provision of a material of such structural character as to constitute a square deal to the consumer on the other. It also developed that there were 32 different thicknesses of a one-inch board in current use, and that some minority of manufacturers in the drive of unfair competition were gradually thinning the board, until it threatened to become paper. There also had to be developed the exact differences which threw a board into four or five different grades, and there had to be a determination of standard trade names for different species of wood. The point was that an accurate standard had to be determined before discrimination as to fair dealing and public service could be gauged. That occasion was the foundation of ethics in one-inch boards.

These conferences established some 80 questions, involving the whole technology of lumber and comprising for the first time a definite series of national standards. Here is the sum of our problem. It could only be accomplished through an associa-

tion in the industry. It is proof of industrial conscience and service.

The second part of the practical problem which I enumerated before is enforcement. Again associational activities were called upon. The manufacturers were not alone in these conferences, but the distributor and consumer were also represented by the Architects' Association, the Building Contractors' Association, the railway and other purchasing associations, and the retailers associations. The action and reaction of the buyer and seller upon each other in their desire to secure fair dealing in industry can procure enforcement. Joint inspection bureaus have been erected, where complaint for violation can be lodged and determination made. Enforcement may not be 100 per cent, but the standards are there and a sense of individual responsibility and self-interest will eventually, I am confident, make them universal.

For years aggrieved persons and some of the trade have been agitating this question of lumber standards in Congress. Numerous bills have been introduced. If this effort succeeds, no legislation will be necessary. This is keeping the government out of business through the remedy of abuses by business itself.

I propose now to mention one other case of a most vitally important and entirely different order, rendered possible only through associational activity, in which the Department of Commerce has been in active co-operation. That is the bituminous coal industry. There have been developed in this industry, as many of you are aware, 30 per cent too many mines, operating intermittently during nearly every week of the year, with a large seasonal dip in summer. Thus they required 30 per cent more labor and 30 per cent more capital than was necessary to produce the nation's coal. One effect of this situation was that some proportion of the employees secured too few days' work to yield them a reasonable standard of living, even at the apparently high daily wage. This minority of employees were naturally a constant source of agitation and disturbance. The result of all this was a higher cost of producing coal and consequently a higher national coal bill; speculation and uncertainty to the opera-

tors; hardship and difficulty and instability to a considerable portion of the workers. The fundamental cause was a vicious cycle of seasonal fluctuation in demand, annual shortages in coal cars, and periodic strikes, which grew out of the instability of labor relationships. These periods of shortened or suspended production always resulted in famine prices for coal and great stimulation to the opening of new mines.

At least four government commissions have examined this question. Probably 40 bills have been introduced into Congress proposing governmental regulation, in an attempt to correct the abuses and wastes and public danger that lay in the situation.

The associational agencies in the field were those of the operators, of labor, of the railway executives, and of the various associations of industries as consumers. The first problem was to secure a general knowledge of the causes, to which I feel the Department of Commerce contributed substantially. Remedy was undertaken in many directions. The railway association induced the construction of a more ample supply of coal cars and greater expedition and interchange in handling between different railways. The Department of Commerce, in co-operation with the chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, railway and public utilities associations, secured that more coal should be put in storage during the summer season. The result was that last year, for the first time in many years, we had no interruption in the distribution of coal due to car shortages. One element of the vicious cycle in this situation is eliminated, provided we can continue this same co-operation in the future.

The second part of the solution was the general agreement by both operators and labor that stability could not be restored in the industry unless there was a long period of continuous operation, in which the absence of coal famines and profiteering would eliminate the speculative and high-cost producers and reduce the units in the industry, and thus its intermittency. The labor agreement between these associations made last February for a term of three years has assured this improvement.

Here we have an example of the most

profound national importance in at least the beginning of stabilization of an industry involved in a most vicious cycle of waste and trouble. The national savings can be measured in hundred of millions and the human hardships greatly lessened. There will be some preliminary hardship in so great a self-imposed surgical operation, but I am confident it will heal to the mutual interest of the operators, the public, and the workers. Today I do not believe there is any sentiment for government regulation of the bituminous coal industry.

Another instance of great interest in which I had the honor to participate was the abolition of the 12-hour day in the steel industry through the action of the steel association.

I could give you a multitude of examples of the beginnings of constructive self-government in industry among many other associations. The very publication of codes of ethics by many associations instilling service as the primary purpose; the condemnation of specific unfair practices; the insistence upon a higher plane of relationships between employer and employee—all of them are at least indications of improving thought and growing moral perceptions.

All of this is the strong beginning of a new force in the business world. The individual interest is wrapped up with the public interest. They can find expression only through association. Three years of study and intimate contact with associations of economic groups, whether in production, distribution, labor or finance, convince me that there lies within them a great moving impulse toward betterment.

If these organizations accept as their primary purpose the lifting of standards, if they will co-operate together for voluntary enforcement of high standards, we shall have proceeded far along the road of the elimination of government from business. American business is never secure unless it has public confidence behind it; otherwise it will always be a prey to demagoguery and filled with discouragement.

The test of our whole economic and social system is its capacity to cure its own abuses. New abuses and new relationships

to the public interest will occur as long as we continue to progress. If we are to be wholly dependent upon government to cure these abuses, we shall by this very method have created an enlarged and deadening abuse through the extension of bureaucracy and the clumsy and incapable handling of delicate economic forces. The old law merchant is the basis of much of our common law. A renaissance of a new law merchant could so advance our standards as to solve much of the problem of government in business.

American business needs a lifting purpose greater than the struggle of materialism. Nor can it lie in some evanescent, emotional, dramatic crusade. It lies in the higher pitch of economic life, in a finer regard for the rights of others, a stronger devotion to obligations of citizenship, that will assure an improved leadership in every community and the nation;

it lies in the organization of the forces of our economic life so that they may produce happier individual lives, more secure in employment and comfort, wider in the possibilities of enjoyment of nature, larger in its opportunities of intellectual life. Our people have already shown a higher sense of responsibilities in these things than those of any other country. The ferment of organization for more definite accomplishment of these things in the practical day-to-day progress of business life is alive in our business world.

The government can best contribute through stimulation of and co-operation with voluntary forces in our national life; for we thus preserve the foundations upon which we have progressed so far—the initiative of our people. With vision and devotion, these voluntary forces can accomplish more for America than any spread of the hand of government.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

JAPAN AND IMMIGRATION EXCLUSION

(NOTE.—Following is the text of the Japanese protest against the exclusion provisions of the Immigration Bill, handed to Secretary of State Hughes on May 31 (I), and of the Secretary's reply.)

I

JAPANESE EMBASSY,
WASHINGTON, *May 31, 1924.*

HON. CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.

SIR: In pursuance of instructions from my government, I have the honor to present to you herewith a memorandum enunciating the position of Japan on the subject of the discriminatory provisions against Japanese which are embodied in section 13 (C) of the Immigration Act of 1924, approved May 26, 1924.

Memorandum

The Japanese Government are deeply concerned by the enactment in the United States of an act entitled the "Immigration Act of

1924." While the measure was under discussion in the Congress they took the earliest opportunity to invite the attention of the American Government to a discriminatory clause embodied in the act, namely, section 13 (C), which provided for the exclusion of aliens ineligible to citizenship, in contradistinction to other classes of aliens, and which is manifestly intended to apply to Japanese. Neither the representations of the Japanese Government nor the recommendations of the President or of the Secretary of State were heeded by the Congress, and the clause in question has now been written into the statutes of the United States.

It is perhaps needless to state that international discriminations in any form and on any subject, even if based on purely economic reasons, are opposed to the principles of justice and fairness upon which the friendly intercourse between nations must, in its final analysis, depend. To these very principles the doctrine of equal opportunity now widely recognized, with the unflinching support of the United States, owes its being.

Still more unwelcome are discriminations based on race. The strong condemnation of such practice evidently inspired the American Government in 1912 in denouncing the commercial treaty between the United States and Russia, pursuant to the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 12, 1911, as a protest against the unfair and unequal treatment of aliens of a particular race in Russia. Yet discrimination of a similar character is expressed by the new statute of the United States.

The Immigration Act of 1924, considered in the light of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the naturalization laws, clearly establishes the rule that the admissibility of aliens to the United States rests not upon individual merits or qualifications, but upon the division of race to which applicants belong. In particular it appears that such racial distinction in the act is directed essentially against Japanese, since persons of other Asiatic races are excluded under separate enactments of prior dates, as is pointed out in the published letter of the Secretary of State of February 8, 1924, to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives.

Alleges Prior Aloofness by United States

It has been repeatedly asserted in defense of these discriminatory measures in the United States that persons of the Japanese race are not assimilable to American life and ideals. It will, however, be observed, in the first place, that few immigrants of a foreign stock may well be expected to assimilate themselves to their new surroundings within a single generation. The history of Japanese immigrants to the United States in any appreciable number dates but from the last few years of the nineteenth century. The period of time is too short to permit of any conclusive judgment being passed upon the racial adaptabilities of these immigrants in the matter of assimilation, as compared with alien settlers of the races, classed as eligible to American citizenship.

It should further be remarked that the process of assimilation can thrive only in a genial atmosphere of just and equitable treatment. Its natural growth is bound to be hampered under such a pressure of invidious discriminations as that to which Japanese residents in some States of the American Union have been subjected, at law and in

practice, for nearly twenty years. It seems hardly fair to complain of the failure of foreign elements to merge in a community while the community chooses to keep them apart from the rest of its membership. For these reasons the assertion of Japanese non-assimilability seems at least premature, if not fundamentally unjust.

Turning to the survey of commercial treaties between Japan and the United States, Article II of the Treaty of 1894 contained a clause to the following effect:

"It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of laborers, police and public security which are in force or may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries."

When the treaty was revised in 1911 this provisory clause was deleted from the new treaty at the request of the Japanese Government, retaining the general rule which assures the liberty of entry, travel, and residence; and, at the same time, the Japanese Government made the following declaration, dated February 1, 1911, which is attached to the treaty:

"In proceeding this day to the signature of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Japan and the United States, the undersigned Japanese Ambassador in Washington, duly authorized by his government, has the honor to declare that the Imperial Japanese Government are fully prepared to maintain with equal effectiveness the limitation and control which they have for the past three years exercised in regulation of the emigration of laborers to the United States."

In proceeding to the exchange of ratifications of the revised treaty, the Acting Secretary of State communicated to the Japanese Ambassador on February 25, 1911, that "the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the treaty is given with the understanding, which is to be made part of the instrument of ratification, that the treaty shall not be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the act of Congress entitled 'An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States, approved February 20, 1907.' The Acting Secretary of State then added:

"Inasmuch as this act applies to the immigration of aliens into the United States from all countries and makes no discrimination in favor of any country, it is not perceived that

your government will have an objection to the understanding being recorded in the instrument of ratification.' "

The foregoing history will show that throughout these negotiations one of the chief preoccupations of the Japanese Government was to protect their nationals from discriminatory immigration legislation in the United States. That position of Japan was fully understood and appreciated by the American Government, and it was with these considerations in view that the existing treaty was signed and the exchange of its ratifications effected. In this situation, while reserving for another occasion the presentation of the question of legal technicality, whether and how far the provisions of Section 13 (C) of the Immigration Act of 1924 are inconsistent with the terms of the treaty of 1911, the Japanese Government desires now to point out that the new legislation is in entire disregard of the spirit and circumstances that underlie the conclusion of the treaty.

Cites "Gentlemen's Agreement"

With regard to the so-called "gentlemen's agreement," it will be recalled that it was designed, on the one hand, to meet the actual requirements of the situation, as perceived by the American Government, concerning Japanese immigration, and, on the other, to provide against the possible demand in the United States for a statutory exclusion which would offend the just susceptibilities of the Japanese people. The arrangement came into force in 1908. Its efficiency has been proved in fact. The figures given in the annual report of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration authoritatively show that during the fifteen years from 1908 to 1923 the excess in number of Japanese admitted to continental United States over those who departed was no more than 8,681 all together, including not only immigrants of the laboring class, but also merchants, students, and other non-laborers and non-immigrants, the numbers which naturally increased with the growth of commercial, intellectual, and social relations between the two countries. If even so limited a number should in any way be found embarrassing to the United States, the Japanese Government have already manifested their readiness to revise the existing arrangement with a view to further limitation of emigration.

Co-operation "Abruptly Overthrown"

Unfortunately, however, the sweeping provisions of the new act, clearly indicative of discrimination against Japanese, have made it impossible for Japan to continue the undertakings assumed under the "gentlemen's agreement." An understanding of friendly co-operation, reached after long and comprehensive discussion between the Japanese and American governments, has thus been abruptly overthrown by legislative action on the part of the United States. The patient, loyal, and scrupulous observance by Japan for more than sixteen years of these self-denying regulations, in the interest of good relations between the two countries, now seems to have been wasted.

It is not denied that, fundamentally speaking, it lies within the inherent sovereign power of each State to limit and control immigration to its own domains; but when, in the exercise of such right, an evident injustice is done to a foreign nation in disregard of its proper self-respect, of international understandings or of ordinary rules of comity, the question necessarily assumes an aspect which justifies diplomacy, discussion, and adjustment.

Accordingly, the Japanese Government consider it their duty to maintain and to place on record their solemn protest against the discriminatory clause in section 13 (C) of Immigration act of 1924 and to request the American Government to take all possible and suitable measures for the removal of such discrimination.

I am instructed further to express the confidence that this communication will be received by the American Government in the same spirit of friendliness and candor in which it is made.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed)

M. HANIHARA.

II

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WASHINGTON, June 16, 1924.

His Excellency Mr. MASANAO HANIHARA,
Japanese Ambassador.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note under date of May 31, containing a memorandum stating the position of the Japanese Government with respect to the provision of section 13 (c) of

A Gradual Process

When these conditions have been established, confidence in Russia will begin to be restored and the flow of credit will recommence. But the process will be gradual. Credit and confidence can be destroyed at a blow; they take years to restore.

Moreover, the actual conditions of this country and of the world impose limitations on the supply of capital and credit to Russia which it is well to recognize.

From such information as is available, it appears that the Russian Government may be under the impression that upon a settlement very large amounts of capital will be at once available, either from the government direct or through private financial channels. That view is mistaken for the following reasons:

Financial assistance to Russia may, put shortly and in general terms, take one of two forms: either the actual investment of capital, more or less permanently, in productive enterprises in Russia itself—*e. g.*, in railways, ports, industrial, commercial, and financial undertakings, and so forth—or the grant of temporary banking credit for the purpose of financing exports and imports, such advances not constituting any actual investment in Russia itself and being constantly liquidated and renewed in the ordinary manner.

For the permanent supply of capital, which she so urgently needs, Russia, like all other countries, must look not to banking institutions, which cannot lock up their funds in investments of this nature, but to the private investor and the entrepreneur, large and small. But these latter, having the whole world to choose from, will naturally invest their money in those countries where conditions for capital appear to be the safest. It is obvious that they will only choose Russia when and to the extent that full confidence in that country returns.

The case is not altered if, as we assume, any assistance by his Majesty's Government, if it be contemplated at all, takes the form, not of direct loans to the Russian Government, but of extending the Trade Facilities Act and the Export Credits Scheme to Russia; for in either case the risks will fall in the first instance on those persons or companies who are venturing their money in Russia. If, therefore, risks in that country are regarded as greater than elsewhere, these

forms of government assistance will not be made use of.

Moreover, for permanent capital, through whatever channels, government or private, it is provided, Russia must compete with the rest of the world. The amount which this country has available for export to other countries is limited. The Board of Trade has recently estimated that in the year 1923 the total amount which this country had available to lend to all other countries was £97,000,000. In the last three years we have lent on the average to the British Empire alone over £80,000,000 per annum. It must be remembered that our resources for foreign lending have been lessened by the war, as well as by the necessity we are under to repay annually a large sum to the United States.

Banking Credit

The grant of temporary banking credit stands on a somewhat different footing. Such credit for the financing of shipments of raw materials from Russia after they have actually reached seaboard, is, to a certain extent, being provided already; but if the Russian Government attempt to limit all foreign trade to government-controlled channels, it will remain limited. Russia must rely, as all other nations rely, on the thousand and one channels of private financial, industrial, and commercial co-operation.

If, however, the conditions precedent for the restoration of confidence outlined above are honestly accepted and enforced by the Russian Government, credit will begin again to flow and should, if the confidence thus shown proves justified, rapidly increase in volume. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Government regard "the means of the restoration of credit" which we outline as being of a character which they will not or cannot accept, then, while undoubtedly trade will continue between Russia and the outside world, that trade will be strictly limited. Russia's recovery, which depends upon the resumption of accepted methods of intercourse common throughout the world, will be indefinitely delayed.

CHARLES ADDIS.
R. H. BRAND.
LAURENCE CURRIE.
W. R. GLAZEBROOK.
F. C. GOODENOUGH.
HARRY GOSCHEN.
E. C. GRENFELL.

ERIC HAMBRO.
R. HOLLAND-MARTIN.
WALTER LEAF.
R. MCKENNA.
J. BEAUMONT PEASE.
SWAYTHLING.

News in Brief

FOLLOWING THE APPROVAL OF A BILL by the Reichstag, a free port was established at Kiel on April 12. The new free port, located in the Wik, at the entrance of the Kiel Canal, has been under construction since 1919. The bill provides for the extension of the free zone within the boundaries of the Kiel harbor proper, should that become necessary.

IT IS ANNOUNCED that the Russian Government Volunteer Merchant Fleet will maintain regular trips between Leningrad and European ports by 23 steamships, mostly passenger-carrying, with a total capacity of more than 75,000 tons. Weekly service will be maintained to London; also to Hamburg. Trips between Leningrad and Black Sea ports will be made as cargoes are offered. In the Azov Sea region the volunteer fleet has organized coastwise trips. Heretofore the activities of the fleet have been mainly centered in serving the Russian Far East, with trips between Vladivostok and the ports of China and Japan included in the plans.

THE HUNGARIAN MINISTER OF JUSTICE has introduced a bill which considers the setting up of special legal tribunals to deal with "affairs of honor" and the imposition of severe penalties for duelling.

THE PRESENT EXPENDITURE of the Government of China is seventeen times the amount of the funds at its disposal. "A candid examination reveals the fact that the situation is extremely precarious, and that unless speedy reforms are adopted and enforced we can hardly see any bright prospect for the financial future of the country," states the report of Dr. W. W. Yen, chairman of the Commission for the Readjustment of Finances. "The government is supposed to receive Mexican \$209,000,000," says Dr. Yen. Investigation shows, however, that the provinces have retained large sums from revenues, and that the customs amount alone has remained intact. "It can thus be seen," con-

tinues the report, "that out of a nominal total of \$209,000,000 the actual sum realized by the central government is only about \$148,000,000, out of which again has to be deducted the sum of \$98,000,000 for the service of the domestic and foreign loans secured upon the customs and salt revenues and about \$42,000,000 for military subsidies and redemption of different kinds of treasury notes secured upon the salt surplus, thus leaving only about \$7,000,000 unappropriated which can be made use of by the central government for military and administrative expenses." The commission includes representatives of British, French, American, and Japanese financial groups, as well as representative Chinese bankers. The conclusions of the report are that "the provinces must desist from the practice of retaining central government revenues for provincial uses; national expenditures must be reduced by cutting off every unnecessary item of administrative expenditure, and especially by reducing the military expenses, which now take up seven-tenths of the entire expenditure of the national government; a temporary national budget plan should be worked out; preparations for the Special Customs Tariff Conference should be expedited; and the revenues from communications should be left intact, thus to meet loans secured on them and to obtain a surplus to meet other deficits."

PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS, in its annual session assembled, approved the following minute: "This meeting desires to reaffirm its belief that the primary loyalty of all Christians is due to God, our Father, and all his human family. We believe that the whole system of determining right by violence and destruction rather than by friendly conference and negotiation is fundamentally wrong, inefficient, and unchristian. We call upon Christian people of whatever sect or creed to join in renouncing for the future all participation in war, and to seek through our national representatives such international organization as will supply peaceful methods of dealing with all international differences. We also urge upon Christians consideration of inter-class and inter-racial problems and an effort to solve them through good will and understanding."

THE COPENHAGEN-HAMBURG-ROTTERDAM air traffic service was opened on April 23. Seven Fokker machines are being used, each with

accommodation for five passengers. According to the schedule, the machines leave Copenhagen for Rotterdam, and *vice versa*, at 9 a. m., and are due at their destinations between 3.30 and 4.30 p. m. A machine also leaves Hamburg at 9 a. m. for Copenhagen, where it is due at 11 a. m., and whence it returns at 4 p. m. in time to meet the Hamburg express for Cologne. From the latter place the journey may be continued by aeroplane to London, arriving there at 1 o'clock on the day after leaving Copenhagen.

THE RESOLUTION OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT to stop all loans, even for the devastated regions is drawing again the world's attention on the remarkable work of reconstruction which has been going on in France since 1919. Reconstruction work in devastated France was taken up methodically and was completed according to the degree of necessity, dwellings and buildings indispensable for industrial and agricultural production being repaired first. Life is now possible in those regions, but in too many places the buildings are still temporary constructions. So the devastated regions of France are alive again, but they are not yet very comfortable to live in. It was also necessary that the land itself be cleared; 3,306,350 hectares had been devastated, out of which 1,694,587 only needed to be cleared, while 1,494,969 necessitated very important work of transformation. As for the remaining 116,794 hectares (1 hectare is about 2.47 acres), the expenses involved to clear the ground would have cost more than the land itself. On January 1, 1924, 2,911,510 hectares had been cleared of barbed wires, shells, and trenches. Should the 116,000 hectares definitely lost be altogether neglected, there still remains approximately 248,000 hectares to be cleared out. Of the surplus, the most interesting ground is, of course, agricultural land. This represents 1,923,479 hectares to be restored to its former condition, out of which 85,587 hectares are located in the "red" zone—that is, in those parts where the bombarded ground has completely lost its pre-war aspect and its bearing qualities. Today the clearing of tillable soil is very far advanced; 1,788,755 hectares have been leveled and are being cultivated and 21,440 hectares of "red zone" are also utilized. About 1/14 of the devastated area remains to be cleared—that is to say, 134,724 hectares—out of which 64,147 are located in

the "red zone." The reconstruction work has so far been accomplished by France with her own resources.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT, French Senator, with many friends in the United States, died May 15. Born in 1852, the Baron has spent a long life in public and international service. He was a delegate to both Hague conferences, a member of The Hague Court of Arbitration, and has long been in the forefront of those who would urge world disarmament. In 1909 he shared with M. Beernaert the Nobel Peace Prize. He has visited the United States several times, and in 1911 he toured the country, speaking on the "Uselessness of War" and the benefits of arbitration.

AT THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE on Immigration and Emigration, held in Rome in May, the most important question considered by section 3 was that of colonization. Undoubtedly today the best possible method of successful immigration is the immigration of groups economically independent into a country where they can establish themselves permanently, devoting themselves to the cultivation of virgin lands or land only partially improved. This was the opinion of the delegates. Such undertakings are, perhaps, more advantageous to the immigration than to the emigration countries, since they bring civilization into regions where otherwise it would be impossible to introduce it and since they cause an increase in the world production and especially of that of the immigration country. The same section of the conference also approved, with a few changes, the Italian proposals for repression of clandestine emigration and for the exchange of skilled laborers.

BELGIUM RANKED FIFTH among the buyers from the United States in continental Europe before the World War. The imports of Belgium from the United States last year amounted to \$100,000,000, making her again fifth in rank among our continental European customers.

THE DAIL EIREANN ANNOUNCED on June 13 the appointment of Prof. Timothy A. Smiddy Minister Plenipotentiary of the Irish Free State at Washington. Professor Smiddy was at one time professor of economics at Cork University. For some time chairman of the Free State's Fiscal Commission, he has been

recently in the United States unofficially representing Ireland.

DR. NANSEN, the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, reported to the Council June 12 that there are estimated to be 400,000 Russian refugees in France, most of whom show no desire to return to Russia; but 500,000 in Germany, an unknown number in China, and large numbers in other countries bordering on Russia desire repatriation. Negotiations have been in progress with the Soviet Government, but no formal agreement has been reached, as the Soviet Government has not seen its way to include a clause regarding repatriation from the Balkans, providing for the co-operation of the high commission's delegates in Russia. Good progress is being made for the settlement in Brazil of some thousands of Russian families from Germany. Dr. Nansen has again suggested handing the Russian refugee problem over to the International Labor Office, as the matter has ceased to be political and has become purely economic. Dr. Nansen's report concerning the Near East refugees gave the number as 661,000. He had succeeded in establishing a central committee to co-ordinate the action of fifty private and public relief organizations.

SENATOR SHIPSTEAD, on June 3, introduced in the Senate a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to call an international conference of representatives of agricultural organizations from every nation on or before December 1, 1924. The conference would consider, among other things, whether it is feasible to seek an adjustment of the world's staple farm products which enter into international commerce to the probable demand therefor at a profitable price to the producers; also, whether it is feasible to arrange an international pool of the surplus, through government control and co-operation, to stabilize marketing from year to year and to prevent international speculators from exacting extortionate prices. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SENATOR SHIPSTEAD also, on June 3, submitted a concurrent resolution on preservation of world peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The substance of this resolution is that the President propose to all the nations of the world,

definitely binding for all who sign it, a convention to terminate all compulsory military, naval, and related service, under any circumstances, during a period of thirty years from the date of ratification.

THERE ARE IN EXISTENCE IN RUMANIA at the present time 105 schools for apprentices and workers controlled by the Ministry of Labor in collaboration with employers. These schools were attended by over 13,000 pupils in 1922 and by 20,000 pupils in 1923. The schools directed by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce include one institute for sericultural training, eleven workshop schools for home industries, four weaving shops established in monasteries, three craft schools, one training school for the petroleum industry, one school of foremanship, one training school for the mining industry, and an academy for training in higher commercial subjects. In addition to these, several chambers of commerce have opened schools where commercial instruction is given.

A ROYAL DECREE has recently been issued in Spain for the creation of special labor tribunals for the railways, to settle disputes between the companies and their agents and workers.

PAPERS BY PRESIDENT COOLIDGE, by Secretary of Commerce Hoover, and by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, will be read at the Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Conference, which is to take place in Honolulu this summer. A section on international law, under the chairmanship of Dr. R. Masujima, of Tokio, will consider legal co-operation, especially in respect to the plant and animal products of the Pacific peoples.

THE HEAVY EMIGRATION OF LABORERS from Mexico to the United States within the past few months has resulted in a serious labor shortage in the cotton-growing sections of the Laguna district and an increase in wages. The farm laborer now demands seventy-five cents per day of six or seven hours instead of thirty-seven to fifty cents, paid earlier in the season. The cotton-growers are working with greatly depleted forces; the cultivation of the crop is therefore delayed, with some damage to the cotton.

A SURVEY OF RACE RELATIONS will be a feature of the Y. M. C. A. Pan Pacific Conference, to be held in July, 1925, at Honolulu.

Mr. J. Merle Davis, formerly of Japan, is in charge of the survey. The organization and conduct of the survey is representative; the direction of the investigations is in the hands of Dr. Robert E. Park, of the University of Chicago. Preliminary investigations have been in progress since September, 1923. The purpose of the survey is to secure and publish facts—facts representing the experiences with the Oriental of the local communities and of individual men and women. It seeks to impose no program, advocates no specific policy, and champions no special interest.

THE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IN AUSTRALIA is forging steadily ahead in spite of the many handicaps which beset its progress, the greatest of which is small population. (The population of the country, which is geographically as great as the United States, is only six million.) According to a report just issued by the Commonwealth statistician, substantial increases took place in all the principal manufacturing industries during 1922-23, and the value added to materials by factories during the year advanced by £10,465,224, or more than 8 per cent, as compared with the preceding fiscal period. Factories have been increasing at the rate of 959 per annum during the last three years, according to the report, and an average of 11,872 additional employees have been taken on during each of the years.

THE TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES with Latin America for the first quarter of 1924 amounted to \$477,949,891—a gain of about ten million dollars over the first three months and approximately eighty million dollars above the total for the last quarter of 1923. Our imports from Latin America were \$305,659,540 and our exports to that region were \$172,290,351.

ACCUMULATION OF STOCKS OF FLAXSEED in Russia was practically completed by the Central Association of Flax Co-operative Societies in April. For the present season the commissariat is concentrating attention on Siberia and the eighteen most important flax-producing provinces in the rest of the Soviet Republic, and 5,000 tons of seeds were ready for distribution on April 1. The seed will be supplied to the peasants as loans, at prices below cost and at less than two-thirds the market price. The loans are to be returned at the end of the year 1924. It is

anticipated that 50 per cent of the demand for flaxseed will be met, so that the total area under flax this year will be 1,252,530 acres—an increase of 22 per cent over the area sown last year.

SOME 7,000 GERMANS have recently emigrated to Paraguay, South America, for the purpose of colonization. It is expected that the new Japanese minister, accredited to Argentina and Paraguay, will, after presenting his credentials, consult the officials regarding the possible immigration of Japanese for the purpose of cotton cultivation. Several ranch owners have informed the Department of Lands and Colonies of their willingness to place families on their lands.

THE BUENOS AIRES WESTERN RAILWAY announces a substantial rebate of freight charges on wheat and barley used as seed for the next crop. This conforms with the general policy of the Argentine railroads to encourage industry and agriculture along their lines.

RECENT REPORTS FROM MOSCOW INDICATE that the Soviet Government and the Communist circles in general are still considerably exercised over the recent raid of the German political police on the headquarters of the Soviet trade delegation in Berlin. The Moscow Government has chosen to lend the occurrence the air of a major diplomatic incident, and serious negotiations are still in progress between the German and the Russian Foreign Offices, while the Russians have taken such drastic "repressive" measures as the shutting down of Russian commercial offices in Germany, the re-routing of goods destined for German ports to other European ports, and the withdrawal of Russian exhibits from the Leipzig Fair.

CANADA IS TODAY THE SECOND BEST FOREIGN MARKET for American produce and manufactures and has the highest per capita consumption of American goods. It is also our chief source of supplies. Our trade with Canada is increasing rapidly and on a favorable basis, as our merchandise balance has for years shown an excess of exports. The large increase in trade with the United States is due not only to the proximity of the two countries, but to the growing predominance of American capital in that market. At the beginning of 1924 foreign investments

in Canada exceeded \$4,500,000,000, of which the United States held more than 50 per cent. Recent statistics compiled by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics gave the total foreign investments in 1915 as \$2,420,000,000, and in 1923 they were \$4,640,000,000. Of these the United States accounted for about \$420,000,000 and the United Kingdom \$1,860,000,000 in 1915, while in 1923 the United States investments had increased to \$2,425,000,000 and the British to \$1,890,000,000. Approximately 15 per cent of all American foreign investments are in Canada. It is estimated that United States capital now owns about one-third of the mines, large portions of the timber and water power, one-third of municipal, provincial, and Dominion bonds and debentures, and a great and increasing share in Dominion manufactures. There are about 1,000 branch factories from the United States now operating in Canada.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE WORLD CRISIS. By *the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill*. Charles Scribner, New York, 1923. Pp. 578. Price, \$6.50.

This is the second volume of the account of the World War written by the former First Lord of the British Admiralty, Winston Churchill. It deals with the year 1915, a year of ill fortune for the Allies. It was the year of the Dardanelles disaster.

Mr. Churchill, in the preface, disclaims the position of a historian. With his record and special point of view, it is not, he thinks, for him to pronounce a final conclusion. He asks only that his account shall be placed on record and shall survive as one of the factors upon which the judgment of our children shall be founded. As history of a documentary sort, however, it is already among the most valuable sources.

At this short distance of time and space, it is difficult for a lover of peace to think of the war as a game of skill, however grim and tremendous. It is almost impossible to lend oneself to the study of the mistakes or successes of military movements. One does not wish even to imagine how it might be better

done again. The whole war is a nightmare, and the prevention of another seems to be the immediate business of mankind.

But Mr. Churchill tells his story with forceful clearness. His summary of events after Gallipoli could not have been better presented by the veriest pacifist. "There was nothing left on land now but the war of exhaustion—not only of armies but of nations. . . . Good, plain, straightforward frontal attacks by valiant flesh and blood against wire and machine-guns, 'killing Germans,' while Germans killed Allies twice as often; calling out the men of forty, of fifty, even of fifty-five, and the youths of eighteen, sending the wounded soldiers back three or four times into the shambles—such were the sole manifestations now reserved to the military art. And when at the end, three years later, the throng of uniformed functionaries, who in the seclusion of their offices had complacently presided over this awful process, presented victory to their exhausted nations, it proved only less ruinous to the victor than to the vanquished."

LATITUDES. By *Edwin Muir*. B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1924. Pp. 322. Price, \$2.00.

We have become accustomed to Mr. Muir's sound and genuine critical work in the columns of the *Freeman*, now unfortunately discontinued. His quiet sanity combined with modern philosophy give him a position almost unique among reviewers, youthful as he. Though he divines and admits the "deep dark powers" of the unconscious, he does not, like Lawrence, grovel therein. Rather, he sends down roots to stabilize the crown of the symmetrical tree growing healthily above ground.

In this collection of essays and notes Mr. Muir confines himself to the minds of men and movements, not like Gamaliel Bradford, to the soul, the personality. With discriminating judgment, however, and much beauty of line, he canvasses many fields. Of especial interest, because of its originality in treatment, is the note on Nietzsche, who, he says, was always fated to be more true and interesting than his philosophy. Nevertheless, "he brought an atmosphere into European thought—an atmosphere cold, glittering and free—and any thinker of our time who has not breathed in it has, by that accident, some nuance of mediocrity and timidity which is displeasing."

The three essays on the North and South give a fresh analysis of the differences underlying the mentality of the classic, romance peoples of the South and the races of the North. He applies the touchstone of the attitude of these races toward fate. Fate in the South is accepted as a fact. In the repose that follows, literature can follow the classic model. In the North, on the other hand, is the continual sadness, the wistfulness of exiles from the home land of the South. German and Scandinavian literature is full of the sorrowful questioning of fate. Outside both, but partaking somewhat of the qualities of both, are on the West the British, striving to mold fate, "chancing it," but good sports if they fall; also outside, but to the East, are the Russians, having no dynamic relations to fate, merely "waiting about" until finally something happens.

Probably no such cursory review of any races or peoples can be absolutely true; yet Mr. Muir does indubitably pick out, with his searchlight, high spots which are as true as the hills.

STORY OF THE PAN-AMERICAN UNION. By *William A. Reid*. Published 1924. Pp. 87. Price, 75 cents; 80 cents by mail.

Here is a worthily written little brochure on the Pan American Union. The history of the Union for the first thirty-five years of its life is traced; its home in Washington is described, and its activities—publications, divisions, and bureaus—are outlined.

The summary of accomplishment, as given in part 4, is astonishing to a reader who has not followed the educational, social, and economic work of the Union. Its achievements in preventing possible war would be enough in itself to justify its existence.

The book closes with a report of Director-General Rowe on the fifth Pan American Conference at Chile.

BUDDHISM AND BUDDHISTS IN CHINA. By *Louis Hodous, D. D.* Macmillan Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 84. Price, \$1.25.

This volume follows, in the World's Living Religions Series, the book by Saunders on Buddhism and Buddhists in Southern Asia, which was reviewed in our issue for last November.

Dr. Hodous has not only served a long apprenticeship as a missionary in Foochow, which is a center of Buddhism, but he has

extraordinary capabilities in understanding and interpreting the trained Buddhist mind. The side-lights which this study throws upon Japan, which he says is at present the leader in modern Buddhism, are timely and illuminating. The interpretation of Buddhist civilization in China, especially its points of similarity with Christianity, as well as its differences, is stimulating.

It is pleasant to hear, also, that the recent awakening and new organization of Buddhism, not only in China and Japan, but in Mongolia and Tibet as well, is not necessarily antagonistic to Christianity.

ARBITRATION TREATIES AMONG THE AMERICAN NATIONS AT THE CLOSE OF THE YEAR 1910.

William R. Manning, editor. Oxford University Press, New York, 1924. Pp. 472.

This is one of the publications of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, under the division of International Law. Its scope is sufficiently indicated by the title. Like all the publications of the Endowment, this work is thoroughly done, beautifully printed, and abundantly furnished with tables and notes, which make of it a most useful tool for those interested in this field of study.

THE COLLEGE BLUE BOOK. Vol. I. By *H. W. Hunt*. F. H. Riley, Chicago, 1924. Pp. 472.

This volume, treating only of colleges of liberal arts and sciences, is to be followed by a second on professional and technical education, and a third, on music and the fine arts. It is a non-advertising reference book, giving the name and standards of all the colleges in this group in the United States. A brief section tabulates facts about universities in the world at large; an educational atlas of the United States follows, with facts about high schools and their standards. The book closes with an excellent index.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN, A PAGEANT OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE. By *Alice C. D. Riley*. A. S. Barnes Co., New York. Pp. 49. Price, \$1.50.

Visual education has been rediscovered. Years ago the church taught religion and religious history by means of miracle plays. Many folk in those days could not read. In these days, even though most people, even children, can read, we are discovering a large field of education which can be better

done by the picture and drama than by any more didactic methods.

The Brotherhood of Man is a pageant, which aims to show, by means of a prolog and eight short episodes, the growth of the brotherhood ideal. Beginning with David and Jonathan, who represent the smallest group in friendship, it goes up through other increasing groups till it reaches the brotherhood of all civilization.

For reading purposes, there is a certain stilted measure to the lines, many of them; but the truth they express is indisputable.

The pageant is meant, however, for actual production. To this end valuable suggestions are included in the book as to stage settings, which are simple, as to costumes and suggestions for the musical program, which is to accompany the text.

CRYSTALLIZING PUBLIC OPINION. By *Edward L. Bernays*. Boni & Liveright, New York. Pp. 218. Price, \$2.50.

What is public opinion? Whatever it is, it is often so vague, chameleonic, and evanescent that attempts to formulate it are in vain. But, in general, public opinion may be defined as the aggregate of individual judgments—the conclusions, sometimes uniform, but frequently conflicting—of the men and women constituting society or any one of its various groups.

The ever-increasing importance of public opinion in our modern world has created a new profession—"counsel on public relations." This is a new phrase to describe an activity that is old. In his book, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, Mr. Edward L. Bernays, a professor in New York University, sets forth the scope and functions of the profession. The work of the counsel on public relations is of growing importance, he points out, because of three facts: The tendency of small organizations to group themselves in one large organization of a semi-public nature, the increased willingness of the public to make its voice heard in the conduct of affairs, and the keen competition in modern methods of selling. The function of the public relations counsel is, therefore, "something like the business of the attorney—to advise his client and to litigate his causes for him." In the motivation of public judgments, he must begin with the established point of view which has its foundations in individual notions or "stereotypes." In the

technique of his work, he is aided, in spite of the highly heterogeneous nature of society, by the interlapping of innumerable groups which make possible widespread appeals. In the ethical relations involved, certain it is that the counsel on public relations, as purveyor and creator of news, must conform to the highest moral and technical requirements.

Thus in his treatment of the scope and functions of the newly recognized profession—public relations counsel; in his analysis of group psychology underlying the subject; in his description of the technique and methods employed; and in his portrayal of the ethical issues involved, Mr. Bernays has made a contribution to the better understanding of public opinion. He has indicated clearly what is the duty of those who are learned and expert in discovering, interpreting, and creating the public will. In the words of Professor Tonnies, cited by Mr. Bernays, "They must inject moral and spiritual motives into public opinion. Public opinion must become public conscience."

RUSSIAN DEBTS AND RUSSIAN RECONSTRUCTION. By *Leo Pasvolosky and Harold G. Moulton*. McGraw-Hill Company, New York. 243 pages and index. Price, \$2.50.

In a deeper sense than we are in the habit of thinking, the most important problem of our modern world is Russia. Industry and commerce, in their larger aspects, will have to wait upon the economic reconstruction of Russia. It is of importance, therefore, that we turn our attention to that country. There are authorities in our country who say that the United States can only plan its future on a resuscitated Europe, particularly of a reformed Russia. In the presence of our wonderment over the future of that land, there comes this book from Messrs. Pasvolosky and Moulton, of the Institute of Economics. It is a worthy companion piece of the Institute's other book, "Germany's Capacity to Pay," published a year ago. It aims to be a study in investment credits, particularly as regards public finance. It deals almost exclusively with the relation of the existing debt situation to the problem of economic reconstruction. Bankers and business men, particularly, will be peculiarly interested in the facts of Russia's foreign indebtedness, her budget and her trade. Graphs, tables, and documents enrich the text.

the Immigration Act of 1924. I take pleasure in noting your reference to the friendliness and candor in which your communication has been made, and you may be assured of the readiness of this government to consider in the same spirit the views you have set forth.

At the time of the signing of the Immigration Bill the President issued a statement, a copy of which I had the privilege of handing to you, gladly recognizing the fact that the enactment of this provision "does not imply any change in our sentiment of admiration and cordial friendship for the Japanese people, a sentiment which has had and will continue to have abundant manifestation." Permit me to state briefly the substance of the provision. Section 13 (c) related to all aliens ineligible to citizenship. It establishes certain exceptions, and to these classes the exclusion provision does not apply, to wit:

Those who are not immigrants as defined in section 3 of the act—that is (1) a government official, his family, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business or pleasure; (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States; (4) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (5) a *bona fide* alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter temporarily the United States solely in the pursuit of his calling as a seaman; and (6) an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing treaty of commerce and navigation.

Bona Fide Students

Those who are admissible as non-quota immigrants under the provisions of subdivision (b), (d), or (e) of section 4—that is, (b) an immigrant previously lawfully admitted to the United States, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad; (d) an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination, or professor of a college, academy, semi-

nary, or university, and his wife and his unmarried children under 18 years of age, if accompanying or following to join him; or (e) an immigrant who is a *bona fide* student at least 15 years of age and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at an accredited school, college, academy, seminary, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Secretary of Labor, which shall have agreed to report to the Secretary of Labor the termination of attendance of each immigrant student, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such reports promptly the approval shall be withdrawn.

Also the wives or unmarried children under 18 years of age of immigrants admissible under subdivision (d) of section 4 above quoted.

It will thus be observed that, taking these exceptions into account, the provision in question does not differ greatly in its practical operation or in the policy which it reflects from the understanding embodied in the gentlemen's agreement under which the Japanese Government has co-operated with the Government of the United States in preventing the emigration of Japanese laborers to this country. We fully and gratefully appreciate the assistance which has thus been rendered by the Japanese Government in the carrying out of this long-established policy and it is not deemed to be necessary to refer to the economic considerations which have inspired it. . . .

Exercised Prerogative

The point of substantial difference between the existing arrangement and the provision of the immigration act is that the latter has expressed, as the President has stated, "the determination of the Congress to exercise its prerogative in defining by legislation the control of immigration instead of leaving it to international arrangements." It is not understood that this prerogative is called in question, but, rather, your government expressly recognizes that "it lies within the inherent sovereign power of each State to limit and to control immigration to its own domains," an authority which it is believed the Japanese Government has not failed to exercise in its own discretion with respect to the admission of aliens and the conditions and location of their settlement within its borders. While the President would have preferred to

continue the existing arrangement with the Japanese Government and to have entered into negotiations for such modifications as might seem to be desirable, this government does not feel that it is limited to such an arrangement, or that by virtue of the existing understanding or of the negotiations which it has conducted in the past with the Japanese Government, it has in any sense lost or impaired the full liberty of action which it would otherwise have in this matter. . . .

Thus in the treaty of commerce and navigation concluded with Japan in 1894 it was expressly stipulated in Article II:

"It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances, or regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of laborers, police and public security which are in force or which may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries."

It is true that at the time of the negotiation of the treaty of 1911 the Japanese Government desired that the provision above quoted should be eliminated, and that this government acquiesced in that proposal in view of the fact that the Japanese Government had, in 1907-8, by means of the gentleman's agreement, undertaken such measures of restriction as it was anticipated would prove adequate to prevent any substantial increase in the number of Japanese laborers in the United States. In connection with the treaty revision of 1911, the Japanese Government renewed this undertaking in the form of a declaration attached to the treaty. In acquiescing in this procedure, however, this government was careful to negative any intention to derogate from the full right to exercise, in its discretion, control over immigration. . . .

"Without Prejudice"

It was with the distinct understanding that it was without prejudice to the inherent sovereign right of either country to limit and control immigration to its own domains or possessions that the treaty of 1911 was concluded. While this government acceded to the arrangement by which Japan undertook to enforce measures designed to obviate the necessity of a statutory enactment, the advisability of such an enactment necessarily remained within the legislative power of this government to determine. As this power has

now been exercised by the Congress in the enactment of the provision in question, this legislative action is mandatory upon the executive branch of the government and allows no latitude for the exercise of executive discretion as to the carrying out of the legislative will expressed in the statute.

It is provided in the Immigration Act that the provision of section 13 (c), to which you have referred, shall take effect on July 1, 1924. Inasmuch as the abstention on the part of the United States from such an exercise of its right of statutory control over immigration was the condition upon which was predicated the undertaking of the Japanese Government contained in the gentlemen's agreement of 1907-08 with respect to the regulation of the emigration of laborers to the United States, I feel constrained to advise you that this government cannot but acquiesce in the view that the Government of Japan is to be considered released, as from the date upon which section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act comes into force, from further obligation by virtue of that understanding.

In saying this, I desire once more to emphasize the appreciation on the part of this government of the voluntary co-operation of your government in carrying out the gentlemen's agreement and to express the conviction that the recognition of the right of each government to legislate in control of immigration should not derogate in any degree from the mutual good will and cordial friendship which have always characterized the relations of the two countries.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

ATTITUDE OF THE ALLIES TO THE EXPERTS' REPORT

(NOTE.—The Reparation Commission has published the following replies from the four Allied governments to its communication of April 17, transmitting the reports of the Committee of Experts. The British, Belgian, and Italian replies are dated April 24; the French answer, signed by M. Poincaré, April 25.)

The British Reply

1. His Majesty's Government note with satisfaction that the Reparation Commission has unanimously approved the conclusions of

the Committees of Experts and is taking the necessary steps to give effect to these in regard to matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

2. His Majesty's Government for their part accept, and will do everything in their power to give practical effect to, the recommendation of the commission that the Allied governments should likewise adopt the conclusions of the committees in regard to matters falling within the jurisdiction of those governments.

3. The recommendations of the experts do not appear to involve any reduction of the total of the German reparation debt, and the necessary modifications of the schedule of payments of May, 1921, appear to be within the competence of a unanimous decision of the Reparation Commission and not to require the specific authority of the several governments represented on the commission under Article 234 of the Treaty of Versailles.

4. If, however, there is any doubt on this point, his Majesty's Government are prepared to grant such specific authority.

5. The only other matters arising on the experts' recommendations which appear to be within the jurisdiction of the Allied governments are:

(a) The restoration of the economic and fiscal authority of the German Government over the whole of German territories.

(b) The steps necessary to give binding effect to the new guarantees and controls, in so far as these may not be clearly covered by the existing provisions of the Treaty of Versailles.

(c) The inclusion of all the financial liabilities of Germany under the peace treaty in a single annuity.

6. On the first point His Majesty's Government are prepared to give their full support to the experts' recommendation and take, in consultation with the other governments concerned, whatever steps may be necessary to effect full restoration at the earliest possible date.

7. As regards the second, the agreement of the German Government having already been obtained, all that remains to be done is to give formal effect to it. His Majesty's Government will be prepared to proceed by whatever may be found to be the most convenient and effectual method of achieving this object.

8. On the third point, His Majesty's Gov-

ernment accept the experts' recommendation and are prepared for their part, to ask the Reparation Commission to propose a scheme to put this provision into execution.

9. Should any other of the recommendations of the experts be held by the Reparation Commission to require endorsement by, or action on the part of, the Allied governments, His Majesty's Government will for their part be prepared to take whatever steps may be necessary to give effect to them.

The French Answer

I have studied the experts' reports with the greatest interest. They fulfill exactly the tasks assigned to them by the commission—on the one hand to ascertain the measures necessary to secure the balancing of the German budget and the stabilization of the currency, and, on the other, to ascertain the means of estimating and causing the return to Germany of capital exported abroad.

These documents were to enable the Reparation Commission to consider, in conformity with the provisions of Article 234 of the Treaty of Versailles, the resources and capacity of Germany.

The experts' reports form an extremely interesting and complete whole, and I can only congratulate myself on having taken the initiative of requesting the French delegate on the Reparation Commission to propose the convocation of the experts. I am glad to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the great competence which they have shown, to their impartiality, and to their appreciation of actual facts.

In possession of such detailed and valuable information the commission is now in a position to pronounce judgment and the governments have the right to expect from it a definitive decision which will embody the conclusions contained in the experts' reports, will support them with argument, will give them practical form (since in most cases they are drafted, as is only proper in the case of reports from advisers, in the form of mere indications), and will complete them on certain points which the Experts have left to the commission itself to deal with or on which they have not expressed any opinion. It is only when the Reparation Commission has completed this work, and has thus clearly defined all the matters which come within its competence under the treaty and those which are not within its jurisdiction,

that it will be in a position to communicate the latter to the governments concerned.

The governments will not, in fact, be able to take useful action until they have exact information as to the practical effect which the Reparation Commission gives to the experts' proposals. They must also be in a position to ascertain whether the German Government has, for its part, taken the necessary measures to carry out the Commission's decision. It is evident that this decision cannot be taken until the commission has approved the drafts of the laws and decrees which it has requested the German Government to submit to it, with a view to insuring the execution of the plan. But it is also evident that it is only after this decision that the Allied governments will be in a position to arrive at "the conclusion coming within their jurisdiction, in order that the plans proposed may be brought into full operation without delay." In the circumstances the German Government and the Allied governments cannot in fact be placed on the same footing.

The Reparation Commission, acting in virtue of its powers under the peace treaty, can take into account the observations made to it by the German Government, which is entitled to a just opportunity to be heard, and must then give its decision with all the authority which the treaty confers upon it.

The experts have, moreover, stated that, in their opinion, the economic and financial unity of the Reich should be restored as soon as the plan recommended is put into execution. Since the commission has decided to accept the experts' conclusions as a whole, the French Government ventures to assume that on this point of capital importance it does not intend to modify these conclusions. The governments will have to consider together under what conditions the securities at present held by France and Belgium shall be merged into or exchanged for those which will be handed over as an undivided whole to all the Allies. These operations cannot, however, take place until Germany has effectively put the plan into execution, and it is for the governments to determine by common agreement the guarantees which these operations may render necessary.

It is, moreover, understood that in the course of the conversation to be entered into the French Government, which appreciates the experts' work, as do the other Allied

governments, will, in a spirit of conciliation and mutual understanding, make every necessary effort compatible with the vital interests of France to facilitate the prompt execution of the definitive decision to be communicated to it by the commission.

The Belgian Reply

The Belgian Government has examined the experts' reports with the greatest interest.

The indisputable competence of the members of the committees, their objective aims and the co-operation of America, have given their unanimous conclusions a high moral importance which the Belgian Government is pleased to recognize.

It has the honor to inform the Reparation Commission that it is prepared to accept the experts' conclusions as a whole, with a view to a practical and equitable settlement of the reparation problem.

It hopes that the Reparation Commission will give careful consideration to the drafts of the laws and decrees which it has asked the German Government to submit to it and which are necessary for the complete execution of the experts' plan.

The Belgian Government further hopes that the Reparation Commission will lose no time in preparing the measures, the details of which were entrusted to it by the report, so that when this work has been carried out the plan recommended may be brought into prompt operation by common agreement among the Allied governments. The Belgian Government is placing itself immediately in touch with these governments.

Italian Position

The Italian Government has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the letter of the Reparation Commission under date of April 17, communicating the reports of the two Committees of Experts, together with a copy of the letters exchanged between the commission and the German Government and the text of the decision adopted by the commission on the same date.

The Italian Government has taken the greatest interest in examining these two reports, which, on account of the competence of the experts and the unanimity with which they adopted their conclusions, must be considered to be documents of the greatest value.

Since the Royal Government considers the

contents of the two reports to be an indivisible whole, it has noted with satisfaction that the Reparation Commission had adopted them in their entirety and is sure that the commission will be able to pursue its work rapidly.

The Italian Government for its part is willing immediately to adopt the experts' reports in their entirety, as well as the principles underlying them, being convinced that these conclusions and principles can constitute a fair basis for the settlement of the question of reparations and connected questions in accordance with the line of action always followed by the Royal Government.

The Royal Government considers, moreover, that the conclusions unanimously adopted by the experts and approved by the Reparation Commission will facilitate the solution of the general problem by the settlement of questions among the Allied governments which are within their jurisdiction and which were not within the mission of the experts.

THE LAST MAC DONALD-POINCARÉ CORRESPONDENCE

(NOTE.—Following is the text of the correspondence between Premiers MacDonald and Poincaré during the period just before and subsequent to the latter's defeat at the polls.)

Mr. MacDonald to M. Poincaré
(*Purely Personal and Unofficial*)

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 10, 1924.*

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

I have just heard that you have decided not to come to Chequers on Monday on account of the political situation of France at the present moment. May I assure you that I took delight in sending you the invitation, not merely because it was to give us an opportunity of talking over matters in which your country and mine are very deeply concerned, and upon which, in the interests of every country in Europe, you and I had to come to an agreement which would be generally acceptable, but also because I wished to have the pleasure of meeting you personally at my residence.

We political leaders, I suppose, have to cultivate the habit of regarding no office as an abiding place and be prepared for "ups and downs" just as they come. Believe me,

however, I regret very much that that common fate should have deprived me of the opportunity of making your personal acquaintance.

I do not wish to ask any improper question or to make any objectionable suggestion, but I know that you are equally concerned with me in trying to make preliminary arrangements for putting the experts' report into operation, and thus establishing a more satisfactory state of affairs in Europe. Might I, therefore, ask if everything must now remain just where it is until next month, or whether it would be possible, without doing anything which would be a violation of the parliamentary or constitutional practice of France, to pursue at any rate tentatively explorations of our problems, so that when formal and official communications between our governments can be normally resumed time may be saved and conclusions arrived at speedily?

I know this is rather a delicate matter to refer to, and I only venture to do it trusting to your known good will and your belief that it is made in all sincerity.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

M. Poincaré to Mr. MacDonald

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
PARIS, *May 14, 1924.*

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER AND COLLEAGUE:

Having announced to the President of the Republic my intention of placing in his hands, on the opening of the new Parliament, the collective resignation of the cabinet over which I have the honor to preside, I regret very much that I am unable to accept the kind invitation which you were good enough to send me. I should have been very happy to pass a few hours with you at Chequers, and to thank you for the straightforwardness and friendly courtesy which, since your advent to power, you have not ceased to show to the French Government.

Moreover, the detailed account which MM. Theunis and Hymans have with your full consent communicated to me of the conversations which they had with you, and the confirmation of these conversations which you have sent me, enabled me to expect the best results from our meeting, and I had every ground for hoping that we should arrive without difficulty at a final agreement. I do not doubt that such an agreement will

be brought about at an early date in conditions satisfactory for our two countries.

The government over which I preside have accepted without restriction or reservation the conclusions of the report of the experts as ratified by the Reparation Commission, and they have declared that they were ready to re-establish the economic unity of the Reich as soon as Germany applied the program laid down by that commission.

We are, therefore, entirely in accord with you on this point, since you explained to MM. Theunis and Hymans that the economic hold ought to cease on the very day on which the experts' plan enters into force; but that that would not, of course, be until the German Government, so far as it was concerned, had carried out the suggestions of the experts in their entirety and obeyed their directions.

The experts did not give it to be understood in their report that the reestablishment of economic unity implied the abandonment of the military occupation of the Ruhr. I know very well that no British Government has approved this occupation, although it has never been to us an end in itself, but only a means, and I am the last person to wish to resuscitate misunderstandings which, like you, I desire to see dissipated. Therefore I am very much touched by the delicacy with which you spoke of this point to MM. Theunis and Hymans.

To me also it appears quite useless to hark back to the past. We have always announced that we would leave the Ruhr in proportion as Germany effected payments. This sufficiently indicates that we hope to be able to leave it as soon as possible. We think it prudent, however, to preserve guarantees and to remain in a position to resume pledges in the event, which is unfortunately not impossible, of Germany subsequently failing again in her obligations to make reparation. You were good enough to tell MM. Theunis and Hymans that in the event of a breach of the undertakings contracted by her, Germany would find herself confronted by England, Belgium, and France inflexibly united, as they were during the war.

It seemed to you difficult, however, to foresee at the present moment the nature of the guarantees which, in such an eventuality, we might be led to take by a common agreement. It goes without saying that France will always prefer measures taken in common with

her allies to measures taken by herself alone. We should therefore only contemplate resuming the exploitation of our existing pledges in the event, which I am anxious to believe improbable, of our not having agreed together upon the necessary guarantees when the moment arrived. On this point, likewise, it seemed to me that your conversation with MM. Theunis and Hymans was a step toward a solution acceptable to our two countries.

I had examined at length with MM. Theunis and Hymans another question—that of the railways administered by the Franco-Belgian Régie. When MM. Theunis and Hymans broached the subject to you, you pointed out to them that it was already under examination by M. Lefevre, his British colleague, and a German delegate, and that agreement on the subject was about to be reached. We, too, had believed, like MM. Theunis and Hymans, that the best solution was to leave the experts to find a practical arrangement which would reconcile the financial unity of the German railways, as provided in the experts' report, with the rights conferred upon us by article 10 of the Rhineland Agreement, to insure the observance of which has been essentially the object of the Franco-Belgian Régie. It is a very important question and one which I should have liked to have been able to settle with you as soon as the experts had formulated their proposals; nor does it seem to me to be a question which threatens to divide the governments of Great Britain and France.

This question would have led me to speak to you, if you had agreed, about the problem of security, which presents itself today under a really grave aspect. I have ventured to communicate to you in these last few weeks information furnished to me by General Nollet, the president of the Inter-Allied Commission of Military Control, or by General Dégoutte, the general commanding the troops of occupation. There does not seem to be any doubt that Germany is deliberately violating the stipulations of the Treaty of Versailles and reconstituting her war material and military formations.

In consequence of circumstances to which I have no intention of referring again, France has not obtained the guarantees that she had a right to hope for during the negotiations leading up to the Treaty of Versailles. It would have been very agreeable to me to seek with you, whom I know to be

animated by sentiments so sincerely and resolutely pacific, the means of supplying on this capital point the precautions which were not then taken, and whose absence might be fatal to the peace of the world when the Allied armies come to evacuate the occupied territories.

Although the course of events forbids me to examine with you these different questions, I must thank you warmly for the cordial manner in which you offered to discuss them with me, and I shall not fail to report to the Government which succeeds me the deep impression of confidence that your conversation with MM. Theunis and Hymans had already made on our Belgian colleagues.

Believe me, my dear Prime Minister and colleague,

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) R. POINCARÉ.

M. Poincaré to Mr. MacDonald

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
PARIS, *May 15, 1924.*

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

Lord Crewe conveyed to me this morning your personal and private letter of yesterday. It crossed the one which I asked M. de Saint-Aulaire yesterday evening to communicate to you. I was looking forward to the great pleasure of passing an evening by your fireside and of having a heart-to-heart talk with you. As my letter of yesterday will prove to you, I do not doubt that such a purely private conversation would have led us to the conclusion that we could easily establish an agreement on the questions which are vital for our two countries. You have understood that, after having announced to the President of the Republic my intention of placing in his hands at the opening of the forthcoming Parliament the collective resignation of the cabinet over which I have the honor to preside, it was very difficult for me to maintain my acceptance of your very kind invitation to Chequers. But I think with you that the conversation so happily begun through the intermediary of our common friends can quite well continue, at least in a preliminary form, without our waiting till next month, in order to prepare the basis of an agreement destined to restore European affairs to a normal footing.

From the constitutional point of view, since the powers of the Parliament elected in 1919 do not expire till June 1, the present

government is not charged solely with the conduct of current affairs. Whilst it is determined to do nothing which may impede the action of the government that will succeed it, the present government is qualified to continue with you the study of such urgent problems as the present, so that time may not be lost in arriving at solutions which I shall be in a position to recommend personally to my successor. I am, moreover, convinced that nothing will be changed in the foreign policy of France. I recently had occasion again to make a statement to this effect in the Senate.

Our conversation can be carried on by means of personal letters or by the intermediary of our ambassadors. I myself yesterday embarked on the course that you indicate. You explained to me your views with a delicacy and perception which, if you will allow me to say so, have greatly touched me and for which I am very grateful. Accordingly, nothing stands in the way of your communicating to me directly or through the intermediary of M. de Saint-Aulaire the considered observations which my letter of yesterday will have suggested to you.

I have found since you have taken office such sympathy between your sentiments and my own that the exchange of ideas which will take place between us up to the 1st of June cannot in any case fail to advance matters very appreciably toward the result for which we are both so confidently hoping.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) R. POINCARÉ.

Mr. MacDonald to M. Poincaré

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 23, 1924.*

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

It was with real pleasure that I received your letters of the 14th and 15th of May, which great pressure of work has prevented my acknowledging sooner. Not only do I value their courtesy and cordiality, but I was happy to learn from them that I could count on your continued co-operation in preparing the way for an agreement to place European affairs once more upon a normal footing and, by the creation of the mind of peace, in providing the beginning of a security against war.

You have been good enough to inform me that you are so much in agreement with the views which I expressed to M. Theunis and M. Hymans on the occasion of their visit to

Chequers that you had expected the best results from your visit to me. That is most gratifying. I have never concealed from you, nor have you from me, the difficulties in reconciling some of our respective views, but your response to my approaches has convinced me that a candid exploration of the realities of our position would end in harmony without sacrificing the permanent interests of France and Great Britain.

I fully understand and respect your disinclination in any way to hamper the action of the new government, and I am glad that you saw that I expressed myself in such a way as to show that I was conscious of the delicacy of the position and anxious to embarrass neither you nor your successors, with whom I shall pursue the same frank exchange of thoughts as we have done.

In the meantime, administrative details have been dealt with through the usual channels, and I await the establishment of your new government to take up where it has been interrupted a consideration of the points not yet agreed upon.

Finally, I think we may congratulate ourselves on the very real progress which has been made in the last few months in improving the relations of our two countries, and, whatever may be the results, I shall ever remember with gratitude the generous response you gave to my early endeavors to put those relations on a basis of mutual understanding and confidence.

If good fortune were to bring us together personally, either when you are in England or I in France, it will be a happy moment for me when I greet you.

With every assurance of friendship and respect,

I am, yours very sincerely,
(Signed) J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

M. Poincaré to Mr. MacDonald

May 25, 1924.

MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER:

I am much touched by the sentiments which you are so good as to express to me, and I wish to assure you once more that I shall continue in all circumstances to do everything in my power to maintain and strengthen between our two countries an *entente* so necessary for the peace of the world.

Pray believe, my dear Prime Minister, in my sincere friendship.

(Signed) R. POINCARÉ.

BRITISH BANKERS MEMORANDUM ON RUSSIAN CREDIT

(NOTE.—The following memorandum was addressed to the British Prime Minister, on April 13, by leading bankers, on the subject of the restoration of Russian credit in Great Britain.)

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have informed his Majesty's Government of their intention to send to London in the immediate future representatives with full powers, among whose tasks will be "the determination of means for the restoration of Russia's credit in Great Britain."

Since it is desirable that all those who are interested in the restoration of normal conditions between this country and Russia should contribute what they can to the solution of this problem, we venture to indicate what in our view are the means by which the Soviet Government's aim can be achieved. In expressing our views below we believe we interpret correctly the general opinion of the financial community of this country.

Conditions of Credit Restoration

The "means" for the restoration of Russia's credit in Great Britain are the following:

- (1) That a recognition of debts, public and private, should be agreed upon acceptable to both countries.
- (2) That an equitable arrangement for restitution of private property to foreigners should be made.
- (3) That a proper civil code should be brought into effective operation, independent courts of law created, and the sanctity of private contract again firmly established.
- (4) That the Russian Government should definitely guarantee that in future private property shall in all circumstances be free from danger of confiscation by the State.
- (5) That bankers, industrialists, and traders in this country should be able to deal freely without interference by government authorities, with similar private institutions in Russia controlled by men of whom they have personal knowledge and in whose character, word, and resources they have confidence.
- (6) That the Russian Government should abandon their propaganda against the institutions of other countries, and particularly against all those from whom they propose to request financial assistance.

The Will to End War

By Arthur Deerin Call

This pamphlet of 39 pages tells of the cost of war—reasons for the will to end war—beginnings of the modern peace movement—the organizations of peace societies, periodicals, congresses—international plans and organizations—the two Hague conferences—the League of Nations and World Court.

The original statute of the International Court and the statute as finally adopted are both included.

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Order from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Any Book on International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership IN The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional	\$25.00
Contributing	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual	\$2.00		

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$_____ PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A _____
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name _____

Address _____

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 8

August, 1924

Foreign Policies in the Party
Platforms

Can the Dawes Plan Win?

Again We Refuse a League Proposal

British Imperial Problems

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	451
EDITORIALS	
Our Parties and Our Foreign Policies—Fate of the Dawes Report— A Marked Persistence—Interparliamentary Union—In the Main— Editorial Notes.....	453-460
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
Inter-Allied Conference—Britain's Imperial Problems—Latin Amer- ica—Third American Scientific Congress—American Rubber—The Confusion in China.....	461-471
GENERAL ARTICLES	
Interparliamentary Union.....	472
By its Secretary-General	
Practical International Work of the Rockefeller Foundation.....	478
By the President of the Foundation	
International Instruction Through Social Studies.....	487
By Jessie C. Evans	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
Foreign Policies in the Party Platforms.....	492
Text of the League's Proposed Treaty of Mutual Assistance.....	495
Reply of our State Department.....	499
Canada and the Lausanne Conference.....	500
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	503
LETTER BOX.....	505
BOOK REVIEWS.....	509

Vol. 86

AUGUST, 1924

No. 8

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEEES

The minimum fees for membership:

Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Senator from Illinois, Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. PHILIP NORTH MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN, 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., 1155 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, California. Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, Ex-President Fairmont Seminary, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 W. 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS

HENRY C. MORRIS

PAUL SLEMAN

THEODORE STANFIELD

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D.

Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., Richmond, Indiana.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

GEO. H. JUDD, Washington, D. C.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD

(Adopted by the American Peace Society May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment wherever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective: and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

AUGUST, 1924

NUMBER
8

EDITORIALS

OUR PARTIES AND OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

MR. COOLIDGE, Mr. Davis, and Mr. La Follette are the three candidates for the office of President of the United States with whom we shall be seriously confronted on election day, November 4 next. To what foreign policies do these men subscribe? The answer to this question must be found in the platforms upon which they have been nominated.

As to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Republican Party indorses the Court and favors the adherence to it of the United States, as recommended by President Coolidge. The Democratic Party simply renews its declaration of confidence in the ideals of the World Court of Justice. Mr. La Follette's platform says nothing about it.

As to the League of Nations, Mr. Coolidge must abide by the decision of this government definitely to refuse membership in that body, and to assume no obligations under the Covenant of the League. Upon that he must stand. Mr. Davis, unless he repudiates the Democratic platform, must renew his confidence in the ideals of the League of Nations and argue that there is no substitute for that body as an agency working for peace. But he must contend that this question should be lifted out of party politics, and that whether or not the United States shall join the League of Nations should be submitted to the American people at a referen-

dum election advisory to the government. He cannot argue that we should join the League of Nations. He can only propose a general election upon the one question, "Shall the United States become a member of the League of Nations upon such reservations or amendments to the Covenant of the League as the President and the Senate of the United States may agree upon?" Under the terms of his own platform, Mr. La Follette is not called upon to refer to the League directly or indirectly.

The Republican Party believes in cooperation with other powers in humanitarian effort, always with the provision, however, that this country shall make no political commitments involving the sacrifice of our independence. There is no evidence that the Democratic candidate must disagree with this position. Upon this matter Mr. La Follette is also silent.

Mr. Coolidge must defend the Dawes report. Mr. Davis has no obligation in this respect. Mr. La Follette does not refer to it.

The Republican Party is opposed to the cancellation of debts owed to this country by foreign powers. The Democratic Party has taken no position upon these debts; neither has Mr. La Follette.

The Democratic platform calls for the conscription of all the resources of the nation in time of war, for an adequate army and navy, for the outlawry of the whole war system. Upon these matters

the Republican Party is silent. Mr. La Follette believes in the outlawry of war, and in the abolition of conscription.

All three parties are in substantial agreement upon the necessity for the reduction of armaments on land and sea by joint agreement.

Mr. La Follette believes that the Treaty of Versailles must be revised in accordance with the terms of the Armistice, and that there should be "public referendums on peace and war." The Democratic Party believes in a war referendum except in the case of actual attack. Upon these matters the Republican Party is silent.

In other words, all three candidates must stand for the limitation of armaments upon land, in the air, on and under the seas, by treaty agreements. All must stand for an effective foreign policy calculated to lessen the chances of war. None of the candidates can favor the United States entering the League of Nations. Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Davis can work for our adherence to the Court of International Justice. All three parties are evidently in perfect agreement that it is of supreme importance that "America be placed and kept on the right side of the greatest moral question of all time," the question of dethroning the war system.

Judging from the platforms, none of the candidates will concentrate upon our foreign policies as a major issue. Evidently the campaign is to be fought over questions arising out of our more immediate industrial, agricultural, and political situation. It seems to be the view that these questions are sufficiently complicated without bringing in the larger and more difficult problems of our foreign relations. The farmer and the laborer in industry are trying to find a common program which will promote the interests of both. The political scandals of the last year are coming in for their share of debate and wrangle. The tariff is already beginning to let loose its customary oceans

of talk. Personalities, as usual, are coloring the harangues. It is reasonable to expect that animosities, vague and frictional, will arouse opinion more and more to a fever heat. Splits, in familiar variety, are already bringing the usual consternation into the opposing camps. Oratory is splashing the landscape o'er. And November 4 will come and November 4 will go, and the throes of another election will leave us a little better informed, somewhat clearer-visioned, and a bit more eager for another four years of effort to improve our American brand of living. Our political campaigns are not a net loss.

Yet the lack of party interest in foreign policies is a misfortune. There is an intimate relation between the interests of our farmers and laborers—and this includes pretty much all of us—and the attitude we take toward other nations. Our production and trade hang on foreign markets increasingly, and of course the weal of our people is vitally affected by every problem of peace or war. In our judgment, the candidate who visualizes most clearly what the foreign policies of this government should be is the candidate that ought to be elected. The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* is politically non-partisan. All it can do in the present campaign, therefore, is to recommend to the voters that they measure each candidate by the "Suggestions for a Governed World," appearing elsewhere in these columns, and vote accordingly.

The United States of America will move onward and we believe upward, whoever resides in the White House. No man is indispensable to our development in America; no man can hinder that development, for long. A venerable guide of the Capitol remarked casually to us the other day that the Democrats and the Republicans of the House look very much alike to him, "They are all Americans." The election of November presents no crisis, in any dangerous sense.

THE FATE OF THE DAWES REPORT

THERE are reasons for believing that the Allied conference now meeting in London will be unable to agree upon the Dawes report. In the first place, the opposition to it in Germany is real and determined. A more important reason, however, is that the struggle between France and Germany cannot be expected to end today, tomorrow, or the next day. This is true, whatever plan is discussed or even adopted.

The reason for the continuation of the conflict between France and Germany is not that these two peoples hate each other. There is hatred enough, it must be confessed; but hatreds become increasingly ephemeral when interests no longer demand them. It is not reparations demanded by France that are prolonging the struggle. France expects reparations from Germany. France is entitled to these reparations under the laws of war and the laws of right reason. The reparations question is, therefore, a serious question, but it is not the most fundamental cause of the continuing ill-will across the Rhine. The reason for this unhappy belligerency is not that France demands security against another attack from the east. France wants security. She is entitled to security. But France knows that there is no such thing as security against a German attack so long as there is a German wishing to attack. In this situation there are two courses open to France. One is that she be prepared in terms of guns and men to meet any force which Germany brings to bear. The other is to have a Germany psychologically so minded that a military blow at France would be unthinkable. So far, it is the former of these two methods which has appealed most strongly to French judgment. In this the French may have been right; but

it is not this alone that perpetuates the atmosphere of strife between the two countries.

Neither is it because there is any unusual lack of common sense among these two peoples. They are not peculiarly stubborn nor unnaturally blind to their mutual interests. It is true that their many fights have left deep wounds which are far from healed. Their wars have been vicious and devisive. In the meantime England, a bit flirtatious, wooing first this country and then that, cannot be said to have helped the situation, for neither France nor Germany has sufficient faith in England. So they do not arrange their households for peace. And the scandal of Europe goes on. But the reason for this lies deeper still.

When the family court of experts was set up with an American gentleman presiding, the world breathed easier; for men said, France and England will be shown the way to peace at last. The court drew up a plan for bringing the family together and for enabling the parties to balance their budget, providing they went to work and established an income, and then to go ahead once more with less caterwauling and kicking of shins. This plan is the Dawes plan.

The question now is, Can the Dawes plan work, and, if so, how? This question is being threshed out by a conference of representatives from ten of the Allied powers, including unofficial American advisors.

Seemingly insurmountable difficulties face the conferees. These difficulties do not relate to the main aspects of the Dawes report, for upon these the governments, including Germany, are in accord, at least on the surface. Note these lesser but possibly insurmountable difficulties: Shall France evacuate the Ruhr before Germany begins to pay up, or shall Germany begin to pay up before France be-

gins to evacuate? One thing may be accepted as certain, France will not begin to evacuate at least until the Allies submit a substitute guarantee that France will be paid. This, of course, is a direct challenge to the international bankers. In the meantime France and England are in perfect disagreement upon the nature of these guarantees. Furthermore, France and England are far apart upon the manner of deciding questions of Germany's default, if default there be, again. The military activities of German secret societies complicate the situation by casting a cloud upon the sincerity of Germany.

In the midst of all this the American ambassador to Great Britain has presented to the conference four proposals in the nature of compromise. These proposals are as follows:

"1. That the Allies should solemnly undertake not to proceed to take sanctions which would interfere with the financial and fiscal sovereignty of Germany to the prejudice of the lenders and service of the loan.

"2. That they would undertake that, if sanctions were applied, the sums necessary for the service of the loan would be provided from the proceeds of such sanctions.

"3. That the Reparation Commission would be empowered to declare a German default by a majority vote and the Allies would undertake to apply such sanctions as would conform with the indications given by experts.

"4. That, subject to the foregoing provisions, the problems of treaty interpretations, would remain unaffected and all treaty rights enjoyed by the Allies would remain unimpaired."

Under the first and second of these terms, if accepted, the proposed loan to Germany would have smoother sailing because it would be secured by priority rights. This will probably arouse little objection. It is not reasonable to expect, however, that France will agree to refer the determination of Germany's default

to a majority of the Reparations Commission, for France might thus lose control. Furthermore, France has consistently insisted upon her rights to act independently against Germany in case of Germany's default. She will probably not relinquish this right. Another question facing the conference is, Shall Germany be notified in advance of the purposes of the Allies in case of German default, or shall the whole question of sanctions be deferred pending an emergency which may arise?

All these questions may seem to be minor. As a matter of fact, they may become major, for one very important reason. And this brings us to the very heart of the whole case. Germany and France are finding it impossible to work together because they are, economically speaking, at each other's throats. The war of arms has simply given way to an economic warfare. It is the war under another guise, but the war nevertheless. Both France and Germany are fighting for their economic lives. This is the outstanding fact of Europe; the very high mountain facing the Dawes report. An anxious world hopes it may not prove insurmountable.

A MARKED PERSISTENCE

THE Secretary-General of the League of Nations evidently does not propose that the United States shall forget the existence of the League of Nations. Under date of January 9, 1924, he wrote to Secretary Hughes, requesting the views of our Government respecting a Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance to which the Third Committee of the Assembly of the League had unanimously agreed after two years of work by the Temporary Mixed Commission, and after revision in accordance with the decisions of the Assembly. The proposed guarantee treaty represents the views of the League Committee on Disarmament under the terms of Article 8

of the Covenant of the League. This article reads:

"The members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations. The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several governments."

This proposed treaty is an attempt to make operative Article X of the Covenant. Its submission for an expression of opinion by our Government is, therefore, but another illustration of the wide differences between the political views of European statesmen and the Government of these United States. Certain officials of the League do not seem to have heard of our political campaign of 1920.

The treaty, furthermore, would outlaw wars of aggression by asserting "that aggressive war is an international crime." This rather naïve and meaningless statement does not augur well for the quality of the plan which follows. And the plan which follows, considering the time and labor put into it, is correspondingly amateurish and disappointing. It is a proposal to organize an alliance for the coercion by force of arms any recalcitrant State. It is a war plan pure and simple. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, when interpolated upon it recently in the House of Commons, expressed the view that it would mean the increase rather than the decrease of armaments. It is a proposal to organize the world not for peace but for war, and evidently the European statesmen responsible for the document seriously believe that the United States can be beguiled into accepting such a plan, promising in advance to fare forth with navy and army at a moment's notice in disputes the nature of which we cannot now foresee.

It would seem that the officials of the League of Nations understand the United States of America less rather than more clearly with the passing of the years.

Statesmen of the world should know by this time that the United States will not enter into any alliance to guarantee military assistance through an indefinite future, that it cannot under the circumstances help to define directly or indirectly the competency of the Council of the League of Nations, and that it cannot give up its control of its own foreign policies to an outside body of men without vital changes in the very structure of this Government.

We are so anxious that the League of Nations shall render a service to the cause of international peace that we wish it might find it possible to understand better the United States of America, its aims, its powers and its limitations. We would then find it unnecessary to call to the attention of the officials of the League, directly and indirectly, the futilities of their bootless proposals.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION AT BERNE AND GENEVA

THE Interparliamentary Union, as announced heretofore, is to hold its twenty-second conference, beginning August 22, in the city of Berne, Switzerland. Its last session will be held in Reformation Hall, Geneva, August 28.

The Interparliamentary Union has had a worthy history covering thirty-five years. Thus for a generation this "Parliament of Parliaments" has been laboring for the arbitration of international disputes as a substitute for war. It is now known that the Interparliamentary Union was largely responsible for the Muravieff manifesto, out of which came the First Hague Conference. The Union had a marked influence upon the deliberations of the First

Hague Conference. It paved the way for the calling of the Second Hague Conference and materially influenced the deliberations of that conference. Dr Lange's article, appearing elsewhere in these columns, will be of special interest to our readers.

The American Group of the Interparliamentary Union is to be represented at the coming conference by Senator William B. McKinley, President of the Group; by Representative Theodore Burton, of Ohio, member of the Executive Committee and President of the American Peace Society. Senators Caraway, of Arkansas; Spencer, of Missouri; Weller, of Maryland; Curtis, of Kansas, and Representatives Montague, of Virginia; Tom Connally, of Texas; J. J. McSwain, of South Carolina, are also to be present.

Because of the history of the Interparliamentary Union, because of the fact that twenty-seven of the world's parliaments are members of that body, because of the interest of our American Senators and Representatives, and because the President of the United States is about to invite the Union to hold its twenty-third conference in the United States during 1925, this body may be expected to become of increasing interest to the people, particularly of this hemisphere.

WE AGREE, IN THE MAIN

THE President-General of the Daughters of the American Revolution has just sent out a communication to all State regents of the organization warning them against the activities of those "who are knowingly and deliberately disloyal to our government and our political institutions." That sounds good. It seems to ring clear and strong. We confess, however, we do not know exactly what it means. In a sense Messrs. Davis and Bryan are "knowingly and deliberately disloyal" to

a very definite portion of our "government and our political institutions," namely, to President Coolidge, his cabinet, and all his works. And as for Messrs. La Follette and Wheeler, they are still more "knowingly and deliberately" at the job of ousting, indeed, our present government and of scrapping not a few of "our political institutions." While, of course, the head of the "Daughters" cannot mean to refer to these "activities", such reflections make it clear that one must use one's language with care if one would be understood.

Evidently sensing this, the President-General aims later to be more specific. The culprits which must be brought up with a turn are "the societies that are trying to exact unpatriotic promises of their members." That sounds all right. But to what particular "societies" does she refer? The "Youth Movement" is the only one called by name. She says that it "is the most dastardly of all the Old World evils that has been brought to our shores." We don't know much about this "Youth Movement." Evidently, we ought to know more about it. Is it a corporation? Who are its officers? What are its principles? Who finances it? Where can we find it? If it is what the President General says it is, it must be unlawful. Have the Daughters of the American Revolution brought action against this organization or its officers in a court of law? If not, why not? Any group out "to destroy the moral fiber of our girls and boys" ought to be scotched at once. Arrests, we should say, are in order.

The President-General has somebody else also in mind. She says: "Pacifist groups in America have waxed strong because of their sentimental appeals to our women and to our women's organizations." This, not especially complimentary to our women, is less ominous be-

cause less specific. We are not told who these "pacifist groups" are. The adjectives applied to their propaganda are much milder, as, for instance, "far-reaching," "persuasive," "twisted," "spacious." (We suspect this was intended to be *specious*.)

The trouble here again, however, is a lack of definiteness. The phrase "pacifist groups" doesn't seem to get us very far, since the President-General said in the same communication that the Daughters of the American Revolution are "opposed" to war, "as are all right-minded thinking peoples." This means that the Daughters of the American Revolution is itself a "pacifist group." But surely the Daughters are not making "sentimental appeals to our women and to our women's organizations." Therefore, all "pacifist groups" are not doing this subversive thing. Therefore, again, the President-General should be more specific, if we may venture a suggestion in a matter of this delicate nature.

The President-General goes on to say, however, that "if necessity arises—if the fundamental laws of God and man are set aside—then they [the Daughters] are sacredly pledged to the loyal support of their nation, and they believe, with the President of the United States, in its adequate defense at all times by land and sea." The American Peace Society subscribes to this doctrine with all its soul. It has never failed its country in such a crisis. But the American Peace Society, we suppose, is a "pacifist group." Hence it is not true that two "pacifist groups in America"—the Daughters of the American Revolution and the American Peace Society—are subject to condemnation by the President-General of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The President-General concludes her statement with the following paragraph:

"What we actually need in our national life is that individuals and societies shall cling fast to the good, so-called, old-fashioned virtues, with their standards of clear thinking and honest living, and that we shall have a God-fearing respect in our hearts and minds with regard to the observance of law and order. Our society believes that women have a great mission to perform in the world today, and nowhere is that mission greater than in America; but we know that we shall most successfully set about it in our new era of political equality, not by aiding and abetting the forces which would destroy our governmental agencies, but by upholding with our most earnest efforts the great ideals of government for which our forbears fought and died. Daughters of the American Revolution further believe that every boy and girl in America today is entitled to future participation in the blessings of the era of freedom and good government made possible by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. They also mean to oppose with all the vigor and strength of their beings any individual or groups of individuals who would substitute for our great institutions of government untried theories and dangerous Communist doctrines."

With these views we are in substantial accord. We are not so sure of the calumny attached to "untried theories," for we suspect that progress lies along the line of trying out here and there certain new theories of government. But in the main we agree.

We must keep talking about these things, if we are to get anywhere. Macaulay put it more sententiously when he remarked that "men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely." Of course, the great stylist did not mean to exclude women.

AMENITIES go a long way toward promoting friendship between nations as between persons. The Fourth of July was celebrated at Prague again this

year, as in every year since 1918. The celebration was participated in not only by the permanent American colony in this beautiful capital of Czechoslovakia, but also by the people of the country as a whole. Our friends of Czechoslovakia seem glad to express their appreciation of the United States of America not only for aid in their struggle for freedom and the attainment of independence, but also for American services of a humanitarian nature at a time when they were faced with famine and an uncertain future. Evidently our friends of that country remember our efforts in behalf of public health, social welfare and public service organizations in their midst. It is, of course, pleasing to us to hear of the hoisting of the Stars and Stripes in Prague on the Fourth of July and that our flag was "greeted with warmth and respectful feeling."

EVIDENTLY Czechoslovakia purposes to keep alive the principles upon which it is founded. Sunday, the thirtieth of June, a procession of legionaries took place at Prague. These legionaries are the people who won state independence for the Czecho-Slovak peoples. Evidently the demonstration was both elaborate and impressive. The legionaries issued a manifesto setting forth the principles which had actuated them in their struggle for emancipation. These principles included complete freedom and equality in religion, the separation of the church from the state, social justice, progress, work for universal peace, and the defense of truth and democracy. Surely here is the stuff of which the future must be made, not only in Czechoslovakia but everywhere.

WHEN a trained scientist talks of the future of man, we are all instinctively interested. In the June number of *Asia*, Henry Fairfield Osborne, President

of the American Museum of Natural History, writes on "Where Did Man Originate?" He concludes his analysis with these arresting words:

"And now I must turn to another and more pressing phase of my subject, namely, the future of man. Several recent writers on the future development of man, among them Bury, Inge, and Conklin, have taken a decidedly pessimistic view. They are, no doubt, under the influence of the shock of the World War, which they regarded, and in a measure rightly so, as a racial calamity of the first magnitude. France, where the Napoleonic wars had already cut off three inches from the stature of the average man, lost one million four hundred thousand of its best men. England, too, has deteriorated racially. So has Germany. Of the original Teutonic stock, the men of the time of Goethe and Schiller, one-tenth remains; nine-tenths of the population of Germany is of Slavic or Alpine stock. In eastern America, too, the original New England stock is dying out. In the opinion of Dr. Ting, China is not much better off—the change for the worse in the Chinese race being, however, due, not to war, but to the absence of sexual selection.

"Racial deterioration appears to prevail throughout the world. No wonder men become pessimistic! I am an optimist, but I am convinced that we must alter our entire point of view. The doctrine of individualism, so rampant everywhere today, is the greatest enemy of racial progress. Our motto today is, 'Be careful of the individual and never mind the race.' We must come back to the point of view so well expressed by Tennyson in regard to Nature's mode of work:

"So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life."

"Care for the race, even if the individual must suffer—this must be the keynote of the future of man. Not quantity, but quality, must be the aim in the development of each nation, to make men fit to maintain their places in the struggle for existence. Above all, we must be concerned with racial values. With care for them more widespread, the course of human evolution will again take an upward trend and the future of our race will be secure."

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

THE INTER-ALLIED CONFERENCE

JULY 16 witnessed the opening in London of what promises to be the most important inter-Allied conference since the end of the war. The way for such a conference was opened first by the work of the Committees of Experts appointed by the Reparation Commission, and, second, by the results of the French parliamentary elections, which placed Edouard Herriot at the head of the French Government. The conference itself was preceded by a number of interesting events, and there were moments in the preliminary discussions when the fate of the conference itself hung in the balance.

MacDonald and Herriot Confer at Chequers

The first act in the process of making the inter-Allied conference a possibility consisted of a visit paid by the new French Premier to the British Prime Minister at the latter's country place, the Chequers. The meeting of the heads of the British and French governments took place on June 20-21 and was devoted to an expression of views on the problems concerned with a reparation settlement and the whole European situation in general.

After the meeting at Chequers the following official bulletin was issued:

The conversation revealed general agreement between the French and British points of view, and on the part of the two prime ministers a common determination to meet the difficulties which beset their countries, and, indeed, the whole world, by continuous co-operation. It was agreed that, subject to the convenience of the other Allies, a conference should be held in London not later than the middle of July for the purpose of definitely settling the procedure to be adopted.

The two prime ministers agreed to pay a brief visit to Geneva together at the opening of the Assembly of the League of Nations in September next.

This non-committal bulletin did not, of course, satisfy the political leaders, either in Great Britain or in France. The Chequers meeting came in for a good deal of discussion in both the British and the French parliaments.

On the day following the meeting a series of questions was addressed to Mr. MacDonald in the House of Commons. These questions dealt especially with the problem of American and German representation at the conference and with that of the inter-Allied debts.

The Prime Minister replied that the presence of American representatives was highly desirable, and that steps would be taken to make that possible. He stated that representation of Germany was discussed, but, quite obviously, it was first essential that there should be an agreement between the Allies as to what they were prepared to do to put the report into effect. It was felt that certain obligations imposed on Germany by the Experts' Report were somewhat outside the obligations imposed on her by the Treaty of Versailles, and the question remained for consultation with Belgium and Italy in pursuance of the consultation which had taken place as to how best to bring Germany in, to make her a willing partner in sharing those obligations. The exact form was not settled, but was under consideration. The business at the inter-Allied Conference would be the Dawes Report. As soon as that report was put into operation, as soon as all the machinery was arranged for putting the Dawes Report into operation, they would go on to discuss and he hoped to arrange, the other outstanding matters between France and Great Britain, including inter-Allied debts. He hoped the House would be perfectly clear about this—as he could assure it he was perfectly clear himself—there was going to be no mixing up of inter-Allied debt questions with the putting into operation of the Dawes Report. M. Herriot, in his statements made be-

fore both the Senate and the Chamber, was much more specific than was Mr. MacDonald in his statement. The tone of the French Premier's remarks was most optimistic, and the inference from his report concerning his meeting with the British Prime Minister, as well as the conference he had with the Belgian Premier on his way back from London, was that a substantial agreement had already been reached as among the principal Allied statesmen. This inference resulted in an outburst of newspaper comments, which led Mr. MacDonald to a denial of the assumption that any definite conclusions had been reached in advance of the projected conference, and also caused vigorous criticism of M. Herriot by Mr. Poincaré and his followers. This led to the second act in the conference-creation process—Mr. MacDonald's visit to Paris.

MacDonald Goes to Paris

Mr. MacDonald's visit to Paris, undertaken at the request of the French Premier, was timed in such a way as to postpone a discussion of the situation, of which M. Poincaré gave notice. The French political circles were exercised over the perennial problem of French security, and the specific question that led M. Poincaré back into the limelight of discussion was the status of the Reparation Commission in questions involving default on the part of Germany.

On the question of what should be Great Britain's position in case of German default was made perfectly clear by Mr. MacDonald in a speech which he delivered in the House of Commons on the eve of his departure for Paris. In the course of this speech he said:

I am very anxious that if we can come to an agreement about the Experts' Report we should supplement it by an agreement between the Allies that in the event of a willful default on the part of Germany, after she has accepted the report, we should stand shoulder to shoulder in imposing her responsibility upon her.

The real point was as to who is to decide when Germany is in willful default.

In the course of the conversations which took place in Paris between Mr. MacDonald and M. Herriot, it became per-

fectly apparent that France was not prepared to yield an iota of her position in the Reparation Commission, nor to countenance the curtailment of the powers conferred upon that body by the Treaty of Versailles. To this position on the part of France Mr. MacDonald gave sufficient acquiescence for M. Herriot to be able to face his critics in the Senate and convince them of the fact that the foreign policies of France were safe in his hands. In the vote of confidence which M. Herriot received after his explanations, even M. Poincaré joined with an "aye."

The stage was then entirely clear for the inter-Allied conference to take place.

The Opening of the Inter-Allied Conference

The inter-Allied conference opened in the morning of July 16 with representatives of ten nations in attendance. The Allied powers represented are as follows: Great Britain (including representation from the dominions), France, Italy, Belgium, Japan, Jugoslavia, Rumania, Portugal, and Greece. Besides these nine powers, the United States has an unofficial representation at the conference.

These American observers are Ambassador Kellogg and Colonel Logan, the American observer on the Reparation Commission.

The questions before the conference fall into the following five groups: 1, The status of the Reparation Commission; 2, The economic evacuation of the Ruhr; 3, German representation at the later stages of the London Conference; 4, The question of future German default; and 5, The agency for the interpretation of the Experts' Report in its actual application.

It is reported that the conference will be invited to adopt a protocol containing the following points:

1. The signatory Powers adhere to the Experts' Report.

2. The Germans will have to take all steps necessary to give effect to the experts' plan before a date to be fixed by the conference.

3. The Allies will have to suppress all the economic and financial sanctions at present enforced in Germany before another date, two or three weeks subsequent to the first, and also to be fixed by the conference.

4. The Allied Powers undertake to enforce no sanctions unless Germany seriously defaults in her engagements. All such defaults must in future be examined by a new organization independent of and separate from the Reparations Commission, in view of the fact that the new obligations to be undertaken by Germany are not provided for in the Treaty of Versailles.

All disputes to which the interpretation of this protocol may give rise shall be settled by the International Court at The Hague.

Inter-Allied debts and the question of security shall be excluded from discussion.

Germany and Armament Inspection

One of the by-products of the occupation of the Ruhr has been a difficulty encountered by the Inter-Allied Commission of Military Control in its attempts to carry out the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles concerning periodic inspections of armaments in Germany. Such an inspection obviously cannot be carried out without the will and co-operation of the German Government, and the latter's willingness has not been forthcoming for the past eighteen months.

MacDonald-Herriot Warning to Germany

On May 28, 1924, the Council of Ambassadors addressed a note to the German government, asking the latter to set the date for an armament inspection. No reply to this note was made by the German Government, with the result that on June 24 Premiers MacDonald and Herriot addressed to the German Foreign Minister the following joint note:

We wish to address Your Excellency direct on a subject which is causing grave concern to both our governments. Information which reaches them makes them apprehensive that the German Government may be contemplating the return of an unfavorable answer to the note recently addressed to their ambassador at Paris by the Ambassadors' Conference on the subject of military control in Germany. At the same time most disquieting reports reach us of continued and increasing activities of nationalist and militarist associations, which are more or less openly organizing military forces to precipitate

further armed conflict in Europe. These reports are too persistent and too substantial to permit of their being neglected. They are tending to incite the justifiable anxieties of public opinion both in France and in Great Britain, anxieties which must inevitably react on the attitude of the two governments. If these reports are unfounded, we are sure that the German Government will not only consult their own interests but do a great service to the whole of Europe by assisting such an examination as will dispel suspicions regarding secret military preparations.

We cannot conceal from the German Government, and we think it only right to warn them, that any fresh failure on their part to meet loyally and scrupulously their obligations under Part V of the treaty would gravely affect the international situation at the very moment when the prospects of a real application of the scheme recommended by the Dawes Report is creating in all the countries affected a hope of a definite settlement of the problem of reparations which should pave the way to a general and genuine pacification.

We therefore beg the German Government to give all the support in their power to the promotion of this pacification, and, as a first and important step to this end, to co-operate in a ready and determined spirit with the Allied governments in giving effect to the legitimate requirements of the Military Commission of Control.

It should be to the interest of the German Government themselves to see the real facts as to Germany's disarmament in accordance with their treaty engagements authoritatively established. If they wish to convince the Allies of the sincerity of their attitude in this matter, they ought to welcome the opportunity of proving it by helping the Control Commission to determine the facts.

We would appeal to Your Excellency not to lose this chance of eliminating a source of serious trouble for our respective governments. France and Great Britain have no desire to cause embarrassment to the German Government, nor to continue control longer than is necessary. On the contrary, they look forward to the withdrawal at the earliest possible date of the Control Commission. So soon as the several points on which the Allied governments have explained that they must be satisfied shall have been properly met, the Allied governments are ready and anxious to see the machinery of the

Control Commission replaced by the rights of investigation conferred on the Council of the League of Nations by Article 213 of the treaty. All they demand is that their legitimate anxieties be appeased. They cannot be expected to allow their security to be threatened by a disregard of the safeguards which have been assured to them in the terms of the peace treaty.

It is in this spirit that we renew the expression of our earnest hope that the German Government will return to the note of the Ambassadors' Conference the only answer which is called for by the facts of the situation and the sanctity of the solemn engagements entered into under the treaty.

(Signed) J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.
HERRIOT.

Germany Consents to Allied Inspection

The MacDonald Herriot note had an almost immediate reaction in Berlin. On June 30 the German Government dispatched a note in reply, giving its consent to another inspection.

The substance of the German note is that Germany accepts the general inspection of the state of her armaments demanded by the ambassadors, but urges that the inter-Allied Commission of Control shall get its work done by September 30. The idea that new conflicts are likely to arise on account of the activities of German organizations is declared to be a misconception. It is not denied that there are numerous gymnastic associations in Germany, but these have set themselves the task of encouraging the physical training of the German youth. As the former compulsory military training had its educational value, so do these associations in inculcating respect for law and order. There is no justification, it is asserted, for associating the sporting and athletic associations in any way with military preparations.

The idea of war, continues the reply, is rejected by the German people, and every political group is unanimously convinced that a secret encouragement of armaments must be laid aside as impossible, useless, and dangerous. The German Government has done its best to disarm certain political organizations, which have nothing to do with the sporting or gymnastic associations, so that there can

no longer be any question of a serious armament of these organizations.

Further, the note declares that no serious military authority could hold the opinion that Germany could provoke any armed conflict in Europe, even if she wanted to do so, since the technical means and material strength of her army are less than those of even quite small States.

The reply goes on to give as the reason why the German Government accepts today the inspection which it refused three months ago the fact that the Committee of Guarantees has been abandoned by the Allies and the change to a more friendly attitude which it perceives on their part.

While the tone of the German note has not produced a favorable impression in the Allied countries, the prompt consent of the Berlin Government to another inspection is generally regarded as a hopeful sign. As to Germany's demand that the forthcoming inspection be the last of its kind, and that the matter be referred in the future to the League of Nations, it is pointed out that that would have to depend very largely upon the findings of the Commission of Control.

GREAT BRITAIN'S IMPERIAL PROBLEMS

SIDE by side with the momentous negotiations in which the British Government is now involved over the European settlement, Mr. MacDonald faces an increasing number of important problems concerned with the affairs of the British Empire. Some of these problems are the aftermath of the Imperial conferences which took place shortly before Mr. MacDonald took office; others are of much longer duration.

Defeat of the Imperial Preference Idea

One of the outstanding results of the Imperial conferences held last fall was the adoption, in a very mild form, of the rudiments of the idea of Imperial preference. This idea was very strongly urged by some of the dominions—notably Australia and New Zealand—as the most efficient means of Imperial development. It was opposed by Canada, for reasons of her peculiar position with regard to

the United States. In Great Britain the views on the matter were divided. The conservative groups, which were just embarking upon an electoral campaign with protection as their slogan, favored the idea very strongly. The Liberal and Labor groups, on the contrary, rejected it, since they considered it merely an entering wedge of a protectionist policy.

The Imperial Conference actually adopted ten provisions for trade and financial preference within the Empire. The operation of those provisions was contingent upon their acceptance by the British Parliament, and on June 17 Mr. Stanley Baldwin introduced resolutions in the House of Commons asking for the ratification of the provisions passed by the Imperial Conference. After two days of heated debate, in which representatives of all parties took prominent part, the first four resolutions, introduced by Mr. Baldwin, were defeated. Mr. Baldwin then announced that he would let the other six resolutions rest, and the idea of Imperial preference was effectively buried, at least for the present.

Development of an Imperial Foreign Policy

The problem of the participation of the dominions in the formation of foreign policy has been considerably in the foreground of all Imperial discussions ever since the war endowed the overseas portions of the Empire with a new status. The discussion was projected into real prominence recently in connection with Canada's refusal to ratify the Treaty of Lausanne. The documents relating to this incident (published in the *International Documents* section) tell their own story.

As a result of this, ample provision has been made by the British Government to insure proper representation for the dominions at the London Inter-Allied Conference. In reply to an inquiry on the matter in the House of Commons, Mr. MacDonald said:

I think I had better just give this assurance: that, without committing myself to details as to how it is to be done, the dominions will be completely consulted, so that they may feel that they are partners with us in everything we may do.

The growing of the spirit of independence in the dominions, so far as foreign affairs are concerned, has been recently emphasized still further by the appointment of an Irish Minister to Washington. Professor Timothy Smiddy is the first official envoy of the Irish Free State, appointed with full cognizance and consent of the British Government.

The question of Imperial foreign policy is expected to come up for serious discussion at the next Imperial Conference.

The Breakdown of Mosul Negotiations

At the end of May and the beginning of June a conference took place at Constantinople between the representatives of the British and the Turkish governments regarding the question of Mosul. This conference was arranged in pursuance of the Treaty of Lausanne, which provided that the question of the frontiers of Mosul should be settled by direct negotiations between Great Britain and Turkey, and also that in case of failure of such negotiations the question should be referred to the Council of the League of Nations.

The negotiations were doomed to failure from the start. The Turks reiterated their claim to the Mosul vilayet and refused flatly to consider the question of frontier delimitation as the basis of discussion. Their representative claimed that the British were not negotiating in the spirit of the Lausanne Treaty, and refused, therefore, to consider the British proposal that the conference at least draw up the terms of reference whereby the question would be passed over to the League of Nations.

Postponement of Anglo-Egyptian Negotiations

The attempted assassination of the Egyptian Premier, Zaghul Pasha, has postponed the negotiations between the British and the Egyptian premiers, scheduled for the end of July. These negotiations were to be concerned with the adjustment of the problems left unsettled at the time when Egypt was given its independence, in February, 1922. The most important outstanding question is concerned with the status of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, which is causing con-

siderable tension between Great Britain and Egypt. The Egyptians want complete control over the Sudan, while the British are determined to preserve the condominium arrangement established in 1899.

LATIN AMERICA AT A GLANCE

THE trade of the United States with Latin America for the first eleven months of the recent fiscal year through May passed the billion and a half mark and exceeded the figures for the eleven months ending May, 1923, by nearly \$42,000,000, according to R. F. O'Toole, Chief, Latin American Division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The value of American merchandise sold to Latin American markets jumped some \$75,000,000, or from \$585,000,000 to nearly \$660,000,000. Our purchases of Latin American products declined in value, however, dropping from \$957,000,000 to \$923,000,000. As a result of the heavier sales and the lighter buying, our unfavorable trade balance with Latin America was reduced by approximately \$109,000,000, to about \$263,000,000 for the eleven months ending May, 1924.

Our shipments to Cuba increased in value by some \$31,000,000, the largest individual gain accounting for about 41 per cent of the total augmentation in exports. Argentina was the country from which our purchases registered the greatest decline, a decrease of approximately \$48,000,000. We bought larger quantities of Mexican, Brazilian, Colombian, and Peruvian products during the recent 11-month period, however.

Business Conditions in Latin America

Latin-American business conditions in general are on the mend, though seasonal dullnesses and unsettled political situations have brought about a temporary falling off in commercial and industrial activity in certain markets.

Exports of Argentine products continue large, with prices satisfactory, but the market for imports appears to be passing through a slack period, and competition is reported to be very keen. The prospects for the future are good, inasmuch as the purchasing power of the country is in-

creasing with the profitable exports. The Brazilian situation has been affected by the revolt, in Sao Paulo, of the State police, and a State holiday has been proclaimed to last from July 7 to 15. The Federal and State governments are reported to have the situation well in hand. The milreis has fallen off slightly, but coffee prices have been strong, and further gains seem probable, in the opinion of the trade.

Business in Chile is characterized as satisfactory. Much interest is being exhibited in the visit of the Italian "floating fair," and a quickening in the demand for Italian products is anticipated by the promoters. The reports from Bolivia are encouraging, and everything points to a recovery from the recent depression. The United States took 31 per cent of Bolivia's tin exports in 1923, but Great Britain took double that, or 67 per cent. A slight improvement has been registered in Ecuador, and slow progress is reported from Peru.

Conditions in the Caribbean Countries and Mexico

The Caribbean coast countries have been experiencing better business conditions, but seasonal dullness has been felt in the market for imported goods, both in Colombia and Venezuela. The Central American countries are in a better position to buy our products as a result of satisfactory coffee crops, sold largely to Europe at good prices.

In Cuba the end of the sugar-grinding season is causing the annual change in the aspect of this market. Wages fall and the purchasing power of the people suffers a temporary decline. The weather generally has been favorable to the 1924-25 sugar crop, according to reports in Cuba, and cane fields are said to be well advanced in growth and in excellent condition. The seasonal dullness is shown by a decline in bank clearings in May, as compared to April, of about 12 per cent. The Debts Commission has up to June 19 approved claims worth over \$31,000,000 and rejected others amounting to nearly \$13,000,000.

In Mexico, business houses are holding off the market until after the excitement of the presidential elections, which began

July 6, subsides. Banks have been withholding all credits for the time being, and have been making strenuous efforts to collect outstanding indebtedness. Another dock strike at Vera Cruz appears as a possibility. Deposits in banks are larger than last year and, once the unsettled political situation is quieted, it seems likely that business will register an encouraging improvement.

THIRD PAN AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

M. V. VILLARÁN, president of the organization committee of the Third Pan American Scientific Congress, informs us that the Second Pan American Scientific Congress, which sat in the city of Washington from December 27, 1915, to January 8, 1916, appointed the city of Lima as the seat of the Third Congress, which, in accordance with a decree from the Peruvian Government, under whose auspices it will meet, will be inaugurated November 16 next. The sessions will last over the fortnight following and the papers presented will therein be read and discussed. Under the program of the congress all branches of science, both general and abstract, as well as those more particularly concerning the continent of America, will be admitted. The official festivals to commemorate the first centenary of the battle of Ayacucho will commence immediately after the closing of the congress.

The Congress of Washington designated Messrs. Javier Prado, Manuel Vicente Villarán, and Alejandro O. Deustua to organize the Lima Congress. Due, however, to the death of Dr. Prado, the Peruvian Government appointed Engineer José J. Bravo his substitute.

The Organization Committee has been formed as follows: Dr. Manuel Vicente Villarán, rector of the university, president; Dr. Alejandro O. Deustua, dean of the faculty of letters and director of the National Library; Engineer José J. Bravo, president of the Peruvian Association for the Advancement of Science, secretary general.

The congress will comprise the nine sections herein below mentioned, the presidents whereof have been appointed:

1. Anthropology, history, and related sciences—President, Dr. Felipe de Osma, president of the Historical Institute of Peru.

2. Physics, mathematics, and related sciences—President, Rear Admiral M. Melitón Carbajal, president of the Geographical Society of Lima.

3. Mining, metallurgy, economic geology, and applied chemistry—President, Engineer José Balta, professor of economic geology at the Lima School of Engineering.

4. Engineering — President, Engineer Darío Valdizán, dean of Peruvian engineers.

5. Medicine and sanitation—President, Dr. Guillermo Gastañeta, dean of the faculty of medicine.

6. Biology, agriculture, and related sciences—President, Dr. Wenceslao F. Molina, dean of the faculty of sciences.

7. Private, public, and international law — President, Dr. Mariano Ignacio Prado y Ugarteche, dean of the faculty of jurisprudence.

8. Economics and sociology—President, Dr. José Matías Manzanilla, dean of the faculty of politics and economics.

9. Education—President, Dr. Alejandro O. Deustua, dean of the faculty of letters and director of the National Library.

Subsecretary General of the Congress, Dr. Cristóbal de Losada y Puga.

The Organization Committee of this Congress is naturally anxious that it shall not fail to live up to the spirit and ends underlying such assemblies and to the success of foregoing ones and therefore trusts to secure throughout the warm support of American scientific institutions.

This Third Pan American Scientific Congress will meet under the auspices of the Government of the Republic of Peru. The congress will be composed of official delegates, representatives of universities and scientific institutes, societies and bodies of American countries, citizens of the countries attending the congress and foreigners therein residing invited by the organization committee, and authors of the papers submitted to the congress. All members of the congress shall be entitled to attend its sessions, to take part in the debates, and to receive a copy of the pub-

lications issued by the organization committee. The official languages of the congress shall be Spanish, English, French, and Portuguese. Resolutions will be adopted on the majority rule, each State having one vote.

OUTLOOK FOR AMERICAN CONTROLLED RUBBER

THE Philippines and parts of South and Central America provide regions where the soil and climate are suitable for first-class rubber plantations of practically unlimited area. Certain unfavorable economic and legislative factors must be carefully considered, however, before plantation projects could be started in those regions on a competitive basis with the large areas in the East, where 95 per cent of the world's output is now produced. This information was submitted recently to representatives of the American rubber manufacturing industry in conference in New York, by the U. S. Department of Commerce investigators who have just returned from explorations and surveys in the Far Eastern and American tropics.

The World Rubber Situation

Outlining the situation briefly, it was explained that the total area planted in the East was found to be about 4,266,000 acres, of which 2,729,000 acres are owned by European and American capital and 1,537,000 acres by Asiatics. About 3,500,000 acres are producing or old enough to be tapped. Through domicile of plantations in British territory and through ownership of plantations by British capital in other territory, Great Britain controls 77 per cent of the total area under rubber. American capital invested in the East is estimated at only \$32,000,000 against \$489,000,000 for Great Britain, \$130,000,000 for Holland, \$40,000,000 for Japan, 27,000,000 for France and Belgium, and \$47,000,000 for other European countries.

The Commerce Department investigators believe that the operation of the British restriction laws, adopted in November, 1922, will probably reduce the aggregate potential output for the years 1924, 1925, and 1926 by upward of

200,000 tons of rubber. Rubber planted by the native population and old areas on European estates, which have not been properly cared for, are expected to show declining yields in the future.

Ample land and labor are available for new planting in Malaya, Sumatra, and Indo-China, but India and Burma are not attractive because of unfavorable climatic conditions. Very little desirable unoccupied rubber land is left in Java and Ceylon. Taxation is a serious drawback to further investment in Netherlands India, while in Indo-China American capital would probably experience considerable difficulty in acquiring control over large areas under the present and proposed corporation laws. Low-price levels at present are curtailing new plantings in the East. Were all areas in that region producing to capacity, it is estimated that their potential output would be approximately 500,000 tons for 1924, 550,000 for 1925, 580,000 for 1926, 600,000 for 1927, 610,000 for 1928, 612,000 for 1929, and 616,000 for 1930.

Possibilities in the Philippine Islands

Concerning possibilities in the Philippines, the Commerce Department representatives expressed the opinion that the dangers of typhoons and lack of labor supplies, two deterrent factors stressed in previous reports, had been exaggerated. The uncertainty of the present political situation with respect to the Philippines and the reported lack of encouragement toward the introduction of large American or other investments are outstanding factors in the situation as a whole which militate considerably against rubber developments in the Islands.

Extensive investigations were conducted in the islands of Mindanao, Basilan, and Jolo, where more than 1,500,000 acres of land were located as having the topography, soil, and climatic conditions favorable for the planting and cultivation of the Para rubber tree on a commercial scale. A number of small plantations aggregating 2,500 acres already planted to rubber now exist in this region, and produce yields which compare very favorably with the best rubber-growing areas of the East. The present land law, however, which prevents the acquisition of more

than 2,500 acres by any one company or individual, is a handicap against plantation developments on an economic quantity basis sufficient to make America independent of foreign production.

The Commerce Department's crude rubber investigating party, which covered the Philippine Islands, also conducted a survey of British North Borneo. While this region is one of the minor plantation rubber areas of the world, it has shown an increasing volume of rubber exports over the past few years and may hold an important place in the future. While a British protectorate, it retains a quasi-independent political status which is unique, in that it is administered by the British North Borneo Company under a royal charter, almost independent of the Colonial Office. The company promulgates its own laws, issues its own currency, stamps, and executive decrees, levies its own import and export duties and internal taxes, and holds sovereign title to all lands.

Investigations in Tropical America

The countries visited by the Commerce Department's Caribbean party were Guatemala, Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, and Ecuador. Information was also gathered on western Venezuela and southern Mexico. Physical conditions suitable for Para rubber cultivation were found in small portions of northern Guatemala; portions of Honduras, extensive areas in eastern Nicaragua and northeastern Costa Rica; limited and segregated areas in Panama; sections contiguous to the Atrato and San Juan rivers in Colombia; limited areas in southwestern Colombia, in the vicinity of Tumaco; and an extensive area on the coastal plain of Ecuador. It should be carefully noted, however, that this commendation does not necessarily apply to certain important factors regarding labor, taxation, and legislation, which in some cases present formidable obstacles. Conditions are regarded as least suitable, due to definite dry seasons in southwestern Mexico, southern Guatemala, western Costa Rica, southern Panama west of the Canal, and certain arid regions on the coast of Ecuador.

The aggregate area of desirable land in tropical America is sufficient for the de-

velopment of rubber plantations to rival the present cultivated area in the East.

It was found that, generally, taxes on land are either non-existent or inconsiderable and the land tenure conditions vary greatly.

The attitude of the various republics toward the Commerce Department investigators was one of extreme cordiality and sincere desire to point out means of making land available for enterprises of large magnitude. In some cases, where existing laws appeared to impede such development, it was intimated that if there were sufficient incentive there was a possibility of enacting laws to meet the special conditions.

Transportation Facilities Considered Adequate

All of the regions enumerated are in a strong strategic position from the standpoint of transport. The total labor force of the Central American and Colombian region available for large planting developments is estimated at not to exceed 40,000 men, sufficient for from 120,000 to 150,000 acres. For operations of magnitude, it would, therefore, be necessary to draw on the outside for a labor supply.

The Amazon investigation covered Bolivia, Peru, the disputed territory between Colombia and Ecuador, the three Brazilian States of Amazonas, Matto Grosso, and Para and the Acre Territory of Brazil. The party was greatly aided by the Brazilian Government. Topography and climatic conditions favorable to the production of plantation rubber are reported over large areas along the main river and south of it. The presence of the South American leaf disease on wild rubber trees in many parts of the Amazon Valley is a danger that should be carefully considered before plantation rubber is undertaken. The plantation industry of Dutch Guiana has been practically wiped out by this disease. The governments are apparently very favorably inclined toward new projects, especially rubber developments in Amazonas and Matto Grosso.

It was explained that the complete data secured will be published at the earliest opportunity, in the form of separate reports covering the different regions. This information will deal with every important phase of the industry.

CONTINUED CONFUSION IN CHINA

CONDITIONS in China continue to be thoroughly confused, although in recent weeks important external problems have been settled or are in the process of settlement. To add to the rest of her troubles, China, in the middle of June, went through a cabinet crisis occasioned by a disagreement between the ministers and the Parliament.

Parliament at Odds with the Cabinet

The Peking correspondent of the *London Times* reports that the June crisis was the outcome of recent negotiations with Germany. These negotiations have been concerned with the release to the government of a large sum of ready money held in London against coupons of the reorganization loan, and Parliament claims the right of veto, which is acknowledged by the Prime Minister but denied by some of the other ministers. Meanwhile the government has concluded the business with Germany, though both parties deny that any agreement has been signed. The whole affair is wrapped in mystery, but it is accepted here that terms have been arranged between the Deutsche Asiatische Bank and the Ministry of Finance, and that cognizance thereof has been taken by an exchange of notes between the German legation and the Wai-chiaopu (Foreign Office). The local press has it that Parliament will be propitiated by the payment of two months' arrears of salary to members—a very cheap arrangement, considering the price paid for votes on the occasion of the presidential election.

Parliament is also interesting itself in the subject of the Boxer indemnity. As payments have been renounced by several Powers, members feel that the large sums to be available require handling by a special parliamentary committee which shall evolve schemes of educational endeavor and control expenditure. It is doubtful whether the Chinese educational authorities here will welcome the intervention of Parliament in this matter.

The answer of the Powers to the request for a preliminary conference to discuss the 2½ per cent increase in customs duties is a disappointment to China, for until

this concession is obtained there is no possibility of the consolidation of the unsecured floating debt or of any windfalls resulting from that process. Each legation replied separately to the effect that a preliminary conference could not commit the conference proper to any decision, so that there could be no advantage in holding one. While this alone is an adequate answer, there is behind it the decision of the interested Powers not to add duties on foreign imports for the purpose of paying China's debts, but to adhere to the original intention of consenting to a customs increase only as an offset to the long-contemplated abolition of internal charges on foreign goods. Whether circumstances will compel a revision of this decision in the near future remains to be seen. France, in any case, declines to ratify the Washington resolutions relative to China until China settles the gold-franc case to her satisfaction. On this point the Chinese are become more tractable and there is hope of an early solution.

Recognition of the Soviet Government

Considerable interest, especially among foreigners and foreign representatives in China, has been aroused by the recognition of the Soviet Government. The transaction involved in the recognition is embodied in two agreements, seven declarations, and an exchange of notes. These documents together cover the same ground as the initial draft, but a few modifications have been introduced to meet the wishes of China, which, on her part, concedes an additional undertaking that former Russian property surrendered by Russia shall not be transferred to any third Power or foreign organization. The modifications made at the request of China are as follows:

The article relating to the cancellation of Tsarist treaties with third parties which affect China's sovereignty is supplemented by a declaration that it is understood that China will not recognize as valid any treaties, etc., affecting China concluded with third parties since the Tsarist régime. This condition is applicable to treaties which may have been made by the Bolsheviks with Mongolia, and while it is placed on record that China denies the validity of any such treaties, there appears to be no pledge on the

part of Soviet Russia to denounce them. [The Soviet Government is understood to have signed a treaty recognizing the independence of Mongolia.] In connection with the same subject, there is a slight change of wording implying that the withdrawal of Russian troops from Mongolia after the conference which is to be held to settle details shall not be conditional, but shall occur as a matter of course.

Finally, with regard to the Russian Church property in China, of which, under the initial agreement, the Soviet Government was to obtain full possession, it is now agreed that China shall transfer it as soon as the Soviet Government shall designate a Chinese person or organization to take possession of it, in accordance with the Chinese law relating to the holding of property. In the meanwhile, China undertakes to guard the property and to eject the persons now living there—a savage requirement on the part of the Soviet Government which affects the Orthodox bishop and clergy and a large number of Russian refugees who are being maintained on the premises of the mission.

There are also several subsidiary arrangements reported, the text of which, however, has not as yet been made public.

Consular Protests against Canton Plots

The American Legation at Peking reports that on July 10 the consular body at Canton addressed a note to the civil governor of Kwangtung, complaining that plotters agitating against the foreign Powers seem to be utilizing Canton as a rendezvous and a place from which to proceed with their activities. In this note the consular body requested the Canton provincial authorities to take speedy measures to suppress such movements and plots.

The American Consul General states that the consular body has received no reply to the above-mentioned communication, but from indications it appears that this protest has produced some effect in persuading the local authorities to commence a cleaning-up campaign.

According to the press telegrams from Canton, it is stated that, as the outcome of a conference between the British and French authorities, rate-payers on the Island of Shamen, the foreign concession, recently adopted regulations, to become

effective on August 1, whereby all Chinese entering the foreign concession after 9 o'clock at night would be required to produce a permit with a photograph of the bearer thereon.

According to a telegram sent by the American Consul General to the American Legation on July 15, it is stated that all the Chinese in the foreign concession have given notice that they would strike, commencing at 6 p. m. that same evening, July 15, as a protest against the above-mentioned new municipal regulations. In general, foreign concerns, as well as the American Consulate General and the American firms in the foreign concession, will in all probability be affected.

A further telegram received from the American Consul General, dated July 16, states that all Chinese, including clerks, servants, and native representatives, employed in the foreign concession struck on July 15, at 6 p. m., and left the concession.

The municipal council has organized a volunteer militia to preserve order. This militia will include some Americans. At the present time no reliable estimate can be made as to the duration of the strike. The water works of the foreign concession are operated by volunteers, and the electric-light current from the native city has not as yet been tampered with. The bridges leading to the island upon which the foreign concession is situated are picketed by the strikers, but so far no disorder has been reported. Food supplies and mails are arriving at the foreign concession directly from Hongkong and are being delivered.

JUST as health and happiness can be achieved only in sunshine and fresh pure air, so freedom and progress can be attained only in an atmosphere which is free from taint of poison and impurity. Such an atmosphere for the nations is peace.

Peace is not a state of passivity any more than is the clean breath of the winds the palpitating ray of sunlight. It is the condition under which alone growth and progress can naturally take place.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

By DR. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE

Secretary General of the Union

THE Interparliamentary Union was founded during the Universal Exhibition in Paris in 1889. Two men who had played a prominent part in the movement for peace and international understanding had taken the initiative. Randal Cremer, a member of the House of Commons, founder of the International Arbitration League, addressed himself to M. Frédéric Passy, who was the leader of the peace movement in France, and suggested that they should invite to a preliminary meeting in Paris in 1888 some members of Parliament from the different countries who were sympathetic to their ideas. Just about this time there was a movement on foot for the conclusion of permanent arbitration treaties between the United States of America and Great Britain. Randal Cremer had obtained signatures from 234 members of the House of Commons, of some prominent members of the House of Lords, and some leaders of the trade-union movement in favor of such a treaty, and had carried this address across the Atlantic and submitted it to President Cleveland in the White House. At the same time Frédéric Passy had called the attention of the French Parliament to this movement, and this was how the two men got into touch with each other. At the preliminary meeting in 1888 only French and British parliamentarians were present, but they decided to organize a meeting to which members of all parliaments should be invited, during the exhibition, in the following year. Then 96 parliamentarians, representing nine different countries, met in Paris and founded "*The Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration.*"

The interesting thing is how the two founders and the institution which they called into life centered on a limited object of a constructive nature—the advancement of arbitration in international affairs. It was a happy thought. It is doubtful whether hard-headed statesmen would have affiliated with an institution having a very general character of rather a moral and sentimental nature. Up till that period the peace movement had had

a pronouncedly moral and even religious character. The friends of peace were, so to speak, a small sect, rather despised by so-called practical men. It was the thin edge of the wedge which was introduced when arbitration was put to the front by the interparliamentarians, and soon very important results were obtained.

During the next years interparliamentary conferences were held in quite a number of European capitals. The meetings became more and more representative and attracted attention in wider and wider circles. Just to show how quite unexpected results may sometimes come from generous initiatives, the following story may be told; it is a matter of history which has quite recently come to light:

After having, during the very first years, advocated the conclusion of permanent arbitration treaties, the interparliamentarians from 1892 concentrated their efforts on an attempt to create a permanent Arbitration Tribunal. This was due to the initiative of the Hon. Philip Stanhope, a young member of the British House of Commons, who later became still better known as Lord Weardale. He suggested that a special committee should be entrusted with the task of elaborating a draft international convention for such a tribunal, and in 1895, at the fifth conference, which sat at Brussels, this draft was discussed and put into shape. The following year the conference met at Buda-Pest, in Hungary. This conference was followed by the Russian Consul-General in the Hungarian capital, M. Basily, and his secretary, M. Priklonsky. On the proposal of the well-known Hungarian statesman, Count Apponyi, who from that time onward was one of the leaders of the Interparliamentary Union, the conference paid the compliment to their distinguished Russian visitors of suggesting that non-parliamentary countries might also be represented at the interparliamentary conferences if so authorized by their governments. The Russian Consul wrote a report to his Foreign Office about the conference and its discussions. Soon both he and his secretary

were called home to St. Petersburg, where a new Minister of Foreign Affairs had taken office. In 1898 the Russian War Minister proposed in the cabinet a large vote for the acquisition of new artillery, in view of the extensions which the Austrian Government had made to their armaments. The Finance Minister, Count Witte, protested on grounds of economy, and during the discussion the idea of an understanding with Austria that both countries should abstain from increasing their weapons was mooted. This, however, appeared difficult of execution. On hearing about this, M. Prikloonsky prevailed upon his chief, Basily, to lay before the Foreign Minister the idea of a general understanding in favor of a limitation of armaments. He reminded him of the conference which had met at Buda-Pest and of the growing importance of the peace movement in general. Basily asked his secretary to draw up a memorandum on this matter, and the Foreign Minister, Count Muravieff, consented to submit this memorandum to the young Czar, Nicholas II. Nicholas at first absolutely refused to comply with such a suggestion, but after some time, through the reaction characteristic of irresolute natures—he himself said, on that occasion, that he had changed his mind under the influence of the Czarina—accepted the idea, and the consequence was that the famous Muravieff manifesto was launched upon a startled world in August, 1898. It will be remembered that this manifesto suggested a meeting of an international conference which would have to discuss the problem of the limitation of armaments.

The world was not only startled; it was largely also scandalized. The celebrated German historian, Theodor Mommsen, said that the conference was an "error of printing" in the history of the world. As a matter of fact, limitation of armaments proved impracticable at that moment, and even the Russian Government foresaw, before the meeting of the conference, that it could hardly succeed in this field. Again the Russians followed on the lines indicated by the interparliamentary conferences. To the object of disarmament a second circular, laying down a detailed program of the conference, added the suggestion of developing international or-

ganization in favor of arbitration, and when the conference met at The Hague, in 1899, the draft elaborated by the Brussels Conference, four years before, was taken as the basis of discussion. The Belgian Senator, Baron Descamps, who had presided over the Interparliamentary Conference at Brussels, became the rapporteur of the special committee of The Hague Conference, and under the inspiration of Andrew White, head of the American delegation; Lord Pauncefoot, then British Ambassador in Washington, head of the British delegation, and Léon Bourgeois, head of the French delegation, the famous Hague Convention on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes came into being, which exactly followed the lines indicated by the interparliamentary draft of Brussels in 1895.

Thus the seed deposited by parliamentary friends of peace grew fruit, even more important than any of the initiators had expected. The international work of The Hague was started and an important step taken in the direction of the organization of international relations.

It goes without saying that the interparliamentarians were encouraged by these results. At the same time the Union had perfected its organization. It had founded a permanent office at Berne, in Switzerland; groups had been formed in different countries; some individual Americans had been present at the conferences held during the last years of the century, and among them was Congressman Theodore E. Burton, who is still an active and interested member of the institution. In 1904 a National Group was formed in the American Congress, and it at once showed its vitality by inviting the Union to hold its conference that year at the St. Louis Exhibition. Here a new and important initiative was taken. On the basis of a report read by Theodore Burton, the conference decided to ask President Roosevelt to call a second Hague Conference, and Roosevelt, with characteristic promptitude, at once accepted it. The American Government had, however, for reasons of diplomatic etiquette, to stand aside and leave the convocation of this conference also to the Russian Government. Because of the Russo-Japanese War, the meeting could

only take place in 1907. For this conference, too, the interparliamentary conference prepared material. At one of the most important meetings of the Union, the conference held in London in 1906, during the first year of Campbell-Bannerman's administration, a draft model treaty of arbitration was hammered into shape. The following year it became the chief object of discussion at The Hague Conference. While at the first conference only 26 States had been represented, this second conference could legitimately be called a Parliament of Humanity. All the States of Latin America were represented there, the full number of delegations being 44. The result of the deliberations at the The Hague on this central question was, however, negative. In diplomatic conferences the principle of unanimity has to prevail, and because of the opposition of the German Government and of some other European countries the world treaty of arbitration failed.

The interparliamentarians realized that though they had succeeded in inspiring action of the States along the lines which was theirs, the Union was as yet not strong enough to carry full victories. The lesson was taken to heart, and during the following years the members of the institution concentrated their efforts on the creation of a more efficient organization. Lord Weardale was the heart of this effort. He had prevailed upon his own government to give the promise that if and when the Interparliamentary Union created a better organization for itself, the British Government would be prepared to give an annual subvention toward the expenses. At the conference held in Berlin in 1908 important decisions were, therefore, taken. The Union had for some time been led by an Interparliamentary Council composed of two delegates from each group. This was a rather cumbersome organization. Now an executive committee of five was put at the head of the Union and a permanent office, with a paid secretary-general, was created. The example of Great Britain was soon followed by other countries, and the finances of the Union were thus put on a better basis. By contributing toward the expenses of the Union, the governments recognized the usefulness of its work and

implicitly engaged themselves to take account of its recommendations. During the next few years the efforts of the Union were directed toward the preparation for the Third Hague Conference, which was expected to meet in 1915 or 1916. The most important draft prepared by the parliamentarians during these years was a proposal for a Permanent Court of International Justice.

Then, in August, 1914, the World War intervened. The preparations for the next conference, which was the nineteenth in the series, had just been finished. It was to meet at Stockholm, and more than 20 parliaments had announced their participation in great numbers. All the preparatory documents had been printed and were being distributed. The conference was to discuss, among other important subjects, a detailed plan for an International Court of Justice. The following year the Union was to meet at Washington, where Congress had extended a cordial invitation and voted an important sum for the reception of the parliamentarians. The year after that a conference was to sit at Madrid. The outlook then for the work of the Union had been bright and hopeful.

Now everything was cut short. The Interparliamentary Bureau, which for the last years had been located at Brussels, had to leave that city and was transferred to Norway. The activity, properly speaking, of the Union could not continue. One single object remained to be looked after: the maintenance of the organization and of the relations between the central office and the different national groups. The task was not easy, and during the war several of the groups died of anæmia, so to speak. Nevertheless, a sufficient number, particularly in the States neutral during the war and in the two Anglo-Saxon countries, were maintained and developed a certain activity. They not only remained in touch with the central bureau, but some of them worked with success for the preparation of an international organization to be created after the war. It is said that the famous French revolutionary leader, Abbot Sieyès, was asked after the terrorism what he had done during that period. He simply answered, "I managed to live." The In-

terparliamentary Union might have said the same thing after the war.

As soon as the World War had come to a close a new situation presented itself. A League of Nations was created as an outgrowth of many efforts, those of the Interparliamentary Union not being the least important. When the Council of the Union met for the first time after peace had been concluded, in October, 1919, at Geneva, it was quite natural that the first question to be discussed was whether it would be possible and natural for the Interparliamentary Union to continue its work. Some voices had been heard saying that after the League of Nations had been created the Union had no serious mission to fulfill. This, however, was not the feeling which prevailed among parliamentarians themselves. They realized that any governmental organization, whether the League of Nations, or the Pan-American Union, or the International Labor Office, or any diplomatic conference whatsoever, was exclusively, and could only be exclusively, a representation of the governments. The Union, through its parliamentary character, would still remain a valuable element in the international life of the world.

Besides, as to the most important institution in existence, the new League of Nations, it was to be expected that for some years to come it would not be of a universal character. There were among the members of the Council who met at Geneva different views as to the present character and the future of the League. Most of them cordially supported the institution, though there were divergent views as to its proper line of development. Others were rather opposed to it. It was unanimously resolved that the Union was to go on with its work and at the first conference held after the war, at Stockholm, in 1921, the important question of the relations between and the relative importance of the League of Nations and the Interparliamentary Union was discussed. It appeared then that, particularly among the American members, but also among the European ones, there was considerable doubt as to the future of the League. The conference laid down its views in the following two resolutions:

I

The 19th Interparliamentary Conference cordially approves the principle of an association of nations with the aim of organizing the world for the maintenance of peace, which the conference is entitled to consider as an important aspect of the work zealously pursued by the Union for a long period of years, and, recognizing that forty-eight different nations have already joined in the existing League of Nations, registers as its opinion that it is both urgent and necessary that such an association should attain an all-embracing character, which will render it able to exercise that high mission with which it must naturally be entrusted.

II

Always anxious to devote itself to useful and practical work, the conference is of the opinion that the Interparliamentary Union must increase and strengthen its activities in the field of international co-operation, to the end that the burden of armaments may be reduced and the peace of the world may be attained.

In these resolutions it was implied that the Interparliamentary Union was to go on with its work as an independent organization.

Since the war three conferences of the Union have met—at Stockholm in 1921, at Vienna in 1922, and at Copenhagen in 1923. This year the conference will meet in Switzerland, and for next year an invitation has been received to meet at Washington, where the Union would have sat ten years before if the war had not intervened.

The progress of the organization has been considerable during these years. Twelve groups were represented at Stockholm in 1921; now 27 national groups are in full working order. This is not nearly as great a number as it should be. Considerable efforts have been made to attract parliamentarians from other countries, particularly from Latin America. The Stockholm Conference passed a resolution expressly inviting these countries to join the Union. So far, only Chili has been represented, at the Conference of Vienna. It is the universal desire of the members of the Union to have with them, as soon as possible, an important number of Latin

American politicians, and it is hoped that the Washington Conference next year may see this wish fulfilled.

Which are the questions in the forefront of interparliamentary discussions at the present moment?

First, problems of an economic and financial nature. The Union has worked with all its might for the liquidation of the war system of seclusion and suspicion. It has tried, and partly obtained, satisfaction as to the abolition of the passport system; it is going this year to discuss particularly the problems of international railway traffic and its development toward more normal conditions. Last year, at Copenhagen, a most important debate took place on the closely related questions of reparation for war damages and of interallied debts. This debate is illuminating in so far as it shows the particular usefulness of an interparliamentary discussion. There was no lack of opposite points of view. The American viewpoint as to interallied debts is absolutely different, not to say opposed, to the European one. Frenchmen and Belgians on the one hand, Germans on the other, do not look in the same way on the reparations problem. The debates were, therefore, lively and sometimes heated; nevertheless, it was possible to arrive at a unanimous conclusion recommending a solution of the problem along international lines. It may be said that the creation of the committees of experts was the first step on the way outlined by the Copenhagen Conference, where more than 400 parliamentarians from 26 different countries were present.

The problem of minorities is a most vexed one in the old continent of Europe. It will be generally recognized that great progress was made through the settlement after the war by the liberation of nationalities, such as the Poles and the Czechs, who had for centuries been under foreign rule. Besides, an organization was created giving protection to racial and religious minorities, in the States of Central Europe; but at the same time these reforms have given rise to new problems. Social conditions have changed and large communities of highly civilized people find themselves in a very difficult position. The League of Nations, which exercises a sort of supervision in this field, has not

been able to give satisfaction to all parties concerned. The advantage of discussion of these difficult problems before the interparliamentary conferences, as compared to the Assembly of the League of Nations, is that while in the latter only governmental representatives can meet and speak, the Interparliamentary Conference also gives an opportunity for accredited representatives of minorities to be present and to voice their views. A most interesting proposal has been mooted in this connection. It is due to a Swiss politician belonging, then, to a country consisting of three or four different races, but which has been able to create a system of mutual tolerance which should be an example to be followed by other countries. The proposal tends to create, in countries where minorities exist, round-table conferences to settle local questions. It is to be hoped that some States may act upon this suggestion. It would present the great advantage that some questions might be eliminated from an international discussion before the League of Nations.

It will be impossible in this short article to enumerate all the problems submitted to discussion within the Interparliamentary Union, such as the control of foreign policy, the publicity of treaties and institution of open diplomacy, or the different questions in the field of social politics, or colonial problems, particularly the interesting innovation of colonial mandates under the Covenant of the League.

Some words should, however, be said as to the chief problem, perhaps, in the international field at present—the problem of a limitation of armaments. The conference to sit at Bern in August will take up for discussion and push toward practical realization some questions as to ways and means in this field. In the first place, it will discuss the question of the private manufacture of arms and munitions and the control of the traffic in such merchandise. It is hoped that the co-operation, within the Union, of Americans, on the one side, and representatives of the League of Nations States on the other, may prove fruitful of practical results. In the second place, a most important question for the relations between France and Germany will be put forward, that of

demilitarized zones on exposed and dangerous frontiers. In the third place, some plans for a reduction of armaments on the basis of budgets or on the basis of peace effectives of the States will be submitted for consideration.

It is interesting to note that the discussion on the problems of disarmament will take place at Geneva itself, in the hall where some days later the League of Nations Assembly will sit. That Assembly will be remarkable through the presence of some of the new leaders of European governments. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and M. Herriot have just declared that they intend to be present. Perhaps they may find in the proposals of the Interparliamentary Conference food for thought and action.

It will be seen that the field of action of the Interparliamentary Union has been considerably extended since its foundation, thirty-five years ago. It does not limit itself exclusively to the question of arbitration. It is becoming more and more a sort of "Parliament of parliaments," where all questions of international interest can be raised. On the agenda for the Conference at Washington next year it is to be foreseen that particularly the question of an extension of international jurisdiction and the preparation of a codification of international law will form the main subject of discussion.

It is characteristic of the conferences that all political parties are welcome and admitted. Only one group can be created in each parliament, but this group is not exclusive; any member of parliament may join. The voting rules within the conferences are such that the different points of view can be represented through a proportional system.

The Interparliamentary Union is working along three lines of action: It tries, in the first place, to suggest and inspire new measures. Governments are proverbially slow to move. In the Union new ideas are brought forward for the consideration of the governments—now for action to be taken within each country, now for discussion when they meet in common council.

In the second place, the Union helps toward the realization of international reforms as soon as they have obtained the

sanction through one or other of the international conferences. It must be remembered that a conference, either in the form of the Assembly of the League of Nations or of a meeting of the Pan-American Union, or of any conference, whatever diplomatic form it may take, can only submit draft conventions for the ratification of the governments. Repeatedly the Interparliamentary Union has acted and is still acting through its national groups in order to obtain the necessary ratification of such drafts from the governments. A case in point is its action with regard to the Naval Conference at Washington two years ago, which obtained the cordial approval of the Vienna Conference in 1922. In so far, the national groups may be considered as executive organs of the Union.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, is the personal contact and the open discussion between political men from different countries, even from different continents, which is made possible through the annual meetings of the Union. Thus ties are created which have proved fruitful in the past and which may contribute, perhaps, still greater results in the future.

A governmental or diplomatic assembly must needs be dominated by national and exclusive interests. Anxiety for these interests is quite legitimate, and the Union has never overlooked or forgotten them. There is, however, a danger that they may assume supreme importance, to the exclusion of other considerations. Side by side with the representatives of national and political interests, there should also be representatives of the *common interests of mankind*. In the world today, there are great political, economic, and humanitarian movements which are not confined within national boundaries and which seek to obtain international sanction for their efforts, such as, to quote only a few: international social reform and improvement of labor conditions; the principle of free trade; protection for the rights of national and religious minorities; the advancement of intellectual interests, and the efforts directed against intemperance and moral depravity. These movements will find a suitable channel for the expression of their views in an unofficial

body such as the Interparliamentary Union, which has at its disposal a wider and more elastic organization than an exclusively official institution composed of States, such as the League of Nations.

The Union, therefore, still has important work to do. In accomplishment of this work it appeals to all men of good will throughout the parliaments of the world.

REVIEW OF WORK IN 1923 OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION*

By GEORGE E. VINCENT, President

DURING the year 1923 the International Health Board, the China Medical Board, and the Division of Medical Education of the Rockefeller Foundation (1) supplied fellowship funds for 636 individuals in 29 different countries; (2) supported through the League of Nations interchange institutes for 54 public health officers from 27 nations; (3) arranged international visits of one commission and of 24 visiting professors; (4) furnished emergency relief, in the form of medical literature or laboratory equipment and supplies, to institutions in 15 European countries; (5) sent scientific material to Japan after the earthquake and invited a group of Japanese medical scientists to use the laboratories of the Peking Union Medical College as guests of the institution; (6) continued to contribute to schools or institutes of hygiene at Harvard, London, Prague, Warsaw, and São Paulo, Brazil; (7) cooperated in nurse-training at Yale University and in France, Belgium, Brazil, China, and the Philippines; (8) accepted an invitation from Brazil to participate in a comprehensive attack upon yellow fever; (9) had a share in demonstrations of malaria control in 12 American States and conducted malaria surveys or studies in the United States, Brazil, Australia, Nicaragua, Porto Rico, Salvador, the Philippine Islands, and Palestine; (10) either continued or began anti-hookworm work in conjunction with 20 governments in various parts of the world; (11) contributed to 183 county health organizations in the United States, New Brunswick (Canada), and Brazil;

(12) continued a study of the medical schools of the world by visits to Belgium, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Turkey, Hongkong, the Straits Settlements, Siam, Canada, England, Scotland, Wales, the Netherlands, Mexico, and Colombia; (13) offered to contribute 280,750 pounds sterling to the development of medical education in certain universities in the British Isles; (14) gave \$500,000 to the University of Alberta, and pledged \$250,000 to the University of Pennsylvania toward buildings for anatomy and physiological chemistry; (15) continued to support a modern medical school and teaching hospital in Peking; (16) aided two other medical schools and 25 hospitals in China; (17) assisted premedical education in several institutions in China and agreed to do this also in Bangkok, Siam; (18) lent representatives to governments and institutions for various types of counsel and service; (19) continued to support a disease-reporting service of the Health Section of the League of Nations; (20) contributed to mental hygiene projects, demonstrations in dispensary administration, organization of dispensary work in France, and to other undertakings in the fields of public health and medical education. . . .

"The Peaceful Strife of Science"

The phrase is Pasteur's. At an international scientific congress in Italy he spoke in paradox, declaring that science is at the same time of no nationality and also the highest expression of nationality. "Science," he said, "has no nationality, because knowledge is the patrimony of humanity, the torch which gives light to the world. Science should be the highest personification of nationality, because, of

* Extracts from President Vincent's "Review," giving a fair summary of the activities of this beneficent organization.

all the nations, that one will always be foremost which shall be first to progress by the labors of thought and of intelligence. Let us, therefore, strive in the pacific field of science for the pre-eminence of our several countries."

The great French scientist loyally exemplified this ideal. He worked unremittingly for the welfare and prestige of France, but he never forgot that he was also adding to the knowledge which is the "patrimony of humanity." This ever-growing common fund is reviewed, rectified, reorganized, and augmented by thousands of investigators in university and industrial laboratories, botanical and zoological gardens, agricultural experiment stations, hospitals, and research institutes of many kinds in almost all the countries of the world.

To keep the workers conscious of their common task, to recruit young men and women and to train them for productive work, to make sure that each investigator has an opportunity to know what others are doing in his special field, to put new knowledge at the service of the whole world as soon as may be—these are aims of modern science thought of as a vast teamwork of the nations.

It was the privilege of the Rockefeller Foundation in the year 1923 to have a part in the recruiting and training of young scientists by promoting international migration. Either directly or through other agencies, it provided fellowships for 636 men and women who were preparing for teaching or administration in public health, medicine, biology, physics, chemistry, medical and premedical education, and nursing. Of these fellowships the International Health Board granted 130 (including staff members on study leave); the China Medical Board, 135; the Division of Medical Education, 51; the National Research Council, 113; a German committee, 194; the British Medical Research Council, 4; other agencies, 9. . . .

The League of Nations Interchange

It is not enough that many young workers should get a part of their training in foreign lands, and thus feel the stimulus of contrasts and of generous rivalry. Older persons, already in important offi-

cial positions, need experience abroad, the chance to make comparisons, to get new ideas, to meet colleagues, to feel a sense of comradeship across national frontiers. It was a happy idea of the Health Section of the League of Nations to establish what are termed interchanges of health officials, or international institutes, which are attended by representatives of several countries.

Two such institutes were held during 1923. Early in the year 29 health officers from Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Russia, Sweden, the United States, and Jugoslavia assembled in London. After a preliminary study of the English system of central and local health administration, the party broke up into small groups, which proceeded independently to an intensive study of health conditions and organization in some large provincial city, a county, typical agricultural and industrial districts, and a large port. After three weeks in the provincial areas and another week spent in studying the special health problems of London, the group went to Austria, where a similar program was carried out.

The other session assembled in the United States in September. Twenty-five delegates represented 18 countries, including four which are not members of the League—Germany, Mexico, Russia, and the United States. After general sessions in New York and Washington, the party was divided into sections which studied health activities in typical city and rural areas in Virginia, Alabama, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. A final conference of the European delegates was held in Geneva for a review and discussion of their experience in the United States.

The value—scientific, practical, and international—of such meetings as these is unquestionable. The by-product in friendliness and good will is by no means negligible. The International Health Board is providing the funds for a period of years to meet the expenses of these interchanges.

Ambassadors of Science

Still other migrations of scientific men took place under the Foundation's aus-

pices during 1923. Twenty-four specialists in medicine, public health, or physical science, representing seven different nations, visited other countries than their own, as guests of the Division of Medical Education, the China Medical Board, and the International Health Board. These visits varied in length from a few weeks to several months.

A commission of six distinguished Japanese scientists—two professors of medicine, two of pathology, one parasitologist, and one surgeon—made a tour of the chief medical centers of the United States. Each member of the party had been asked in advance to indicate the men and institutions he most desired to see, and arrangements had been made accordingly. The outcome was gratifying. American scientific workers gained respect for the standards and ideals of the Japanese, who in turn said they had profited from observing the equipment, methods, and personnel of institutions in the United States. Other visitors from foreign countries included: a health official from Hungary; another from Poland; and two professors of the medical school of the University of Hongkong, appointees to new university chairs which had been endowed by the Foundation.

From the United States, on the other hand, the Foundation sent one pathologist to Brazil, another to Siam, physicists to Chinese universities in Nanking and Tientsin, and a specialist in science teaching to the National Education Association of China. To the Peking Union Medical College went eight visiting professors: two from Johns Hopkins Medical School, two from the Harvard Medical School, and one each from Columbia University Medical School, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the University of Vienna, and the Central Institute of Brain Research in Amsterdam.

Safeguarding the Succession of Scientists

If the scientific "patrimony of humanity" is to be protected and enlarged, there must be no break in the continuity of investigators and teachers. The leaders of today must train and inspire the younger students, who will take over the responsibility for conservation and progress in the future. Because science is a world prod-

uct and a heritage of all the nations, an interruption in the scientific succession of any leading country is of concern everywhere.

Thus the Foundation made an emergency grant for a three-year period when, at the close of the war, a great institute for research found difficulty, because of the diminished value of its endowments, in recruiting young assistants. A leading reason for establishing fellowships in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and medicine, under the auspices of the National Research Council, was the fear that industrial and professional careers might draw promising investigators and teachers from the less financially attractive pursuit of pure science.

The plight of young medical scientists in the Central European countries and the Balkans has recently become so critical that the continuity of workers has been seriously threatened. In Germany especially the danger of a breakdown has aroused the anxiety of the scientific world. German medicine, for example, has contributed so much to the common fund of knowledge and technique that the turning of large numbers of young medical investigators to other pursuits would sooner or later affect medical progress as a whole.

The Rockefeller Foundation, in the interest primarily of modern medicine, therefore asked a committee of German scientists to select promising younger workers who, if they had no aid, would be compelled to turn to other pursuits, and to appoint them to "resident fellowships." These provide small stipends, together with sums for laboratory supplies and experimental animals. In 1923 the committee granted 194 of these fellowships. The trustees have authorized the extension of this plan to other countries in which similar conditions may be found.

Professional Training for Health Workers

The Rockefeller Foundation fixes its attention upon permanent, constructive activities in the fields of public health, medical education, and the premedical sciences. Experience clearly shows that the fundamental need in the progress of preventive medicine is a specialized personnel thoroughly grounded in the under-

lying sciences and familiar with the best methods of practical application and administration. The idea that an ordinary medical education fits a doctor to be a health officer is a serious error which does much harm. He needs additional graduate training for what is recognized as a special profession.

A mere enumeration of the subjects now included in the public-health curriculum leaves no doubt about the necessity for specific training: (1) micro-organisms and various parasites, animals, and insects which cause or transmit diseases; (2) resistance and immunity, including vaccines and sera; (3) technical methods of controlling communicable diseases; (4) sanitation, including water-supplies, sewerage, disposal of wastes, etc.; (5) chemistry and physiology of hygiene, including nutrition and diet and health habits; (6) mental aspects of disease, delinquency, and feeble-mindedness; (7) legal relations of sanitation and hygiene; (8) maternity and child hygiene; (9) collection and interpretation of statistics of births, deaths, and sickness; (10) methods of organizing and administering public-health work. To meet the growing demand for proper public-health training the Foundation, on the initiative of the International Health Board, has endowed a School of Hygiene and Public Health at Johns Hopkins University, has enabled Harvard University to reorganize its courses into a new School of Public Health, has agreed to provide land, buildings, and equipment for a School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine in London, and has contributed substantially to institutes of public health in Prague and Warsaw. During 1923, in the development of this plan, a half-million was appropriated to Harvard, an interim maintenance fund was voted to the London School, and building appropriations were made to the Czechoslovak and Polish governments. . . .

The Rôle of the Trained Nurse

Created by the demands of war, the trained nurse became a necessity in peace. At the bedside in home and hospital, in the tuberculosis sanatorium, in the dispensary, in the maternity center, in the factory and store, in the crowded tene-

ment district, in the isolated countryside, the nurse in her professional garb has become a part of contemporary life in the United States, in Great Britain, to some degree in continental Europe, and in other countries. The type of nurse, her social and professional status, her education and training, her salary, and her future outlook vary widely from country to country, with differences in traditions, social ideals, educational standards, economic conditions, and religious influences. In one place she may be hardly more than a slightly sublimated servant; in another, intelligent, highly trained, well paid, socially esteemed, enjoying a professional status; in a third, a devoted and experienced member of a religious order, giving her life to the service of the sick and the unfortunate; in a fourth, well trained and respected, but poorly paid and over-worked.

The contacts of allied medical and hospital units during the war, the European services of the national Red Cross Societies, the activities of the League which these societies formed, and the work of various American organizations in France have all emphasized national differences in ideals and standards of nursing service and of nurse training, have aroused interest and discussion, and have set at work international influences. It is to be hoped, by exchange of ideas and experience and by interchanges of personnel through fellowships and visiting delegates, that stimulus will be given to nations which have been slow to develop nursing services, and that useful suggestions will be made, even to the countries which have regarded themselves as leaders in the movement.

The chief ideas which emerge from present discussions of nursing and nurse training seem to be: (1) the desirability of making the course of training more consciously educational and less of a routine apprenticeship; (2) the possibility by this means of shortening the course; (3) the importance of combining, so far as possible, bedside and public-health training; (4) the need, for economic reasons, of creating a new type of nurse's assistant to serve under a registered nurse; (5) the essential value of the visiting nurse as a member of the public-

health staff; (6) an organization of the visiting nurse, the local dispensary, and the town hospital as a partial solution of the problem of medical and health care for rural populations; (7) the recognition that in predominantly Catholic countries hospital administration and to a large extent nursing service will remain a function of the religious orders with which agencies for improving nursing standards must co-operate; and (8) that costs of training and salaries of nurses in a given country cannot rise far beyond a level fixed by general economic conditions and by rates of pay in comparable services.

Lending a Hand in Nurse-training

The Foundation's interest in nursing and nurse-training has found expression (1) in encouragement and financial support of surveys and studies of nursing in the United States and in 12 foreign countries, (2) in aid for a demonstration of newer methods of training, and (3) in contributions to a few projects which aim at improving both general training courses and special courses for public-health nurses.

Following a report made in 1922 after a detailed study of nursing education in the United States by a special committee supported by the Foundation, the trustees pledged in 1923 to Yale University an annual contribution for a five-year period toward an experiment and demonstration in the education of nurses. The essential features of the plan are a more systematically educational organization of instruction, a shorter period of training (28 months), and the inclusion of public health as an organic part of the course.

During 1923 the International Health Board contributed to the nurse-training problem (1) by continuing to co-operate with the Health Department of Brazil in maintaining a general hospital training school, a special course for public-health nurses, and a visiting nurse service in Rio de Janeiro; (2) by aiding in France in preparing health visitors, and in strengthening a few centers for training both bedside and public-health nurses; (3) by lending to the Philippine Government a specialist who has helped in the organization of courses in public-health nursing and the improvement of standards; and

(4) by appropriation to the State Health Department toward an experimental correspondence course for public-health nurses in Ohio.

The China Medical Board continued to maintain a nurse training school in the Peking Union Medical College and to assist a number of hospitals in which nurse-training is carried on.

In Europe studies of nursing education were continued until by the end of 1923 the conditions in ten countries had been observed. The fellowship plan was used to send French and Belgian nurses to England, a Siamese nurse to Peking, and to bring French, Polish, Czechoslovak, and Philippine nurses to America for further study.

Brazil's Final Bout with Yellow Fever

The outstanding feature during 1923 of the systematic, concerted attack upon yellow fever, in which the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation has been engaged since 1916, was the decision of the Brazilian Government to undertake a definitive campaign to eliminate the disease from the seed beds along the northern coast from Pará to Bahia, where fever still appears from time to time. The board warmly welcomed the invitation of the Brazilian authorities to have a part in this work. Noguchi, of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the discoverer of the yellow-fever organism, sailed for Brazil in November to make further studies, and was soon followed by staff members with equipment and supplies.

This latest, and it is to be hoped final, bout with yellow fever in Brazil recalls the brilliant way in which the capital was freed from yellow fever under the leadership of that distinguished scientist and able administrator, Oswaldo Cruz. Graduated from the University of Rio de Janeiro, for four years a student and investigator at the Pasteur Institute in Paris, himself a bacteriologist of distinction, intelligent, resourceful, of compelling personality, an undaunted leader, he overcame all obstacles and opposition and made Rio de Janeiro as safe as it is beautiful.

Oswaldo Cruz's death, in 1917, prevented him from following, as he would have

done with so much satisfaction, the later success of the campaigns organized by the International Health Board; the formation of national yellow-fever commissions in Mexico, Central America, and in northern South America; Noguchi's discovery of the causative organism and his preparation of a vaccine and a serum; the clearing-up (1918-1919) of Guayaquil, in Ecuador, the chief endemic center; the exploratory expedition (1920) to the West Coast of Africa to investigate cases reported there; the elimination of the fever from Peru (1921); the quick control of incipient epidemics in Central America; and the active participation of the Mexican Government in the movement until by 1923 it was possible to make a most encouraging report. The situation in 1923 may be summarized as follows: No cases reported from Mexico, Central America, Ecuador, or Peru; outbreak in Colombia promptly put under observation; well-organized control measures under way in northern Brazil and workers in training to resume study and observation along the coasts of West Africa from which cases of yellow fever have been reported.

Studying the Behavior of Malaria Mosquitoes

Control of malaria is not always so simple as a statement of the essential facts would make it seem. The disease can be transmitted only by certain mosquitoes (the *Anopheles*), which become infective after having fed upon the blood of a person who is suffering from the disease. By the use of quinine the parasites in the blood can be injured or killed, so that there is nothing for the mosquito to transmit. And if the mosquito can be eliminated either by preventing its birth or by luring or screening it away, the dangerous circle may also be broken. When the two procedures can be made to re-enforce each other, effective control is made more certain. But variations in local conditions of mosquito-breeding, in climate, in the character and distribution of populations, in occupations, in the nature of dwellings, in the presence of domestic animals, and in other factors create rather complicated problems which call for a combination of measures peculiarly adapted to each situation.

The International Health Board has been engaged in malaria control work since 1916. Special attention has been given to small towns and rural areas. A large number of demonstrations have shown that under fairly favorable conditions control is at once feasible and economical. But from the first the need of further facts has been recognized and staff members have devoted a good deal of time to studies of various kinds. During 1923 special malaria investigations were carried on in the United States, Brazil, Nicaragua, Palestine, the Philippine Islands, Salvador, and Porto Rico. In connection with control measures in many parts of the United States incidental observations of importance were also made.

A film which shows in detail the cause, transmission, effects, cure, and prevention of malaria was prepared during the year under the auspices of the International Health Board.

The board continued to participate in demonstrations of malaria control in which local governments, State boards of health, and the United States Public Health Service shared. In 1923 the program included 66 county-wide projects and 82 town demonstrations in 12 States. These demonstrations offered additional proof that under ordinary conditions many communities can reduce malaria to an almost negligible point, at per capita costs which are within the limits of local taxation.

"Parasites Lost and Parasites Regained"

This phrase, which reports the impression of a Fijian schoolboy after he had heard on the same day a talk about hookworms and an address on Milton, describes precisely what happens unless proper precautions are taken. The life cycle of the hookworm is a vicious circle.

Since 1910, when the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission (later merged into the International Health Board) began hookworm work in the Southern States, campaigns have been carried on in many parts of the tropical and subtropical zones within which hookworm disease handicaps and enfeebles millions every year, reducing economic efficiency, causing unhappiness, and increasing mortality. The policy of the board is to work only with

governments, which (1) assume some part of the cost from the beginning, (2) agree to undertake the installation of latrines, and (3) promise to take over the entire responsibility for the project at the end of a given period. The usual plan of campaign includes (1) an infection survey, (2) an intensive demonstration of treatment, together with (3) the education of the public in the cure and prevention of the disease, (4) installing of latrines, and (5) resurveys at intervals to measure the degree of control which has been secured.

During 1923 the board carried on hookworm work in Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Saint Lucia, Trinidad, Porto Rico, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Salvador, Colombia, Dutch Guiana, Brazil, Australia, Fiji, Siam, Ceylon, India, and Mauritius. Resurveys were made in a few Southern States where hookworm control as such has been merged in the programs of county health units, as is also the case in one or two States of Brazil. An invitation to co-operate with the Government of Mexico was accepted.

Simple as hookworm control appears, there is much still to be learned about the nature of the disease and methods of dealing with it. A special study of hookworm infestation in China by a parasitologist of the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health was financed by the board. Staff members in all parts of the world made useful observations on the effects of a new vermifuge on the simplification of treatments, on the wearing of shoes as a protection, and on reported hookworm in pigs. One doctor found the Australian aborigines eager to take treatments in return for a gift of tobacco. The board's film, "Unhooking the Hookworm," continued to prove useful in instructing the public.

Rural Health and Happiness

Hookworm disease and, to a considerable extent, malaria and typhoid fever are rural problems. . . . The average county health program includes: inoculation against typhoid, smallpox, and diphtheria; building of sanitary, fly-proof latrines; medical inspection of school children, with dental and tonsil clinics; maternity care and infant welfare; control of communicable diseases generally,

including special attention to tuberculosis; and education of the community in public and personal hygiene. The typical full-time staff comprises a health officer, a sanitary inspector, one or more visiting nurses, and an office clerk. Motor transportation is provided. The average total annual cost of such a health service in the counties with which the board is co-operating is \$10,000.

The Doctor and Public Health

There are certain small nations which have low death-rates, although there seems to be little done in the way of public-health work as such. The low mortality is credited in part to favorable conditions of climate, food, and outdoor life, but it is said to be largely due to the influence of a well-trained and efficient medical profession, which has the confidence of a public intelligent enough to choose and trust expert guidance. Hence sanitation, quarantine, inoculation, and hygienic living become a part of daily routine and are fixed in the official machinery, social customs, and personal habits of the people. In all this the physicians, esteemed and trusted, play a leading part.

In all lands doctors are an essential part of the public-health movement. They report births, causes of death, and cases of communicable disease. Upon them depends the introduction of new resources of diagnosis and treatment; for good or ill they educate their patients; they influence public opinion for or against preventive policies. No health service can prosper permanently unless it can command the loyal support of competent, local practicing physicians. The presence of physicians, poorly trained or with no interest in preventive medicine, or of representatives of various occult, empirical, or fraudulent cults is a serious handicap to sane and effective sanitation and hygiene in a city, town, or countryside.

It follows that medical education plays an essential part in the leadership and success of public-health work. The Rockefeller Foundation is concerned, therefore, in aiding influential medical schools in many parts of the world to improve their facilities, to strengthen their teaching staffs, to perfect their methods, to maintain high standards, and grad-

ually, in the words of a distinguished British medical authority, to "permeate the curriculum with the preventive idea." With respect to the last suggestion, the International Health Board is supporting in a leading American medical school a plan which aims at getting every teacher to emphasize the preventive and community aspects of every topic with which he deals in his regular courses.

Medical Education Around the World

During 1923 the Division of Medical Education continued to gather facts about the medical schools, numbering approximately 450, which are to be found in 74 countries of the world. Much of the material was secured by post, but a good deal was brought home by representatives who personally visited schools in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Turkey, Hongkong, the Straits Settlements, Siam, Canada, England, Scotland, Wales, the Netherlands, Jugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Mexico, and Colombia. The data collected have to do with buildings, equipment, curriculum, staff, annual budget, and other significant points.

The returns so far received reveal a world-wide distribution of certain national influences. Thus British ideas and methods give character in varying degrees to medical schools throughout the Empire, from Canada to the Cape and from Halifax through Hongkong to Bombay. The French or Latin tradition predominates in southern and western Europe, in Algeria and Syria, in Central and South America, and in Indo-China. German medicine is found to be fundamental in central and northern Europe and in Japan. In addition to these variations due to historical causes, the medical schools of the world display wide differences in resources, personnel, standards, and aims, due to varying racial, economic, governmental, and social conditions.

International co-operation between medical centers the world over is tending to make these differences less pronounced. One aim of the Foundation is to facilitate the contacts and intercommunications by which this international exchange of ideas is accomplished. By aiding schools to

send official representatives abroad, by inviting commissions from one country to visit another, and by stimulating an international exchange of professors, it is hoped that gradually fruitful interchanges and progressive adaptations will take place.

As a contribution to this end, the Division of Medical Education has had in preparation during 1923 a series of bulletins in which well-known professors in different medical schools in several countries will describe recent developments of buildings, equipment, and teaching methods in their respective departments. These will be sent to medical schools throughout the world. For example, a series of papers will deal with new or projected anatomical laboratories. In this service the Foundation seeks merely to serve as a means of disseminating promptly and accurately reports of new ideas and methods which have been found especially useful and effective in different medical schools of the world.

Since the Foundation began to have a part in medical education it has aided in varying degrees 117 medical schools in 31 different countries. The policy has been: (1) to help for the most part only such medical centers as are likely to make significant experiments, demonstrate progressive methods, and set standards which will have a wide influence; (2) to contribute only a part of the funds needed for a given project, with the understanding that the remainder will be provided from other sources; (3) to assume no responsibility for administration or supervision of institutions to which gifts have been made; but simply (4) to help faculties and trustees to hasten the realization of plans which they have worked out and in which they have genuine faith. Furthermore, (5) no assistance is ever given to a medical school until after a representative of the Division of Medical Education has visited it and conferred personally with its teachers and administrators.

The kind of aid which the Foundation gives varies with the special circumstances of each situation. Here a contribution to a laboratory may seem most useful; there an addition to general endowment may be indicated; in a third case equipment and

permanent income for a particular department may be deemed important to round out an otherwise well-balanced institution. Again, aid to premedical education may appear to be the first needed step; or for still another school traveling fellowships for teachers and a few visiting professorships may be desirable.

In accord with the policy which has just been described, offers were made to certain medical schools in the British Isles, contingent upon improvements or reorganization contemplated by their authorities. The medical education program of 1923 also included a gift of \$500,000 to the University of Alberta (Canada) toward the endowment of its clinical teaching, a pledge of \$250,000 toward a total of a million dollars for laboratories of anatomy and physiological chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania, and an authorization for the Director of the Division of Medical Education to confer with the authorities of the King Edward VII Medical School of Singapore with a view to considering some form of co-operation with that institution.

A Medical Center in the Orient

The visitor to Peking today who has had no warning in advance is surprised to find, on the site of what was once the palace of a Chinese prince, a group of beautiful buildings which make a somewhat puzzling impression. At first glance they seem to be of classic Chinese architecture. The curved roofs of glazed tiles, the elaborately decorated eaves, the formal courts, the white-marble steps and balustrades, the main gate guarded by archaic lions—all seem characteristically Chinese; but on closer examination other features are noted. The buildings are of brick—two, three, or even four stories high. The windows are large and glazed. Yonder rises a tall chimney evidently belonging to a power-house. Half hidden at one side one recognizes the storage tank of a gas plant. Here evidently is an institution of the West which has assumed some outer aspects of the East. It is the Peking Union Medical College, built, equipped, and maintained with funds supplied by the Rockefeller Foundation through the China Medical Board.

In these laboratories, class-rooms, and

hospital pavilions teaching and research are being carried on in the modern scientific spirit, by well-trained men and women from many parts of the world. The 78 members of the medical school and hospital staffs who hold medical degrees represent 38 medical colleges of 11 different countries. In increasing numbers Chinese scientists and doctors are being welcomed as members of the faculty and advanced to positions of responsibility. In a premedical course students are being prepared to enter the regular undergraduate medical school. A school of nursing is a part of the plan. Graduate students, Chinese physicians, and medical missionaries on furlough from their stations are pursuing special studies or serving as voluntary assistants. From time to time brief intensive courses are organized in medicine, surgery, the clinical specialties, the fundamental laboratory sciences, and roentgenology for groups of doctors who wish to keep abreast of recent progress. Visiting professors from America and Europe have a share in these courses as well as in other teaching, and bring to the institution the stimulus of their ability, experience, personality, and prestige. In October, 1923, the total number of registered students was 176. The college is a development of an institution founded under missionary auspices. It seeks to perpetuate ideals of high character and loyal service and to work in sympathetic relations with the missionary movement and with the Chinese themselves.

In spite of the heavy burden thrown upon the faculty by the organization and administration of a new institution, a gratifying amount of significant investigation has been done. The scientific papers by members of the staff, collected by the college and issued in an annual volume, have won recognition for the institution as an important center of medical progress. Among a number of investigations reported upon during 1923, a study of kala-azar deserves mention for the thoroughness of the work and the value of the results.

Obviously a modern medical school cannot prosper in isolation. Normally it must have close relations with the educational system; it must command the con-

fidence of the medical profession and must win the support of public opinion. In China peculiar conditions must be met. The national system of education is in process of development. Secondary and higher education has hitherto been provided to a large extent by schools and colleges under foreign control. The number of well-trained Chinese doctors is small. Full appreciation of Western medicine is confined to a relatively few educated Chinese. The China Medical Board has, therefore, aided medical schools, contributed to hospitals as centers of training for doctors and nurses and as a means of education for the public, has co-operated in premedical education, and has granted fellowships for study both in China and in foreign countries. In 1923 contributions were made toward a women's department in the medical school of Shantung Christian University, maintenance funds were continued to that institution and to premedical work and nurse-training at the Hunan-Yale Medical School at Changsha, a gift was made to Canton Christian College for a science laboratory, and pledges were fulfilled by continuing appropriations to 25 hospitals. . . .

The Comradship of Science

Science, as a common fund to which all nations contribute and from which each may freely draw, grows steadily in volume and in value. The world is dotted with centers of research and with individuals who are in quest of truth. These scientists are in frequent communication through the printed page, the visits of fellow-workers, and international congresses. One can trace the outlines at least of a vast co-operation which tends more and more to ignore national frontiers. In this teamwork of the nations the medical scientists and the sanitarians have an inspiring part. They not only feel the thrill of discovery and of high adventure in coping with the problems which challenge their knowledge and skill, but they know the satisfaction of safeguarding life and of alleviating suffering. They have, too, a sense of comradeship in enriching "the patrimony of humanity" and in attacking a common enemy. This spirit not only hastens the progress of science, but it offers hope of more sym-

pathetic insight and closer accord in world relations. By promoting the migration of scientists and administrators, by helping to diffuse more rapidly new ideas, by strengthening world centers of teaching and research—in short, by fostering medical science and public health as forms of international co-operation—the Rockefeller Foundation seeks to fulfill the purpose of its charter, "the well-being of mankind throughout the world."

TEACHING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THROUGH SOCIAL STUDIES*

By JESSIE C. EVANS

William Penn High School, Philadelphia

YOU will remember that Dr. Robinson in "The Mind in the Making" starts out with the statement: "If some magical transformation could be produced in men's ways of looking at themselves and their fellows, no inconsiderable part of the evils which now afflict society would vanish away or remedy themselves automatically. If the majority of influential persons held the opinions and occupied the point of view that a few rather uninfluential people now do, there would, for instance, be no likelihood of another great war; the whole problem of 'labor and capital' would be transformed and attenuated; national arrogance, race animosity, political corruption, and inefficiency would all be reduced below the danger point." One of the most discouraging things about life is one's inability to make any impression on the opinions of most grown-up people. Who has not after an effort to discuss, let us say, the labor question, or the League of Nations, been glad to change the subject to the weather, which, at least, offers no opportunity for violent differences of opinion? But we teachers of the younger generation, having what some may consider an unfair advantage over our audience, may hope to *try* at least to bring about the "magical transformation."

I can already feel dissent in the air. Some years ago I was present at a discussion here in New York led by Dr. Beard,

* This article appeared in *The Historical Outlook* in October, 1923.

in which the consensus of opinion seemed to be that the wise teacher had no opinion, at least, in the classroom! The first time I addressed this association, many years ago, I was rebuked by an eminent historian for presuming to suggest that history might be interpreted by the teacher. So I must hasten to justify myself by saying that I have not an intention of suggesting propaganda of any sort. Nothing but the truth should be taught in any classroom, and the chief aim of any teacher of history should be to teach his pupils to think for themselves. But it is perfectly evident that nowhere except in the history seminar can all the facts of history be presented; a choice must be made. The responsibility of making this choice rests upon the teacher and textbook writer. By the choice of subjects for discussion the minds of the young people may be directed into the paths desired. All this is apropos of teaching international relations.

Fortunately for the purpose of our discussion the importance of our subject no longer needs any proof. In 1918, and even in 1920, interest in international relations seemed confined to a few, but the developments of the post-war period have convinced all but the most hard-headed advocates of "normalcy" of the existence of a world community. To students of history, economics, and social conditions it has long been evident that the intense nationalism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was merely a phase of development, recent in its origin, and no more sure of permanency than any other phase of human history. The increasing complexity of modern life, with its interlocking political and social interests, means either international suicide or international co-operation. Even those in high places who are estopped by recent political history from taking the path into the existing League of Nations are willing to admit that much.

If it is the chief duty of the teacher of the social studies to train his pupils for worthy citizenship in the community, what shall we consider to be the community? We have taken up the home, the school, the neighborhood, the city, the State, and the nation. Now it seems that the world as a community claims our attention.

To train for world citizenship, the teacher should try to develop (1) appreciation of international interests, (2) appreciation of the contributions of other nations to our common heritage, (3) love of humanity, regardless of race or color, (4) appreciation of the essential unity of human history, (5) pride in national achievements for world benefit rather than mere national aggrandizement at the expense of others.

To accomplish these purposes it is not necessary to introduce new courses into an already-crowded curriculum. The essentials are World History (including the History of the United States), Economics, Civics, Sociology, Geography, and Current Events. Our first step is to be sure that these are required of all students. Until this is done it is futile to suggest special courses in international relations, which would be unintelligible unless based upon these studies. It is a deplorable fact that many high and preparatory schools have the most fragmentary courses in the social studies. Students are graduated with only Ancient History, or only American History, or only Industrial History. Such schools, far from preparing for world citizenship, are not preparing even for intelligent American citizenship. But, even if we could afford the time, a special course would seem to me to be undesirable in the secondary school. The aims in view can be much better secured by a new emphasis in the standard courses.

Just as United States History and Civics are fundamental to the teaching of national citizenship, so World History is fundamental to the understanding of world citizenship. It is strange to realize how recent is the movement for the teaching of World History! In a way it is a return to the practice of twenty-five years ago, but with a great difference. General History, useful in its time, was a compendium of information; World History, as now taught, is a study of human progress. In the interval between the two we divided our history into national compartments, thus emphasizing a separation which existed more in imagination than in reality. Mr. Wells attacked that sort of history in 1919 in his well-known fashion:

"The History of England has the effect of something going on upon a doormat in a passage outside a room full of events and with several other doors. The door opens, the Norman kings rush out of the room, conquer the country hastily, say something about some novelty of which we have learned nothing hitherto, the Crusades, and exit to room again.

"From which presently King Richard returns dejected. He has been fighting the Saracens. Who are the Saracens? We never learn. What becomes of them? We are never told. So it goes on. The broad back of history is turned to England throughout. Its face and hands are hidden and we make what we can of the wriggling of its heels.

"The American story is still more incomprehensible. An innocent continent is suddenly inundated by Spanish, Portuguese, French, Dutch, and British, who proceed at once to pick up the threads of various conflicts, initiated elsewhere. Some one called the Pope is seen to be dividing the new continent among the European powers. Colonies are formed. What are colonies? These colonies, in what is apparently a strenuous attempt to simplify history, break off from their unknown countries of origin. A stream of immigration begins from west and east. The American mind establishes a sort of intellectual Monroe Doctrine and declares that America has no past, only a future. From which sublime dream it is presently aroused to find something of unknown origin called European imperialism wrecking the world. What is this imperialism? How did it begin?

"Suppose other subjects were taught in the same fashion that we adopt for history; suppose we taught human physiology by just sitting down to the story of the liver, only alluding distantly at times to the stomach or to the diaphragm or the rest of the body. Would students ever make anything of physiology?"

When he followed this declaration by an excursion into the historical field himself to do what he felt no historian had the courage or the insight to do, he offended and startled the historical brotherhood. However, they soon began to realize that the public were with him, and then began to try to beat him at his own game.

World History, sympathetically taught, affords the opportunity to give the young people most of the ideas which I suggested: Appreciation of international interests, of the contributions of other nations to our common heritage, of human progress, of the essential unity of human history and love of humanity. Of course, the teacher must be on the lookout for opportunities to stress these ideas. He must be careful lest he "fails to see the wood because of the trees." I remember one successful lesson of mine, memorable because the class for once did me credit when a visitor was in the room. We were discussing Charlemagne's empire-building and his ideal of a universal State, which should bring peace and order to the distracted world. The girls were easily led to go back to Alexander and Cæsar for comparison. I ventured on Napoleon, who was really outside their range at that time, but some knew of him. It being war time, we paid our respects to the Pan-German dream of universal kultur and then passed on to Woodrow Wilson's ideal of the League of Nations. The discussion of the world State became so interesting that our visitor joined in and we had a thoroughly socialized recitation. I hope that the members of the class remember that lesson as well as I do!

Another lesson on internationalism which pleased me (there were no visitors to bear me witness of its success) occurred the other day in a discussion of Lehman's picture of the siege of a city in the fourteenth century. I asked the question, "Why do not our cities have walls like those of the middle ages?" The members of the class were able to show how our national organization for protection had taken the place of the small units of the feudal period. They were much amused at the folly of a method which would have required New York and Philadelphia to build walls and maintain armies against each other. I then raised the question of the possible opinion of people two or three centuries from now as to the folly of *nations* arming against each other. After a long discussion the bell rang with one irreconcilable still holding out for the difference in language as an insuperable bar to a community of nations.

Miss Tuell, in her little book, "The Study of Nations," has shown us in admirable fashion how we may teach appreciation of the characteristics and contributions of other nations. Whether we follow her method or not we may accomplish the purpose by taking some leaves out of her book. Ambassador Geddes, in a memorable address in Philadelphia recently, said that he considered the false teaching of history one of the greatest bars to the amity of nations. As a Scot, he said that it was drilled into him as a boy that the English were an ignorant, stupid, blundering, inferior race. But he humorously remarked that he got out of that opinion in spite of his bad start. Every nation has written some page of its history to glorify itself at the expense of another nation. We might give as examples the accounts in the older textbooks of the American Revolution and the War of 1812.

Next to World History in its importance for our purpose is the study of current events. Whether this is taken as a separate course or as a continuing part of all courses in the social studies, it cannot fail, if interpreted by a teacher of broad interests, to impress the students with the importance of international questions. In fact, ever since the outbreak of the World War the current periodicals have been so filled with European news that it is hard to find time for national and local events. I happened to overhear two girls who were working the other day as a committee on our school bulletin board. "Now, what do you think o' that," said one, "'most all we got is European news!" "That just shows," replied her companion, "what them foreigners can do!"

Economics may be treated from a purely national point of view. But, again, the teacher who wishes to do so can make almost every topic international in scope. Take, for example, the conservation of natural resources. That used to be merely a question of whether or not we were going to make America's material possessions serve the future generations of her own people. The last few years have shown us that it is perhaps the paramount world issue. Ambassador Geddes, in the speech to which I have just referred, said that in his opinion the questions which would make or mar the peace

of the world in the future were connected with lumber, coal, and oil. Those who have attended the recent luncheons of the Foreign Policy Association must be impressed by that fact. The economic issues are the ones which are going to make us have to live in peace or commit national suicide. Communication, transportation, trade, corporations of international scope entangle our affairs so with those of other nations that we can no longer exist separately.

Labor problems occupy a large place in any course in economics. They may be treated from a purely American point of view, but any broad consideration must lead at once to world questions: the international organizations of labor, the attempts of the socialist labor groups to bring about internationalism, immigration, the effect of world markets upon employment, the racial elements in the present labor force, and many others.

It would be better for our purpose if United States History could be taught as part of world history, and in some progressive schools that is being done. It is undoubtedly a mistake to do as Mr. Wells charges: establish a sort of intellectual Monroe Doctrine. However, there are so many purely national questions which must be understood in order to train for *American* citizenship that a separate course is defensible. Such a course should, however, follow one in World History and contain constant cross-reference to foreign affairs.

The Monroe Doctrine itself is too often considered apart from the world situation which brought it about. The Jacksonian Period is usually treated as a curious group of phenomena peculiar to our country, with no reference to the great democratic revolution proceeding at the same time in Europe. The wave of humanitarianism of the middle of the nineteenth century is frequently not at all connected with the period of reform in England and France. A little care on the part of the teacher will show that our social development was but a part of a general movement. So, also, is it with the treatment of the industrial revolution, the financial panics, and a host of other things.

I have already referred to the tendency which we share with all other nations to

attempt to twist history so as to make it appear to our advantage and to the disadvantage of some other nation. It is strange that this had seemed to be necessary in order to feed our national pride. Are we not great enough, have we not enough to be proud of without claiming what is not ours? There is no harm in admitting some mistakes and failures. Our national pride should be based upon our real achievements, our contributions to the stream of world progress. What matters if the War of 1812 was not as glorious a success as we used to think it was? Did we not give to the world the cotton gin, the reaper, and the farm tractor? Did we not return the Chinese indemnity that it might be used for the education of young China? Has our charity not fed the starving of the whole world? Would that we had more world services to recount; but let us make the most of those we have, rather than of the aggrandizement which we have secured at the expense of Mexico and Spain!

In training world citizens, we must train them not only to be "historically minded," but internationally minded. It is curious how fearful people are of the word "international"! I suppose that is because of its adoption by the socialists. There seems to be a feeling that one cannot be internationally minded without being in some way disloyal to one's country. It is as though it were to be said that if a man loved his city he must therefore have no regard for his home. While, on the contrary, the more he loved and worked for his city the better his home would be cared for.

In the teaching of civics, as in American History, our first interest is, of course, to make good American citizens. Most of the time must be occupied in the accomplishment of that purpose. It is perfectly possible, however, to have international interests in mind even there. Curiously enough, that was first impressed upon my mind by a small seventh-grade boy in a summer-school class. We were developing together the various communities to which we all belonged: the home, the school, the city, the State, the nation. When we seemed to stop there he insisted that the world was also our community, and we all agreed with him. The discussion of health leads to the

question of foreign relations through quarantine against world epidemics, the inspection of immigrants, the difference in standards of living among immigrant groups. The study of municipal government is much enriched by comparisons with methods of sanitation, housing, transportation, and the like in European cities. The study of the work of Congress would not be complete without a discussion of the treaty-making power of the Senate and its predominant influence on our foreign relations. It would probably be unseemly for the teacher to point out the great need of training in world citizenship of candidates for the Senate!

Above all things, we must teach the meaning of *progress*, both for national and for world citizenship. An appreciation of the growth of ideas is the best preparation for an acceptance of growth and change in contemporary society. If we could only train up a generation who were expectant of change, and who welcomed it when it is for the betterment of mankind, it would not matter what particular ideas we tried to inculcate! In their day, which will not be ours, world problems may have developed in a way entirely unforeseen by us. The important thing is that they should have open and sympathetic minds and should have acquired the habit of thinking internationally.

“**W**HAT a discovery I made one day, that the more I spent the more I grew, that it was as easy to occupy a large place and do much work as an obscure place to do little; and that in the winter in which I communicated all my results to classes, I was full of new thoughts. . . . If a man knows the law, he may settle himself in a shanty in a pine forest, and men will and must find their way to him as readily as if he lived in the City Hall. . . . Penetrate to the bottom of the fact that draws you, although no newspaper, no poet, no man, has ever yet found life and beauty in that region, and presently when men are whispered by the gods to go and hunt in that direction, they shall find that they cannot get to the point which they would reach without passing over that highway which you have built. Your hermit's lodge shall be the Holy City and the Fair of the whole world.”

RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

PARTY PLATFORMS AND FOREIGN POLICIES

FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(NOTE.—Following is the text of the sections of the platform adopted by the Republican National Convention in Cleveland on June 11, 1924, dealing with the foreign policies which are advocated by the Republican Party.)

Permanent Court of Justice

The Republican Party reaffirms its stand for agreement among the nations to prevent war and preserve peace. As an important step in this direction, we endorse the Permanent Court of International Justice and favor the adherence of the United States to this tribunal, as recommended by President Coolidge. This government has definitely refused membership in the League of Nations, and to assume any obligations under the Covenant of the League. On this we stand.

While we are unwilling to enter into political commitments which would involve us in the conflict of European policies, it should be the purpose and high privilege of the United States to continue to co-operate with other nations in humanitarian efforts in accordance with our cherished traditions.

The basic principles of our foreign policy must be independence without indifference to the rights and necessities of others and co-operation without entangling alliances. This policy, overwhelmingly approved by the people, has been vindicated since the end of the great war.

America's participation in world affairs under the administration of President Harding and President Coolidge has demonstrated the wisdom and prudence of the national judgment. A most impressive example of the capacity of the United States to serve the cause of world peace without political affiliations was shown in the effective and beneficent work of the Dawes Commission toward the solution of the perplexing question of German reparations.

New Disarmament Conference

The first conference of great powers in Washington called by President Harding accomplished the limitation of armaments and the readjustment of the relations of the powers interested in the Far East. The conference resulted in an agreement to reduce armaments, relieved the competitive nations involved from the great burdens of taxation arising from the construction and maintenance of capital battleships, assured a new, broader and better understanding in the Far East; brought the assurance of peace in the region of the Pacific, and formally adopted the policy of the open door for trade and commerce in the great markets of the Far East.

The historic conference paved the way to avert the danger of renewed hostilities in Europe, and to restore the necessary economic stability. While the military forces of America have been reduced to a peace footing, there has been an increase in the land and air forces abroad which constitutes a continual menace to the peace of the world and a bar to the return of prosperity.

We firmly advocate the calling of a conference on the limitation of land forces, the use of submarines and poison gas, as proposed by President Coolidge, when, through the adoption of a permanent reparations plan, the conditions in Europe will make negotiations and co-operation opportune and possible.

Treaties and Agreements

By treaties of peace, safeguarding our rights and without derogating those of our former associates in army, the Republican Administration ended the war between this country and Germany and Austria. We have concluded and signed with other nations during the last three years more than fifty treaties and international agreements in the furtherance of peace and good will.

New sanctions and new proofs of permanent accord have marked our relations with Latin America. The long-standing contro-

versy between Chile and Peru has been advanced toward settlement by its submission to the President of the United States as arbitrator, and with the helpful co-operation of this country a treaty has been signed by the representatives of sixteen American republics, which will stabilize conditions on the American continent and minimize the opportunities for war.

Our difficulties with Mexico have happily yielded to a most friendly adjustment. Mutual confidence has been restored and a pathway for that friendliness and helpfulness which should exist between this government and the government of our neighboring republic has been marked. Agreements have been entered into for the determination by judicial commissions of the claims of the citizens of each country against the respective governments. We can confidently look forward to more permanent and more stable relations with this republic that joins for so many miles our southern border.

Policy of Practical Aid

Our policy, now well defined, of giving practical aid to other peoples without assuming political obligations has been conspicuously demonstrated. The ready and generous response of America to the needs of Japan gave evidence of our helpful interest in the welfare of the distressed in other lands.

The work of our representatives in dealing with subjects of such universal concern as the traffic in women and children, the production and distribution of narcotic drugs, the sale of arms, and in matters affecting public health and morals, demonstrated that we can effectively do our part for humanity and civilization without forfeiting, limiting, or restricting our national freedom of action.

The American people do cherish their independence, but their sense of duty to all mankind will ever prompt them to give their support, service, and leadership to every cause which makes for peace and amity among the nations of the world.

Foreign Debts

In the fulfilment of our solemn pledge in the national platform of 1920, we have steadfastly refused to consider the cancellation of foreign debts. Our attitude has not been that of an oppressive creditor seeking immediate return and ignoring existing financial con-

ditions, but has been based on the conviction that a moral obligation such as was incurred should not be disregarded.

We stand for settlements with all debtor countries similar in character to our debt agreement with Great Britain. That settlement, achieved under a Republican Administration, was the greatest international financial transaction in the history of the world. Under the terms of the agreement the United States now receives an annual return upon \$4,600,000,000 owing to us by Great Britain, with a definite obligation of ultimate payment in full.

The justness of the basis employed has been formally recognized by other debtor nations.

Great nations cannot recognize or admit the principle of repudiation. To do so would undermine the integrity essential for international trade, commerce, and credit. Thirty-five per cent of the total foreign debt is now in process of liquidation.

The Tariff

We reaffirm our belief in the protective tariff to extend needed protection to our productive industries. We believe in protection as a national policy, with due and equal regard to all sections and to agriculture, industries, and occupations. It is only by adherence to such a policy that the well-being of the consumers can be safeguarded and that there can be assured to American agriculture, to American labor, and to American manufacturers a return to perpetuate American standards of life. A protective tariff is designed to support the high American economic level of life for the average family and to prevent a lowering to the levels of economic life prevailing in other lands.

It is the history of the nation that the protective tariff system has ever justified itself by restoring confidence, promoting industrial activity and employment, enormously increasing our purchasing power, and bringing increased prosperity to all our people.

The tariff protection to our industry works for increased consumption of domestic agricultural products by an employed population instead of one unable to purchase the necessities of life. Without the strict maintenance of the tariff principle, our farmers will need always to compete with cheap lands and cheap labor abroad and with lower standards of living.

The enormous value of the protective principle has once more been demonstrated by the emergency tariff act of 1921 and the tariff act of 1922.

We assert our belief in the elastic provision adopted by Congress in the tariff act of 1922, providing for a method of readjusting the tariff rates and the classifications in order to meet changing economic conditions when such changed conditions are brought to the attention of the President by complaint or application.

We believe that the power to increase or decrease any rate of duty provided in the tariff furnishes a safeguard on the one hand, against excessive taxes, and, on the other hand, against too high customs charges.

The wise provisions of this section of the tariff act afford ample opportunity for tariff duties to be adjusted after a hearing, in order that they may cover the actual differences in the cost of production in the United States and the principal competing countries of the world.

We also believe that the application of this provision of the tariff act will contribute to business stability by making unnecessary general disturbances which are usually incident to general tariff revision.

FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(NOTE.—The sections of the Democratic platform, as adopted in New York City, June 28, 1924, referring to our foreign policies, are as follows:)

War

War is a relic of barbarism and it is justifiable only as a measure of defense.

In the event of war in which the man power of the nation is drafted, all other resources should likewise be drafted. This will tend to discourage war by depriving it of its profits.

Disarmament, War Referendum, and National Defense

We demand a strict and sweeping reduction of armaments by land and sea, so that there shall be no competitive military program or naval building. Until agreements to this end have been made, we advocate an army and navy adequate for our national safety.

Our government should secure a joint agreement with all nations for world dis-

armament and also for a reference of war, except in case of actual or threatened attack.

Those who must furnish the blood and bear the burdens imposed by war should, whenever possible, be consulted before this supreme sacrifice is required of them.

League of Nations

The Democratic Party pledges all its energies to the outlawing of the whole war system. We refuse to believe that the wholesale slaughter of human beings on the battlefield is any more necessary to man's highest development than is killing by individuals.

The only hope for world peace and for economic recovery lies in the organized efforts of sovereign nations co-operating to remove the causes of war and to substitute law and order for violence.

Under Democratic leadership a practical plan was devised under which 54 nations are now operating and which has for its fundamental purpose the free co-operation of all nations in the work of peace.

The Government of the United States for the last four years has had no foreign policy, and consequently it has delayed the restoration of the political and economic agencies of the world. It has impaired our self-respect at home and injured our prestige abroad. It has curtailed our foreign markets and ruined our agricultural prices.

It is of supreme importance to civilization and to mankind that America be placed and kept on the right side of the greatest moral question of all time, and therefore the Democratic Party renews its declaration of confidence in the ideals of world peace, the League of Nations and the World Court of Justice as together constituting the supreme effort of the statesmanship and religious conviction of our time to organize the world for peace. Further, the Democratic Party declared that it will be the purpose of the next administration to do all in its power to secure for our country that moral leadership in the family of nations which, in the providence of God, has been so clearly marked out for it. There is no substitute for the League of Nations as an agency working for peace; therefore we believe that, in the interest of permanent peace, and in the lifting of the great burdens of war from the backs of the people, and in order to establish a permanent foreign policy on these supreme questions, not subject to change with change of party administrations,

it is desirable, wise, and necessary to lift this question out of party politics, and to that end to take the sense of the American people at a referendum election, advisory to the government, to be held officially, under act of Congress, free from all other questions and candidacies, after ample time for full consideration and discussion, throughout the country, upon the question, in substance, as follows:

"Shall the United States become a member of the League of Nations upon such reservations or amendments to the covenant of the League as the President and the Senate of the United States may agree upon?"

"Immediately upon an affirmative vote we will carry out such mandate."

Asiatic Immigration

We pledge ourselves to maintain our established position in favor of the exclusion of Asiatic immigration.

Armenia and the Lausanne Treaty

We condemn the Lausanne Treaty. It barbers legitimate American rights and betrays Armenia for the Chester oil concession.

We favor the protection of American rights in Turkey and the fulfillment of President Wilson's arbitral award respecting Armenia.

Republic of Greece

We welcome to the sisterhood of republics the ancient land of Greece, which gave to our party its priceless name. We extend to her government and people our cordial good wishes.

MR. LA FOLLETTE'S FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. La Follette's foreign policies constitute article four of his faith as adopted in Cleveland, Ohio, July 4. This article is as follows:

We denounce the mercenary system of degraded foreign policy under recent administrations in the interests of financial imperialists, oil monopolists, and international bankers, which has at times degraded our State Department from its high service as a strong and kindly intermediary of defenseless governments to a trading outpost for those interests and concession seekers engaged in the exploitation of weaker nations, as contrary to the will of the American people, destructive of domestic development, and provocative of war. We favor an active foreign policy to bring about a revision of the Ver-

sailles Treaty in accordance with the terms of the armistice and to promote firm *treaty agreements* with all nations to outlaw wars, abolish conscription, *drastically reduce land, air, and naval armaments*, and guarantee public referendums on peace and war.

In supporting this program we are applying to the needs of today the fundamental principles of American democracy, opposing equally the dictatorship of plutocracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We appeal to all Americans without regard to partisan affiliation, and we raise the standards of our faith, so that all of like purpose may rally and march in this campaign under the banners of progressive union.

The nation may grow rich in the vision of greed. The nation will grow great in the vision of service.

THE LEAGUE TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AND THE UNITED STATES

(NOTE.—Following is the text of (1) the treaty of mutual assistance, submitted to the United States by the Secretary General of the League of Nations; and (2) the reply of the Department of State.)

TEXT OF THE TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

Preamble

Pact of Non-aggression.—The High Contracting Parties, being desirous of establishing the general lines of a scheme of mutual assistance with a view to facilitate the application of Articles X and XVI of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and of a reduction or limitation of national armaments in accordance with Article VIII of the Covenant "to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations," agree to the following provisions:

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that aggressive war is an international crime and severally undertake that no one of them will be guilty of its commission.

A war shall not be considered as a war of aggression if waged by a State which is party to a dispute and has accepted the unanimous recommendation of the Council, the verdict of the Permanent Court of International Justice, or an arbitral award against a High Contracting Party which has not accepted it, provided, however, that the

first State does not intend to violate the political independence or the territorial integrity of the High Contracting Party.

Article 2

General Assistance.—The High Contracting Parties, jointly and severally, undertake to furnish assistance, in accordance with the provisions of the Present Treaty, to any one of their number should the latter be the object of a war of aggression, provided that it has conformed to the provisions of the present Treaty regarding the reduction or limitation of armaments.

Article 3

In the event of one of the High Contracting Parties being of opinion that the armaments of any other High Contracting Party are in excess of the limits fixed for the latter High Contracting Party under the provisions of the present Treaty, or in the event of it having cause to apprehend an outbreak of hostilities, either on account of the aggressive policy or preparations of any State party or not to the present Treaty, it may inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that it is threatened with aggression, and the Secretary-General shall forthwith summon the Council.

The Council, if it is of opinion that there is reasonable ground for thinking that a menace of aggression has arisen, may take all necessary measures to remove such menace, and in particular, if the Council thinks right, those indicated in sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the second paragraph of Article 5 of the present Treaty.

The High Contracting Parties which have been denounced and those which have stated themselves to be the object of a threat of aggression shall be considered as especially interested and shall therefore be invited to send representatives to the Council in conformity with Articles IV, XV and XVII of the Covenant. The vote of their representatives shall, however, not be reckoned when calculating unanimity.

Article 4

In the event of one or more of the High Contracting Parties becoming engaged in hostilities, the Council of the League of Nations shall decide, within four days of notification being addressed to the Secretary-General, which of the High Contracting Parties are

the objects of aggression and whether they are entitled to claim the assistance provided under the Treaty.

The High Contracting Parties undertake that they will accept such a decision by the Council of the League of Nations.

The High Contracting Parties engaged in hostilities shall be regarded as especially interested, and shall therefore be invited to send representatives to the Council (within the terms of Articles IV, XIII and XVII of the Covenant), the vote of their representatives not being reckoned when calculating unanimity; the same shall apply to States signatory to any partial agreements involved on behalf of either of the two belligerents, unless the remaining Members of the Council shall decide otherwise.

Article 5

The High Contracting Parties undertake to furnish one another mutually with assistance in the cases referred to in Article 2 of the Treaty in the form determined by the Council of the League of Nations as the most effective, and to take all appropriate measures without delay in the order of urgency demanded by the circumstances.

In particular, the Council may:

(a) Decide to apply immediately to the aggressor State the economic sanctions contemplated by Article XVI of the Covenant, the Members of the League not signatory to the present Treaty not being, however, bound by this decision, except in the case where the State attacked is entitled to avail itself of the Articles of the Covenant;

(b) Invoke by name the High Contracting Parties whose assistance it requires. No High Contracting Party situated in a continent other than that in which operations will take place shall, in principle, be required to co-operate in military, naval or air operations;

(c) Determine the forces which each State furnishing assistance shall place at its disposal;

(d) Prescribe all necessary measures for securing priority for the communications and transport connected with the operations.

(e) Prepare a plan for financial co-operation among the High Contracting Parties with a view to providing for the State attacked and for the States furnishing assistance the funds which they require for the operations;

(f) Appoint the Higher Command and

establish the object and the nature of his duty.

The representatives of States recognized as aggressors under the provisions of Article 4 of the Treaty shall not take part in the deliberations of the Council specified in this Article. The High Contracting Parties who are required by the Council to furnish assistance, in accordance with sub-paragraph (b), shall, on the other hand, be considered as especially interested, and, as such, shall be invited to send representatives, unless they are already represented, to the deliberations specified in sub-paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (f).

Article 6

Complementary Defensive Agreements.—For the purpose of rendering the general assistance mentioned in Articles 2, 3, and 5 immediately effective, the High Contracting Parties may conclude, either as between two of them or as between a larger number, agreements complementary to the present Treaty exclusively for the purpose of their mutual defense and intended solely to facilitate the carrying out of the measures prescribed in this Treaty, determining in advance the assistance which they would give each other in the event of any act of aggression.

Such agreements may, if the High Contracting Parties interested so desire, be negotiated and concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

Article 7

Complementary agreements, as defined in Article 6 shall, before being registered, be examined by the Council with a view to deciding whether they are in accordance with the principles of their Treaty and of the Covenant.

In particular, the Council shall consider if the cases of aggression contemplated in these agreements come within the scope of Article 2 and are of a nature to give rise to an obligation to give assistance on the part of the other High Contracting Parties. The Council may, if necessary, suggest changes in the texts of agreements submitted to it.

When recognized, the agreements shall be registered in conformity with Article XVIII of the Covenant. They shall be regarded as complementary to the present Treaty, and shall in no way limit the general obligations of the High Contracting Parties nor the

sanctions contemplated against the aggressor State under the terms of this Treaty.

They will be open to any other High Contracting Party with the consent of the signatory States.

Article 8

The States parties to complementary agreements may undertake in any such agreements to put into immediate execution, in the cases of aggression contemplated in them, the plan of assistance agreed upon. In this case they shall inform the Council of the League of Nations, without delay, concerning the measures which they have taken to ensure the execution of such agreements.

Subject to the terms of the previous paragraph, the provisions of Articles 4 and 5 above shall also come into force both in the cases contemplated in the complementary agreements and in such other cases as are provided for in Article 2 but are not covered by the agreements.

Article 9

Demilitarized Zones.—In order to facilitate the application of the present Treaty, any High Contracting Party may negotiate, through the agency of the Council, with one or more neighboring countries for the establishment of demilitarized zones.

The Council, with the co-operation of the representatives of the Parties interested, acting as Members within the terms of Article IV of the Covenant, shall previously ensure that the establishment of the demilitarized zone asked for does not call for unilateral sacrifices from the military point of view on the part of the High Contracting Parties interested.

Article 10

Cost of Intervention.—The High Contracting Parties agree that the whole cost of any military, naval or air operations which are undertaken under the terms of the present Treaty and of the supplementary partial agreements, including the reparation of all material damage caused by operations of war, shall be borne by the aggressor State up to the extreme limits of its financial capacity.

The amount payable under this Article by the aggressor shall, to such an extent as may be determined by the Council of the League, be a first charge on the whole of the assets and revenues of the State. Any repayment by that State in respect to the principal

money and interest of any loan, internal or external, issued by it directly or indirectly during the war shall be suspended until the amount due for cost and reparations is discharged in full.

Article 11

Disarmament.—The High Contracting Parties, in view of the security furnished them by this Treaty and the limitations to which they have consented in other international treaties, undertake to inform the Council of the League of the reduction or limitation of armaments which they consider proportionate to the security furnished by the general Treaty or by the defensive agreements complementary to the general Treaty.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to co-operate in the preparation of any general plan of reduction of armaments which the Council of the League of Nations, taking into account the information provided by the High Contracting Parties, may propose under the terms of Article VIII of the Covenant.

This plan should be submitted for consideration and approved by the Governments, and, when approved by them, will be the basis of the reduction contemplated in Article 2 of this Treaty.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to carry out this reduction within a period of two years from the date of the adoption of this plan.

The High Contracting Parties undertake, in accordance with the provisions of Article VIII, paragraph 4, of the Covenant, to make no further increase in their armaments, when thus reduced, without the consent of the Council.

Article 12

The High Contracting Parties undertake to furnish to the military or other delegates of the League such information with regard to their armaments as the Council may request.

Article 13

The High Contracting Parties agree that the armaments determined for each of them, in accordance with the present Treaty, shall be subject to revision every five years, beginning from the date of the entry into force of this Treaty.

Article 14

Reservation for Existing Treaties.—Nothing in the present Treaty shall affect the rights and obligations resulting from the

provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations or of the Treaties of Peace signed in 1919 and 1920 at Versailles, Neuilly, Saint Germain and Trianon, or from the provisions of treaties or agreements registered with the League of Nations and published by it at the date of the first coming into force of the present Treaty as regards the signatory or beneficiary Powers of the said Treaties or agreements.

Article 15

Compulsory Jurisdiction of the Court.—The High Contracting Parties recognize from today as *ipso facto* obligatory, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice with regard to the interpretation of the present Treaty.

Article 16

Signature, Adhesion, Ratification, Denunciation.—The present Treaty shall remain open for the signature of all States Members of the League of Nations or mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

States not Members shall be entitled to adhere with the consent of two-thirds of the High Contracting Parties with regard to whom the Treaty has come into force.

Article 17

Any State may, with the consent of the Council of the League, notify its conditional or partial adherence to the provisions of this Treaty, provided always that such State has reduced or is prepared to reduce its armaments in conformity with the provisions of this Treaty.

Article 18

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible at the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

It shall come into force:

In Europe when it shall have been ratified by five States, of which three shall be permanently represented on the Council;

In Asia when it shall have been ratified by two States, one of which shall be permanently represented on the Council;

In North America when ratified by the United States of America;

In Central America and the West Indies when ratified by one State in the West Indies and two in Central America;

In South America when ratified by four States;

In Africa and Oceania when ratified by two States.

With regard to the High Contracting Parties which may subsequently ratify the Treaty, it will come into force at the date of the deposit of the instrument. The Secretariat will immediately communicate a certified copy of the instruments of ratification received to all the signatory Powers.

It remains understood that the rights stipulated under Articles 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 of this Treaty will not come into force for each High Contracting Party until the Council has certified that the said High Contracting Party has reduced its armaments in conformity with the present Treaty or has adopted the necessary measures to ensure the execution of this reduction, within two years of the acceptance by the said High Contracting Party of the plan of reduction or limitation of armaments.

Article 19

The present Treaty shall remain in force for a period of fifteen years from the date of its first entry into force.

After this period, it will be prolonged automatically for the States which have not denounced it.

If, however, one of the States referred to in Article 18 denounces the present Treaty, the Treaty shall cease to exist as from the date on which denunciation takes effect.

This denunciation shall be made to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, which shall, without delay, notify all the Powers bound by the present Treaty.

The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the date on which notification has been communicated to the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

When the period of fifteen years, referred to in the first paragraph of the present Article has elapsed, or when one of the denunciations made in the conditions determined above takes place, if operations undertaken in application of Article 5 of the present Treaty are in progress, the Treaty shall remain in force until peace has been completely re-established.

REPLY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JUNE 16, 1924.

The Honorable HUGH S. GIBSON,

American Minister, Berne.

SIR: I enclose, for transmission by you in the usual manner, a communication to the

Secretary General of the League of Nations, in reply to one addressed by him on January 9, 1924, to the Secretary of State, requesting, in conformity with a direction of the Council of the League, the views of the Government of the United States as a government not a member of the League of Nations, respecting a draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

For the Secretary of State:

JOSEPH C. GREW.

[Enclosure]

The Secretary of State of the United States of America has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a communication of the Secretary General of the League of Nations, submitting, by direction of the Council of the League of Nations, the draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance, proposed by the Third Committee to the Fourth Assembly, and requesting the expression of the views of the Government of the United States.

In reply it may be said that the Government of the United States is most desirous that appropriate agreements should be reached to limit armament and thus to reduce the heavy burdens of expenditure caused by unnecessary and competitive outlays in providing facilities and munitions of war. The desire and purpose of this government were fully manifested when the great military and naval powers were invited by the President of the United States to send representatives to meet in conference at Washington in 1921, for the purpose of considering the limitation of armament. While that conference resulted in the conclusion of an important naval treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan for the limitation of capital fighting ships, it was found to be impossible to obtain an agreement for the limitation of the tonnage of auxiliary naval craft or to make any progress in the direction of limitation of land forces. The Government of the United States, having reduced its own armament, continues to cherish the hope that the desired result in the case of other powers may be achieved, and it notes with keen and sympathetic interest every endeavor to that end. In this spirit the draft treaty submitted has been carefully considered.

It appears from the preamble of the treaty that it has been formulated with the desire "of establishing the general lines of a scheme of mutual assistance with a view to

facilitate the application of Articles 10 and 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and of a reduction or limitation of national armaments in accordance with Article 8 of the Covenant "to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations."

The following provisions of the draft treaty may be especially noted:

(Here the Department quotes) Articles 2, 3, 4, and 5, of the proposed treaty.

Without attempting an analysis of these provisions, or of other provisions of the draft treaty, it is quite apparent that its fundamental principle is to provide guarantees of mutual assistance and to establish the competency of the Council of the League of Nations with respect to the decisions contemplated, and, in view of the constitutional organization of this government and of the fact that the United States is not a member of the League of Nations, this government would find it impossible to give its adherence.

The Government of the United States has not failed to note that under Article 17 of the draft treaty "Any State may, with the consent of the Council of the League, notify its conditional or partial adherence to the provisions of this treaty, provided always that such State has reduced or is prepared to reduce its armaments in conformity with the provisions of this treaty," but it would not serve a useful purpose to consider the question of a conditional or partial adherence on the part of the Government of the United States when the conditions imposed would of necessity be of such a character as to deprive adherence of any substantial effect.

Department of State, Washington, June 16, 1924.

CANADA AND THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE

(NOTE.—The British Government has issued, as a White Paper (Cmd. 2146), the correspondence between it and the Canadian Government on the subject of the settlement with Turkey, effected at Lausanne. Following are some significant portions of this correspondence.)

Invitation to Canada

The correspondence opens with the following telegram, sent on October 27, 1922, by the Duke of Devonshire, Secretary of State

for the Colonies, to the Governor-General of Canada, for the Prime Minister of Canada:

Yesterday invitations were sent by governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy to the Japanese, Rumanian, Yugoslav, Greek, and Turkish governments (both of Constantinople and of Angora) to send representatives to Lausanne, November 13, to conclude treaty to end war in east, which would replace Treaty of Sèvres, Russian Soviet Government and Bulgarian Government also being invited to send to Lausanne, at a date to be fixed, representatives to take part in discussions on questions of the Straits, which the conference will undertake at a later stage. Inquiry is also being addressed by the three governments to the Government of the United States, expressing hope that they will permit United States representatives to be present during Lausanne negotiations, in a capacity similar to that in which United States representative was present during negotiations at San Remo, in 1920, or to take more active part in the negotiations, especially on question of the Straits.

According to arrangements agreed upon with French and Italian governments, each government will be represented at Lausanne by two plenipotentiaries. Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will personally act as chief British plenipotentiary, and it is proposed that he should be accompanied by British High Commissioner at Constantinople. Dominion governments will be kept informed from time to time of the general lines of policy on which British plenipotentiaries propose to proceed, and of the course of negotiations, and, as in case of the other treaties arising out of the peace settlement, they will of course be invited to sign new treaty and any separate instruments regulating status of the Straits.

His Majesty's Government trusts that this procedure will be in accordance with wishes of your government.

British plenipotentiaries are fully acquainted with the imperial aspect of the problem and with the keen interest taken by the Dominion governments in its solution. Similar telegram sent to other Prime Ministers.

Canadian Reservation

On October 31 the Governor-General transmitted the following reply to the Secretary of State from the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King):

Our government has no exception to take to the course pursued by His Majesty's Government with respect to the conclusion of a treaty to end the war in the Near East. As, however, it is proposed to keep our government informed from time to time of the general lines of policy on which British plenipotentiaries propose to proceed and of the course of the negotiations, and to invite us to sign a new treaty and any separate

instrument regulating the status of the Straits, we deem it advisable to avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity to inform His Majesty's Government that in our opinion extent to which Canada may be held to be bound by the proceedings of the conference or by the provisions of any treaty or other instrument arising out of the same is necessarily a matter for the Parliament of Canada to decide, and that the rights and powers of our Parliament in these particulars must not be held to be affected, by implication or otherwise, in virtue of information with which our government may be supplied.

Through the medium of the Secretary of State and the Governor-General, the Prime Minister (Mr. Bonar Law) sent the following telegram to the Canadian Prime Minister, under date of November 16:

I brought your message of October 31, as to Lausanne Conference, before Cabinet today. We fully understand that it is the desire of Canadian Government that any treaty with Turkey which may result from conference should be submitted to Canadian Parliament for approval before His Majesty is advised to ratify it. It is our most earnest desire that you should be kept fully informed of the developments of the conference and we shall endeavor to send you full details.

Through the Governor-General the Canadian Prime Minister telegraphed:

November 24.—Your Grace's message of November 16, in reply to mine of October 31, concerning Lausanne Conference, was carefully considered by our Cabinet today. We feel that purport of my message of October 31 has not been correctly interpreted or understood. Our government has not expressed a desire to have any treaty with Turkey which may result from conference submitted to Canadian Parliament for approval before His Majesty is advised to ratify it, nor do we wish to be understood as preferring any such request. My message was intended to make clear that we had no exception to take to Canada not being invited to be represented at the conference; but, inasmuch as we had been informed that we would be invited to sign a new treaty and any separate instrument regulating status of Straits, we wished to make it perfectly clear that in our opinion extent to which Canada may be held to be bound by the proceedings of conference or by provisions of any treaty or other instrument arising out of the same was necessarily a matter for the Parliament of Canada to decide. We deem it of utmost importance that there should be no misunderstanding as to our position with respect to Canada's obligations in this and kindred matters. In our opinion, Parliament will desire, as respects treaty with Turkey and any other instru-

ments arising out of Lausanne Conference, to reserve to itself the right to decide, upon the merits of the case, what action on the part of people of Canada is right and proper. In this connection we shall be pleased to have authority to place before Parliament all the information with which we may from time to time be supplied.

British Cabinet's Position

The Secretary of State on December 8 sent the following telegram for transmission to the Canadian Prime Minister:

Treaty with Turkey.—Our message of November 16 was framed on assumption that Canadian Government would wish to follow procedure adopted in case of peace treaties with Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria. I am sorry if your telegram of October 31 was not fully understood here. As you say, it is most important that there should be no misunderstanding on so important a question. May I therefore set our position as it appears to us? It is this: Any treaty resulting from Lausanne Conference will, of course, replace Treaty of Sévres, and until it comes into force a state of war between the British Empire and Turkey will technically continue. The treaty must, therefore, be binding on the whole empire when ratified. It remains to be seen whether there will be successful issue to Lausanne Conference, but if there is we should much prefer that any new treaty should follow Paris precedent and include signatures on behalf of all the dominions. Do I gather from your telegram that the Canadian Government are not averse from procedure proposed as regards signature of new treaty and of any separate instrument regarding Straits, but wish to make it clear that should anything in treaty or instrument be held to impose any serious international obligation on Canada, as part of the British Empire, it cannot be considered binding on Canada, until approved by Parliament? If so, it does not appear to us that procedure which you propose is essentially different from that which we should adopt in relation to Parliament here, if contingency contemplated should arise. In any event, should legislation be required to give effect to technical provisions of treaty, this would presumably necessitate its submission to Parliament in Canada as here.

As regards last sentence of your telegram, would it not be well to wait until it is known whether the Lausanne Conference results in signature of a treaty or treaties, and then lay instruments themselves before Parliament? I do not think that it would be possible to publish any of the telegrams now being sent to you concerning proceedings at Lausanne, seeing that they often contain records of confidential interviews and impressions and other material intended only for private information.

Canadian Reply

On December 31 the Governor-General sent the following telegram from the Canadian Prime Minister:

Treaty with Turkey.—Your Grace's telegram of December 8 begins: "Our message of November 16 was framed on the assumption that Canadian Government would wish to follow the procedure adopted in the case of the treaties with Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria."

Procedure referred to is, we understand, that adopted with respect to Paris Peace Conference, and followed later with respect to Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament. As regards Canada's participation, there were in that procedure four separate, distinct, and essential stages:

1. Direct representation of Canada at the conference at which treaties were drafted and participation in the proceedings of the conferences by Canada's representatives, each representative holding a full power, signed by His Majesty the King, in the form of letters patent, authorizing him to sign "for and in the name of His Majesty the King, in respect of the Dominion of Canada," any treaties, conventions, or agreements that might tend to the attainment of the object of the conference, the Canadian Government having by order in council, sanctioned issuance of these full powers by His Majesty.

2. Formal signing of the treaties on behalf of Canada by the plenipotentiaries named.

3. Approval by the Parliament of Canada of the treaties thus signed on behalf of Canada.

4. Assent of the Government of Canada to the final act of ratification by His Majesty the King of the treaty signed on behalf of Canada approved by Parliament of Canada.

Your Grace is quite right in assuming that, as regards the treaties in which Canada is supposed to have a direct or immediate interest, the procedure here outlined is the one which our government would wish to follow. In the case of main political treaties concluded since the war, the general rule seems to have been followed that, wherever the dominions could be said to have a direct or immediate interest, the procedure was shaped to include their participation and signature of the proceedings. That in the case of the Conference at Lausanne a like procedure has not been followed with respect to representation and participation by Canada has been regarded by us as evidence that, in the opinion of the countries by whom invitations to the Conference at Lausanne were extended, Canada could not have been believed to have the direct and immediate interest which she was supposed to have in the conferences at Versailles and Washington.

To the course pursued with respect to the Lausanne Conference we have, as mentioned in my telegram of October 31, no exception to take. As regards the procedure, however,

it must be apparent that, quite apart from any action or representation on the part of the Government of Canada, a different procedure has been followed in the case of the present Conference at Lausanne to that followed at Versailles and Washington. In so far as one stage in procedure is necessarily dependent upon the stage preceding, it is difficult to see how a like procedure can be followed. Canada has not been invited to send representatives to the Lausanne Conference, and has not participated in the proceedings of the conference, either directly or indirectly. Under the circumstances we do not see how, as respects signing on behalf of Canada, we can be expected, in the case of a new treaty or of any separate instrument regarding Straits, to follow the procedure adopted in the case of the treaties with Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria.

The Signing of the Treaty

The Secretary of State, telegraphing on January 27, 1923, to the Governor-General, said:

Your telegram December 31, Lausanne Conference. Please inform your Prime Minister that in the circumstances His Majesty's Government are willing to fall in with his suggestion that any treaties with Turkey resulting from conference should be signed only by British plenipotentiaries who have negotiated them, if it is generally acceptable. Am ascertaining whether it will be agreeable to prime ministers, Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, and Union of South Africa. [This was done by telegraph and answers obtained in the affirmative.]

The next dispatch is dated June 7, 1923, and was sent by the Secretary of State to the Governor-General. It is as follows:

With reference to my telegram of January 27, I am assuming that if, as is hoped, Conference at Lausanne results in completion of treaties with Turkey, your Prime Minister would wish previous arrangement regarding signature by British plenipotentiaries to hold good.

On June 15 the Governor-General replied:

Your telegram of June 7. In the event of the Conference at Lausanne resulting in completion of treaty with Turkey, Canadian Government are agreeable that the previous arrangement for signature of British plenipotentiaries should hold good.

On February 22, 1924, the Secretary of State (now Mr. Thomas) telegraphed to the Governor-General:

My telegram of today [summarizing the provisions of the Lausanne Treaty], Treaty of Peace with Turkey. In order that necessary action may be taken as soon as possible after bill becomes law, hoped that your

ministers will be in position at very early date to signify concurrence in ratification of treaty and conventions in question, including convention relating to reparation, and also to intimate their wishes as regards declaration in connection with convention respecting conditions of business and commercial convention. See my predecessor's dispatch, August 20, paragraph 3.

[The dispatch of August 20 is not printed. It expressed the hope that the Canadian Government would be in a position to signify, not later than the beginning of December, their concurrence in ratification of the treaty of peace and other conventions, and inquired their wishes as regards declarations under the conditions of business and commercial conventions (Nos. IV and V in Treaty Series, No. 16 (1923), Cmd. 1929).]

No Canadian Ratification

On March 21 the following further telegram was sent by the Secretary of State to the Governor-General:

My telegram February 22. Treaty of Peace Turkey Bill has now been read third time, House of Lords, and hoped to introduce it into House of Commons March 28, and to secure passage within very short period thereafter. Considered extremely important that His Majesty's ratification should take place at earliest possible moment after passage of bill. In the circumstances hoped that your ministers may be in position to reply to my telegram at very early date and, if possible, by end of March.

The Governor-General replied on March 24 as follows:

Your telegram of March 21 and your telegram of February 22. Canadian Government not having been invited to send representative to the Lausanne Conference and not having participated in the proceedings of the conference, either directly or indirectly, and not being for this reason a signatory to the treaty on behalf of Canada (see my telegram of December 31, 1922, to your predecessor), my ministers do not feel that they are in a position to recommend to Parliament approval of the Peace Treaty with Turkey and the convention thereto. Without the approval of Parliament they feel that they are not warranted in signifying concurrence in the ratification of the treaty and convention. With respect to ratification, however, they will not take exception to such course as His Majesty's Government may deem it advisable to recommend. This appears to be in harmony with the resolution of the recent Imperial Conference (Cmd. 1987, pages 14 and 15). The provisions thereof with reference to signature 2 (a) on page 14 and ratification (a) on page 15 appear to cover this case, which is not within the provisions of signature 2 (b) on page 14 and ratification (b) on page 15.

News in Brief

PIERRE PAUL CAMBON, former French Ambassador to London, died in Paris on May 29. Paul Cambon, brother to Jules Cambon, who was ambassador at one time to Washington, was born January 20, 1843. In 1886 he became French Ambassador to Madrid, and two years later went to Constantinople in the same capacity. In 1898 he presented his credentials as Ambassador to the Court of St. James. He was still in London when, six years later, the relations between England and France had reached a critical stage over the Fashoda incident in Egypt. King Edward VII had launched his program to readjust Europe's equilibrium and bring England, France, and Russia together as a means of offsetting the powerful Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy. It was largely through Paul Cambon that the many difficulties were ironed out.

A PAPAL BULL WAS ISSUED MAY 29 by Pope Pius XI. It is an invitation to the faithful to return to holy customs and to restore human society; it declares the year 1925 a holy year. In it he calls upon all non-catholics to celebrate the "twenty-second jubilee" by a return to the "true church." He adjures the faithful to avoid profane distractions, to show modesty in manners and clothes, and to adopt a spirit of penitence during the "Holy Year." "I speak of peace," the pontiff says; "not of peace written in treaties, but peace written on hearts, which must be restored among peoples."

THE SALVADORAN GOVERNMENT has ratified the conventions and agreements signed at the Central American conference in Washington in February, 1923.

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR., has placed \$1,000,000 at the disposal of a Franco-American Committee to reconstruct the roof of the Rheims cathedral, destroyed by the Germans in the World War, and restore and beautify the fountains and gardens at Versailles and Fontainebleau. Mr. Rockefeller is moved to make this gift because, as he

says in a letter to Premier Poincaré dated May 3, "among the treasures of which France is custodian are some which belong to the patrimony of all nations, for their influence is a source of inspiration of universal art."

THE REPUBLIC OF ARGENTINA is presenting to Brazil a collection of 5,059 books by noted Argentine authors. "From the reading of these erudite works," says the *Journal de Brazil*, "one cannot but derive the conviction that our powerful neighbor nation has always worked for the preservation of peace, which it considers indispensable for the realization of its cherished ideals."

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION on the study of industrial fatigue is the subject of an article by Mr. D. R. Wilson, Secretary of the British Industrial Fatigue Research Board, in a recent publication of the International Labor Office. One experiment in a coal mine, dealing with the effect of lighting, shows that better illumination, because of its influence on fatigue, may bring about an improvement of nearly 15 per cent in output. Such examples show that the worker unconsciously responds immediately to his physical environment to an extent which, if not unknown before, had never been measured numerically. Second, they indicate that the selection of the best conditions for the worker is an economic proposition as well as a social duty.

A COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT in 1921 to investigate the wages and old-age pensions of women workers of the State has recently presented its report in a volume of nearly 300 pages. The committee suggests a common wage system for male and female employees, with provision for the application of the family-wage principle, and finds that a certain difference in the wages paid to male and female employees is justifiable on the following grounds:

(1) The rate of sickness among the female employees has been proved to be greater by more than 40 per cent than that of the men;

(2) Women occupy a special position as regards old-age pensions, having regard to their lower qualifying age (generally three years lower than for men) and their longer average life;

(3) Relative output of work of men and women; and

(4) Certain other factors, such as the liability of men to conscription and the impos-

sibility of the State ignoring wage conditions on the general labor market.

Exceptions from this general conclusion, however, are proposed for female employees who attain the higher grades of the public service. In such grades to which promotion is made according to proved merit, men and women would nominally receive the same rate of pay. The women members of the committee state in a memorandum that they do not consider the proposed solution of the women's wages question satisfactory from the point of view of principle, nor final, but, having regard to the financial position of the State and in order not to run the risk of postponing the coming into force of the new act relating to the eligibility of women for State employment, they have considered themselves bound to agree to the proposal now submitted.

LIBERIA, AFRICA'S WELL-KNOWN REPUBLIC, is one of the best wooded little countries in the world. In the northwest and northeast portions of Grand Capt Mount District, for example, there are sections of from sixty to seventy miles of forests containing walnut, mahogany, cherry, peach, redwood, mulberry, white gum, greasy peach, sweet gum, etc. This range runs along the entire Anglo-Liberian boundary for two hundred and fifty miles. One of the great drawbacks here is that there are no manufactories, such as sawmills, planing mills, and sash and door factories. All the sawing of the largest timbers is done in the most primitive way, by hand.

THE SUEZ CANAL TRAFFIC IN 1923 surpassed all previous records, reaching 22,730,162 net tons, an increase of 1,986,917 tons, or 9.6 per cent, over 1922 and of 13.4 per cent over 1913. The number of ships was 464 less than in 1913, but the average net tonnage per ship had risen from 3,940 in 1913 to 4,919 in 1923. The recovery in the cargo movement through the canal has been continuous since 1919, but the total is still below the pre-war level.

GERMANY WAS, BEFORE THE WAR, the principal export market of the American dried-fruit trade. In 1913 Germany bought dried fruits amounting to 77,500,000 pounds from this country. In the first six months of 1924 such imports amounted to 77,000,000 pounds. Indications point, therefore, to continued increase in the dried-fruit market in Germany.

LETTER BOX

JAMAICA PLAIN,
BOSTON, MASS.

DEAR SIR:

Perhaps you may be inclined to give the enclosed place in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

Yours sincerely,

C. F. DOLE.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE AMERICAN PEACE AWARD

I have not known what to do with the proposed Peace Plan, except, using your kind permission, to write this brief answer to your question without signing the card.

(A) I cannot see anything but a remote connection between the Prize Plan and the great object—permanent peace. There is no attempt to grapple with the appalling evil of war.

(I) I see little wisdom for the nation or the individual to make preparation for litigation in anticipation of the need. Let us seek to keep out of courts, while pledged and ready, if necessary, in all cases to use some appropriate form of arbitration. The disposition to be just is the great thing, without which the best court offers a new field of possible friction.

(II) The position of a nation which desires to sit in with the League of Nations, without full membership, seems obscure and anomalous. I cannot see how the present oligarchical constitution of the League would open the door for such half-way membership or how our Senate would sanction it.

(1) I am grateful to your committee for stressing the emphasis which the Prize Plan lays on the fact "that the only kind of compulsion which nations can freely engage to apply to each other in the name of peace is that which arises from conference, from moral judgment, from full publicity, and from the power of public opinion." This statement is the chief contribution of your plan. Should not the Senate of the United States be now urged to make a public assurance that our nation henceforth proposes to trust in and use only this method of friendly urgency in all our dealings with other nations?—

(2) I believe that the Monroe Doctrine, having long outgrown whatever usefulness it ever had, ought to be "scrapped," as a dangerous, meddlesome, and imperialistic pretension to the hegemony of the Western Continent, obnoxious to the peoples south of us, and provocative and distrustful to the nations overseas. As now held, the Monroe Doctrine is the most subtle stay of American militarism.

(3) This section in the brief of your plan does not go far enough. We need to move for something more curative and purifying to the conscience of the world, namely, the complete removal from the Versailles Treaty of the cruel falsehood which charges Germany with the sole blame of the war. How can we look for permanent peace while we are content to remain a party to a constant injustice?

(4) Of course, we wish to see no pariah nation outside of any general league which we may join. In fact, the cheerfulness of our hospitality toward Germany, Russia, Turkey, and Mexico will be the measure of our sincerity as a democratic people.

(5) We see little use at present in drawing or codifying international laws. Our "international law" is now weighted with the traditions of bloody and barbarous times. The less legislation, the less danger of disagreements and friction. The group of sixty or more nations ought to be like a roomful of acquaintances who know well enough how to behave and propose to treat one another as gentlemen. They will easily develop whatever simple rules of behavior which they need, as soon as they agree to carry no murderous weapons in one another's company.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES F. DOLE,

President of the Association to Abolish War.
Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass., March 10, 1924.

A NOTE.—The purpose of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* is to promote international understanding. Our readers have been interested to know more of the controversies between Bulgaria and Jugoslavia, particularly over the actions of the Macedonian revolutionaries. We are glad to print further correspondence between Dr. Matthéeff, of Bulgaria, and Captain Gordon Gordon-Smith, of the Jugoslav Legation in Washington.—THE EDITOR.

SOFIA, BULGARIA, March 8, 1924.

To the Editor of the Advocate of Peace:

The aim of your paper is the attainment of peace and, of course, to avoid strife. I

am sorry to see that my communication, you kindly published in your issue for February last, has led to bitterness and abuse on the part of an opponent.

I laid before your readers some details of an incident which occurred in Sofia, in Bulgaro-Yugoslavian relations, in the mildest language possible, considering the outrageousness of the case. My object was peaceful; to draw the attention of your readers, who should be particularly sensitive in the face of a case in which decency and ordinary respect for justice in international relations are wantonly disregarded, and which are bound to lead to a dangerous crisis, that they may contribute to the non-repetition of such conduct.

The incident in question is of the greatest significance, coming so soon after the Italo-Greek-Corfu affair, which would have brought on a new war had Greece been championed as Serbia was by Russia in 1914.

Violence and abuse do not forward the defense of a just cause. Such are, however, the habitual and only arms of Mr. G. Gordon-Smith in defense of Serbia. He not only throws the entire blame on Bulgaria, but reviles her rule and even existence.

In my statement of facts I qualified the incident as a home scandal, and said that the man mostly involved took refuge in the Yugoslav legation and was denied to the authorities charged with the investigation. Mr. G. Gordon-Smith has found it safer to take no notice of these details.

The assault was committed in the military attaché's apartment, at an hour at which he was habitually absent, on his servant, by comrades fallen out with him on account of a woman of low morals. A contemptible affair which should have been left there.

The military attaché was the man most surprised when he heard of the outrageous procedure his government had decided upon.

The withdrawal of the demand for an inquiry, and that for the indemnity to be fixed by The Hague Tribunal, has not the shadow of a generous action on the part of Yugoslavia, as Mr. G. Gordon-Smith asserts, but the consent of Bulgaria is undoubtedly such. Bulgaria's greatest wish was to have the opportunity of placing her case before an official international body.

The incessant threatening attitude Yugoslavia, armed to the teeth, holds toward Bulgaria, disarmed by the treaty, obliged Bulgaria to execute the outrageous ultimatum and also to consent to the withdrawal of the

two points in question—for the sake of peace and quiet. Vain hope.

Two years ago the Yugoslav Government threatened to march into Bulgaria to put an end to the alleged organization of armed bands to operate in Yugoslav territory, Macedonia. Bulgaria demanded an inquiry on the spot, and the question was referred to the Conference of Ambassadors. Yugoslavia objected before the conference to such an inquiry and pleaded for a friendly understanding between the parties concerned. Bulgaria generously accepted.

Mr. G. Gordon-Smith has introduced in this discussion also the question of Macedonia, a festering sore for Serbia. As to the conditions ruling at present in that ancient unhappy land, the inclosures herewith will enlighten your readers, should you find it opportune to publish them. These inclosures are: a confidential circular of the late Minister of the Interior, Mr. D. Drashkovitch, to the authorities there, systematizing unheard-of terror over the population, and a petition from Union of the Organized Macedonian Emigrants to the Secretariat General of the League of Nations.

The common opinion of the local diplomatic corps on the subject is that the incident should have been treated with contempt and forgotten. They all have reported the case to their respective governments in that light. I have not the least objection to Mr. G. Gordon-Smith assuring himself of this fact by an inquiry in the archives office of the State Department in Washington. Further, the same diplomatic corps is of one mind—that the ultimatum and its peremptory execution must ultimately redound to the advantage of Bulgaria. Mr. G. Gordon-Smith's bringing in international law and the privileges of a member of the diplomatic corps cannot bear him out; the case is a low scandal between low men involved with a low woman.

Propaganda, you say in the first paragraph of your editorial, in the same issue, covers multitude of sins. It is of such sins that Mr. G. Gordon-Smith is suffering. He has suffered from them since 1918, in company with his friend, Professor Reiss, and others. He cannot lose an opportunity to revile everything Bulgarian. He has in this instance arrayed a list of political murders against the Bulgarian Government. I think the less a spokesman for Serbia speaks of political murders the better for that country. Of the nine princes who have ruled over

Serbia, some were foully murdered and all the rest were dethroned and exiled. Only one died in his bed at home without adventure. He was expiring when the rights to the throne came to him. The most atrocious political murder ever committed on king and queen was perpetrated by the Serbians. For years the late King Edward refused to send his representative to King Peter, father of the present King of Yugoslavia. Why? Surely Mr. G. Gordon-Smith knows the story.

Mr. G. Gordon-Smith, as all Serbians, insists upon the responsibility of Bulgaria for the desperate work the Comitadjis are carrying on in Macedonia. I mentioned before how two years ago Bulgaria was driven to appeal for an inquiry on the spot, and how Yugoslavia withdrew from the contest before the Ambassadors Conference, sitting then in London. He stands up for the wretched Stamboliski, late dictator-tyrant of Bulgaria, and claims for him hard work for friendly relations between the two countries. Those who have been interested in the situation will remember how Belgrade repulsed and scoffed at the efforts Stamboliski made to that end.

We have on the one hand Bulgaria, bound down, defenseless, overburdened with reparations, helpless as regards her neighbors—this by the force of a mercileas treaty; on the other hand Serbia, bloated out into Yugoslavia, three times greater than Bulgaria, with an army ten times that of Bulgaria, and in complete understanding with Rumania and Greece to keep Bulgaria down. It is, therefore, unthinkable, under such conditions, of Bulgaria dreaming of an injurious action against Yugoslavia. Bulgaria is clean on that point, and is ever ready to have every accusation Yugoslavia brings against her submitted to an impartial inquiry.

Unfounded imputations, bitterness of language, and abuse cannot improve conditions and contribute to friendly understanding between the two countries; still less tyrannical ultimatums demanding peremptory execution, with troops menacing your frontier.

Impartial inquiry into complaints or incidents and honest adjustment of differences are the only means to a definite settlement. Bulgaria is open to such, is ever entreating for them.

Serbia or Yugoslavia refuses such means, and no denial of Mr. G. Gordon-Smith or anybody else will prove the contrary.

P. M. MATTHÉEFF.

WASHINGTON, March 31, 1924.

To the Editor of the Advocate of Peace by Justice:

SIR: I am completely unwilling to continue indefinitely a polemic with M. Matthéeff. I must, however, take exception to his statement that my last communication to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE was characterized by "bitterness and abuse," and that "violence and abuse are the habitual and only arms of Mr. G. Gordon-Smith." I am unaware of any occasion on which I "reviled the rule of Bulgaria and even her existence." I am of opinion that I have remained courteous in everything I have written, and have stated my arguments with studied moderation of language.

I have no desire to return to the discussion of the attack on Colonel Kristich, the military attaché of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in Sofia. In my last communication to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE I accepted M. Matthéeff's own version of the incident, and merely pointed out that I saw no undue hardship in the Bulgarian Government being called upon to express its regrets or in the rendering of military honors to the legation which had thus been grossly outraged.

That I, "like all Serbians, insist upon the responsibility of Bulgaria for the desperate work of the Comitadjis are carrying out in Macedonia," is true. I see nothing unreasonable in such an attitude. Todor Alexandroff, the brothers Brlo, and other Comitadjis leaders prepare their raids on Bulgarian soil and take refuge there when pursued by the Serbian gendarmerie. As the Sofia Government is responsible for the maintenance of law and order in Bulgaria, the Yugoslav Government is completely justified in calling upon the Tzankoff Ministry to put an end to the activities of the Comitadjis.

It may be, as is currently reported, that they are powerless to do so and dare not arrest Todor Alexandroff and the other leaders. If this is the case, a very grave situation is created, and it will be for the Belgrade Government to take the measures which it demands.

As regards the circular of M. Drashkovitch, former Minister of the Interior, I see nothing to take exception to in the document. It offers amnesty and pardon for all past offenses to all who lay down their arms, and only threatens punishment to those who persist in their criminal activities.

I trust that this somewhat sterile polemic is now closed. Nothing that M. Matthéeff has said has given me any reason to change my views regarding what he himself describes as "the desperate work of the Comit-adjs." They are Bulgarians, or at least subject to the authority of the Bulgarian Government. Is it unreasonable to ask it to put an end to this "desperate work"?

Yours very sincerely,

G. GORDON-SMITH.

MINNEAPOLIS, 1924.

GENTLEMEN :

For the first time I have recently read two of your last issues. I am convinced of the sincerity of your desire to aid in achieving international peace, but some statements in an article entitled "French Imperialism" lead me to question whether you are familiar with certain facts in the deplorable struggle between France and Germany now going on in Europe, which France has been carrying on offensively since the Armistice.

May I submit for your consideration a few references and personal observations? Quoting from the *Century Magazine* of February, 1924, an article by Francis Hackett, is the following:

"In France we find the meanest, self-seeking, bitter, un-Christian vengefulness, the most unscrupulous chauvinism, and a totally corrupt press. A nation that had suffered from militarism uses a cruel militarism to avenge itself. It uses black troops against the Germans, spreads syphilis among the German women, lavishes the death penalty, wrecks industry, fails to pay its own debts, and yet expects monstrous sums in reparation."

Again, from an article by Pierrepont B. Noyes, former U. S. Rhineland Commissioner, in *The Nation*, March 14, 1923:

"It is a pity that we cannot discuss the situation in Europe with a single eye to the misfortunes of France and the reparation justly due her. Our present task, however, is to examine, as unemotionally as possible, whether the policy that nation's rulers have elected to pursue is wise, or whether, in seeking reparation and revenge for the disaster, she is likely to bring upon herself and upon the rest of the world immensely worse disasters."

"There have been, I believe, two governing factors in bringing about the present Ruhr situation—factors whose recognition will explain many otherwise unexplainable incidents of the future: First, the German indemnity has at all times been fixed at an immensely

larger amount than any country of Germany's size could possibly pay: second France knows this; she has always known this; she has purposely insisted on a figure which would insure German default. Ever since 1920 the political power in France has been in the hands of men who regarded the destruction of Germany as immensely more important than the collection of reparations."

The following is from an article by Brigadier General P. R. C. Groves, in the *Atlantic Monthly* of February, 1924, "For France to Answer":

"With the best will in the world, it is no longer possible to support the claim that French air policy, which is the driving force behind this new and fervid competition in armaments, is dictated by the danger of a camouflaged development of air power in Germany."

I believe it is safe to say that the greatest danger to peace today is in the present struggle between France and Germany; and struggle it surely is, to any one who has examined and observed the conditions along the Rhine since the Armistice. I have done so. I have lived and studied with the French since the war, and have traversed a good part of Germany. A statement by Marshal F. Foch in the *Outlook* of March 16, 1921, prompted me to make an investigation along the Rhine during my twelve months' stay in Europe soon afterward.

I cannot agree with you that France is fighting for her security, or in defense of civilization, with her African savages and their tactics. In my opinion, she is doing everything to outrage her neighbor and make war inevitable—all this under the guise of peace, security, and in quest of reparations.

France and Germany are neighbors. At present the most intense hate abounds in both countries against the other—hate and fear until war is to decide—what? It would seem there had been not enough destruction and slaughter during the last war. That these two great nations, both wrong-doers, both with so much to their credit, should be at loggerheads in this deplorable fashion is more than unfortunate.

I sincerely wish France to be forever relieved of a recurrence of the disastrous invasion she has suffered; to be protected against such loss of life as the last war cost her, and to have safeguarded those many things precious and dear to her; but I cannot condone her intention to ruin Germany,

body and soul, and as many Germans as well; nor could I expect Germans to deliver themselves to the voracious French leaders. The Treaty of Versailles stands. As a contract, it has been broken oftentimes; it rests on force. Past events should indicate what such violence will lead to.

I hope the Treaty of Versailles will be revised. I hope France will realize soon that she cannot kill her neighbor without killing herself; that she cannot convince the world that her vile methods will bring her what she desires; that in mutual understanding will be found a hope for peaceful relations in the future. For Americans who have not witnessed actual conditions in Europe, it is hard to understand the realities of the situation. There is too much that is good in both France and Germany that they should try to carve out each other's hearts. The Germans feel that death is preferable to perpetual bondage of the vilest sort. And so it is, for they are dying anyway.

As I see it, the problem is how to bring both nations towards a spirit of tolerance and understanding for their respective rights. Therefore I believe you are wrong in giving your support to the present French program, if you desire peace, because in my opinion, which I offer humbly but firmly, the ultimate success of the French program means the negation of every vestige of justice and elemental decency in human relations, and because I believe the continuation of that program will lead to war of the most vicious kind.

If I have mistaken your intentions in this matter, I am in error and would be grateful for a correction.

Very respectfully yours,

J. D. HOLTZERMANN.

BOOK REVIEWS

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, 1922 AND 1923. Amsterdam, 1924. Rand Book Store, 7 East 15th Street, New York. Pp. 167. Price, 60 cents.

The report of the International Federation of Trade Unions on its activities during the

years 1922 and 1923 gives a comprehensive survey of the many-sided activities of the Federation. Thus the report contains a succinct account of the work of the Federation, or the attitude adopted by it in the following spheres: the anti-war movement; the relief action for the German Trade Union movement; the relief for Russia; the reconstruction policy of the I. F. T. U.; the relations of the I. F. T. U. to the Communist Trade Union movement; the work of the labor delegates in the International Labor Office and the relations of the I. F. T. U. to the Socialist and Co-operative internationals. The compactness of this pamphlet makes it very useful to any one who takes an interest in the International Trade Union movement.

THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN, A CENTURY OF HISTORY. By *William Haslam Mills*. 147 pages. Henry Holt and Company, New York. Price, \$2.50.

The *Manchester Guardian* celebrated its Centenary in 1921. It is interesting to note that the first issue of this influential publication appeared May 5, 1821, the day of the death of Napoleon at St. Helena. Mr. Mills points out in his book, entitled *The Manchester Guardian, a Century of History*, that "if we return to the origin of a newspaper established a century ago we shall find ourselves among the things of the mind and spirit. Among movements! Among martyrdoms! A newspaper in that age had much soul and very little substance. It was most probably established not to make money, but to make opinion. It had something to say, but very little to tell." Such was the case of the *Manchester Guardian*, and we have here an interesting and lucidly written account of its history—a history which is, in a sense, a social and political history of England for a hundred years.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND SOME CURRENT ILLUSIONS. By *John Bassett Moore*. Macmillan Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 381. Price, \$4.00.

The author of these essays is the American judge on the bench of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. His has been a life-long study of historical and legal subjects. Here are gathered together essays and addresses written at various times, some as early as 1912 and 1914, others as late as the current year.

In international law, as well as the illusions connected with it, there could scarcely be a better interpreter to his own people. The "illusions" to which Mr. Moore refers are several. One is that breaches of law alter law; another, that property of an enemy subject, brought into a country before a war, impounded during the war, may be confiscated; a third fallacy is that the recent war was unique in its destructiveness. The thirty-years war, the wars of the Spanish succession, and the Napoleonic wars were, he says, fought with greater proportionate loss of life and property.

His report on The Hague conference of 1922-23 on the use of air-craft and radio during the war is most valuable. But the paper of utmost importance just now is that on the World Court. Professor Moore's experience as judge in this court gives his words unique authority. His knowledge of his own countrymen make him the best of interpreters for them. He explains not only the structure of the court, but gives in considerable detail the arguments, opinions, and judgments of the court in the cases in which it has already rendered decisions.

The book is a distinguished contribution, by a most distinguished scholar, to the discussion of subjects increasingly vital to the American citizen.

SOME FOREIGN FICTION

Solomon's Proverbs have omitted to say that ignorance is the beginning of suspicion, and that the discovery of similarity is the mother of understanding. These are statements of fact, nevertheless; and it is also true that all the treatises and essays ever written will not reveal the life of a people as does their fiction.

For these reasons it is sometimes advisable to run over the publishers' lists for current novels and recent translations. These stories, if well done, give an intimate notion of the daily lives of our neighbors over the way, and, what is quite as important, they are apt to give us an amazingly clear impression of their likeness to ourselves; for, under varying local customs and traditions, the same fundamental human emotions are found to sway humanity everywhere.

Like our own fiction, too much of the foreign output is cheap or morbid. Among the better books which have been written or translated this season, a few of the outstanding ones have been chosen for this list.

It is to be hoped, in the interest of international understanding, that a demand for the best that is coming out in Europe and elsewhere will call out an ever-increasing number of translations of such books here.

DOOMSLAND. By *Shane Leslie*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1924. Pp. 370. Price, \$2.50.

Shane Leslie, Nationalist editor of the *Dublin Review*, has here given a curiously impartial picture of Ireland. It is the Ireland of the thirty years preceding the recent revolution—Protestant Ireland, Catholic Ireland, the Gaelic revival, and all the important factions of recent times.

The plot of the story is not so vital as the very living characters and their reactions upon each other. A somber story, but rich with the impulsive, loyal, superstitious, and poetic nature of the Celt.

Upon a substructure of ancient racial history Mr. Leslie has allowed his Gaelic imagination to co-operate with an exquisite style to produce a haunting story of fine finish.

EIGHT PANES OF GLASS. By *Robert Simpson*. Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 301. Price, \$2.00.

Not so beautiful in style as *Doomsland*, this tale of the Scottish Highlands is, nevertheless, fresh and readable. It is slightly reminiscent of *MacLaren*, but not to be compared with *Barrie*.

The story is that of a shrewd little bedridden woman, Janet Cromarty. She industriously manages the fates and futures of most of her little world, whom she watches through her one little eight-paned window.

There seems to be a somewhat undue emphasis upon the marriage theme. Only one of the many matches which Janet plans fails of accomplishment.

Most of the characters stand out distinctly and humorously. One suspects, however, that the author himself was unable to manage two of them. There is an apparent intention to make big John Donaldson the hero of the book, as he was Janet's dearest charge; but somehow the scapegrace Red Roderick MacKay succeeds in being always the most interesting person. Indeed, the story is chiefly worth reading for two persons in it—Janet herself and the bad, reckless, but tender, Red Roderick MacKay.

RED SAND. By *T. S. Stribling*. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 325.

Spanish America, the peon, the aristocrat, but, most of all, universal humanity, find expression in this gay and sorrowful little romance of Venezuela. The style of the book has at times a lack of surface; in other spots it has the polish of poetry and music.

The love of an honest, simple-hearted bull-fighter for the delicately reared, no less simple-hearted daughter of an old Spanish family is developed in all its high lights and shadows. The inevitable contrasts are heightened by the philosophic comments of the poet brother of the girl, who is also an enthusiastic admirer of the peon lover.

The tropical background is indicated with restraint and is therefore an effective means to the understanding of the tale. A sentence, for instance, puts one in the mood for the lover's serenade. "The shadowed lawn was sweet with evening fragrance, and the air was full of those endless insect noises which compose the silence of a tropical night."

The human interest of the story, which moves unerringly to its conclusion, excuses the centering of dramatic interest in the bull-fights; yet these, too, are accurate pictures of one phase of Spanish-American life.

BUBBLES OF THE FOAM. Translated by *F. W. Bain*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Pp. 160.

Like a beautiful piece of Indian jewelry, this book is a pattern of story within story. First, there is the border of comment by the translator, by means of introduction and foot-notes. Then a prolog, which consists of the talk of Maheshwara, the "moon-crested" god, with a goddess who is called "Daughter of the Snows." He narrates the main story to her.

This story, too, has a prolog, telling of the double curse which was pronounced on the goddess of beauty and the selfish god of love. Both are condemned to earth, and their unhappy infatuation constitutes the body of the story. His unhappiness is that of selfishness and its recompense; hers that which follows the delusion of seeking happiness in an earthly love. For, says the philosophy of India, the world is unreal, a delusion; sense is deception; earthly happiness a dream, a mirage, seen because in our loneliness we long for it. Indian philosophy is well illustrated in the tale.

To complete the pattern, many little gems

of folklore or myth story are told by some character in the book to illuminate the theme.

The Indian attitude toward guilt and revenge is exemplified in one of the most poetic passages in this jewel of a book. The "Mooney crested," commenting on the murder of the two villains, says: "And he should have left Aranyani's vindication to the deity, who knew what was necessary far better than himself and had his eye upon it all. For there is no retribution so just, or so sure, or so adequate, or so awful as that which evil-doers lay upon themselves, in the form of their own ill-deeds, which dog them like a shadow, clinging to their heels, from body to body, through birth after birth, till the very last atom of guilt has passed through the furnace of expiation and the very last item of their debt to everlasting Yama has been weighed in his scales and struck from the account and utterly redeemed."

Who shall say that, with all its passivity and age-long sadness, the soul of the Brahmin has no strength or hope?

MARIFLOR. By *Concha Espina*. Translated by *Frances Douglas*. Macmillan Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 425. Price, \$2.50.

This romance of the Spanish Highlands was awarded the highest prize in the gift of the Spanish Academy. It is a tale set among the Maragatans, a primitive tribe of Spanish peasants. These ancient people are the remnant of the earliest inhabitants of Spain.

By way of contrast, two characters are taken from the more polished and modern life of the country. But the story concerns particularly the hard, bitter lives of the Maragatan women, wringing meager existence from the unfriendly steppe.

The book is written in a flowery, romantic manner, not much followed in English since the days of Cooper. The particular lack is, as always in the florid style, its lack of humor. Yet the studies of character ring true from start to finish.

There is almost no plot except the inevitable stresses of character upon character. Unlike the story of "The Betrothed," the Church, which broods over the daily lives of her people, is unable, in this book, to help events, except in the preaching of dull submission and abnegation.

The book is remarkable because of the strongly drawn picture of an almost-forgotten portion of the Spanish people.

THE PRISONER WHO SANG. By *Johan Bojer*. Century Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 295. Price, \$2.00.

In strong contrast with the novels from the south of Europe is this searching study in psychology. Only a Scandinavian could have written it.

As a story, it is dramatic, and the Norwegian manners and life are shown in a delightfully understanding mood. The strange central character, an imaginative, egotistic, dramatic boy, moves through an inexorable series of steps in disintegration till he becomes a dual personality—during the day a rapacious pawnbroker, at night a Communist orator.

The book, not so great as some of Bojer's other works, is gripping, and the craftsmanship with which he handles the complexities of his hero's nature has more than a hint of his well-known genius. The book is not morbid, because of its universality. Under a lesser artist this might easily have been lost in a study so pathological. It is man's nature which he has portrayed. "I have found," says the hero at the end, "something behind the liar, the mask, and the shadow. That is the eternal longing of humanity—the thirst for light. Do you know it?"

THE BETROTHED. By *Alessandro Manzoni*. Translated by *Daniel J. Connor*. Macmillan Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 666. Price, \$3.00.

"It is not enough that the intellectual moment of a long period be presented; enduring literature must do much more than that. It must depict the personality of a people which the people themselves recognize as the ideal personality of an epoch."—*Georg Brandes*. According to this standard, "The Betrothed," which is a historical novel of the seventeenth century, first published in 1827, is surely enduring literature.

When the book appeared it became at once what would now be called a "best seller." It was read all over Europe. Lamartine, Chateaubriand, Goethe, all read it rapturously, and praised it. Most readers of that day compared Manzoni with Scott. It has, however, admittedly, a much wider appeal and is much more a national production than the Waverley novels.

Coming out of Catholic Italy, the plot weaves in and out of the Church in a beautiful and natural manner. "If the Church of

Rome really were what Manzoni represents her to be," says Macaulay in his diary, "I should be tempted to follow Newman's example."

The hero and heroine, unlike those in most of Sir Walter's books, are peasants. Robber barons and brigands, riots and a plague, serve to enliven the plot and shake people out of routine. Humor crops up deliciously and naturally in spots. During the bread riots in Milan, for instance, Renzo saw the mob culminating their frenzy by burning, in the city square, the baker's kneading-hutches and winnowing fans. It occurred to him that this might not be the wisest way to promote abundance of bread. "He kept his wisdom muzzled, however; for not one of all the faces about him bore an expression which might be construed to say, 'Correct me, brother, if I err, and I shall be beholden to you.'"

It is the Church which removes, one by one, all the seemingly insuperable obstacles which keep the lovers apart, and it all ends gaily, to the chiming of wedding bells.

BOOKS RECEIVED

ENCHANTED AISLES. By *Alexander Woolcott*. G. P. Putnam, 1924.

TOWARDS INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE. By *F. N. Keen*. Harcourt, Brace & Co.

WAYS TO PEACE. Twenty plans selected from those submitted to the American Peace Award. Introduction by *Esther Everett Lape*. Preface by *Edward Bok*. Chas. Scribner's Sons. Price, \$3.00.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY. By *Vandervere Custis, Ph. D.* Macmillan Co., New York, 1923. Pp. 324. Price, \$2.25.

THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR IN AMERICA. By *Norman Thomas*. B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1923. Pp. 299. Price, \$2.00.

OUTBREAK OF THE WORLD WAR. German Documents Collected by *Karl Kautsky*. Max Montgelas and Walther Schucking, editors. Oxford University Press, New York, 1924. Pp. 688.

PRELIMINARY HISTORY OF THE ARMISTICE. Official Documents Published by the German National Chancellery. Translated by the Carnegie Endowment. Pp. 163. Oxford University Press, 1924.

The Will to End War

By Arthur Deerin Call

This pamphlet of 39 pages tells of the cost of war—reasons for the will to end war—beginnings of the modern peace movement—the organizations of peace societies, periodicals, congresses—international plans and organizations—the two Hague conferences—the League of Nations and World Court.

The original statute of the International Court and the statute as finally adopted are both included.

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Order from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Any Book on International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership IN The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional	\$25.00
Contributing	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual	\$2.00		

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$_____ PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A _____
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name

Address

.....

.....

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, Nos. 9-10

September-October, 1924

Europe's New Spirit

Reparation Agreement

Meaning of Defense Day

Congressmen in Europe

Important International Dates

Anglo-Russian Treaties

Task Before France

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	515
EDITORIALS	
The New Spirit in Europe—American Influences in Europe—Inter- course with Soviet Russia—Editorial Notes.....	517-522
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
The London Agreement—U. S. and the League Disarmament Work— The British-Soviet Agreement—Civil War in China—Revolution in Chile—International Peace Congress.....	523-530
IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL DATES.....	531
GENERAL ARTICLES	
America and World Affairs.....	533
I. By President Coolidge	
II. By Hon. John W. Davis	
The Meaning of Defense Day.....	536
By Hon. Herbert Hoover	
Congressmen in Switzerland.....	539
By Arthur Deerin Call	
Achievements of the Interparliamentary Union.....	543
By Hon. Theodore E. Burton	
The Task before Premier Herriot.....	547
By Joseph Caillaux	
Rights and Duties of States.....	550
By the Rt. Hon. Lord Phillimore	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
Results of the XXII ^d Interparliamentary Conference.....	553
Anglo-Russian Treaties.....	565
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	572
BOOK REVIEWS.....	574

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Senator from Illinois, Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. PHILIP NORTH MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN, 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., 1155 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, California.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, Ex-President Fairmont Seminary, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 W. 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON
ARTHUR DEERIN CALL
Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN
Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY
Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE
Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS
HENRY C. MORRIS
PAUL SLEMAN
THEODORE STANFIELD
JAY T. STOCKING, D. D.
Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.
Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.
Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.
GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., Richmond, Indiana.
Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.
Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.
GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.
Rt. Rev. Bishop J. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.
Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
GEORGE A. FINCH, Washington, D. C.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hon. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.
CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.
Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.
GEO. H. JUDD, Washington, D. C.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.
JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.
L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.
Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.
Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.
Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.
EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.
*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.
Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

Suggestions for a Governed World

(Adopted by the American Peace Society, May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions, and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable, with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment whenever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that.

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective; and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
36

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1924

NUMBERS
9-10

EDITORIALS

THE NEW SPIRIT IN EUROPE

HOWEVER incomplete may be the settlement of the reparation problem made in London this summer, it cannot but be welcomed as a real step forward. In the very nature of things it had to be a compromise. Too much bitterness had to be allayed, too much hostility laid at rest, too many open rifts to be bridged, too many divergent views to be reconciled. Yet the result is promising—the first unmistakable ray of hope on the darkly overcast reparation horizon.

A new spirit permeated this London parley. In a sense, it was the first real peace conference between the Allies and Germany since the end of the war.

The Peace Conference in Paris was an assemblage at which the victors dictated terms to the vanquished. At one stage of the negotiations, in connection with a question which was bound to arouse protest from Germany, Mr. Wilson was asked what he thought the Germans would say to the terms that were being laid down for them. His reply was most characteristic of the atmosphere that permeated the Paris negotiations:

“Oh, the Germans will have nothing to say. They will be told to sign on the dotted line.”

If even the most moderate of the negotiators of the Versailles Treaty could have caught so unmistakably the spirit of a victor peace which was being forged in Paris, what could have been said of the

other negotiators and of the general body of public opinion behind them? War was still in the very essence of life. The Paris peace was truly a war, not a peace, settlement.

And war was still in the very essence of life in Germany, as well as on the Allied side of the battle front. She accepted the terms laid down for her only under protest, and her attitude was a poor augury for her execution of these terms.

The plain fact of the matter was that the basic Allied terms, as laid down in Paris and elaborated at later parleys, were impossible of execution. The burden laid upon Germany was far too excessive in the first place, but if, by some miracle, the Allied terms could possibly have been executed, they would have plunged the whole world into an economic situation, in which the Allies themselves would have suffered.

It took nearly five years for these facts to gain anything like general recognition. In the meantime, the same spirit that had permeated the Paris Conference was only too much in evidence in all the subsequent parleys. Dictation was the rule of the day on one side, evasion dominated the other. And through it all there was growing up in Europe more hatred and more distrust than were engendered even by the war itself.

The incubus of the reparation problem grew and grew, until it was assuming truly terrifying proportions. So long as the reparation problem remained on the

plane on which it had been placed by the Peace Treaty and the London Schedule of Payments, it was insoluble, as an economic proposition. And so long as the two principal powers of Continental Europe stood facing each other in all the fearful panoply of distrust and hostility, the problem could not be removed to any other plane.

A new spirit had to emerge in Europe before it became possible to treat of the original reparation settlement as something human and not sacrosanct. The report of the Committee of Experts was the first effective break in the blind wall against which Europe had pressed for nearly five years. It placed the whole problem on a new plane, and thereby made it at least possible of solution. But the new spirit had to go further and deeper than that.

For five years Europe attempted a settlement by dictation. At the Inter-Allied Conference in London we had the first approach to a settlement by negotiation. The Germans were admitted to that conference, not merely to sign on the dotted line, but really to negotiate.

The machinery set up by the London Conference for the carrying out of the Dawes Plan may not have produced the results expected from it. The expectations on which the plan is based may still be too optimistic. Germany may not be able to pay, and France may not be willing to receive, even the sums indicated in the plan. But whatever happens, future differences between Germany and the Allies will be settled by negotiation and arbitration, not by dictation. For that the machinery set up in London is quite adequate. And there can be no better basis than that for good faith and conciliation. It is this that makes the London Conference the most important international parley since the end of the war and an unmistakable expression of the new spirit in Europe.

AMERICAN INFLUENCES IN EUROPE

LAST year, at the meeting of the Inter-parliamentary Union in Copenhagen, Congressman Burton made the statement that the United States is always willing and even eager to help Europe in the solution of her problems. But he warned the European statesmen whom he was addressing that America will never come to Europe as a partisan—only as an impartial friend. And, moreover, she will come only when Europe expresses a clear and sincere desire for her to come on that basis.

During the months that have elapsed since these words were uttered by the veteran American statesman, who is also President of this Society, European affairs have taken a turn in precisely the direction which makes possible effective American participation in the solution of European problems. We rejoice wholeheartedly in the fact that this has taken place.

Before this became possible, an indispensable condition had to be fulfilled by Europe of her own accord. A new spirit had to manifest itself—the spirit of compromise and conciliation as among the great powers. This spirit, of which we spoke in the preceding editorial, showed its first signs of appearance at the beginning of the present year, when the Reparation Commission sent out its call for the best brains that could be furnished by two continents to set to work on the reparation dilemma. It came fully into evidence at the Inter-Allied Conference in London. It permeates the machinery which that Conference has set up for the future.

America's influence was most effective at all these stages. Europe called to America, and she called in a spirit which America could not but welcome. At the first stage America was represented by private citizens; at the second by fully

empowered officials. In both cases her presence was felt so unmistakably, as to be almost determinative.

But important as was our rôle in these two outstanding events of the past few months, a still more important rôle is reserved for our influence in the future. Under the reparation machinery now in operation American citizens become the arbiters of the bitterest quarrel that has arisen in modern history. The London Conference has restored to Germany the status of equality with the other great powers of Europe, but the good faith of that nation is still under suspicion. She has assumed certain solemn obligations, the fulfillment of which may or may not be within the range of possibilities. And if they prove to be beyond human powers of fulfillment, at least Germany must be given full opportunity to show whether or not she is acting in good faith.

There are two pivotal points in the new reparation machinery at which the determination of Germany's good faith will become imperative. The first is concerned with a possible default of the German Government in making payments on account of reparation to the representatives of the Reparation Commission. The second has to do with the transfer of these funds to the creditor countries. At both of these points American citizens have been placed in commanding positions.

The problem of Germany's default is no longer to be dealt with by her creditors alone, as it has been heretofore. The determination of default will still be in the hands of the Reparation Commission, but in every case of a discussion of this question an American member will be added to the Commission. Moreover, should the Commission, even with the American member, fail of unanimity in its decision and should the dissenting member so request, the whole question has to be handed

over to a neutral committee of three, presided over by an American citizen.

The transfer of the reparation funds from Germany abroad is placed in the hands of the Agent for Reparation Payments. It is for him to decide whether or not transfers should be made at any particular time, and his decision is final. The Reparation Commission has already chosen its Agent. For the time being the post is occupied by Mr. Owen D. Young. After the end of this year, it will be occupied by Mr. S. Parker Gilbert, former Undersecretary of the Treasury.

Thus the whole operation of the machinery for dealing with the problem of German reparation payments will depend largely upon the ability, fairness, and tact of two or three Americans. Their responsibility is great, but the field for their influence is fully commensurate with it.

There is another important post in Europe, also concerned with a problem of post-war finance, already occupied by an American. Mr. Jeremiah Smith, a Boston lawyer, is in Budapest, as the Commissioner-General of the League of Nations for Hungarian reconstruction.

America, through her diplomatic representatives, as well as through her outstanding citizens, is coming to Europe—always as an impartial friend, not a partisan of any nation or any cause. And Europe is rapidly learning to appreciate this. Europe is beginning to understand America, instead of decrying and criticising her, as has been the fashion during the years immediately following the war. In this she has been greatly helped this summer by the visits paid across the ocean by such American statesmen as Secretary of State Hughes, Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, Mr. Hurley, the new member of the Debt Funding Commission, and the American delegates to the conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

INTERCOURSE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

RUSSIA has remained for over five years practically outside international intercourse, mainly because her communist régime has been adamant in refusing to private citizens of other States the rights which they enjoy all over the world under the civilized usages that obtain today. It is true that similar rights are denied to Russian citizens as well, but that fact does not in the least alter the situation, so far as foreigners are concerned.

Whatever her régime, Russia needs intercourse with the rest of the world. Similarly, the world needs intercourse with Russia. World recovery from the ravages of the past decade is only partly possible, so long as one-seventh of the earth, represented by Russia, remains outside the pale of civilization. But there is neither need, reason, nor justice in the other countries of the world accepting the principles which reign in Russia today. It is rather for Russia to accept civilized usages, in the place of her own chimeras, which have brought her to her present sorry plight.

But there are two ways for regarding the question of intercourse with Russia, from the point of view of the rights of foreigners: One is on the basis of equal treatment accorded to Russians and to foreigners, and the other on the basis of different treatment.

Great Britain, in her recent negotiations with the Soviet Government, has followed the second of these alternatives. She has succeeded in obtaining from the Soviet Government promises to satisfy a part of the claims presented by her nationals on account of the annulment of Russia's state debts and of the confiscation and nationalization of private property. All this Soviet Russia has granted "by way of exception" to her existing

legislation. How far Great Britain has gone in following the second of the alternatives outlined above is perfectly apparent from the Anglo-Russian treaties, signed in London on August 8, the text of which appears in the *International Documents* section of this number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

The agreement reached in London between Great Britain and Soviet Russia naturally raises the question of what should be the attitude of the United States toward the question of intercourse with Russia in the light of that agreement. Our government is still adamant in refusing to accord official recognition to the Soviet régime in Russia. It is to be hoped that it will never consent to follow the lines of the British agreement.

If the world needs a resumption of intercourse with Russia, it is only reasonable to expect that the conditions under which such resumption should take place would work toward a betterment of the situation in Russia, not toward a perpetuation of the plight in which that unfortunate country finds itself today. Yet it is precisely in that second direction that the British policy points.

For foreign powers to accept a resumption of intercourse with Russia on the basis of obtaining rights for foreign nationals which are denied to Russian citizens is to reduce Russia virtually to the rank of nations to which the principle of extraterritoriality has been applied heretofore. Such a course of action might be based upon the hope that once certain rights are granted to foreigners they may be eventually extended also to the people of Russia. But it would involve in reality the establishment of guarantees which would not be dissimilar to those imposed upon such States as Turkey and China. The history of the relations between these latter countries and the civilized powers shows how precarious a foundation such

an arrangement constitutes for the normal processes of intercourse among nations.

Were our policy with regard to the recognition of the Soviet régime based upon the seizing of advantages rendered possible by the unfortunate condition into which Russia has been plunged, it would have been logical for us to pursue just such a course. But since we have heretofore consistently grounded our policy in a sincere desire to assist the people of Russia back to their normal position among the powers of the world, the acceptance of a situation in which foreigners would be placed in Russia in a more privileged condition than Russians themselves would be directly contrary to our openly avowed policy of friendship for the Russian people and our tradition of fair play in international affairs.

It is, therefore, insufficient to make the resumption of Russia's international obligations the sole condition prerequisite to according the present régime in Russia an equal footing with the civilized governments of the world. This condition itself, if it is to fulfill the purpose implied in our policy, namely, adequate assistance to the Russian people toward actual recovery, should be based upon the establishment in Russia of the basic conditions that govern organized life in civilized States. Unless a bill of civil rights, with everything that it implies in regard to such conditions as private property, freedom of speech, press, public worship, etc., receive in Russia the sanction of its present régime, that régime cannot be credited with good faith by the powers from which it seeks recognition.

In creating new States after the war, the great powers saw morally fit to impose upon them such vital obligations as guarantees of the rights of minorities. The same moral right holds true in regard to the terms upon which these powers would be ready to readmit Russia into the family of nations.

The conditions, therefore, which should precede the recognition of any Russian régime by the United States are as follows:

1. Adequate proof that such a régime is established in good faith upon national principles. In the case of the present Russian régime, this means specifically that the connection which now exists between the Soviet régime and the Third International, through the fact that the outstanding leaders of the Soviet régime are also members of the governing body of the International, and that the International is subsidized by the Russian treasury, should be completely and openly broken.

2. All foreign debts owed directly by the State or guaranteed by it should be recognized unreservedly and unequivocally, in conformity with the principle of Government succession.

3. The resumption by a Russian Government of the obligation to reimburse foreign owners of property in Russia confiscated during the revolution should be based, not upon special privilege thus extended to foreign nationals, but upon the principle of a re-establishment in Russia of generally accepted civilized usages. In the case of the present régime, this means a complete and retroactive renunciation of the so-called "revolutionary law of expropriation," under which private property was confiscated without compensation, in accordance with a social theory, and not as a punitive measure, and the establishment in Russia of the fundamental civil liberties which alone would provide a basis for faith in the sincerity of whatever action the present Russian régime undertakes to carry out.

SLOWLY, but surely, the task of establishing friendly and normal relations between the United States and Mexico is being carried forward. On Au-

gust 30 the General Claims Commission for the two countries began its sessions in Washington. At the opening session Secretary of State Hughes made the following straightforward statement of the policy of our government toward our southern neighbor:

"May I, on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, take this occasion again to express our profound interest in the prosperity of our great neighbor on the south, the United Mexican States, our abiding friendship for her people, our earnest desire to have the co-operation which proceeds on the acknowledged basis of mutual esteem and mutual recognition of the rights and obligations of independent States? We feel that we are entering upon a new era of mutual confidence in our relations with Mexico to the advantage of the peoples of both countries."

With this as the policy north of the Rio Grande, and with sanity on the ascendent south of the dividing river, there is every reason for optimism as to the future of our relations with Mexico.

IT IS a pleasure to welcome a new addition to the Diplomatic Corps in Washington in the person of Professor Smiddy, the first Minister to the United States of the Irish Free State. Professor Smiddy has been in this country for some time, in a semi-official capacity, studying some of our fundamental problems for the benefit of his resurrected country. He will be able to do this work with even greater facility, now that he has been confirmed in a fully official diplomatic status. The Irish Minister will act quite independently of the British Ambassador in all matters relating to Ireland, though any question as to whether or not any particular matter comes in the category of those matters which are to be handled by him will have to be determined by consultation with the Ambassador.

ANEW attempt is being made to introduce greater unity and harmony in the affairs of the Succession States by means of a conference of these States, which will take place in Rome this autumn. The conference is being called at the instance of the Italian Government, which is thus carrying a step further the policy it has inaugurated in signing treaties of amity with Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. All of the Succession States have expressed their willingness to attend the Rome conference, which ought to mark distinct progress in the mutual relations of these struggling new States of Central Europe.

SEPTEMBER 1 marked the first anniversary of the fearful misfortune that visited Japan last year, when the worst earthquake in history caused the destruction of the country's capital and its largest seaport. It is most gratifying to note that during this year Japan has made truly heroic efforts to repair the damage. While it is true that both Tokyo and Yokohama are still cities of temporary dwellings, that fact is due to a wise decision on the part of the Japanese Government to re-plan the cities in the process of their permanent rebuilding. Tokyo, for example, will now be cut by wide arterial roads, which will minimize in the future the danger of widespread fires, that played such havoc with the narrow and overbuilt streets of the destroyed city. In spite of the absence of permanent buildings, however, over 70 per cent of the population of the devastated areas have returned, factories have been restored to the extent of 80 per cent of the number of workers, and in the city of Tokyo the telegraph system, the light and power stations, the water and gas works, and the tram service have been restored almost to normal.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

THE LONDON AGREEMENT

THE conference of the Allied powers held in London lasted exactly one month. During this comparatively short period the conference was, on a number of occasions, close to a breakdown, and the results achieved are necessarily in the nature of a compromise. These results are embodied in a protocol, initialed on August 16 and signed on August 30. The purport of the protocol is that the governments concerned and the Reparation Commission have confirmed their acceptance of the Dawes Plan and have agreed to its being brought into operation. Certain agreements necessary for that purpose have been drawn up. These agreements are regarded as mutually interdependent. The protocol is followed by four annexes.

Agreement between the Reparation Commission and the German Government

Annex I sets out the terms of agreement between the Reparation Commission and the German Government:

(1) The German Government undertakes to take all appropriate measures for carrying the Dawes Plan into effect, especially as regards the promulgation of laws and regulations, notably those concerning the banks, the railways, and the industrial debentures, in the form approved by the Reparation Commission. It will also apply the necessary provisions as to the control of the revenues assigned as security for the annuities under the Dawes Plan.

(2) The Reparation Commission undertakes, on its side, to take all appropriate measures for carrying the plan into force, and in particular to facilitate the issue of the German loan and for making necessary financial and accounting adjustments.

(3) The Reparation Commission and the German Government agree, in their respective spheres, to carry into effect such additional arrangements as may be agreed as necessary to the application of the plan, these to be signed later on and to form a schedule to the London pact. Further,

any dispute that may arise as regards the agreements or the German legislation to put them into effect shall be referred to arbitration.

Agreement between the Allies and Germany

Annex II contains the terms of the agreement between the Allied governments and the German Government concerning the agreement set out in Annex I:

Clause 1. Subject to the powers of arbitration given to the Reparation Commission by the Treaty of Versailles and to provisions as to arbitration contained in the Dawes Plan or elsewhere, any dispute between the commission and Germany shall be referred to three arbitrators appointed for five years, one by the commission, one by Germany, and one by agreement between the two parties, or, failing such agreement, by the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Clause 2 is a very long and detailed agreement, mainly concerning the work of the transfer committee. Germany recognizes the right of this committee to pursue ordinary commercial methods in employing funds at its disposal, and that delivery programs shall not be subject to limitations prescribed by the Treaty of Versailles, and undertakes to facilitate these programs. The most important point in this clause is the stipulation that in default of agreement between Germany and the Reparation Commission as to delivery programs, these programs for certain periods shall be laid down by an Arbitral Commission, of which the chairman shall be a citizen of the United States, the members to be appointed in the same manner as the arbitrators referred to in Annex I, clause 1. The Arbitral Commission, whose decision is to be final, is to take into account all the pertinent factors in Germany's financial and economic position. Allied governments, if dissatisfied, may submit reasoned claims to this commission.

Clause 3. Germany agrees to the appointment of a special committee, not ex-

ceeding six members (the Allies and Germany to be equally represented), with the power to co-opt a neutral member, to determine procedure with regard to deliveries in kind, and to examine the best means of insuring the fulfillment of German undertakings. The decisions of this committee will be subject to the approval of the Reparation Commission and, where applicable, the transfer committee.

Clauses 4 and 5 provide for arbitration in the case of certain possible differences between the transfer committee and the German Government, or, in the case of divided opinion on the transfer committee in certain matters.

Clause 6 prescribes the procedure for an appeal to arbitration where any Allied government considers that there is a defect in the plan as regards collection of deliveries which can be remedied without affecting the vital principles of the plan.

Agreement Regarding the Institution of the Dawes Plan

Annex III contains the terms of the main agreement between the Allies and Germany as regards the institution of the Dawes Plan. Article I is of primary importance and is reproduced below in full:

(A) The Experts' Plan of April 9, 1924, will be considered as having been put into execution, except as regards measures to be taken by the Allied governments, when the Reparation Commission has declared the measures prescribed by it in its decision No. 2877 (4) of July 15, 1924, have been taken—that is to say—

(1) That Germany has taken the following measures:

(a) The voting by the Reichstag in the form approved by the Reparation Commission of the laws necessary to the working of the plan, and their promulgation.

(b) The installation with a view to their normal working of all the executive and controlling bodies provided for in the plan.

(c) The definitive constitution, in conformity with the provisions of the respective laws, of the bank and the German Railways Company.

(d) The deposit with the trustee of certificates representing the railways bonds and such similar certificates for the industrial debentures as may result from the report of the organization committee.

(2) That contracts have been concluded assuring the subscription of the loan of 800 million gold marks as soon as the plan has been brought into operation and all the conditions contained in the experts' report have been fulfilled.

(B) The fiscal and economic unity of Germany will be considered to have been restored in accordance with the experts' plan when the Allied governments have taken the following measures:

(1) The removal and cessation of all vetoes imposed since January 11, 1923, on German fiscal and economic legislation; the re-establishment of the German authorities with the full powers which they exercised in the occupied territories before January 11, 1923, as regards the administration of customs and taxes, foreign commerce, woods and forests, railways (under the conditions specified in Article 5), and, in general, all other branches of economic and fiscal administration; the remaining administrations not mentioned above will operate in every respect in conformity with the Rhineland agreement; the formalities regarding the admission or readmission of German officials will be applied in such a manner that the re-establishment of the German authorities, in particular the customs administration, may take place with the least possible delay; all this without other restrictions than those stipulated in the Treaty of Versailles, the Rhineland agreement, and the experts' plan.

(2) The restoration to their owners of all mines, cokeries, and other industrial, agricultural, forest, and shipping undertakings exploited under Allied management or provisionally leased by the occupying authorities since January 11, 1923.

(3) The withdrawal of the special organizations established to exploit the pledges and the release of requisitions made for the working of those organizations.

(4) The removal, subject to the provisions of the Rhineland agreement, of restrictions on the movement of persons, goods, and vehicles.

(5) In general, the Allied governments, in order to insure in the occupied territories the fiscal and economic unity of Germany, will cause the Interallied Rhineland High Commission to proceed, subject to the provisions of the Rhineland agreement, to an adjustment of the ordinances passed by the said commission since January 11, 1923.

Articles 3, 4, and 5 of Annex III are mainly concerned with dates on which various stages toward the application of the measures necessary for the institution of the Dawes Plan should be brought into full operation, September 20, the date for the transfer of the railway system of the Reich to the new company. Owing to delay in the signing of the London pact, the time table will presumably be proportionately delayed. Article 7 provides for amnesty in respect of offenses in occupied territory since January, 1923, and other conciliatory measures.

Agreement between the Allied Governments

Annex IV gives the terms of agreement between the Allied governments and has three main features. First, and by far the most important, is the provision that in all deliberations affecting the Dawes Plan a seat on the Reparation Commission shall be occupied by a representative of the United States, to be appointed by unanimous vote of the commission, or, failing that, by the President of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The person so appointed is to hold office for five years. The second point is the following:

In order to secure the service of the loan of 800 million gold marks contemplated by the experts' plan, and in order to facilitate the issue of that loan to the public, the signatory governments hereby declare that in case sanctions have to be imposed in consequence of a default by Germany they will safeguard any specific securities which may be pledged to the service of the loan. The signatory governments further declare that they consider the service of the loan as entitled to absolute priority as regards any resources of Germany, so far as such resources may have been subjected to a general charge in favor of the said loan, and also as regards any resources that may arise as a result of the imposition of sanctions.

The third point is that, unless otherwise stipulated in the London agreement, the signatory governments reserve all their rights under the Versailles Treaty.

Exchange of Letters on the Ruhr Settlement

Together with the text of the London agreement were published the letters exchanged between the Belgian and French

delegates and the German chancellor on the subject of a Ruhr settlement. The first Franco-Belgian letter restates the well-known defense of the legality of the Ruhr occupation, but promises evacuation within the maximum period of a year, provided the London agreements for the putting into force of the experts' plan "are carried out in the spirit of good faith and pacification which has inspired the deliberations of the conference." Dr. Marx, in reply, repeats the German view of the illegality of the Ruhr occupation and urges the desirability of "hastening as much as possible military evacuation so as to terminate it before the date fixed by you." By way of answer, Messrs. Herriot and Theunis promise immediately "military evacuation of the zone between Dortmund and Höde, and of the territories outside the Ruhr occupied since January 11, 1923." Finally, Dr. Marx writes, "rejoicing at this decision."

The evacuation of these territories was duly carried out on the day after the signature of the London pact.

U. S. AND THE LEAGUE DISARMAMENT WORK

THE Department of State has made public the correspondence with the Secretary General of the League of Nations relating to the invitation to the United States Government to have a representative at the meetings of the Third Committee of the Assembly of the League of Nations, now in session at Geneva, when it has under consideration the proposed convention for the control of the traffic in arms.

The Government of the United States holds that the convention for the control of traffic in arms, known as the Convention of St. Germain, which was formulated in 1919, contains provisions which make it impossible of acceptance by the United States. The reasons are explained by the Department of State, which, however, indicates its desire to aid in any proper way in the restriction of the traffic in munitions of war. It is apparent that in dealing with a convention for this purpose it would be necessary for the American Government not only to consider its relation to governments which might not

be signatories of the conventions, but also to respect the constitutional limitations of Congress, which would be called upon to provide legislation in order to make the convention effective.

The subject was taken up by the Temporary Mixed Commission of the League of Nations and the American Government was invited to send a representative. The invitation was accepted, and Mr. Grew, then Minister to Switzerland, was designated. The American Government, through Mr. Grew, expressed its desire to aid in the proper control of the traffic in arms and munitions of war, and to this end pointed out with precision the sphere of congressional authority and the lines upon which a convention could be drawn in which this government could join. These meetings were held in the early spring of this year. When Mr. Grew became Under Secretary of State his place was taken by Mr. Gibson, Minister to Switzerland, who attended further meetings for the same purpose.

The result was that a convention has been drafted by the Temporary Mixed Commission and the views of the United States have been expressed upon every point involved. It is understood by the American Government that it is not probable that the Third Committee of the Assembly of the League of Nations would attempt to do more than to consider whether this draft convention affords a satisfactory basis for the calling of an international conference in order that the convention might be concluded. This is referred to in the invitation. The special point on which the views of the American Government are desired is understood to be whether it would be disposed to participate in such a conference.

As the Government of the United States has thoroughly discussed the various points of the draft convention and its position on every point is well understood, it is not considered that any useful purpose would be served by attending the meetings of the Third Committee. The Government would, however, be disposed to consider favorably participation in an appropriate international conference to negotiate and conclude a convention.

It is also pointed out that the subject under consideration is not the limitation

of the armament of governments, but the control of traffic in arms, a different matter, which, so far as proposed by the European governments, does not restrict the armaments of the signatory powers.

THE BRITISH-SOVIET AGREEMENT

THE Russo-British conference began on April 14 and lasted until August 6. The day before it ended official announcement was made to the effect that no agreement could be reached; yet on the very next day full agreement was announced.

In the Glasgow journal *Forward*, Mr. E. D. Morel, the Socialist Member of Parliament for Dundee, has given an account, which has the appearance of being first hand, of the sudden resumption of the negotiations. From this and other information the following appears to be the story of this amazing incident.

The Breakdown of the Negotiations

The British and Soviet delegates had met at the Foreign Office at 11 a. m. on Monday, August 4. It was the first plenary meeting after a short visit to Moscow of M. Rakovsky, and in the meantime the British Cabinet (despite its previous decision) had agreed to the principle of guaranteeing a loan to Russia.

All points at issue were settled except that of the rights of British private owners of property in Russia. The Bolsheviks absolutely refused to admit liability. They would agree to examine each separate case "on its merits," and so on, but would accept no phraseology that indicated that the dispossessed owners had any rights at all. The British delegation could not acquiesce in this complete repudiation of British rights and British principles. Formula after formula was tried, uselessly, all through the night, and the attempt was finally abandoned at 7 a. m. on Wednesday. A *communiqué* was then issued, according to which "No agreement was reached. Negotiations broke down, and the treaty will not be signed."

Yet on Wednesday at 7.30 p. m.—that is, 36 hours later—the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who had himself pre-

sided over the negotiations leading to the rupture, announced to an astonished House of Commons that an agreement had been reached at 3.30 that afternoon, and that a treaty would be signed next day.

Labor Members of Parliament Step In

It appears that the steam which got the conference machinery going again consisted of six members of Parliament—believed to include Mr. Purcell, Mr. E. D. Morel, Mr. Lansbury, Mr. Wallhead, and Commander Kenworthy. They telephoned to Mr. Ponsonby, expressed to him their keen disappointment, and arranged to meet him at the Foreign Office at 2 p. m. With his knowledge and consent, they then arranged a meeting with the Soviet representatives, and with them found a fresh formula which might serve as a basis for renewed discussion. Some 12 other members of the Labor Party were present at this meeting, which was held in the House of Commons—the regular members of the official British delegation, with the exception of Mr. Ponsonby, being all this time apparently kept in complete ignorance of what was happening. Later that evening a deputation of four of the 18 interested Members of Parliament proceeded to Mr. Ponsonby and laid their views before him, with the result that at 11 p. m. they were able to inform the Russians that, if they liked, the British delegation would be ready to reopen discussions with them at 11 next morning.

The official members on the British side were therefore suddenly informed by telephone early on the morning of Wednesday, the 6th, that they were to meet the Bolsheviks again at 11 a. m. Even at that meeting no agreement was reached, and again the four Members of Parliament intervened. They were received by Mr. Ponsonby at 1.30, and went on immediately afterwards to the Russian Agency offices in New Bond Street. They persuaded M. Rakovsky to accept a formula, with the result that at 3.30 another plenary conference was held, at which the unofficial agreement was officially accepted.

It is understood that Mr. MacDonald, who took little part in the actual negotiations, was throughout determined that some sort of treaty should be signed, but

that this view was not unanimously held in his cabinet.

CIVIL WAR IN CHINA

FOLLOWING the devastating floods which had inundated the valley of the Yellow River in August, another serious misfortune descended upon China early in September. A civil war, which threatens to assume colossal proportions, has broken out and is still in progress.

In order to understand the circumstances in which this civil war broke out, it is necessary to review briefly the outstanding features of the political situation in China. There are three main factors in this situation. The government at Peking, which formally rules the country, in reality exercises its authority only over a limited territory. Its rule is defied by Sun Yat Sen in the south and by Chang Tso-lin in Manchuria. Thus China is virtually divided into three well-defined territories, each with its own political régime.

Opposition to Peking Strongest in Chekiang Province

But even within the territory actually under the authority of the Peking Government there are still provinces which are far from having accepted that authority completely and unquestioningly. The present Peking Government, which represents the Chih-li party, came into power in 1920, when its leader, General Wu Pei-Fu, succeeded, by means of a military coup d'état, in overthrowing the Anfu party, which had been in power until then. Of the provinces which remained loyal to the Anfu party, that of Chekiang became a stronghold of the defeated Anfu leaders. Under its Tuchun (or military governor), Lu-Yung-Hsiang, the Province of Chekiang remained a veritable thorn in the side of the Chih-li régime at Peking, and Wu Pei-Fu has been patiently waiting for an opportunity for removing the menace that was inherent in the continued Anfu domination of the province. That opportunity has now presented itself.

A special importance also attaches to the Chekiang Province from the point of view of the Peking leaders, because of the

fact that it bars the road to Canton, the stronghold of Sun Yat Sen, and renders impossible any moves that Peking might want to make against the insurgent southern leader.

Besides his political quarrel with the Peking Government, based ostensibly upon his championship of the idea of provincial autonomy, as against the centralist tendencies of Peking, Lu-Yung-Hsiang has been on hostile terms with the Tuchuns of the provinces neighboring on his own. His bitterest enmity has been directed against the Tuchun of Kiangsu, with whom he disputes the possession of the great port of Shanghai. All these enmities came to a head recently, when Lu-Yung-Hsiang gave refuge on his territory to some troops from the Province of Fukien, which had revolted against their Tuchun. Under this and other provocation, the provinces of Kiangsu, Anhui, and Fukien began military operations against Lu-Yung-Hsiang, under the leadership of the Tuchun of Kiangsu, Chi-Hsih-Yuan.

Local Struggle Develops into a Civil War

This struggle, which began ostensibly as a local affair, quickly developed into a civil war on a national scale. It was quite apparent from the start that larger issues were involved in the struggle than merely the conflict between two military governors over the possession of the port of Shanghai. Chang Tso-lin, the war lord of Manchuria, who has been a bitter opponent of Wu Pei-Fu, announced himself an ally of the Tuchun of Chekiang and proceeded to declare war on the Peking Government. The floods have made it impossible for Chang Tso-Lin to march to the aid of his Anfu ally, but instead of that he began a march against Peking.

Fighting around Shanghai

At the time of this writing, fighting has been continuing intermittently in the neighborhood of Shanghai since September 3. Some portions of the battle front are within nine miles of the city, which has a considerable foreign population.

Considerable artillery and large numbers of machine-guns have been engaged in the battles on the Shanghai front, but practically no airplanes have been used.

The morale of both armies is reported as excellent. Reports indicate that the Ki-angsu forces have developed an offensive on both flanks of the front, with the Woo Sung forts on the left and the Shanghai-Hangchow Railway and the Kiangnan arsenal on the right as their objectives. Chekiang troops are reported to have been on the offensive west of Tai Ho Lake. The Shanghai hospital is receiving hundreds of Chekiang wounded.

The combined Nanking and Fukien naval forces are said to consist of two cruisers, two gunboats, four torpedo boats, and two transports, which are anchored off Liu Ho. So far, they have not participated in the military maneuvers. The commanders of both the Chekiang and the Kiangsu fleets have promised not to fire in the Whangpoo River.

Foreign naval contingents landed at daybreak on September 9, merely as a precautionary measure, and took up stations, as did also the Shanghai volunteer corps. There are in the harbor of Shanghai eleven American, four British, two Japanese, two French, and one Italian ships. The naval contingents which went ashore number approximately 1,360, and there are about 1,000 members of the Shanghai volunteer corps.

PEACEFUL REVOLUTION IN CHILE

THE Republic of Chile has just passed through a peaceful and bloodless revolution, which has resulted in the establishment of a strong semi-military government and the virtual withdrawal of the duly elected President of the Republic. The change, which took place on September 5, came with a startling rapidity. The Chilean Parliament, elected last March, has been generally accused of being immersed in factional politics to the neglect of national interests. The discontent with the Parliament came to a head on September 3, when the members laid aside the budget and other urgent bills in order to vote themselves a salary of 2,000 pesos a month. This caused such an outburst of indignation that the cabinet in office, which is blamed for the general disorganization of government, resigned.

New Cabinet and the Withdrawal of the President

On September 5 the cabinet's place was taken by a group consisting of two generals, an admiral, and three civilians. The following statement was then issued by the President of the Republic:

Officers who met today offered me unconditional adherence, and a new cabinet has been formed as follows:

General Altamirano, Prime Minister and Interior; Don Emilio Bello Codecido, Foreign Affairs; Señor Amunategui, Public Instruction; Admiral Nef, Finance; General Bennett, War; Señor Guarello, Public Works.

General Altamirano stated that radical changes in public administration would be the feature of his government, together with the abolition of party politics and the stabilization of finances. My program is the same as that presented by the brave officers. It is a program of valor and probity, devoted to honest government and the welfare and progress of the republic.

In spite of the friendly tone of this statement, there was a considerable tension between President Alessandri and the new cabinet. The cabinet immediately set to work and forced the Parliament to pass the necessary legislation, the bills being duly approved by the President. Immediately upon the signing of these bills the President offered his resignation to the cabinet, which, however, refused to accept it, requesting the President, instead, to leave the country "on a leave." It is expected that during the President's absence the Parliament will be dissolved and new parliamentary as well as presidential elections will be held.

Circumstances Leading to the Revolution

In describing the circumstances which led up to these startling events in Chile a correspondent of the *London Times* says that President Alessandri was elected during the afterglow of war prosperity, but took office at the beginning of the slump that affected all South America. The exchange value of the Chilean peso fell very considerably when nitrate became a drug upon the market; more than half the nitrate works were closed down, and these, as well as the great copper-mining companies, were forced to discharge tens of thousands of men.

In this crisis the Chilean Government sought temporary palliatives only. In common with many other rulers of the destinies of nations, it shirked hard facts. The ruthless reductions in expenditure which might have balanced the Chilean budget were not made, because a country accustomed during the last 40 years to national revenues of twenty-five to thirty-five million dollars from nitrate export taxes would not realize the emptiness of its coffers.

The difficulties of the Alessandri régime were not lessened by the demands of the extreme radical elements in the Liberal alliance, not unaffected by the ideas of Bolsheviks and the I. W. W. (Industrial Workers of the World); and they became acute when growing bitterness between the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies rendered impossible any effective work by the cabinet ministers.

In February of this year various important reforms were cast into shape by Congress; in March parliamentary elections gave Chile a new Chamber of Deputies, with the Liberal alliance again dominant, and changed one-third of the senators, whose "color" was then altered from that of the *Union Nacional* to that of the *Alianza*. Public opinion hailed the dominance of one party, hoping that harmony would henceforth prevail, that a permanent ministry would be placed in power, that the budget would be passed, and the hand of the President upheld.

These hopes were vain. President Alessandri continued to work with the lame help of a provisional cabinet, and the budget for 1924 was not passed.

The new Senate immediately revoked certain of the reforms agreed upon by its predecessor in February; and as a culmination of exasperations, the Congress proceeded to vote itself salaries. It was then that a group outside party politics rose and grasped the reins.

PROVISIONAL PROGRAM

Of the 23d International Peace Congress of the International Federation of Peace Unions, Berlin, October 2-7, 1924.

Thursday, October 2:

10 a. m.—Session of the Council of the International Bureau.

3 p. m.—Constitutional session of the congress.

(A) Election of the chairmen and of the secretaries.

(B) Appointment of the commissions: (a) Actualities, (b) Legislation and League of Nations, (c) Disarmament, (d) Economic and Social Questions, (e) Education and Propaganda.

(C) Assigning of the resolutions to the commissions; order of the congress.

Friday, October 3:

10 a. m. and 3 p. m.—Sittings of the commissions.

Saturday, October 4:

10 a. m.—Sittings of the commissions.

3 p. m.—General meeting of the International Federation of Peace Unions.

Sunday, October 5:

11 a. m. in the Reichstag—Official opening session, memorial celebration.

In the afternoon—Excursion.

8.30 p. m.—Evening party, official reception.

Monday, October 5:

10 a. m.—First general session of the congress.

Report on the International Historical Conference of the "Bund entschiedener Schulreformer," given by Professor Oestreich; reports on Disarmament.

3 p. m.—Second general session. Reports of the Commission C and debate.

8 p. m.—Mass meeting.

Tuesday, October 7:

10 a. m.—Third general session. "Pan-Europe and League of Nations"; reports, Commission B reports, and debate.

3 p. m.—Fourth general session. Actualities (Commission A), Commission D and E reports.

The evening is left free to finish up the work of the congress.

Delegates are further informed as follows:

From October 2 to 4 an "International Historical Congress," arranged by the Bund entschiedener Schulreformer, takes place in Berlin. We enclose the program.

An "Anti-War Exhibition," prepared by the Berlin group of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, will be open during the days of the congress. Contributions for the exhibition

(pictures, books, toys, etc.) received at Internationale Frauenliga, Berlin N. W. Händelstr. 21.

On October 8 the German Peace Society has its general convention.

Dr. Coudenhove-Kalergi, Vienna, consented to speak on "Pan-Europe and the League of Nations." Generals of several nationalities are to speak on "Disarmament."

Those attending the congress may be:

1. Delegates with a vote: (a) representatives of organizations affiliated to the Bureau; (b) representatives of authorities and institutions subsidizing the International Bureau.

2. Attendants without a vote: (a) members of all peace organizations; (b) members of other organizations if they have been affiliated to the International Bureau for at least three months; (c) persons invited by the International Bureau or the Congress Committee, or directly or through their organizations.

Fee: 5 marks for each attendant or delegate.

Votes: Organizations affiliated to the International Bureau with a minimum of 30 members are sending one voting delegate for every 100 members up to 20 votes.

The address of the Bureau International de la Paix is now at 8 Rue Charles Bonnet, Geneva (formerly at Bern).

THE THIRTY-THIRD CONFERENCE of the International Law Association opened at Stockholm, September 8, under the presidency of Dr. Hammarskjöld, Governor of the Province of Upsala and former Prime Minister of Sweden. The subjects to be discussed are numerous and some of them very technical. Among the latter is one of very great importance to the commercial and shipping interests of the entire world—a new code for regulating the adjustment of shipping losses which come under the head of "general average." At this section of the conference the commercial interests of all maritime countries will be represented. Of more general interest will be the proposed statute for a permanent international criminal court, put forward by Dr. Hugh Bellot.

IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL DATES

(July 15–September 15)

July 16—London Conference opens.

July 20—London Conference reaches agreement on default question. Major Imbrie, U. S. Consul in Teheran, murdered by a crowd of Persian fanatics.

Secretary of State Hughes arrives in London.

July 28—London Conference decides to invite a German delegation.

United States Government sends a note to Persia, demanding military guard for the American Legation and agreement to defray the expenses of sending an American warship to take the body of the murdered consul to America.

New cabinet is formed in Jugoslavia, headed by Lyuba Davidovich, leader of the opposition bloc.

July 29—Secretary of State Hughes arrives in Paris.

July 30—German Government informs the Council of the League of Nations of its unwillingness to accept the proposed pact of mutual guarantees.

Protocol signed between Germany and Soviet Russia, ending diplomatic conflict over the status of the Soviet Trade Mission.

August 2—London Conference reaches agreement on proposals for putting the Dawes plan into operation, and an invitation is sent out for a German delegation to attend the conference.

The diplomatic body in Peking informs the Soviet ambassador that, subject to approval of their respective governments, they have no objections to his taking possession of the Russian legation in Peking.

August 3—Secretary of States Hughes arrives in Berlin.

August 5—German delegation arrives in London and takes part in plenary session of the conference.

Anglo-Soviet conference breaks up without reaching agreement.

August 6—Anglo-Soviet conference re-assembles and two treaties are agreed to.

German delegation submits its observations to the London Conference.

August 11—The principal celebration of the fifth anniversary of the Weimar Constitution takes place in Berlin.

August 12—Following outbreaks of Egyptian railway troops at Atbara and Port Sudan and after being attacked by the mutineers, Arab mounted rifles open fire at Atbara, killing four Egyptians.

August 14—It is reported that 50,000 persons have been drowned in the floods which have devastated several provinces in North China, where the inhabitants are threatened with famine.

August 16—The London Conference ends.

August 18—The British Government reiterates its warning to the Egyptian Government about the policy it intends to pursue in the Sudan.

August 19—The French Cabinet unanimously approves the work of the French delegation at the London Conference.

The German state premiers, including the Bavarian, approve the decision taken by the German delegates in London as representing the best terms that could be obtained.

August 21—M. Herriot reads the ministerial statement on the London Conference in the French Parliament.

The Reichsrat approves the draft laws with the necessary two-thirds majority.

August 24—After a debate on the London agreement, prolonged until 5 o'clock in the morning, the French Chamber of Deputies passes a vote of confidence in the Herriot Government by 336 votes to 204.

- August 25—All the members of the Persian Cabinet resign except the Sardar, who remains Prime Minister.
- August 26—M. Poincaré makes a long speech in the French Senate, criticizing the London agreement. The Senate approves the government's action by 200 votes to 40.
- August 27—The bill for the ratification of the Treaty of Lausanne, already passed by the French Chamber of Deputies, passes in the Senate.
- A Franco-German commercial agreement is concluded with regard to the export of potash to America.
- August 29—The Reichstag passes the bills necessary for the carrying out of the Dawes scheme.
- The Council of the League of Nations meets at Geneva.
- August 30—The London agreement is signed.
- The Reparation Commission makes several appointments to special posts created under the Dawes scheme, including that of Mr. Owen D. Young as agent for reparation payments *ad interim*.
- August 31—The first steps are taken by the French authorities toward the economic evacuation of the Dortmund zone of occupied German territory.
- September 1—The League of Nations Assembly begins its sittings at Geneva, M. Motta, the chief of the Swiss Political Department, being elected president.
- September 3—Hostilities begin in China between the Kiangsu and Chekiang forces.
- Mr. MacDonald and M. Herriot attend the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva.
- The Reparation Commission announces that Mr. Seymour P. Gilbert, a New York lawyer, has been appointed agent general for reparations payments.
- September 4—Mr. MacDonald delivers a speech before the Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva, explaining the British Government's attitude on the subject of disarmament and security and advocating a system based on arbitration, to be worked out at an international conference.
- September 5—M. Herriot, the French Prime Minister, explains the French attitude on the subject of disarmament and security before the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva, welcoming Mr. MacDonald's advocacy of arbitration, but urging the necessity of force behind arbitration and supporting the draft treaty of mutual assistance.
- September 6—A joint resolution on disarmament is moved by Mr. MacDonald and M. Herriot in the Assembly of the League of Nations and it is passed unanimously.
- The Government of Peking issues a mandate equivalent to the declaration of war on the military governor of Chekiang, to whose aid Sun Yat-Sen announces his intention of going.
- September 8—Chang Tso-lin, the Manchurian dictator, declares war on the Peking Government.
- September 10—The Assembly of the League of Nations concludes its discussions on the question of minorities.
- September 11—Reports received from Russia indicate that the Georgian insurrection against the Bolsheviks is widespread and, apparently, has not been crushed.
- September 12—Signor Casalini, a Fascist deputy, is shot and killed in Rome by a man called Corvi, who said he wished to avenge the death of Signor Matteotti.
- September 15—The rising in Georgia against the Bolsheviks becomes general in the Caucasus, and the President of the Georgian Republic appeals to the League of Nations.

AMERICA AND WORLD AFFAIRS

Extracts from Acceptance Speeches by (I) the Republican
and (II) the Democratic Presidential Candidates

I

By PRESIDENT COOLIDGE

AMERICA, under Providence, has come to be a nation of great responsibility. It exists as one of the family of nations. We cannot be isolated. Other peoples exist all about us. Their actions affect us and our actions affect them, whether we will or no. Their financial condition is not and cannot be entirely separated from our financial condition. But the final determination of our relationship to other countries rises into a higher realm. We believe in the brotherhood of man because we believe in the fatherhood of God. That is our justification for freedom and equality. We believe in the law of service, which teaches us that we can improve ourselves only by helping others. We know that these principles are applicable alike to our domestic and our foreign relations. We cannot live unto ourselves alone.

The foreign policy of America can best be described by one word—peace. Our actions have always proclaimed our peaceful desires, but never more evidently than now. We covet no territory; we support no threatening military array; we harbor no hostile intent. We have pursued, are pursuing, and shall continue to pursue with untiring devotion the cause of peace.

These ideals we have put into practical application. We have sought to promote peace not only by word, but by appropriate action. We have been unwilling to surrender our independence. We have refused to ratify the Covenant of the League of Nations, but we have co-operated with it to suppress the narcotic trade and promote public health. We have every desire to help; but the time, the place, and the method must be left to our own determination. Under our constitution we cannot foreclose the right of the President or the Congress to determine future problems when they arise. We must necessarily proceed upon the principle of present co-operation without future entanglements.

As peace means fundamentally a reign of law, we propose to become a member of

the Permanent Court of International Justice. Such action would do much to indicate our determination to restrain the rule of force and solidify and sustain the rule of reason among nations.

We have observed with sympathy the continuing difficulties of Europe. We have desired to assist whenever we could do so effectively. Late in December, 1922, the Secretary of State announced the American plan, which was finally adopted. Under it the Reparation Commission appointed a committee of experts, of which three were Americans, one of whom, Charles G. Dawes, was chosen chairman. A report has been made which received world-wide approbation and has been accepted in principle by the governments interested. At a conference of prime ministers held to work out the details of putting this plan into operation, I directed the attendance of Ambassador Kellogg, assisted by Colonel Logan, to represent our government. Throughout all this course of events we helped in the only way we could help.

I believe the substance of the plan ought to be adopted. By that test will be revealed whether Europe really desires our co-operation. If Europe should agree to this proposal, then a private loan should be made by our citizens to Germany for the financial support of this undertaking. The governments interested should make necessary concessions for the security of such a loan. In my opinion such action, by stabilizing Europe, would result in improving our own economic condition; but, beyond that, it is the duty of our people who have the resources to use them for the relief of war-stricken nations and the improvement of world conditions.

As this is written, reports indicate that the plan of General Dawes will be adopted, and that the effort of America has made a tremendous contribution to the welfare,

security, and peace of the world. But I await the event.

When the reparations plan is in operation, I shall deem it an appropriate time to approach the great powers with a proposal for another conference for a further limitation of armaments and for devising plans for a codification of international law. I personally should favor entering into covenants for the purpose of outlawing aggressive war by any practical means. Our country has always been against aggressive war and for permanent peace. Those who are working out detailed plans to present such a policy for consideration have my entire sympathy. I trust that never again will the women of this nation be called on to sacrifice their loved ones to the terrible scourge of war.

We have constantly striven to come to

more complete understandings and improve our relations with Latin America. At their request we have undertaken to compose their difficulties. We helped the government of Mexico protect itself against domestic violence. There is little doubt that in extending this assistance and the moral support which it indicated we helped save the people of Mexico from the terrors of another revolution. We also indicated the adoption of a policy of making it worth while for a government so to conduct itself as to merit our recognition. We have secured a written agreement with Mexico to negotiate a treaty of amity and commerce to replace one which was canceled as long ago as 1881, and joint commissions will shortly meet to adjust all American claims against that country.

II

By HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

All that we do will be undone; all that we build will be torn down; all that we hope for will be denied, unless in conjunction with the rest of mankind we can lift the burden of vast armaments which now weighs upon the world and silence the recurring threat of war. This we shall not do by pious wishes or fervid rhetoric. We will not contribute to it as a nation simply by offering to others, no more concerned than ourselves, our unsolicited advice. Providence does not give the gifts of peace to those who will not labor to achieve them. In the name of the Democratic party, therefore, I promise to the country that no enterprise sincerely directed to this end will lack our approval and co-operation. We favor the World Court in sincerity and not merely for campaign purposes or as an avenue of escape from the consideration of larger questions. We believe it a real advance toward peaceful settlement of international disputes—an advance from which America cannot turn away without proving herself false to the teaching of a century.

We wish to see America as a nation play her part in that reconstruction of the economic life of Europe which has proven itself so indispensable to our own well-being and prosperity. We are ready for

any conference on disarmament, provided it is so general in its membership and so wide in its scope as to deal broadly with so broad a theme. We do not and we cannot accept the dictum unauthorized by any expression of popular will that the League of Nations is a closed incident, so far as we are concerned. We deny the right of any man to thus shut the gates of the future against us and to write the fatal word "Never" across the face of our foreign policy.

My own beliefs on this particular subject have been so frequently avowed and are, I believe, so well understood as hardly to need repetition. I yield to no man in my resolve to maintain America's independence or in my unwillingness to involve her in the quarrels of other nations. Yet, from the day when the proposal was first put forward, I believed that American duty and American interests alike demanded our joining, as a free and equal people, the other free peoples of the world in this enterprise. Nothing that has since occurred has shaken me in that belief.

On the contrary, the march of events has shown not only that the League has within it the seed of sure survival, but that it is destined more and more to become the bulwark of peace and order to mankind. Fifty-four nations now sit

around its council table. Ireland, I rejoice to say, has shaken off her long subjection, and once more a nation has made her entry into the League, the sign and symbol of her glorious rebirth. The time cannot be far distant when Germany will take the seat to which she is rightly entitled. Russia, Mexico, and Turkey will make the roll, with one exception, entire and complete. None of the nations in all this lengthening list have parted with their sovereignty or sacrificed their independence, or have imperiled by their presence their safety at home or their security abroad. I cannot reconcile their experience with the fears of those who dread a different fate for the United States.

There are in this country sincere minds who oppose both the World Court and the League and, indeed, any organic contact with other nations, because they wish the United States to live a purely opportunist life. They wish no obligation at any time to any other powers, even the slender obligation to consult and to confer.

I respect such opinions, even though I do not share them; for, on sheerest grounds of national safety, I cannot think it prudent that the United States should be absent whenever all the other nations of the world assemble to discuss world problems. But I must be permitted to doubt the intellectual honesty of those who profess to favor organized international co-operation for peace and who studiously turn away from the only agencies yet created to that end.

In my own thought concerning the League two aspects of the question have been constantly before me. I have never found it possible greatly to concern myself as to terms of our adherence or the language in which those terms might be phrased. Deeds are of more consequence than words. Time and custom and the laws of natural growth will have their way in spite of language, provided a sincere

purpose lies behind them. Whatever the character in which we shall finally appear, it is the fact of our presence that will count.

Neither have I at any time believed, nor do I now believe, that the entrance of America into the League can occur, will occur, or should occur until the common judgment of the American people is ready for the step. We waited for this judgment to ripen in order that we might enter the war. I am content, if need be, to wait until it speaks for the agencies of peace.

That a day can and will come when this great question will finally be lifted entirely above the plane of partisan politics; when men will cease to take counsel solely of their passions, their pride, and their fears, and when the voice of public approval will find means to make itself heard, I am serenely confident.

Until that day arrives, I deem it the duty of the Chief Executive to co-operate officially, by every means at his command, with all legitimate endeavors, whether they come from the League or from any other source, to lessen the prospect of future war; to aid in repairing the ravages of the wars that are past, to promote disarmament, and to advance the well-being of mankind.

Equally, too, his duty and the duty of Congress, burdensome as it may be, to maintain the means of adequate national defense until reason is permitted to take the place of force. We cannot throw away the sword when other scabbards are not empty. Nor can I reconcile it with my ideas of the dignity of a great nation to be represented at international gatherings only under the poor pretense of "unofficial observation." If I become President of the United States, America will sit as an equal among equals whenever she sits at all.

THE MEANING OF DEFENSE DAY

By HERBERT HOOVER

From a Speech at the Dinner of the 106th Regiment,
Brooklyn, New York, September 12, 1924

THIS is the day set aside for the review of our land forces, and it is an occasion on which we can well consider the deeper problems which face the world in armament.

Some of our people feel deeply that these preparations may contribute to the stimulation of militarism in our people; but I am convinced, if we look beneath the surface of what actual militarism is, we will find that America is free from it.

The fear that our people have of militarism is the fear of that dreadful spirit which contributed so much to set the world on fire in 1914 and which still lingers in some parts of the world. Militarism is the direct or indirect fostering of the belief that war is ennobling to a nation; that war is the moment of a nation's greatness; that a martial spirit is a beneficent catalizer of the blood and spirit of the nation; that nations, even in peace, gain in power and add to their prestige and prosperity by dominating armament. In the persuasion of peoples to carry the burdens of great armament these arguments and beliefs are stimulated by painting some neighbor nation as the enemy, by fanning the flames of hate, of fear, and of arrogance in their peoples, and thereby is created that spirit of aggression which in 1914 broke the peace of the world.

We have little of this stuff, in fact, it cannot be stimulated out of our chosen form of a defense system. It does not germinate from small skeleton standing armies dependent upon voluntary reserve forces. Militarism feeds itself most successfully upon populations militarized through peace-time conscription of the whole manhood. It is only in such a nation-wide school that it can be well sustained. There can be little stimulation of these malign ideas in a nation where ten million men could be massed in arms, yet the whole of its standing army is but 140,000 men. Indeed, we are the only important nation today whose standing army

is less than the policemen on its street corners. Our voluntary forces are but 180,000 men, and the essence of voluntary forces is that of sacrifice which must be made by men whose callings and aspirations lie in peace, whose belief is that civilization progresses only in the path of peace.

These spirits of militarism have rarely been conjured up by the responsible American soldier or statesman. Our army has never been the center point of such misguiding of the American people. Once in a while its ugly front shows itself among jingoes on the stump or in the press, and the very promptness with which such utterances are invariably rebuked by the overwhelming sentiment of the country is proof of our freedom from its contaminating influence.

America has been the land of political experiment. In the list of the experiments we have made in many fields has been our determination to carry on our national defense without peace-time conscription. From the very first days of our independence we have set our faces against it as the stimulation to militarism. We have proved the truth of this. We have never been aggressors. In fact, we have sometimes denied ourselves that rightful justice we could have secured did we wish to exert our strength.

Had the United States undertaken peace-time conscription, thereby maintaining a compulsory standing army and reserves on the basis of many countries, we should today have a million and a half standing army and four millions of reserves. In our resolution to maintain our defense on our own system we have saved the Western Hemisphere from the catastrophes of Europe, for had we established such an army we should have imposed the reply of conscription upon every State in the Western Hemisphere, with its net of military alliances and its inevitable clash from the malign forces which such ideas and such armament would have itself produced.

But to say that Americans are not militarists does not imply that they are pacifists. I, like almost a universality of Americans, am opposed to war. It has been my fortune, or perhaps my fate, to see the incantations which raised the violence of the mob; to see the militant armies of many nations on many occasions. I have been present at great parades, tremendous spectacles of military prowess. I have seen soldiers going to battle, their faces set in grim determination and lit with belief in victory for a sacred cause. I have seen them returning from the struggle, their hopes sustained by success or shattered by defeat. I have seen the thousands of dead, the millions of starving women and children. In our generation we need no emphasis of survey of the grief of millions of homes, the miseries of famine and anarchy, the revolutions that have swept many nations and threatened others, the lowered standards of living, the indelible impress of hate, the more terrible possibilities of future war, through ever-advancing science. Nor is it wrong to recall, not alone the moral degeneration and the loss of life that flow from war, but the fact that the delicate machinery of social organization of production and of commerce, upon which civilization is founded cannot stand such a shock again. Our people know the narrow margins by which civilization and all that we hold dear barely escaped destruction six years ago.

So it is that we in America have come to loathe war and to yearn for universal peace. We harbor neither fear nor hate, neither aggression nor desire for power or prestige, other than that which lies in the arts of peace. Our country has led in the limitation of armament.

Nevertheless, however, we might fervently hope and pray that wars are over, we cannot found our national policies upon such a basis. Strive as we may for the ideal, we must look out upon the world through the clear glass of realism. We know how the seeds of war are planted, and that human nature and understanding changes but slowly; that man is proceeding only little by little toward the goal of perfection, and that nations are but aggregations of men. If we survey the world, we find that it is as greatly armed

as in the tinder-box days of 1914, though not in the same places. Preparedness for defense is a necessity so long as great armaments and the spirits of fear, hate, militant nationalism, arrogance, or aggression linger in the world. And the world is not free from these uncomfortable bad fellows, though some of them be stunned by the exhaustion of the last ten years. We must need maintain such forces as assure us in defense, whose equipment and morale keep it ever ready, and whose public support is one of appreciation of a national service well given to the security of us all.

As I realize that all over America today thousands of young men march by in voluntary demonstration of patriotism, my thoughts were not merely upon visual features. We are not marching to cultivate any martial spirit, not to manifest any desire for war, but to show to ourselves and to the world our readiness to protect ourselves against any unlooked-for aggressions. And there is a greater significance than this: America without arming is demonstrating its power to arm and its wish for peace.

When we peer deeper into the forces which impel nations; when we have regard for the combative nature of man; when we study the struggle to lift the standards of life for great peoples; when we witness the pressures of overgrown populations; when we see the unredress of wrong; when we know that nations, like individuals, have moods of madness and arrogance; when we see the ruthless strivings for the intangibles of pride and prestige and territory; when we witness increasing armament for defense against or for aggression in these forces—then some become discouraged lest peace shall be but the recuperation from war. In discouragement they demand greater armament. Yet the world does have longer and longer periods when the forces of peace are triumphant and when the souls of men are striving to greater things. And the minds of men are today directed toward the elimination of the causes of war with more resolution than at any time in centuries. Reduction of armament as a step in the elimination of the causes of war through reducing fear and the malign

forces of militarism has today more support than ever before.

The proposal of President Coolidge for further conferences between nations to accomplish reduction of armaments bids fair to realization. Indeed, it is the next step in the progress of practical peace and reconstruction. Every country today visualizes its defense preparation upon the military strength of its neighbors, and until all can participate there can be little hope of relief. America broke this vicious cycle in naval armament two years ago, and European statesmen are today working again for these ends with hope and courage.

There is a matter of primary importance in the question of reduction of armament which merits great consideration. If we will examine historical experience in the growth of militarism and its contribution to stimulation of war, we will find that it secures its greatest fertilizer in universal conscription in times of peace—a very different thing from universal service in times of war. Here is an enlarged school through which these evil ideas can be inculcated in a people. Reduction of armament will have made but little progress until conscription is abolished. Nor is this fact unrecognized by the world. The first principle of disarmament imposed upon Germany and Austria was the abandonment of conscription. Our own history of over 140 years and the greater freedom of the Western Hemisphere from periodic

great international wars and the burden of great armaments is itself the warranty of experience. If conscription could be abolished in the world, peace would have won a great victory. The security of the world and of America would be increased, the prosperity of the world would be greater, the burdens upon all those who labor would be lighter.

But the reduction of armament is not a simple problem of mathematics among nations. It is a problem of infinite complexity, which will find solution only in the will to peace. It is in this sincerity that statesmen have entered upon renewed determination to bring it about; for behind disarmament must come the allaying of fear, hate, and national greed.

Reduction of armament is a step in the elimination of the causes of war. The settlement of disputes by judicial processes, by the extension of the principles of arbitration, and the prompt settlement of friction and fears by orderly negotiation are others equally important. But in the end peace is not to be maintained by documents, no matter how perpetual their declarations may be, nor is it maintained by institutions, no matter how perfect they be. It is only to be gained through good will, through esteem, by the upbuilding of those same relations of consideration and respect that make good neighbors.

In the meantime, work as we will to these purposes, we cannot go undefended.

Who would be a Queen

That sees what my love hath seen?—

The blood of myriads vainly shed

To make one royal ruby red!

Then tell me, music, why the great

For quarrelling trumpets abdicate

This quick, this absolute estate.

—Alfred Noyes.

CONGRESSMEN IN SWITZERLAND

Twenty-second Conference of the Interparliamentary Union in Bern and Geneva

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Executive Secretary of the American Group

THE thrill of the Twenty-second Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Bern, Switzerland, August 22-27, and in Geneva, August 28, came Saturday morning, the second day of the conference, when Hugh Gibson, United States minister to Switzerland, gracefully and simply presented the following invitation:

To the Interparliamentary Union:

The Congress of the United States of America having by a joint resolution, approved May 13, 1924, requested the President of the United States to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1925 in the city of Washington, it affords me very great pleasure indeed, as President of the United States, to extend to the Interparliamentary Union, in pursuance of the said joint resolution, the cordial invitation of the Government and the Congress of the United States to hold its Twenty-third Conference in the city of Washington at such time during the year 1925 as the Union may fix.

(Signed) CALVIN COOLIDGE.

By the President:

(Signed) CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.

WASHINGTON, June 30, 1924.

Importance of the Invitation

This was a most unusual event. In the first place, only members of parliaments are permitted by the constitution of the Union to speak at its meetings. This difficulty, for arrangements had been made for the United States minister to present the invitation from President Coolidge, vanished in the twinkling of an eye, during the first session of the conference, upon the motion of Baron Adelswård, of Sweden, President of the Interparliamentary Council. It was early in the meeting of Friday, August 22, the first

day, that Baron Adelswård called the attention of the conference to the fact that the United States minister had asked the privilege of presenting a communication to the conference. He added that the Council had examined the question, and that, while addresses before the conference under the rules could be given only by members of parliaments, he considered it necessary to make an exception when it became a matter of receiving a message from the government of a great nation. As he asked the approval of this proposal, the conference agreed with spontaneous and enthusiastic applause.

Still more impressive, this was the first time that the head of a government had presented such an invitation. It marked, therefore, an epoch in the development and importance of the Union. The event added pith and dignity to all the later discussions. It cheered immeasurably the delegates. It heartened especially the men who have labored through the many years for the cause which the Union represents. It revealed the enthusiastic interest of parliamentarians generally in affairs of the United States, and the widespread desire to know more intimately and clearly our people, upon whom, because of our unparalleled growth and potential power, rest so much the future hopes of mankind. The enthusiasm of the delegates at the prospect of visiting the United States was unmistakable. The President's invitation has rendered a great service already to the cause of friendship across the seas.

The City of Bern

Bern is a city to remember and to go back to. There are less than 100,000 people there, but these people and their town have a quality which appeals. Picturesque is the first word one thinks of, as one looks in upon or out of the place. Those sixteenth-century fountains, topped

by their odd, old-time figures and scattered everywhere, have a style all their own, lively and medieval. The arched sidewalks, with the heavy-arched masonry supporting the buildings above; the variety of the bear motive in signs and statues, because Bern is named after the bear—the bear is a sort of patron saint of the city; the narrow, winding streets of the old part; the roofs, with their many dormers one above the other—yet, there is something of Nüremberg about the place. And yet it is no other place at all. It is Bern.

And the view! I like it better than any other in Switzerland. The Blümlisalp, the Breithorn, the Jungfrau, through the iridescent and clinging clouds, all from the windows of our hotel—one hotel called Bellevue with genuine propriety. But such a view is for the poets and the artists to describe. Mere editors are not up to it. But I must add that the Alpine glow glows around Bern. There is no doubt of that.

On Top of the Jungfrau

The Swiss are a kindly and a hospitable people, especially so in Bern. We saw evidence of this in the hotels, in the shops, in the bureaux—everywhere. Sunday, August 24, the Swiss group of the Interparliamentary Union took us by special train to the lake—*Thunsee*; then by boat to Interlaken; then by train and funicular to the top of the Jungfrau, where, some 12,000 feet up, amid the everlasting snows, we saw and felt that glory of color, of line, and of distance which has made scenery and Switzerland synonymous the world round. Of course, we shall all remember the reception given by the city of Bern at the Kursaal Schänzli, the dinner given by the Swiss group, the excursion to Lausanne, and the boat ride from there to Geneva, the reception in Geneva by the Swiss Council of State and the Canton of Geneva; but that day on the Jungfrau has become a permanent possession of the very spirit of every member of that happy party, brought together from many quarters of the globe, on that Sabbath day in August.

The Business of the Conference

Of course, the Interparliamentary Union met in Bern for business. There was

plenty of business. Twenty-five parliaments were represented, as follows: Germany, the United States, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hungary, Dutch-India, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Holland, Poland, Rumania, Jugoslavia, Sweden, Switzerland, and Czechoslovakia. Most of the delegations included a number of the best-known men of their respective countries.

The American party was as follows: Senator William B. McKinley, of Illinois, president of the American group; Representative Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, member of the Executive Committee of the Interparliamentary Union; Senator Selden P. Spencer, of Missouri; Senator O. E. Weller, of Maryland; Senator Charles Curtis, of Kansas; Representative Andrew J. Montague, of Virginia; Mrs. Andrew J. Montague; Representative Tom Connally, of Texas, Mrs. Connally, Mr. Ben Connally; Representative J. J. McSwain, of South Carolina; Arthur Deerin Call, Executive Secretary of the American Group, Washington, D. C., Mrs. Call, Miss Margaret F. Call; Walter Penfield, Assistant Secretary, Washington, D. C.; George Buckingham, Assistant Secretary, Chicago, Ill.; Miss Isabel Sedgley and Miss Nellie Sedgley, of Washington, D. C., and Hon. Richard Bartholdt, member of the Council of the Interparliamentary Union, of Missouri; for a few days, Senator Asmeña, of the Philippine Senate, and his secretary, M. Jassin joined the Americans.

M. Alois de Meuron, president of the Swiss group, was chosen to preside over the conferences. M. Giuseppe Motta, Counselor of State and *chef du Département politique*, welcomed the delegates. As it happened, M. Motta a few days later was chosen president of the fifth Assembly of the League of Nations, at Geneva.

A variety of matters came up for discussion. A number of recommendations relative to the constitution of the Union was submitted by Senator Henri La Fontaine, of Belgium. The financial situation of the organization was presented by Baron Adelswärd, of the Swedish Senate. The report of the Bureau, to which was devoted the greatest amount of discussion, was laid before the conference by

Representative Theodore E. Burton, of the United States, in an address appearing elsewhere in these columns. This address called forth many speeches, some of an order calculated to influence opinion not only within the Union, but in the governments back home.

Two Outstanding Points of Interest

Looking back across these addresses, two facts stand out with striking clearness—the seriousness of the problem of minorities throughout central Europe and the new feeling of hope aroused by the London Conference. Of course, the changes in the constitution, the financial situation of the Union, the scholarly and valuable report on the parliamentary control of foreign policy, submitted by Professor Schücking, of the German group; M. Moutet's statement on colonial mandates and the League of Nations; the problem of reparations, as set forth by Baron Sztterenyi, of Hungary, and the Rt. Hon. Lord Rathcreedan, of Great Britain; Baron Sztterenyi's further report on the economic solidarity of the world and international traffic; the problems of social policy in their relation to emigration and immigration, as set forth by Senator Merlin, of France; the reduction of armaments, reported upon by M. van Walleghem, of Belgium; demilitarized zones, as pleaded for by General Spears, of England, and Dr. Munch's plan for the reduction of armaments, not to mention other aspects of the work of the conference, are all creditable evidences of the tasks attempted by the Interparliamentary Union. But the passion of the conference reached its highest in the appeals for the minorities struggling under their new enforced allegiances and in the pledges for a closer co-operation, especially between France and Germany.

The problem of the discontented minorities was injected into the discussions on the very first day of the conference. M. Brabec, of Czechoslovakia, mentioned them in his address of Friday—rather casually, it is true, but the reference was enough. Nearly every speech thereafter contained some expression of views about these unhappy groups.

The Bitter Minorities

The central thought of many of the

speeches first appeared in the address of Dr. de Lukacs, of Hungary, who regretted that the committee had neglected to deal with the questions of minorities, for, in his opinion, five years of bitter experience had amply proved that the States successors to the former Austro-Hungarian Empire simply deny all rights to their minorities, and that, furthermore, there is no organization competent to protect these minorities.

M. Medinger, of Czechoslovakia, carried the thought further, pointing out that the League of Nations' commission, charged to deal with these questions, has been a disappointment, and that the League itself has been a profound deception. The League, professing to be inspired by the name of Wilson, is a traitor to his thought. It is too inelastic and self-contradictory. It rests upon force and follows the psychology of war. It has established an International Court of Justice, supposed to be accessible to States not members of the League, but it is most difficult for such States to get before the court. The rights of the minorities have been granted with one hand and taken away with the other, since it is impossible for these minorities to get any redress for their grievances. As a result, Europe has been Balkanized. Having failed before the League, these minorities turn longingly to the Interparliamentary Union.

Others who voiced the complaints of the minorities were such men as Wilfan, of Italy; Senator Ledebur-Wicheln, of Czechoslovakia, and Molloff, of Bulgaria, who pointed out that his country is suffering from an excess of hospitality and protection accorded to the many refugees from practically all the bordering countries.

Some of the delegates complained of the propaganda carried on in their countries by governments to whom their minorities formerly belonged. Thus this whole question of minorities, altogether too deep for Americans to understand, is a veritable burning brand in the powder-house of Europe.

The Interparliamentary Union, with its freedom from government control and its detachment from the wiles of diplomacy, with its open discussions, may well be the most useful of all the agencies attempting to solve these most difficult problems.

French and German Cordiality

Even the most conservative members of the conference were impressed by the return of French interest in the Union, and especially by the new will to co-operate across the Rhine. This new spirit appeared most vividly in the addresses by Senator Fernand Merlin, of France, and by former Chancellor Wirth, of Germany. The agreements of the London Conference, so recently accomplished, had their influence; but time and the better natures of men contributed toward the beneficent result. Both speeches held the breathless attention of the conference. Merlin's eloquence ended in a peroration, that it is not war and hate, but work and friendship, which unite nations, and that if the effort continues henceforth the history of the world will not be of wars and battles, but rather of things of the spirit.

Chancellor Wirth met this new challenge with equal grace and eloquence. He was convinced that the address by M. Merlin expressed the new spirit, and in the name of the German delegation he would voice his great joy. He felt it to be tragic that the two great nations, France and Germany, who have contributed so much to humanity, should shatter the hopes of European civilization. "We have been profoundly deceived. This ought not to arrest the hope in a reconciliation."

No such views as these would have been possible at the meeting in Copenhagen a year ago, nor at any meeting of the Union since the war.

Representative Theodore E. Burton, of the United States, said:

In closing this discussion I desire to repeat and emphasize what I said on Friday, that the outlook for peace and good will is infinitely better at the meeting of this conference than in any of the three preceding. The American delegates were especially pleased on Saturday by the words of conciliation expressed by Senator Merlin and ex-Chancellor Wirth. We trust that each of them speaks not for himself alone, not for a party, but for a whole nation, and thus for the welfare of the whole wide world.

Through centuries conflicts between the two nations, France and Germany, have been frequent. The reason for the original visit of Julius Cæsar to Gaul was the protection of a friendly tribe against an incursion from Germany, and these incursions have continued since. Let us hope that in the future the crossings of the Rhine may be but channels of trade, of social intercourse and good will.

The American delegates have with some degree of pain and regret listened to the numerous complaints from minorities. May we not trust that with a more settled world, with better international relations, there may be also more perfect domestic relations, that all these problems may be settled with justice and in a spirit of common interest. One of our theologians once said, "Evolution tells us where we came from, religion tells us where we are going, but the fact is we are *here*;" and those who dwell in these different countries, where there are varied races and men of different religions and languages, are *here*—or *there*. They must dwell together in peace and amity, and we can but call their attention to that great declaration which stated that all men are created free and endowed with certain inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. May there not be a new realization of the independent rights of each individual to follow the dictates of his conscience, to the exercise of his religion, to the greatest possible freedom consistent with public order.

In closing, *Monsieurs*, let me say that much that must be accomplished in the great cause of arbitration and peace, and the international co-operation so dear to our hearts, must be initiated by us. This organization speaks for the prerogatives, the opportunities, and the responsibilities of legislative bodies. Let us meet these responsibilities and quit ourselves like men—not merely patriotic for our own country, but with an international mind which shall bring in a new era among the nations.

The official report of the President and the Secretary General, setting forth the results of the conference, will be found elsewhere in this issue.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Address before the XXIInd Conference of the Interparliamentary Union,
Bern, Switzerland, August 22, 1924.

By THEODORE E. BURTON

Retiring American Member of the Executive Committee of the Union

AFTER the excellent survey of the achievements of the Interparliamentary Union by the Secretary General, in the Report of the Bureau, it would be almost superfluous to give more than a brief mention of its history for the last 35 years. My long association with this organization, however, impels me to make a passing reference to certain prominent facts and incidents. It has a most inspiring record. The actual founder was Sir William Randal Cremer, an English carpenter, for a long time a member of Parliament. He was a trade unionist who had taken a leading part in the settlement of labor disputes by arbitration, and thus became interested in the larger task of the settlement of international controversies by the same method, especially by the establishment of this general congress, to which legislators from all countries are eligible. Thus it appears that the originator of this movement came not from the seats of the mighty, but from the humble ranks of labor. He was a man of the highest motives. Though of very moderate means, when a winner of the Nobel Prize he devoted the larger share of the proceeds to an endowment for the furtherance of the objects so dear to his heart. Time would fail me to mention the long list of publicists who co-operated with him in the most noble work which he had undertaken, and who made the very beginnings of the Union notable as a foundation for that progress in international conciliation which has been accomplished by it.

The original scope of the organization was limited to the promotion of international arbitration, but since the year 1899, under enlarged plans, efforts have been exerted for the securing of every means for the prevention of war and the growth of international co-operation.

Our achievements are written large in the history of pacifist movements. I recall having presented at the White House in

Washington in 1904 a resolution framed in collaboration with Mr. Bartholdt, who is present here today, asking President Roosevelt to request the respective nations to arrange for a second conference at The Hague. This request was acted upon by President Roosevelt and led to the meeting of 1907. Prior to that the committees of the Union had taken a prominent part in framing model arbitration treaties and in active movements for the promotion of peace.

The Russian consul at Budapest, after the meeting of the Union in that city in 1896, was so impressed by its action that he reported the proceedings to his government and prevailed upon the foreign minister, Muravieff, to submit a memorandum to the Czar. The first Hague Conference of 1899 was in no small degree the result of this memorandum. The draft of the Brussels Conference of this body, made in 1895, served as a basis for the discussions relating to international organization for the furtherance of international arbitration at the first Hague Conference, and the draft treaty of arbitration prepared in London in 1906 was utilized in the discussion at the second Hague Conference of the following year.

There was a dramatic scene at the gathering in London in 1906. A group from Russia was present, but just at the time of their arrival a ukase was issued by the Czar, dissolving the Douma, and, amid shouts of "Vive la Douma!" the members of the group most unwillingly went out from the Assembly. In all these years the Union has manifested its usefulness in various ways.

More recently, and within the recollection of most of you, consideration has been given to the perplexing question of the rights of minorities, to parliamentary control of foreign policy, as well as the equitable management of mandated territories for the uplifting of backward peoples, and the adoption of the principle of

the "open door"; for let it be understood that the just and rational ground upon which these mandates should rest is helpful development for the peoples in the mandated territories, not exploitation for the benefit of those entrusted with their care.

Perhaps the greatest benefit of all arises from the association in annual gatherings of representatives of various nations. This renders potent aid in destroying that conceit of nationality which assumes that the highest virtue and excellence dwell only in the country of one's birth and at the same time ignores the fact that the normal development of nations as well as of individuals must depend upon diversity. Peoples of every land and of every race have superior qualities.

Still further these gatherings create cherished friendships between those brought together from lands remote. These are not merely the source of most pleasing personal intimacies, but they also promote good will between the countries represented here.

There are two features to be especially emphasized in forecasting the work of this Union in this year 1924:

The first is the growing importance of legislative bodies, the people's representatives, whether they be mere lawmaking bodies or, as in the larger number of countries, furnish prime ministers and cabinets with executive functions.

This growth has been very marked during the life of this organization and especially in the last twenty years. This interparliamentary Union speaks for the prerogatives, the opportunities, and the responsibilities of the chosen representatives of the people. Now and then there will be reactions in favor of executive or central authority, and this, alike with every legislative body, will be powerful or impotent just in proportion as it manifests or fails to manifest broad vision and an adequate grasp of the problems which are now pressing upon the world with almost bewildering rapidity. It is for us to become a parliament of parliaments.

Let us remember, my fellow-members, that this Interparliamentary Union is not a mere debating society; it is not a "talk-fest"; it is not an organization in which members are authorized to leave after the adjournment and forget the recommenda-

tions and conclusions reached here. We should go home to our respective countries to spread upon the records that which has been done in this organization and, so far as we may, stimulate the adoption of legislation carrying out our recommendations. In my own country the president of our group, Senator McKinley, spread upon the records on his return last year an account of the transactions at Copenhagen, and it will be our effort to bring them to the attention of the people, to secure adoption by our Congress, and to stimulate popular opinion in favor of the conclusions reached here.

The second feature is the vastly more encouraging outlook for peace and international co-operation today. The world has been suffering from the aftermath of war, from the loss of millions of lives and the destruction or waste of hundreds of billions in property values, together with the demoralization and dislocation resulting therefrom; but more serious than all these are the spiritual legacies in manifestations of hatred and revengeful sentiments.

A distinguished historian in surveying events succeeding the downfall of Napoleon said that the return to normal conditions in Europe occurred about four years after 1815. More than four years have already elapsed since the Armistice of November 11, 1918, but in this sixth year a calmer disposition affords assurance of a settlement of the harassing problem of reparations and of all those questions which like a threatening cloud have hung over Europe. We may hope that these settlements will furnish a restoration of national credit and industrial life and secure those objects so necessary for prosperity and happiness.

While the softening influences of time cannot be disregarded, our Secretary of State and our President, in suggesting the Dawes Commission, blazed the way for these adjustments. The agreements recommended must be accepted by diplomats and ratified by parliaments. I am making a bold statement, but I verily believe that if anyone should in this situation block the way to peace it were better that the rocks and hills should fall upon him rather than that he should have to face the indignation of the world, which would be aroused by his opposition. It

should not be forgotten that in dealings between nations the central fact must be a willingness to make reasonable concessions. No nation can expect the adoption of all its claims. Just as in private contracts, so in international agreements, mutual concessions are necessary conditions for success.

It has been requested that I offer some suggestions upon the attitude of the United States toward the European situation. I undertake this with no official sanction, but as a careful observer having perhaps exceptional opportunities for information.

I repeat what I said at Copenhagen last year, that there is the most intense interest in the United States in all that transpires in Europe. Our newspapers give scarcely less—sometimes even more—attention to conferences and measures which look to the settlement of controversies than our own. It is true that among a small minority this interest is based upon commercial and financial considerations, but with the great mass it is the manifestation of a hope that there may be a peaceful and contented Europe. It has been the predominant opinion that our participation in conferences and membership in leagues would be futile so long as the bitter antagonisms which have prevailed are rife. Again, such participation would be a departure from traditional and long-established policies.

What can be accomplished in the absence of such antagonisms as have prevailed here since the war is well illustrated by the negotiation of a treaty at Santiago, in Chile, last year, under which sixteen nations of the New World, the United States included, definitely agreed that in case of controversy between any of them which cannot be settled by the ordinary methods of diplomacy a commission shall be constituted, made up of representatives from each of the contending countries, with arbitrators from neutral nations, and that no warlike action shall be taken until this commission has had adequate opportunity to report upon the facts and the law involved. This effective step for peace and goodwill seems to insure an era of peace in the Western Hemisphere. Our one aim in dealing with the Latin-American countries has been to prevent conflict among them and to promote confidence and good

will. The so-called Monroe Doctrine is by no means a policy of aggression. We do not ask for any special privileges in the Latin-American countries. We believe in the "open door" there as elsewhere.

While not assuming membership in the League of Nations, we look with satisfaction upon any accomplishment which may be the result of its deliberations and have ourselves taken part in humanitarian movements initiated by the League, contributing by private benefaction also for their promotion. We have at all times been ready to act the part of a friend, and suggestions, not always made public, have been made by us for mediation. We are ready to aid with material resources and in such ways as will promote the pacification of Europe. Our President has declared his intention to invite another conference similar to that of 1921-22, and no doubt including a larger number of nations, whenever there is a settled Europe. He has declared himself in favor of joining the International Court, and I may say that the overwhelming opinion of our people is in its favor.

May I be permitted to state an opinion as to some fundamental facts which create the problem of Europe? These facts are those of geography and ethnology.

The geographical configuration of Europe is exceptional. With the exception of the great plains of Russia, the larger part of this continent is divided into areas separated by mountain chains and natural barriers, or made up of jutting peninsulas, as illustrated by Greece, Italy, the Iberian Peninsula, Denmark, and Scandinavia. Besides, there is the United Kingdom, separated from the mainland.

Passing from facts of geography to those of ethnology, Europe was settled by successive migrations for the most part from Asia. These immigrants came with marked diversities of motive: some for orderly settlement, others actuated by the pressure for a greater food supply, others still for plunder and exploitation. The stronger nations or tribes drove the weaker into the less-favored localities. The result of all these factors may be described by the words "segregation, repulsion, rivalry." Within this vast domain there is now and always has been an infinite variety of race, language, religion, and cultural advancement. Circumstances

which make for war and antagonism exist here as nowhere else in the world. Thus, conflicts in earlier centuries were almost constant.

Then, with the discovery of outlying portions of the world, there was a fierce conflict for the acquisition of remote islands and continents. Still later, with the beginning of the industrial era, more than 100 years ago, another rivalry arose, even more fierce, for commercial supremacy, for the supplies and outlets which are demanded by commerce. How different is the situation in the United States, where 48 States are united in social and commercial ties, with the freest access among them and with common aims and a full realization of the benefits of unity and co-operation. It may be said that, as in America, modern means of transportation have pierced mountains and crossed rivers, annihilating barriers; but this development did not occur in Europe until boundaries had been set and types of nationality had been fixed.

I cannot close without a brief reference to the example of Switzerland, the country which has welcomed us within her borders. Here there is a population made up of three races, speaking different languages, divided into religious beliefs, separated by mountains and natural barriers into a large number of distinct areas. Here for centuries there have been peace and all the helpful features which make for unity and co-operation. This was not obtained, however, without constant striving against the foe without and the enemy within. When, more than 40 years ago, with the adventurous spirit of youth, I indulged in

mountain-climbing here, I thought up how much steeper heights and over how much more rugged paths Switzerland had climbed in her struggle for liberty and union. There is here today a splendid example of popular government, of efficiency and of patriotism, with no ambition save for defense, and that defense is secured, more than by mountain walls, by the spirit of her people.

Members of the Interparliamentary Union, I congratulate you upon this occasion, when there is every indication that a calmer spirit will prevail in the world, and sentiments of peace, with an appreciation of common interest, may prepare the way to banish wars. These ennobling aims cannot be gained by the exercise of force, and leagues and conferences will be useless unless there is a will to peace, an enlightened public opinion which will strive to outlaw war and inaugurate the rule of law. It is to these objects that all our activities should be devoted.

Let us engage in our tasks with an earnest desire to render efficient aid in striking at the root of causes for friction, in harmonizing conflicting interests, in suggesting means by which those of different races and traditions may live side by side in harmony. Let us join in every effort to codify international law and enlarge its provisions; also to devise and promote means for the judicial settlement of all international controversies. Thus, in every way, we shall perform our part in securing a settled world, which shall look back upon war as an anachronism and cherish peace and universal concord as the true aim of all nations.

Beyond all other sense of wrong,—
 The loss of money, loss of men,
 The empty streets, divested of the throngs
 Which once did surge, not now and then,
 But always,—
 Is Heartache.

All else beside is but the sordid dross,
 For from the heart spring all things good.
 From now to when Christ died upon the cross
 What is there that the whole world would
 With war compare—
 But Heartache?

—F. H. Coolbroth.

THE TASK BEFORE PREMIER HERRIOT

By JOSEPH CAILLAUX

(NOTE.—This article by the extremely able, though much criticized, French statesman assumes special interest in the light of Premier Herriot's policies and actions at the London Conference and the Assembly of the League of Nations. It appeared originally in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*.)

THE fall of the Government of M. Poincaré shattered by the electoral verdict of May 11; the rapid disposal of M. Millerand, the President of the Republic; the complete collapse of a policy—these events have followed upon one another in my country.

It is revolution, say the reactionaries. But their watch is slow. There has been a revolution, if the word may be taken in the sense of a transformation of institutions without violent strains being placed upon legality; but this revolution took place between 1912 and 1914. Its effects have gone on developing until 1924. In 1924 the French nation has cried a halt. It has notified its sovereign will to see the Republic restored to the shape which is familiar to it, of a republic of peace.

The Nationalists have frequently remarked with justice that a new orientation in the general policy of the country dated from the arrival of M. Poincaré in power, in January, 1912. The change was hardly noticeable for the first year. M. Poincaré, anxious to raise himself to the highest position in the State, which he had long coveted, applied himself to allaying the suspicions of the Left-wing Republicans. He partly succeeded. In any case, thanks to the support which he obtained from the Right, he succeeded in securing his election in 1913 to the supreme magistrature. Carefully avoiding too much publicity, and pursuing his designs by subterranean ways, the new head of the State was able for another year to ward off the storm which was lowering. The tempest was, however, on the point of breaking out. M. Poincaré would have been obliged, if war had not come, to give way before the growing dissatisfaction of the Radicals and the Socialists, who were alarmed at the subtle turn which he was giving to home and, above all, to foreign policy.

During the whole period of the war

patriotism induced in the politicians of the Left a reserve which they carried to the point of abnegation and possibly to excess. They submitted to the dictatorship of the Elysée, which became in 1917 a joint dictatorship with M. Clemenceau. They submitted to the persecution and the ostracism with which some of their leaders were pursued, while their adversaries, surreptitiously pushed forward, first insinuated themselves and finally lorded it in the councils of the government. Finally they submitted to campaigns of vilification which were to do them infinite harm.

The politicians of the Right let their irony play upon the Radicals and Socialists, who had always inscribed "Peace" at the head of their programs; they reproached them for failing to foresee the war and for making insufficient preparations for it; they villified and slandered them, and gradually undermined the position of the Republicans in the country. They would not, however, have succeeded in obtaining a majority in the Chamber of Deputies if the events in Russia had not enabled them to frighten the nation by holding up the Red bogey and arousing the fear of an importation of Bolshevism; and, above all, if they had not had the assistance of a new method of voting, absurdly adjusted, which was intended to baffle, and which did baffle, the body of electors. The Chamber of 1919, the Chamber which was well called the "Sky-blue" Chamber, came into existence through this concatenation of exceptional circumstances. But the circumstances were so exceptional that it was unlikely that they would be reproduced. Once bit, twice shy. Those among the reactionaries who were not wanting in foresight—there did exist a few of these rare birds—realized so well the ephemeral nature of their success that they did their very utmost to put off any fresh consultation of the electorate to the Greek Kalends. Making a pretext of the gravity of the foreign situation, of the Ruhr affair, and so on, they urged the government during 1923 and the early months of 1924 to postpone the appeal to the country.

M. Poincaré resisted the demand. No doubt its enormity alarmed him. It amounted in effect to nothing less than the overthrow of free institutions. The late premier was too crafty a legalist to lend himself to such operations. They are not in his style. No doubt when he was at the Elysée he took certain liberties with the rules of constitutional procedure. But he never openly transgressed them. And after all, what reason was there for him to enter in 1924 upon the perilous path which was being proposed? Was he not constantly being told, and was not he himself convinced, that he enjoyed immense popularity? It was possible that the electors would vote Left, but what of it? Modifying his cabinet in advance, and introducing into it a few moderate Radicals, he was adapting himself to the movement which he half foresaw; in any case, in his view, it could not possibly compromise his predominance.

On May 12 he discovered the extent of his error. For it is he who has been beaten. It is his policy which has been condemned, above all his foreign policy. In vain has he equivocated. In vain has he tried to prove that his defeat was due to the discontent aroused by the new taxation. One single fact sweeps away all these excuses: the whole of the financial policy of the Bloc National and its leaders aimed at sparing—I was going to say favoring—the agriculturists; and it is the rural population which, all over the country, voted in serried ranks for the Cartel des Gauches and sealed the fate of Poincarism.

The members of the late majority tried to shelter themselves behind their leader. There was hardly a constituency in which the Conservative candidates did not declare in their manifestoes and their speeches that to vote against them was to vote against Poincaré, against the great Lorrainer and the sublime patriot. I may say that the majority added that to vote for their opponents was equivalent to voting for the writer of these lines. The country replied as clearly as could possibly be desired. What inspired its decision? The fear of war, the fear of reaction.

It has often been remarked that the French electorate—perhaps it is the same in other countries—is much more inclined to vote against some one or something than

for some one or something. The observation is quite correct, but not quite complete. In our campaigns the peasant forms his opinion not from the papers—he cares nothing for the Paris press and has not much more faith in what the local papers tell him—but from what he hears said around him. When the lord of the manor, the noble, or the rich commoner, of whose reactionary and in many cases royalist views he is well aware, praises a man or a policy in his presence; when he finds that the Catholic priest, who unfortunately is nine times out of ten the mouth-piece of the aristocrats, associates himself with this praise, Jacques Bonhomme has made up his mind. He votes against the man and the policy cried up by those of whom he is always suspicious.

The more the partisans of the late régime declared themselves convinced admirers of M. Poincaré, the more they praised his qualities as a statesman, his unflinching patriotism, and so on, the more the army of the rural voters became suspicious. They are conservative in the highest sense of the word, but they hate reaction. Above all, they will not hear of war, and in all that was said to them about the Ruhr expedition and about the energy of the prime minister and his government they apprehended adventures which were dangerous to peace; and to peace they are more attached than ever after their horrible sufferings in the nightmare of the war.

M. Millerand was bound to be swept away by the electoral tidal wave. The moderate papers sweated blood and water to prove that the new majority was abusing its strength in claiming to cut short the duration of the mandate of the President of the Republic, who is nominated for seven years. They deliberately took a line which was beside the question. No doubt the Chief Magistrate should retain his office for the prescribed period; but on one condition: he must observe the constitutional law, for the inviolacy of which he is responsible. The letter and spirit of the Constitution require that the head of the State, who is not responsible to the chambers, shall not intervene in politics except by appointing the successive prime ministers in conformity with the parliamentary situation. When he was first appointed, M. Millerand made clear his in-

tion to play a more active part than this. No great importance was paid at first to his declarations. Attention was not aroused until on his own authority M. Millerand dismissed the Briand Ministry in January, 1922. But this was not a public gesture; it did not become common knowledge. Public feeling was not aroused until the President came forward in widely disseminated speeches as the defender of the Bloc National and its vagaries. Burning his boats, M. Millerand went so far as to write in the *Matin* last March that he, the head of the State, followed a definite policy, and one yet more markedly of a Right-wing tendency than that of M. Poincaré, whom he formally recommended to the country; and that if the electorate did not share his views he would understand what its verdict would involve.

No doubt M. Millerand was suddenly stricken with deafness, for on the morrow of May 11 he gave no sign of acting up to the intentions which he had announced. He shuffled; he equivocated; he tried to cling to his post. He failed to realize that, having lost the game, he would have to pay up.

"Could not the past be wiped out?" some have asked. Could not the President be forgiven as soon as he promised to mix no more in party struggles? No! Because such undertakings, given at the expense of his dignity, inspired no confidence; every one feared that he was finessing; that he would renew the tactics of his predecessor; that once the storm had passed he would apply himself, as M. Poincaré had done, to undermining the majority by intrigue and by insidiously instigated press campaigns.

The victors of May 11, accurately interpreting the will of the country, were determined to make an end of the surreptitious introduction of a personal policy into the conduct of the State, crippling the parliamentary order. M. Millerand has had to go. He left by the side door, not having the good taste to take the front door.

The suddenness of this evolution in our policy surprised our neighbors. Beyond the frontiers it was supposed as recently as a few weeks ago that MM. Millerand and Poincaré, especially the latter, were the masters of the situation. It was a

strange misjudgment of the general mentality of Frenchmen. It was carried to such a point that I remember reading in various British reviews and periodicals that my country was definitely won for imperialism, towards which it had an innate tendency; that, if the truth were told, a Liberal policy at home and a policy of peace and conciliation abroad had never been more than passing phenomena in her history.

It is the Paris of the boulevards, the Paris represented by the great dailies, which deludes our friends abroad. It hides from them the real France, in which I could not too strongly urge those journalists and writers and diplomats to stroll about who are curious to make the acquaintance of my country. If they will not resign themselves to serious visits into the country, I must advise them to use great caution in their appreciations and prognostications.

A word or two to sum up the situation. The Republic is restored. The new President, who is a firm Republican, will have to conform, and no doubt will conform, to the rules and the traditions which have always been observed, with one exception, by all his predecessors, commencing with M. Loubet and M. Fallières. The head of the State has a mandate to reign, not to govern.

For four years at least, probably much longer, the government will be in the hands of the parties of the Left, of which M. Herriot, their unchallenged leader by virtue of his eminent qualities, his responsible character, his democratic sentiments, and a Europeanism completing and broadening his patriotism, deserves the entire confidence.

Only let him be on his guard! The task of clearance was indispensable; but it was the easiest of his tasks. It will be harder work to construct.

"Well cut, my son. Now we have to sew," said Catherine de Medicis to Henry III, when, by proceedings hardly to be recommended, he had got rid of one of those Lorraine princes who, to serve their evil ambitions at the expense of their country, had gathered in their ranks all the fanatics and all the Nationalists of their epoch.

Today, once more, "we have to sew," dogged once more by Lorraine princes.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES

By the RT. HON. LORD PHILLIMORE

(NOTE.—This is the second of four lectures delivered at the Academy of International Law, The Hague, Holland, 1923, translated from the French. The first lecture appeared in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* for December, 1923.)

IN MY first lecture I finished what I wished you to observe concerning the law or right of sovereignty. Before entering on the discussion of other laws, I wish to introduce an observation of general importance and speak of a precaution which every one who would be an authority on international law ought to take.

One must not confuse that which is positive law with its assured jurisprudence, with principles which, according to one's idea, ought to apply. Certainly one should insist on the latter. It is in insisting that one makes progress. But it would mislead the listeners if the lecturer did not make a clear distinction between that which exists as law and that which ought to become law. For example, after I drew up my first lecture I found in Grotius another definition of a State: "Coetus perfectus liberorum hominum, juris fruendi et communis utilitatis causa sociatus"¹—a charming definition, but too idealistic.

Three years ago, when we were here in the Palace of Peace to draw up the plans for the permanent International Court and we were occupied with the competence of the future court, this distinction between what is actually the law and the law as we wish it might be struck us forcefully. As a result we drew up the following article:

"The court shall apply—

"(1) International conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting States.

"(2) International custom as evidence of a general practice accepted as law.

"(3) The general principles of law recognized by civilized nations,

"(4) Subject to the provisions of article 59, judicial decisions and the teaching of the most highly qualified publicists of the vari-

ous nations as means for the determination of rules of law."

To these propositions were added, in the Assembly of the League of Nations, this paragraph:

"This provision shall not prejudice the power of the court to decide a case *ex aequo et bono*, if the parties agree thereto."

As you can see, it is only by agreement and not by common law that this last principle is applied.

The second branch leaving the trunk is the law or right of independence. Here one must remember that there is a counter-balance. One must never forget this maxim: *Sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas*. One can use one's right as far as the boundaries of the right of others, not beyond.

Perhaps you suppose that it is not possible to have a limit to the right of independence; but you shall see. From the right of independence of a State arises the right to form or change its constitution, to organize or rebuild a kingdom or a republic, to give itself a king, a president, a directorate, or a sovereign assembly; to make its laws, to establish its tribunals, its executive powers, its army, its navy, its police; to regulate its commerce, and all the rest.

Generally speaking, other States have nothing to say concerning the action of their neighbor. They have not the right to oppose it. Thus it is in principle; it is the general rule. But it may be that that which a State performs in its internal organization would be detrimental to other States.

First. If a change of constitution gives place to a civil war or to frequent and violent turmoils, through which the inhabitants of a neighboring country will suffer, because there will be incursions of armed bands, making their country a point of departure for an attack or a refuge in flight; if for lack of police robbers and assassins overstep the frontier and make a descent upon peaceful citizens, the right of independence clashes with another right which the neighboring country

¹ De J. B. et P. lib. i c. i s. 14.

possesses, that of self-protection. It is well known that it is this kind of events in Mexico which has tried the patience of the United States and almost provoked war between the two nations. Or, if it is a maritime State which is in a condition of disturbance, this may give rise to privateering, to the detriment of international commerce, as happened in Venezuela in the year 1885. It happens that I remember a prosecution of some Englishmen for infraction of the foreign enlistment act in joining with the revolting Venezuelans who had acted in this way.²

Secondly. History teaches us that the revolutionary spirit which may take possession of a State is not contented always with its internal success, but tends to spread to other States with seditious propaganda destructive to the tranquillity of neighboring countries. That took place at the beginning of the French Revolution. In 1792 the convention adopted the following decree:

"The national convention declares that it will grant aid to all peoples who wish to recover their liberty, and it charges the executive power to give orders to the generals of the French armies to aid citizens who are liable to be molested for the cause of liberty.

"The national convention orders the generals of the French armies to print and publish the present decree in all the places where they may carry the arms of the Republic."

and then ordered "that this decree be translated and printed in all languages."³ That is being done now or was done recently by the Bolsheviks of Russia. The right of independence does not justify such action.

Thirdly. Although a State can receive and entertain any person it likes—perhaps even malefactors and criminals—according to common law, if the government permits such an asylum to become a hotbed of conspiracies hostile to a neighboring country, or the point of departure for filibuster expeditions, it would be a bad usage of the right of independence. By such proceedings it would offend against the rights of another country.

² See *The Justitia*, 6 Aspinall's Reports of Maritime Cases, p. 198.

³ *Moniteur*, November 20, 1792. Phillimore's Commentaries on International Law, section 396.

Fourthly. A State cannot, by reason of its independence and its sovereignty over all those who are found on its territory, claim the right of maltreating the foreigners who happen to be there with its permission.

In all these four cases the determination of the right proceeds without difficulty. The State which suffers will be able to claim its rights without injury to the right of independence possessed by the other, and its interference in the affairs of the other State, even the most domestic, will be without blame. This is called the doctrine of intervention. But here we touch on the most difficult and the most delicate questions in international law. Outside of these four cases, are there other cases which will justify intervention? What are they?

The doctrine of intervention takes an important place in all commentaries on international law. Two kinds may be distinguished.⁴

1. Intervention of a third State in disputes between two States, of which I am going to speak later.

2. Intervention in domestic or internal affairs, of which I am now speaking.

This latter can be divided into (1) intervention justified by common law, and (2) that which rests on the obligations and stipulations of a previous treaty.

History teaches us that intervention by a State in the domestic affairs of another State has been the principal source of almost all of the most desperate wars of the world. This question, therefore, is found widely discussed by the publicists, especially by those of the last century. Calvo dedicates to it almost all of his Book III, on the independence and preservation of States. I cannot recapitulate—it would be impossible here—his enumeration of the opinions of writers of importance and of historical references, but I can say that his doctrine is more conservative than that of Fiore. He expresses it thus:

"Right or duty, no author furnishes us with clear, irrefutable principles on which one can base fixed and precise rules. It is not, then, in the writings of publicists that one must look for the connecting thread. The multiplicity of interpretations that they

⁴ See Holtendorff, par. 25.

present to us and the divergence that we have just noticed among their opinions show sufficiently the difficulty that the purely theoretical side of the law of intervention offers. In our view, one can only hope to solve the question in an entirely satisfactory manner by examining the practice of States, which goes to prove that, if sometimes interventions have been occasioned by selfish interest or an erroneous interpretation of treaty engagements, yet there have been cases of intervention which can be supported on the exercise of an incontestable right, and the tendency and appreciation of which were logically and necessarily in accord with real international principles. This interpretation is plainly confirmed by the study of the events of the most important cases of intervention which history presents, above all during the times that came near to most of us."*

Hall⁶ will not permit intervention except for the legitimate defense of the intervening State, or to prevent an illegitimate action (which I do not understand exactly), or under the collective authority of all civilized States.

In the same way, Fiore seems to attribute a special position to what he calls collective interference (*ingerenza collettiva*), to which he gives, in my opinion, an excessive extension. Like Calvo, he treats this question under the title of a State's right of independence. That is, I think, good. It is thus that I treat it here. Then he imposes what he calls the just limits of independence, and he says:

"No State can pretend to repel, by reason of its independence, the collective interference of civilized States, which find themselves in accord in determining that its exercise of its sovereign powers constitutes a manifest violation of international law, an attack upon the rights of man or a manifest violation of the common law."

Collective interference must be admitted:

(a) Where a government of a State does something which violates international law.

(b) Where the public authorities in the discharge of their functions clearly violate

a law of the land, applying it with injustice to the prejudice of foreigners, as often as the government, in spite of just complaints made by the representatives of the States to whom the wronged persons belong, has not proceeded to give them complete satisfaction.

(c) Where the law of the land does not sufficiently protect the rights of foreigners or when, in general opinion, the legal and judicial guaranties are insufficient to prevent abuse on the part of the public authority."⁷

Again, under the head of "when collective interference can be justified," he explains:

"Collective interference could be justified (a) when it had for its object to stop or make cease a state of things contrary to law: like the incorporation of a territory effected during conquest; the execution of a treaty imposed by force by the victors on the conquered, and every act that ought to be considered unjust and illegitimate according to common law."⁸

There is in the two passages (sections 242 and 559), much that makes me hesitate. So many things are to be found in them. The sentences are like fathers of families, in the witty words of Talleyrand, "open to anything." One finds in them a meaning as large as that of the nod of Lord Burleigh in the clever comedy of Sheridan, *The Critic*.

My father states it better. According to his teaching,

"The reason of the thing and the practice of nations appear to have sanctioned interference in the following cases:

"1. Sometimes, but rarely, in the domestic concerns and internal rights of self-government, incident as we have seen, to every State.

"2. More frequently, and upon far surer grounds, with respect to the territorial acquisitions or foreign relations of other States, when such acquisitions or relations threaten the peace and safety of other States.

"In the former case the grounds of intervention are:

"1. Self-defense, when the domestic institu-

* Calvo, "Le Droit international," section 134.

⁶ A Treatise on International Law, 7th ed. Pearce Higgins, 1917, pars. 90, 91, 92, 95.

⁷ Fiore, "Diritto Internazionale," sections 241, 242.

⁸ Fiore, "Diritto Internazionale," section 559.

tions of a State are inconsistent with the peace and safety of other States.

"2. The rights and duties of a guarantee.

"3. The invitation of the belligerent parties in a civil war.

"4. The protection of Reversionary right or interest.

"In the latter case the just grounds of intervention are:

"5. To preserve the balance of power—that is, to prevent the dangerous aggrandizement of any one State by external acquisitions.

"6. To protect persons, subjects of another State, from persecution on account of professing a religion not recognized by that

State, but identical with the religion of the intervening State." 9

It must be remarked that my father does not speak of racial sympathy for an oppressed population as a cause of intervention. Hall¹⁰ thinks that my father is the only publicist who admits intervention because of religious sympathy; but I doubt it.

NOTE.—In the second part of this lecture, which will appear in the next number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, Lord Phillimore discusses the causes leading to intervention.

⁹ Commentaries on International Law, section 393.

¹⁰ Par. 92.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

RESULTS OF THE XXIInd INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Official Report of the President and the Secretary General on the Resolutions and Nominations of the Bern-Geneva Sessions.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with Art. 8 of the Regulations of the Bureau of the Union, I beg to inform you that the XXIInd Interparliamentary Conference, which sat at Bern and Geneva from August 22 to 28, 1924, passed the following resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS I AND II

Amendments to Arts 3 and 10 of the Statutes and Regulations for Interparliamentary Conferences

Rapporteur: M. Henri La Fontaine, President of the Belgian Group, in the Name of the Organization Committee

I

AMENDMENTS TO THE STATUTES

New Text of Art. 3

The Interparliamentary Union is composed of national groups.

Only groups constituted within parliaments of States, Dominions, or colonies not represented in any other parliament can join the Interparliamentary Union.

No parliament may have more than one

national group. Each group shall elect a bureau with power to direct its operations and to correspond with the Interparliamentary Bureau (IV), and it shall draw up its own rules of organization and administration. It has to send to the Interparliamentary Bureau, before the end of March of each year, a report upon its proceedings and a list of its members.

New Text of Art. 10

Only members of the Union present in person have the right to vote.

The number of votes to which each group is entitled is determined according to the following rules:

(a) Each group has a minimum of five votes.

(b) In addition to these, groups belonging to countries with less than 1 million inhabitants are entitled to 1 extra vote; those belonging to countries with 1 to 3 millions, 2 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 3 to 6 millions, 3 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 6 to 9 millions, 4 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 9 to 12 millions, 5 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 12 to 16 millions, 6 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 16 to 20 millions, 7 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 20 to 25 millions, 8 extra votes; those belonging to countries

with 25 to 30 millions, 9 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 30 to 36 millions, 10 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 36 to 42 millions, 11 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 42 to 49 millions, 12 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 49 to 56 millions, 13 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 56 to 64 millions, 14 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 64 to 72 millions, 15 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 72 to 81 millions, 16 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 81 to 90 millions, 17 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 90 to 100 millions, 18 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 100 to 150 millions, 19 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 150 to 200 millions, 20 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 200 to 250 millions, 21 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 250 to 300 millions, 22 extra votes; those belonging to countries with 300 to 350 millions, 23 extra votes.

The number of votes allotted to groups belonging to the parliament of a colony shall be calculated on the basis of a reduced figure of population, the said figure to be calculated by multiplying the number of elected deputies in the parliament of the colony by the average number of inhabitants represented by each deputy in the mother country to which the colony belongs.

In cases where a colony is represented in the parliament of the mother country, its population is added to that of the mother country, such population being calculated by multiplying the number of colonial representatives by the average number of inhabitants represented by each deputy from the mother country.

(c) Finally, groups with a membership of at least 50 per cent of the members of the lower house of parliament shall be entitled to one extra vote; those with a membership of at least 60 per cent, to two extra votes; those with a membership of at least 75 per cent, to three extra votes; those with a membership of at least 90 per cent, to four extra votes.

The Council is to inform the various groups of the number of votes to which they are entitled, when it summons the conference.

If necessary, the members of each group taking part in the conference shall nominate those amongst them who are to exercise the right of voting. These nominations shall be

made according to a system of proportional representation. No one member may record more than five votes.

Voting shall take place by show of hands. Every member present at a conference has the right to demand voting by roll-call. The result of such voting shall be inserted in the minutes.

In the election of officers the vote shall be by secret ballot, if not less than twenty members so demand.

II

REGULATIONS FOR INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES

Art. 1. The Interparliamentary Conference shall meet in ordinary session once a year, unless the Council decide otherwise. The place and date of the conference shall be fixed by the Council, if possible at the preceding conference. Convocations to a regular session shall be sent out to the groups at least three months before the date fixed for the opening of the conference.

Art. 2. The conference shall be summoned to an extraordinary sitting by decision of the Council, or if at least six groups so request. In the latter case, the Council shall summon the conference within forty days of the receipt of such a request by the Secretary General.

Art. 3. The Interparliamentary Group of the country in which the conference is to meet shall, by arrangement with the Secretary General, be responsible for the material organization of the meeting. The Council may, however, judge whether it be necessary in certain cases for the Union and the different groups to assume part of the expenses incurred by a session.

Members taking part in a session shall pay a personal subscription, the amount to be fixed by the Council. The subscription shall be payable at the same time as a member enters his name for participation in a given conference.

Art. 4. The duration of each session shall be fixed by the Interparliamentary Council, by agreement with the group which is to receive the conference. Ordinary sessions shall last at least five days.

Questions placed on the agenda shall, except in urgent cases, be submitted to the permanent or temporary committees, to enable their immediate discussion at the plenary sitting any time after the opening of a session.

Art. 5. Unless exceptional circumstances should arise, the Secretary General shall see that the work of the various committees is finished in time to permit of their reports being sent to the groups one month before each session. The committees shall nominate one or several rapporteurs for each question placed on the agenda.

Art. 6. Conferences are opened by the President of the Council or, in case of his absence, by a provisional president chosen for that purpose by the Interparliamentary Group of the country in which the conference is held.

The conference chooses its own president, its vice-presidents and its tellers (Statutes, Art. 8).

The number of vice-presidents shall be equal to that of the groups represented.

Art. 7. The debates at the conference shall be public. They shall only be private if the conference so decide by a two-thirds majority and only if questions relating to individual persons are to be discussed.

Art. 8. Each session shall open with a general discussion on the basis of the report submitted by the Secretary General in the name of the Council. Part of this report shall bear upon the general political situation of the world. Unless it be otherwise decided by the conference by a two-thirds majority and without preliminary discussion, the said discussion shall not last for more than three sittings.

Art. 9. The President shall open, suspend and adjourn the sittings and direct the work of the conference; he shall see that the regulations are observed, call upon the speakers, declare the sittings closed, put the questions to the vote and make known the results of divisions.

The President shall be assisted by the members of the Bureau in the general direction of the work of the conference, the institution of the committees which the conference may decide to form, the decisions as to the communications to be made, the fixing of the agenda of each sitting and the order in which the different questions shall be considered.

Art. 10. No member may speak without the consent of the President.

No member of the conference shall speak more than twice on the same question. The time allotted to each speaker may be limited by a decision taken by the conference with-

out preliminary discussion. The rapporteurs who introduce the questions with which they have been entrusted shall not, however, be subject to the above restrictions; they shall be entitled to take part in the debate whenever they deem it necessary. Other members shall speak in the order in which the applications to speak are made.

The President may call a speaker to order when the latter does not keep to the subject under discussion, and may, if necessary, withdraw the permission to speak.

Should a point of order be raised, the President shall give the proposer the right to speak, and shall at once put the motion to the vote.

Art. 11. The Secretary General shall be responsible for the organization of the secretariat of the conference and for the secretariats of the committees.

The Secretary General may be assisted or represented during the sittings of the conference by one or several delegates. The Secretary General or his delegates may at any time, by request of the President, submit to the conference supplementary reports on any question which the meeting has under consideration. They may be asked by the President to make oral communications on any question before the conference.

Art. 12. The secretariat shall receive, print and circulate all documents, reports or resolutions; it shall print and circulate the minutes of the meetings, preserve the documents of the conference in the archives of the Union, publish the report of each session and in general carry out all the duties which the conference may think fit to entrust to it.

Art. 13. The agenda of a conference shall be fixed by the Council (Statutes, Art. 9). Draft resolutions, amendments and motions relating to questions on the agenda must be communicated in good time and in writing to the President, and copies shall be distributed as rapidly as possible to the members present at the conference.

Draft resolutions or motions which do not figure on the agenda shall only be discussed and voted upon if the conference takes them into consideration and authorizes their discussion by a majority vote of two-thirds, when the opinion of the Interparliamentary Council and brief explanations from the proposers have been heard (Statutes, Art. 9).

Art. 14. The decisions of the conference

are reached by a majority vote of the members present entitled to vote.

In the case of election of officers, if no single candidate obtain a majority of votes, a ballot shall be taken between the two candidates who have obtained the most votes.

The result of a vote by secret ballot shall be ascertained by the tellers appointed by the conference.

Art. 15. Voting shall take place by show of hands or, if a member present so request, by roll-call. The election of officers shall be by secret ballot if not less than twenty members so demand (Statutes, Art. 10).

Each group shall communicate to the Secretary General, at least one month in advance, the names of those of its members who shall exercise the vote, as well as the names of their substitutes, if any.

At the beginning of each conference, the Secretary General shall give each member who is to exercise the vote a card bearing his name, the name of his group, and the number of votes which he may express or to which he is entitled.

Art. 16. The summary minutes of each sitting shall be at the disposal of members half an hour before the following sitting. Any member may, in the course of that sitting, raise objections to the said minutes. Such objections shall at once be taken into consideration and a decision reached. Should no such objections be raised, the minutes shall be considered as approved. Should the conference sit in secret committee, it may decide that no minutes shall be kept.

A stenographic report of the sittings shall be published later, unless exceptional circumstances, of which the Council shall be judge, intervene.

Art. 17. At the close of each conference the President shall enumerate the principal resolutions adopted, which it will be the duty of the groups to present to their respective governments and parliaments (Statutes, Art. 5) in the shape of bills, motions, questions, or under any other form suitable to the circumstances.

Art. 18. In every case not provided for in the present regulations, the customary rules in deliberative assemblies shall be applied. In case of disagreement, the Regulations of the Popular House of the country in which the conference is being held shall be consulted.

III

FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE UNION

Rapporteur: Baron Theodor Adelswærd,
President of the Interparliamentary
Council

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference, seeing that the highly satisfactory development and the increasing activity of the Union demand more ample financial means than those now at its disposal, asks the national groups to make every effort to obtain an increase in the grants stipulated by the present scale of contributions.

It considers that an increase of 50 per cent should be regarded as the minimum.

The conference further realizes that considerable difficulties have arisen from delay in the payment of grants, and therefore urges upon the groups the importance of a regular payment, if possible at the beginning of each financial year, of the amounts due.

IV

PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OF FOREIGN POLICY

Rapporteur: Prof. Walter Schücking, Member of the Reichstag, President of the German Group

I

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference considers that the best guarantee for an international policy of peace and co-operation among the nations will be found in the application of the principle of the widest possible publicity.

In order to achieve such publicity, the conference declares itself in favor of the following measures:

(a) The inclusion in the constitutions of all nations, in accordance with the terms of Art. 18 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, of stipulations forbidding the conclusion of secret treaties or agreements, or the insertion of additional secret clauses, of any kind whatsoever, to treaties.

(b) Communication to parliament of every treaty or agreement concluded with other nations, even in cases where the assent of parliament to the ratification is not provided for in the constitution or does not yet form part of the constitutional traditions of the country.

(c) The institution of a committee on foreign affairs in countries where such commit-

tees do not already exist; these committees to have the right at any time to request the responsible minister to furnish particulars of negotiations in progress, the information to be as complete as possible and accompanied by appropriate documents. It is recommended that in these committees the various shades of opinion within each parliament should be proportionally represented.

(d) While recognizing the expediency of special or confidential communications made by the government to parliament or to the parliamentary committee concerned, the publication, at least once a year, of a full report on the general administration of foreign affairs.

(e) The abolition of "secret funds," since all state expenditure should be subject to public control under the supervision of parliament.

(f) The distribution to all the members of the foreign affairs committee in every country of documents relating to the deliberations and decisions of the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations.

(g) The preliminary presentation and discussion, in the foreign affairs committee, of the instructions given by the government to its delegation to the League of Nations.

II

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference endorses the stipulation inserted in the draft treaty of mutual assistance voted at the Fourth Assembly of the League of Nations, by the terms of which war of aggression is described as *an international crime*, and recommends that proposals be submitted by the national groups to their respective parliaments for amendments to the constitution; such proposals

(a) To forbid resort to war, except in the case of obligations contracted under Art. 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

(b) To make arbitration or other amicable or judicial means obligatory for the solution of disputes with other nations, in cases where an amicable settlement has not been reached by direct negotiation.

The conference lays particular stress on the importance of securing the adherence of all nations to the optional clause of Art. 36 of the Statute of the Court of International Justice.

III

Seeing that the interdependence of peoples and nations is becoming an increasingly marked feature of our times, the XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference asks the national groups to lay before parliament a proposal for substituting, as in the case of the South American republics, the title of "Ministry of International Relations" to that of "Ministry of Foreign Affairs."

IV

The conference begs the Council to set up a committee to consider the possibility of creating a bulletin for international information concerning problems of present-day political and social life, whether in relation to the international or the national life of each country.

V

COLONIAL MANDATES AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Rapporteur: M. Marius Moutet, Deputy (France)

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference, after hearing the report made by M. Marius Moutet in the name of the committee on ethnic and colonial questions, and seeing that the system of colonial mandates can only be crowned with full success through loyal and disinterested co-operation between the League of Nations and the mandatory powers, in accordance with Art. 22 of the covenant, makes the following recommendations:

I

(a) The Assembly of the League of Nations should have the right at any time to modify the terms of each mandate. It should be empowered, if necessary, to revoke a mandate assigned to a power and to entrust it to another.

(b) The competency of the Permanent Mandates Commission should be in accordance with its mission of supervision and control, the above recommendations being taken into account. The commission should have the right to apply directly either to the Assembly or to the mandatory powers. The Council of the League of Nations should exercise the prerogatives granted to it by the covenant with regard to colonial mandates, on the basis of the resolutions passed by the Assembly.

(c) The Permanent Mandates Commission should be empowered to make or to institute inquiries on the spot. Such inquiries should not be entrusted to nationals of a mandatory power.

(d) The difference between mandates B and C should be abolished, territories under C mandates being administered under the same system as those under B mandates.

(e) The intellectual and political education of the natives should be carried on with a view to an ever-increasing autonomy leading to complete independence, in accordance with the principles of the covenant, which states the temporary nature of mandates.

(f) The fiscal organization of a mandated territory should possess the same autonomy as that of an independent State. It should not in any respect be assimilated to that of the mandatory power. Railways and other public enterprises in a mandated territory are the property of that territory and should be worked for its benefit and not for the benefit of the mandatory power.

(g) Since the natives of mandated territories are not the subjects of the mandatory power, they should be endowed with a nationality of their own.

(h) Right of petition to the League of Nations should be unrestricted. All petitions should be addressed simultaneously to the Permanent Mandates Commission and to the local representative of the mandatory power.

(i) Domestic slavery should not be recognized. Fugitive slaves cannot be captured and delivered up to their masters either by force or by judicial or administrative measures.

Compulsory labor is only admissible when it arises from a judgment delivered in accordance with the law by a competent tribunal.

Compulsory work in the form of statute labor is only admissible as a means of discharging unpaid taxes and for public enterprises (roads, irrigation, canals, etc.). Statute labor can only be ordered for the benefit of a private enterprise in cases of "force majeure" and only subject to strict regulations.

(j) The natural resources of a mandated territory can only be offered as security by the mandatory power for the benefit of that territory and after the assent of the Assembly of the League of Nations has been obtained. Under no circumstances shall the

land of a mandated territory be mortgaged by the mandatory power.

(k) The recruiting of natives of mandated territories with the object of increasing the forces of the mandatory power is in contradiction with the explicit text of Art. 22, paragraph 5 of the Covenant. Natives can only be enrolled to the extent required for the maintenance of order and for the defense of the mandated territory.

(l) The extension of the principle of "the open door" for all nations is in accordance with the spirit of the covenant and should therefore be applied without any exception whatsoever, even to nations which are not yet members of the League of Nations. The mandatory powers should be guided by that principle in the application of Art. 122 of the Treaty of Versailles.

(m) The reports furnished by the mandatory powers shall be based on questionnaires of a more complete nature than hitherto. They shall in particular contain statistics and detailed information on public and private education, on public hygiene and on all measures taken for the well-being of the natives.

II

Pending the development of the system of mandates and its application in the spirit of the recommendations set forth above, the XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference requests the committee on ethnic and colonial questions to consider, in the course of its further studies, the question of extending the principle of colonial mandates to other regions than those mentioned in Art. 22 of the covenant, in the interests of the peace of the world and of the well-being of colored races.

The commission should also be requested to make a study of the question of labor under penal contract.

III

With regard to the colonial system in general, the XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference further declares that—

(a) The principle of the "open door" should be extended to all colonies without distinction, except in colonies where trade with the natives is subject to a special régime under the control of the government of the mother country, for the preservation of weak and scanty populations.

(b) Traffic in arms and munitions in all

the colonies should be under the control of the League of Nations, in accordance with Art. 23, *d*, of the covenant.

(*c*) Traffic in drugs and liquor in all the colonies should be under the control of an international body. The guiding principle of such a control should be that wherever the climate, the race or other factors generally recognized by science, testify to the danger-population, their importation should be forbidden.

(*d*) Slavery should not be recognized, either *de facto* or *de jure*.

VI

THE PROBLEM OF REPARATIONS

Reports by Baron Sztrenyi (Hungary) and the Rt. Hon. Lord Rathcreedan (Great Britain), in the Name of the Committee for Economic and Financial Questions

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference registers the fact that the resolution voted by the Conference of Copenhagen, on August 17, 1923, indicated the methods which have since been followed by the States for the solution of the problem of reparations.

The conference expresses its satisfaction at the agreement concluded at London, by which the above problems are transferred from the political to the economic field.

Seeing that the solidarity of the world should be the fundamental principle of the proposals put forward by the Union, the conference expresses the wish that the London decisions be carried out in the same spirit of good will in which they were drawn up, and that the methods recommended by the Copenhagen resolution be applied not only to the study and the solution of the problem of reparations in general, but also to the study of other international questions of an economic and financial nature.

VII

THE ECONOMIC SOLIDARITY OF THE WORLD AND INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC

Rapporteur: Baron Josef Sztrenyi, Former Minister of Commerce (Hungary)

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference considers the re-establishment of the economic solidarity of the nations to be of the highest importance. It believes that one of

the surest means of obtaining this would be to encourage the development of economic relations between the different countries by the suppression of all the hindrances now existing.

The measures which appear to be the most called for are:

(*a*) The conclusion of commercial treaties and of conventions for the regulation of means of transport ensuring equal treatment for all concerned, and the suppression of the restrictions which still impede international relations.

(*b*) A thorough revision of the present customs regulations in order, on the one hand, to ensure the unimpeded transit of goods, the creation of free ports and the simplification of obsolete customs restrictions hindering traffic, and, on the other hand, to introduce and develop to the greatest possible extent the traffic for the perfecting of goods as a means of encouraging industry, while at the same time doing away with the certificate of origin demanded up till now.

(*c*) The introduction of through collective railway, sea and river transport tariffs, a uniform currency being fixed.

Pending the day when it will be possible to establish uniform classification for all goods, the nations should at least endeavor to establish such a classification for the transport agencies of the different countries, at any rate with regard to the principal products. They should also endeavor to give to traffic as a whole a uniform legal basis for the conclusion of international conventions.

(*d*) The total abolition of the passport as being a police measure hindering the relations between countries, or at the very least the abolition of the visa.

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Conference begs its national groups to exert their influence in this direction both in parliament and with their governments, in the interest of the rapid re-establishment of normal economic conditions. It further urges them to work for the immediate acceptance and application of the resolutions and propositions presented to the international conferences convoked by the League of Nations for the study of customs questions, the regulation of traffic, and the question of passports.

VIII

PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL POLICY: EMIGRATION
AND IMMIGRATION

Rapporteur: M. Fernand Merlin, Senator
(France), Member of the Executive
Committee

The XXII^d Interparliamentary Council, after hearing the reports of M. Fernand Merlin on the problems of emigration and immigration, decides to institute a permanent committee on social questions, and requests the said committee to continue the study of the above problems and to present its conclusions at a subsequent conference.

IX

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

I. *Private Manufacture and Traffic in Arms*

Rapporteur: M. van Walleghem, Member of
the House of Representatives (Belgium)

The XXI^d Interparliamentary Conference, seeing that the Covenant of the League of Nations draws attention to the "evil effects" of the private manufacture of munitions and war material; seeing, moreover, that it is generally recognized that these effects can only be completely eliminated by the establishment, in addition to the control of private manufacture of arms, of a competent international control of the traffic in war materials, applicable to all countries and to all parts of the world, expresses the hope that the co-operation begun in this field between the League of Nations and the United States of America during the past year will result in universal agreement upon the fundamental principles of the St. Germain Convention of September 10, 1919, relating to control of the traffic in arms; and that a settlement of these two closely connected problems will thus be reached between all the States concerned in the production of war material.

The conference strongly recommends the calling of an international conference to draw up the necessary international conventions for the purpose, and begs the groups of the Union, in the interest of peace and of the reduction of armaments, to impress the urgency of these questions upon their respective parliaments and governments.

II. *Demilitarized Zones*

Rapporteur: Brigadier-General E. L. Spears,
M. P. (Great Britain)

The XXI^d Interparliamentary Conference, mindful of the beneficial results obtained for the cause of peace by the institution of demilitarized zones, and in particular by the zone created between the United States and Canada by the Treaty of 1817; seeing that every measure tending to avoid immediate contact between military forces would avert the danger of frontier incidents and serve to create on either side a greater sense of security, thus making possible a considerable reduction of armaments, calls attention to the special importance which the generalization of this means of pacification would have under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The conference requests the Permanent Committee for the Study of Disarmament questions to continue its study of the problem of the demilitarization of frontiers, and suggests that a special committee be constituted within the commission, the said committee to meet as soon as possible to discuss this question, which the conference considers to be of the greatest importance.

III. *Plan for a Reduction of Armaments*

Rapporteur: Dr. P. Munch, former Minister
of Defense, Member of the Folketing
(Denmark)

The XXI^d Interparliamentary Conference, recalling the resolutions of previous conferences and insisting emphatically upon the urgency of a reduction of armaments applicable to all countries, draws the special attention of governments, parliaments and peoples to the preliminary symptoms of renewed competition in armaments which have appeared within the last few years.

The conference welcomes with the greatest satisfaction the intention proclaimed by the President of the United States shortly to call a second conference on naval disarmament, as well as the idea which has several times been advanced by the head of the British Government to submit the question of armaments to international discussion.

The conference reminds the governments and public opinion of the repeated recommendations of the Assembly of the League of Nations in support of a limitation of the total budget of expenditure on armaments for

each country, and urges them to undertake the immediate acceptance of the said recommendation.

Recognizing the necessity of giving to the different peoples a feeling of security, the conference asks the groups to investigate all practical methods for the creation of such a mutual feeling. It considers that one of these methods, and perhaps the most fruitful one, would be reduction of armaments in itself. It urges the expediency of an immediate study of the means by which such a reduction might be brought about, and recommends that a general plan be drawn up according to Art. 8 of the covenant, this plan either to be included in a system of mutual assistance based on the covenant, or be carried into effect independently of such a system. Without entering into the details of such a plan, the conference calls the attention of the governments and of the Assembly of the League of Nations to the two proposals for the reduction of armaments appended to this resolution (A and B).

b

The first step to be made in the direction of a reduction of armaments should be an undertaking by the different States to limit the total of their military expenditure (army, navy, aviation, etc.) to fixed figures, it being agreed that the said total shall not be exceeded and that it shall form the starting point for a reduction of armaments.

DRAFT PLANS FOR DISARMAMENT

Plan A

1. Recent developments in means of destruction tend to render the conception of the "defense" of a country by military, naval or aerial methods more or less of an illusion. Armaments have more than ever come to be essentially means of attack. "Defense" consists in forestalling an attack by a counter-offensive, or in reprisals.

2. "Security" for a State is consequently only to be obtained by:

1st. Elimination of the means of aggression of other States as well as of one's own;

2d. The development of a policy of peace and co-operation between all States ("moral disarmament").

3. This being so, a unique opportunity is created for insisting upon the urgent need of material disarmament.

4. The security of a country, being proportionate to the military and other preparations of other States, will remain identical if the reduction affects the armaments of all the States whose military and other preparations might constitute a threat to the country in question simultaneously and to the same extent as its own armaments are affected.

5. Reduction of the armaments of all States is, moreover, a fundamental condition for the proper working of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Such a reduction would remove the temptation to a country to set at defiance the stipulations of the covenant.

6. Decisions relating to the reduction of armaments rest with each individual State; even in the case of members of the League of Nations (Art. 8 of the covenant).

There is, however, a definite moral obligation incumbent on all countries belonging to the League of Nations, by virtue of the covenant and of the peace treaties of 1919 and 1920 (Part V, introduction, of the Treaty of Versailles).

7. The whole military organization of a country is the expression of two factors, the one being what that country believes to be essential for its "security," the other what it considers possible to spend for this purpose, from the point of view of its national economy and of its finance.

The combination of these two factors finds its mathematical expression in the average sum assigned to military, naval and aerial expenditures during a series of years.

8. It therefore follows that *the budgets* should form the basis of the fundamental undertakings for a reduction of armaments.

Incidentally, the principle of the "sovereignty" of the State is thus always safeguarded, because the *fundamental basis* of the reduction is fixed by the State itself, while it may be allowed a great latitude with regard to the details of the organization of its military means (military service, for instance).

9. The budgetary basis for the reduction of armaments can, however, be supplemented in respect of other factors of military organization, particularly those embodying the idea of aggression, thus:

Peace forces; number of large-caliber cannons; number of naval unities; number of submarines; number of aerial unities.

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL
AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE REDUCTION
OF ARMAMENTS

I. *Basis and Procedure*

1. The signatory States undertake not to exceed, during the first budgetary year beginning after December 31, 1925, their average total expenditure on military, naval and aerial objects during the three fiscal years preceding the above-mentioned period.

2. The total sum spent within the limits fixed by Art. 1 during the first budgetary year beginning after December 31, 1925, shall form the basis for the reduction of armaments which is the object of this agreement.

3. The signatory States undertake to decrease the total sum mentioned in Art. 2 in the proportion of 10 per cent from the first budgetary year beginning after December 31, 1927.

The said decrease of 10 per cent will be repeated from the first budgetary year beginning after December 31, 1929, and so on every two years, the total sum mentioned in Art. 2 being taken as basis, until, after a period of ten years, the military, naval and aerial budgets show a total of not more than 50 per cent of the budgetary basis stated in Art. 2.

4. In order to facilitate the execution of the present agreement the States undertake to enter all sums intended for military, naval or aerial purposes in a special section of the budget based on a model drawn up by the Financial Committee of the League of Nations.

The said section shall also include all the credits allotted by the State for the following objects:

a. The development of the industry of the country with a view to its mobilization in case of war;

b. Subsidies to the shipping industry conditional on the transformation, in case of need, of merchant ships into warships;

c. Subsidies to civil aviation with a view to the utilization of the aircraft in case of war;

d. . . .

5. The signatory States further undertake not to increase, during the period of ten years mentioned in Art. 3, the following elements in their military organization, as fixed for the budgetary year mentioned in Art. 2:

a. Their peace forces in all military, naval and aerial services;

b. The number of their cannons (land and naval artillery) whose caliber exceeds — millimeters;

c. The number of their naval unities exceeding — tons;

d. The number of their submarines;

e. The number of their aerial unities;

f. . . .

II. *Exceptions and Reservations*

6. Those States whose armaments were reduced by the peace treaties of 1919 and 1920 shall not be bound by the undertakings stated in Arts. 1 to 5.

7. Expenses incurred in connection with military, naval or aerial action undertaken on the recommendation of the Council of the League of Nations, in conformity with Art. 16 of the covenant, shall not be considered as forming part of the total sum referred to in Arts. 2 and 3.

8. The signatory States recognize that exceptional circumstances—for instance, a considerable increase in prices on the home market, or participation in a war—may in individual cases prevent a State from strict adherence to the stipulations of Arts. 2 and 3.

They undertake if necessary to call the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to the fact that such exceptional circumstances may prevent them from fulfilling their obligations under the present agreement. They pledge themselves to accept the decision of the Council as to the validity of the exceptional cases brought to its notice in conformity with the present article.

III. *Control and Sanctions*

9. The Secretariat of the League of Nations is instructed to publish annually all the information dealing with the application and execution of the present agreement, in a convenient and clear form.

In order to facilitate the work, the signatory States undertake to furnish the secretariat with the necessary documents and information. In particular, they undertake to communicate to the said secretariat—

(a) All draft budgets, definite budgets and annual accounts relating to armaments, simultaneously with the transmission of those documents to the parliament or to the other controlling or inspecting bodies (accountants, etc.) of the State;

(b) Detailed information concerning the elements of their military, naval and aërial organization, referred to in Art. 5.

The latter information shall be transmitted at least three months before the end of the budgetary year mentioned in Art. 2.

10. The signatory States recognize the right of any of the high contracting parties to draw the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to any action which, in the opinion of that contracting party, constitutes an infringement of the undertakings of the present agreement.

11. The signatory States recognize the right of the Financial Committee of the League of Nations to call the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to the fact that in a given State the purchasing power of the national currency has increased in such a way as to make an appreciable difference to that State's power of extending its military, naval or aërial organization.

12. The Council shall immediately come to a decision with regard to the validity of the appeals made to it under Arts. 10 and 11.¹ It shall be empowered to submit contested cases to the International Court of Justice.²

IV. *Duration and Renewal of the Agreement*

13. The present agreement shall be valid until the end of the period of ten years referred to in Art. 3, c.

At least three years before the end of that period, the Council of the League of Nations shall invite the high contracting parties to draft a new agreement for a further reduction of their armaments.

Commentary

1. A. The budgetary year does not coincide in every country with the calendar year, hence the use of the formula "the first budgetary year *beginning after December 31, 1925.*" If another budgetary year than that opening in 1926 is to be taken as basis, the years mentioned in Art. 3 should be altered accordingly.

B. In the case of Federal States like Switzerland, the question whether certain expenditure by the cantons will not have to be included in the treaty will have to be considered.

4. The enumeration at the end of the article is an approximate one; it can be altered and amplified.

5. A. The enumeration is an approximate one and will be subject to alteration. The main purpose of the stipulation is to prevent a State from concentrating its military preparations on one branch of its organization which might prove a grave danger to another country.

B. The term "peace forces" will perhaps have to be defined, especially in the case of countries with a militia (Norway, Switzerland).

8. A body other than the Council of the League of Nations might be entrusted with the inquiry into "exceptional cases," as, for instance, the International Court of Justice, assisted if necessary by technical assessors (cp. Art. 10).

12. A. The Council would probably have to vote by simple majority and the States concerned—the accuser and the accused—who would be represented, in conformity with Art. 4 of the covenant, should not have the right to vote (cp. Art. 3 of the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923).

B. If recourse is to be had to the Court of Justice, a special division would have to be instituted for this class of litigation, as has already been done by the statute of the court for litigation concerning labor and for questions of transit and communication (Arts. 26 and 27 of the said statute).

Plan B

The treaties concluded at Versailles, Saint-Germain, Trianon and Neuilly fixed a limit for the armaments of Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria, "in order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations."

It is therefore natural to take the stipulations of the above treaties as a basis for the plans for a reduction of armaments which have to be elaborated in accordance with Art. 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The stipulations relating to the German army being of a special character, the limits fixed for the Austrian army may be taken as a basis.

By the terms of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, the total military force of the Austrian army may not exceed 30,000 men. This number is fixed for a State of 6 million in-

¹ Majority vote?

² (Technical assessors?) Cp. Statute of the Court of Justice, Arts. 26 et 27.

habitants; taking this figure as a basis, a limit of 5,000 men for every million inhabitants should therefore be fixed. The above limit is fixed for an army whose soldiers are engaged for twelve years. The treaty, moreover, contains stipulations relating to the number of officers, to the fighting unities, to the maximum of armaments and stock of munitions, etc. All these stipulations could be used as a basis for plans for a general reduction of armaments.

Nevertheless, provision must be made for another system of recruiting and training than the system of mercenaries now in force in the countries whose military organization has been fixed by the peace treaties. There is no doubt that certain States would prefer a system by which military service would be of much shorter duration—say, six months. An army organized by this method would of course be inferior to an army composed of the same number of mercenaries. States preferring this latter system should therefore be allowed to train a yearly number of soldiers, such as would enable them, if necessary, to mobilize a larger army than the mercenary army of a State with an equal number of inhabitants. They might, for instance, be allowed to train 1,000 soldiers for every million inhabitants each year, which would enable them to mobilize 10,000 men per million inhabitants.

In fixing a general basis of armaments for the different countries, the geographical situation and the special conditions of each State must be taken into consideration, in conformity with Art. 8 of the covenant.

In fixing a basis for the number of soldiers, not only the number of inhabitants of the mother country, but also, to a certain extent, the population and the size of the possessions belonging to each State on other continents, must be taken into consideration. It is impossible to lay down a general rule in this connection; the particular circumstances in each case must be examined.

It must also be remembered that certain countries are in a particularly dangerous position geographically, and that the peace treaties have entrusted some States with special duties of a military character.

With regard to naval forces, the limits fixed for Germany by the Versailles Treaty might be taken as basis. The said treaty allows Germany to maintain a navy of 2,000 tons for every million inhabitants. As the

limits fixed for Germany by the peace treaties with regard to armaments are relatively stricter than for the other States whose armaments have been limited by the treaties, a strength of 4,000 tons to every million inhabitants might, perhaps, be taken as the basis for a limitation of naval power. In fixing the limits of their naval armaments for each State, it would also be necessary to take into account the particular situation of each country and the extent of its possessions on other continents.

I

NOMINATIONS

Interparliamentary Council, from the XXIII to the XXIII^d Conference

President of the Council: Baron Theodor Adelswärd (Sweden)

Austria, MM. Mataja and Waiss; Belgium, La Fontaine and Anseele; Bulgaria, Molloff and Fadenhecht; Canada, Dandurand and Sir Henry Drayton; Czechoslovakia, Winter and Hodza; Denmark, Moltesen and Borghjerg; Dutch East Indies, Galestin and Roep; Egypt, Shamsy and Chamass; Estonia, —; Finland, Mantere and Schaumann; France, Merlin and Moutet; Germany, Schücking and Eickhoff; Great Britain, Lord Treowen and Sir James Agg-Gardner; Greece, —; Holland, Koolen and Rutgers; Hungary, Count Apponyi and de Berzeviczy; Ireland, Hayes and O'Farrell; Italy, di Stefano and Gentile; Japan, —; Latvia, Vesmanis and Felsbergs; Lithuania, Raulinaitis and Slezevicius; Norway, Michelet and Mowinkel; Poland, Dembinski and Buzek; Rumania, Iiiesco et V. V. Pella; Spain, —; Sweden, Baron Adelswärd and Branting; Switzerland, de Meuron and Forrer; United States of America, McKinley and Burton; Yugoslavia, Coumanoudy and Yovanovitch.

II

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The conference nominated M. R. Dandurand (Canada) to take the place of Mr. Burton (U. S. A.), and M. Fernand Merlin (France) to take the place of M. Buisson for the two remaining years of the latter's term of office.

The committee will be composed as follows: Baron Adelswärd (Sweden), Presi-

dent; Count Apponyi (Hungary), to retire at the XXIIIrd Conference; M. Fernand Merlin (France), to retire at the XXIVth Conference; M. Lev. Winter (Czechoslovakia), to retire at the XXVth Conference; M. R. Dandurand (Canada), to retire at the XXVIth Conference.

The committee appointed Count Apponyi to act as President of the Council in the event of the absence, resignation, or death of the latter.

III

AUDITORS

The Council elected MM. le Prof. Dembinski (Poland) and Aloïs de Meuron (Switzerland) to be auditors for the year 1924.

We have the honor to be, your obedient servants,

(Signed) A. DE NEURON,
President of the Conference.

(Signed) CHR. L. LANGE,
Secretary General.

ANGLO-RUSSIAN TREATIES

(NOTE.—Following is the text of the two treaties between Great Britain and Russia, signed in London on August 8. In the text of the General Treaty Articles 2, 3, and 4, referring to the treaties between the two countries, considered as having lapsed or remaining in force, and Article 5, dealing with the fisheries question, are omitted.)

I. The General Treaty

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the one hand, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of the other hand, being animated with the desire to extend and develop the commercial relations established after the signature of the trade agreement of March 16, 1921, and to remove all causes of friction and disagreement between the two countries and to place their relations on a firm, just, and durable basis, have decided to conclude a treaty with this object, and for the conclusion of which they are represented as follows:

Great Britain and Northern Ireland by the Right Honorable James Ramsay MacDonald, M. P., First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister, Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Mr. Arthur Augustus William Harry Ponsonby, M. P., Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by Christian Georgievich Rakovski, Member of the Presi-

dium of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Deputy People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs, Chargé d'Affaires in London of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Adolph Abramovich Ioffe, Member of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Andrei Fëdorovich Radchenko, Member of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, President of the Provincial Council of Trade Unions of the Donets Basin; Aron Lvovich Scheinmann, Member of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat of Finance; Mikhail Pavlovich Tomski, Member of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, President of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions.

These plenipotentiaries having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

Article 1

The present treaty constitutes the formal general treaty adumbrated in the preamble to the trade agreement between His Britannic Majesty's Government and the Government of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic signed in London on March 16, 1921, and as between Great Britain, including Northern Ireland, and the Union replaces that agreement.

Commercial relations between the two countries will in future be regulated by the Commercial Treaty signed this day by the representatives of the two parties.

Article 6

In pursuance of the declaration annexed to the trade agreement of the 16th March, 1921, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that by way of exception to the decree of the 28th January, 1918 (concerning the annulment of debts of the former Imperial and Provisional Governments), it will satisfy, in the conditions prescribed in the present treaty, the claims of British holders of loans issued or taken over or guaranteed by the former Imperial Russian Government, or by the municipalities or towns in the territory now included in the Union, payable in foreign (non-Russian) currency.

The Government of His Britannic Majesty recognizes that the financial and economic

position of the Union renders impracticable the full satisfaction of the claims referred to in the preceding paragraph of this article.

The Government of the Union agrees to meet the claims referred to in the first paragraph of this article in respect of holdings by British subjects or companies other than holdings which were acquired by purchase since the 16th of March, 1921, and were in other than British ownership on that date.

After negotiations between the parties concerned, the terms on which the claims referred to in the first paragraph of this article shall be satisfied will form the subject of an agreement with His Britannic Majesty's Government, which will be included in the treaty referred to in Article 11, provided that His Britannic Majesty's Government is satisfied that such terms have been accepted by the holders of not less than one-half of the capital values of British holdings in the loans referred to in this article.

Article 7

All questions connected with the claims of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against the Government of His Britannic Majesty, or with the claims of the Government of His Britannic Majesty against the Government of the Union, arising out of events which took place between August 4, 1914, and February 1, 1924, are reserved for discussion at a later date. This provision includes claims in respect of—

(a) War loans advanced by the Government of His Britannic Majesty to the former Russian Imperial or Provisional Governments;

(b) Gold belonging to the former Russian Imperial or Provisional governments, and handed over to the Government of His Britannic Majesty by either of those governments;

(c) Russian gold handed over to Germany under the supplementary agreement to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk;

(d) Sums owed by the former Russian Imperial or Provisional governments to British Government Departments, or *vice versa*;

(e) The claims advanced by the Government of the Union on the ground of intervention between November 7, 1917, and March 16, 1921; and also any adjustments made or to be made in the accounts relating to such claims on either side.

There shall similarly be reserved all ques-

tions connected with claims by the nationals of either party against the other party, in respect of loss or damage suffered in the territory of the party whose national the claimant is, and resulting from warlike operations or hostile measures during the above-mentioned period.

Article 8

Claims by nationals (including juridical persons) of the one party against the other party in respect of loss or injury due to events which took place between the 1st of August, 1914, and the coming into force of the present treaty, other than (1) claims covered by other articles of the present treaty, and (2) claims arising out of normal trading relations between the Government of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic or governments allied to or federated with it, or its agents, and British nationals, or between the Government of His Britannic Majesty and citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, shall, in view of the admitted preponderance of the claims of British nationals, be finally settled as between the contracting parties by the payment of a lump sum by the Government of the Union to the Government of His Britannic Majesty.

The distribution of this sum shall be effected by the Government of His Britannic Majesty in such manner as they shall consider just. The Government of the Union undertakes to furnish the Government of His Britannic Majesty with any relevant papers or information in their possession which may facilitate the just distribution of such sum.

Article 9

Each of the contracting parties shall appoint three properly qualified persons to examine the claims of which the settlement is to be effected by the payment of the lump sum provided for in Article 8. These six persons shall make a joint examination of the claims, and shall report to the two contracting parties the amount at which they consider the lump sum should be fixed. If they are unable to agree as to the amount of the lump sum, they shall present separate reports. They will arrange their own procedure, and shall, in particular, be entitled by agreement between themselves to refer the examination of any particular category of claims to two of their number.

Each of the contracting parties shall de-

fray the remuneration and expenses of the persons appointed by it, together with one-half of the expenses incurred jointly.

Article 10

Being desirous of re-establishing the economic co-operation between their two countries, the Government of His Britannic Majesty and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agree as follows:

The Government of the Union will, by way of exception to the decrees nationalizing industrial businesses and land, negotiate with British nationals (including juridical persons) in respect of industrial businesses or concessions which have been nationalized or canceled by it, in order to arrange for the grant of just compensation for such claims.

Furthermore, a commission shall be appointed to examine the validity and ascertain the amount of the claims.

Each of the contracting parties agrees to assist the commission so far as possible with regard to supplying or collecting papers or information required for the proper accomplishment of its task.

If the members of the commission are unable to agree on a joint report in respect of any particular property, they may present separate reports.

In cases where the Government of the Union concludes an agreement with an individual claimant, the commission shall be informed of such agreement in order that the claim in question may be withdrawn from the competence of the commission.

The commission shall consist of six persons possessing the necessary qualifications for their task, three being appointed by the Government of His Britannic Majesty and three by the Government of the Union.

The commission shall settle its own procedure, which shall be approved by the two governments. Each of the contracting parties shall defray the remuneration and pay the expenses of the persons appointed by it, together with one-half of the expenses incurred jointly.

Article 11

A second treaty will be entered into, which will contain:

(1) The conditions accepted in accordance with Article 6.

(2) The amount and method of payment of compensation for claims under Article 8.

(3) An agreed settlement of property claims other than those directly settled by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Article 12

Upon the signature of the treaty referred to in Article 11 His Britannic Majesty's Government will recommend Parliament to enable them to guarantee the interest and sinking fund of a loan to be issued by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The amount, terms, and conditions of the said loan and the purposes to which it shall be applied shall be defined in the treaty provided for in Article 11, which will not come into force until the necessary parliamentary authority for the guarantee of the said loan has been given.

Article 13

The provisions of this chapter constitute a single and indivisible unit.

Article 14

On the coming into force of the treaty referred to in Article 11, Article 10 of the trade agreement of March 16, 1921, will be abrogated, until which time it will be maintained in force, Article 1 of the present treaty notwithstanding.

Article 15

Documents and papers of every kind, which, on November 1, 1917, belonged to individual subjects or citizens of either party, and are now withheld from the owners and are in the possession or under the control of the government or a public institution of the other party, shall be returned to the owners, or to such representative as they may appoint, within two months from the date of a request to that effect.

Article 16

The contracting parties solemnly affirm their desire and intention to live in peace and amity with each other, scrupulously to respect the undoubted right of a State to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way, to refrain and to restrain all persons and organizations under their direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from them, from any act, overt or covert, liable in any

way whatsoever to endanger the tranquillity or prosperity of any part of the territory of the British Empire or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or intended to embitter the relations of the British Empire or the Union with their neighbors or any other countries.

Article 17

The present treaty is drawn up and signed in the English language. A translation shall be made into the Russian language as soon as possible and agreed between the parties. Both texts shall then be considered authentic for all purposes.

Article 18

The present treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in London as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

II. Treaty of Commerce and Navigation

Article 1

For the purpose of developing and strengthening the commercial relations between their respective territories, the contracting parties agree that, without prejudice to any more favorable provisions contained in the present treaty, all facilities, rights, and privileges which in the territories of either of the contracting parties shall be accorded in matters of commerce to the nationals or juridical persons of any other foreign State, established in the territories of that State, or to their property shall be extended, on condition of full reciprocity, to the nationals of the other party, to juridical persons established in the territories of that party and to their property. Each of the contracting parties shall accord to goods, the produce or manufacture of the territories of the other, all facilities, rights and privileges which are or may hereafter be accorded in the territories of the other to goods, the produce or manufacture of the territories of any third foreign country in all that relates to prohibitions and restrictions on importation or exportation, customs duties and charges, transport, warehousing, drawback, and excise. The provisions of this paragraph shall extend to the treatment of commercial travelers' samples.

With the same purpose in view His Majesty's Government, on its part, agrees to extend the facilities of the Export Credits Scheme as laid down in "The Overseas Trade (Credits and Insurance) Act, 1920," as amended by subsequent enactments to trade between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and further agrees that in respect of these and any similar facilities the said trade shall be placed on the same footing as trade with any other foreign country.

Nothing, however, in the present treaty shall oblige the Union to extend to the other party—

(a) The special provisions relating to commerce contained in the treaties which the Union may have concluded or may conclude in the future with those States the territory of which on August 1, 1914, constituted in all respects an integral part of the former Russian Empire, or with continental border States in Asia.

(b) The rights which are or may be accorded to any third country forming part of a customs union with the Union.

(c) The facilities which the Union has or may have accorded to border States in respect of local exchange of goods between the inhabitants of the frontier zones.

Article 2

Taking into account that the monopoly of foreign trade in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics belongs to the government, and that this government may engage in trading operations either directly through the trade representative of the Union or through any body or authority under its control, or otherwise, both parties agree on the following:

1. The trade representative and his assistants (members of the council of the trade representation), the number of which shall be determined at a later date by mutual agreement of both parties, shall be members of the Union Embassy in London, and shall, as such, enjoy all the privileges and immunities appertaining thereto, including extraterritoriality for their offices in the embassy. For this purpose the existing offices of the trade delegation and such other offices as may form the subject of future agreement shall form part of the embassy.

2. The Government of the Union assumes the responsibility for all transactions conducted by or on behalf of the union trade

representative in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and agrees that all such commercial transactions shall be subject to the laws and courts of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, but in view of the responsibility for these transactions which is assumed by the Government of the Union, neither it nor its representatives will be called upon to give security for complying with the orders of the court.

3. This trade, as well as the trade of the above-mentioned bodies, including the trade of any companies organized by the trade representative in conformity with the laws existing in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, shall enjoy the same privileges and facilities and be conducted on the same footing in Great Britain and Northern Ireland as trade which is not conducted by governments.

Article 3

Goods, the produce or manufacture of the territories of either of the contracting parties, passing in transit across the territories of the other by routes open to transit under the general legislation of the country, shall be free in those territories from all transit duties.

Article 4

Juridical persons (including limited liability and other companies and associations) formed for the purpose of commerce, insurance, finance, industry, transport or any other business and established in the territories of either party shall, provided that they have been duly constituted in accordance with the laws in force in such territories, be recognized as having a legal status in the territories of the other, and in particular shall have there the right of appearing before the tribunals, for the purpose of bringing or of defending an action.

In any case the said juridical persons shall enjoy, in the territories of the other party, the same general rights as are or shall be accorded to similar juridical persons of any other foreign country.

It is understood that the foregoing provision does not affect the question of determining whether any such juridical person constituted in the territories of one party shall or shall not be permitted to carry on its business in the territories of the other party, this matter remaining always subject

to the existing regulations on this point in the last-named territories.

It is understood that the foregoing provisions are applicable to juridical persons constituted before the signature of the present treaty, as well as to those which may be constituted subsequently.

This article shall replace the agreement signed at St. Petersburg on December 16/29, 1904, which shall cease to have effect.

Article 5

Each of the contracting parties undertakes to grant to the subjects or citizens of the other the right to enter its territories on conditions not less favorable than those applicable to the subjects or citizens of the most favored nation.

The subjects or citizens of one of the contracting parties who have been permitted to enter the territories of the other may reside there and exercise their trades, industries or professions on condition that they comply with the regulations in force for the citizens of the most favored nation in the territories to which they have been admitted, and they shall be at complete liberty to leave the territories to which they have been admitted whensoever they please.

The subjects or citizens of each of the contracting parties in the territories of the other shall have free access to the courts of justice for the prosecution and defense of their rights without other conditions or taxes beyond those imposed on nationals or on subjects or citizens of the most favored foreign State, and shall, like them, be at liberty to employ in all causes their advocates, attorneys or agents from among the persons admitted to the exercise of those professions according to the laws of the country.

Article 6

The subjects or citizens of each of the contracting parties shall in the territories of the other be exempt from all forms of compulsory military service whatsoever, whether in the army, fleet, air forces, national guard or militia. They can only be subject to military exactions, requisitions and compulsory contributions in kind on payment of compensation. They shall be exempt from all money contributions, compulsory loans and pecuniary taxes for war purposes and from compulsory billeting, except in so far as such contributions, loans, taxes, and billeting are

imposed by the law of the country on all the inhabitants.

The subjects or citizens of each of the contracting parties shall in the territories of the other likewise be exempt from all judicial, administrative, and municipal functions whatsoever, other than those imposed by the law relating to juries, as well as from all compulsory services, except in cases of sudden and unexpected occurrences involving great public danger, and from all contributions, whether pecuniary or in kind, imposed as an equivalent for personal service. They shall be subject only to such taxes and charges as are imposed upon the inhabitants generally by the law of the country.

In all matters covered by this article the treatment accorded to the subjects or citizens of each of the contracting parties in the territories of the other shall not be less favorable than that which is or may be accorded to subjects or citizens of the most favored nation.

Article 7

The subjects or citizens of one of the contracting parties admitted into the territories of the other shall be at liberty to communicate freely by post and by telegraph and to make use of telegraphic codes, provided that they specify beforehand the code being used, and under the conditions and subject to the regulations laid down in the International Telegraph Convention of St. Petersburg of 1875, as revised at Lisbon in 1908.

Article 8

Each of the contracting parties guarantees national treatment to the subjects or citizens of the other party and to juridical persons (including limited liability and other companies and associations) established in the territories of that other party in all that concerns the possession, inviolability and right to dispose of property, whether imported into the territories of the former party or acquired in those territories in conformity with the provisions of the present treaty and with the laws and regulations there in force.

Article 9

The contracting parties undertake to recognize arbitration clauses inserted in contracts between persons in the territories of one party and persons in the territories of the other, such persons being subjects or citizens of either of the contracting parties or jurid-

ical persons established in their territories.

They equally undertake to execute the awards of the arbitral tribunals appointed in conformity with the above contracts, subject, however, to the following conditions:

1. That the award is not rendered incapable of execution by the existence of a previous judgment given on another point by the judicial tribunals of the country where the award would be carried into effect.

2. That the award does not contain provisions contrary to the laws of the country where it is to be carried out.

The contracting parties agree within three months of the coming into force of the present treaty to enter into a convention laying down the procedure to be followed for the better observance of the provisions of this article.

Article 10

The subjects or citizens of one of the contracting parties admitted into the territories of the other shall not be subjected personally or with regard to their property or to their activities to any other or higher taxes, imposts or obligations than those which are or may be imposed in the like conditions upon subjects or citizens of the last-named party, with the exception of special cases provided for by the laws in regard to all foreigners. Such special laws shall not impose taxation on the subjects or citizens of one party in the territories of the other in respect of their industry, trade, occupation, or business, and in regard to all forms of taxation such subjects or citizens shall not be placed in a less favorable condition than the subjects or citizens of the most favored nation.

Juridical persons (including limited liability and other companies and associations) established in the territories of one party and admitted to carry on operations in the territories of the other party shall not be subject in the territories of the second party to any other or higher taxes, imposts, or obligations than those which are or may be imposed in the like conditions upon similar juridical persons there established or upon similar juridical persons of any third State which are admitted to carry on operations in the territories of the second party.

Article 11

Each of the contracting parties undertakes to treat the vessels of the other not less favorably than national vessels or the vessels

of the most favored nation. This equality of treatment shall extend to the rules and regulations governing the transport of goods or passengers from and to the ports of the contracting parties and to any duties or charges levied on the vessels, their cargoes, or passengers, and also to facilities for the stationing, loading, and unloading of vessels in ports, docks, quays, harbors, and roadsteads, as well as tonnage or other dues, charges, and payments of all kinds levied on ships, such as sanitary, port, quay, harbor, pilotage, quarantine, lighthouse, and other similar dues levied in the name of or for the profit of the government, public functionaries, private individuals, corporations, or establishments of any kind.

The contracting parties undertake that imported or exported goods shall not be subjected in their ports or on their railways, rivers, or canals to any differential due, surtax, charge, or disability of any kind based on the flag of the ship by which the goods are imported or exported and to the detriment of the flag of either party. This provision shall not, however, be regarded as preventing either of the contracting parties from entering into contracts with any persons or companies for the purpose of establishing through rates.

Article 12

The provisions of the present treaty shall not extend to—

(a) The application of special laws for the safeguarding, renewal, and development of the national merchant fleet, so long as such laws do not discriminate in favor of the carriage of goods or passengers by national ships or provide for reductions in the dues levied in the ports of either contracting party on national ships.

(b) Privileges granted to marine sports societies.

(c) Port services, including pilotage, towage, and life-saving and maritime assistance.

(d) Facilities granted to national ships engaged in the coasting trade.

(e) Privileges which are or may be conferred upon countries situated on the Arctic Ocean in respect of fishing and the sale of the catch in ports of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics situated on that ocean.

(f) Navigation on inland waters closed to foreign vessels in general, even though such navigation may be open to the vessels of limitrophe States.

Article 13

Nothing in the preceding article shall prevent either party from reserving its coasting trade in whole or in part to national vessels, provided that—

(a) The party so reserving in whole or in part its coasting trade cannot claim, in virtue of the present treaty, that its vessels shall be admitted to the coasting trade of the other party.

(b) Notwithstanding such reservation, vessels of the other party may proceed from one port to another either for the purpose of landing the whole or part of their cargoes or passengers brought from abroad, or of taking on board the whole or part of their cargoes or passengers for a foreign destination, or of carrying between the two ports goods consigned on through bills of lading or passengers holding through tickets to or from a foreign country. While so engaged, these vessels and their passengers and cargoes shall enjoy the full privileges of the present treaty.

So long as the coasting trade of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is thrown open to vessels of the Union, it is agreed between the parties that if at any time any part of the coasting trade of the Union is thrown open to the vessels of any other foreign country it shall at the same time and under the like conditions be thrown open to British vessels.

Article 14

All vessels which, under the law of either contracting party, are national vessels shall for the purposes of the present treaty be deemed to be vessels of that party.

Article 15

The regulation of the mutual protection of rights in industrial, literary, and artistic property of the citizens or subjects of the contracting parties shall be arranged for by special conventions, which shall, so far as possible, embody the principles contained in the international conventions relating to these matters. Such conventions, which shall be concluded within twelve months from the coming into force of the present treaty, shall further make suitable provision for the grant of priority to British subjects or corporations who previously held such rights in the former Russian Empire.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AS A NEW COUNTRY, is anxious that its younger generation should be orientated toward high ideals of citizenship, and it has seen in the Y. M. C. A. movement a valuable means to this end. In conjunction with the government, a \$1,000,000 project has been laid out, three-quarters of the money being put up by Czechoslovakia itself and the rest promised from America. A central "Y" is to be constructed in Prague. It is reported at the recent meeting of the plenary committee of the World Alliance in Geneva that other countries of eastern Europe may adopt a similar attitude, although it has not yet taken concrete form.

BOOK REVIEWS

WAR; ITS CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES AND CURE. By *Kirby Page*. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York, 1923. Pp. 215. Price, \$1.50.

THE SAINT AND THE SWORD. By *Herbert Booth*. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York, 1923. Pp. 344. Price, \$2.00.

CHRIST OR MARS? By *Will Irwin*. Appleton & Co., New York, 1923. Pp. 188. Price, \$1.50.

The books here grouped are all written from the absolutist standpoint, but in manner they are widely different.

Mr. Page follows somewhat the arguments of Mr. Dickinson in his book on a similar subject, and quotes him quite extensively in his review of Imperialism as a cause of the recent war. He, however, enumerates five basic causes of the great war, and cites proof of each in the events preceding, during, and following it.

Outlawry of war is, he believes, in the last analysis, an ethical question. The reasons for it he rests squarely on the Christian religion.

The book contains much that is not new, but the power of its earnestness will be felt by all who believe in what he calls "Jesus' way of life."

An advertisement of the Fellowship of Reconciliation forms an appendix to the book.

The second book of the group is written by the son of the founder of the Salvation Army. It is strictly religious in its treatment. The thesis of the book is that war is anti-Christian and the proofs are drawn from Biblical arguments.

Mr. Booth claims that what we need to defeat "pugilistic Christianity" is a "League of Thoroughly Christianized Christians."

The tremendous earnestness of the book, especially when one remembers that the first draft was written in the midst of war propaganda, gives a special interest to it.

Mr. Will Irwin, in *Christ or Mars*, uses also the religious argument. The manner of appeal is very much like that of some of those who were writing on the subject in the beginning of the peace movement nearly a century ago. But from his participation in the late war, and his travel about the war countries since then, he documents his arguments with personal observations and experiences.

Like the two preceding authors, Mr. Irwin, brings an impassioned indictment against the Christian Church. We do not, he thinks, want peace "hard enough." To improve man's moral tone and to eliminate war we must, he says, return to the basic American creed in matters of conscience, our watchword in crises from the beginning of our history, "It can be done!"

CULTURE AND DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES By *Horace M. Kallen*. Boni & Liveright, New York, 1924. Pp. 347. Price, \$3.00.

In any collection of essays published at different times there are bound to be some repetitions. Some points will be overargued, because they have been previously presented; some points which might well be stressed in the compass of a volume will be understated when cast in the smaller mold of the essay.

Mr. Kallen is quite cognizant of these facts and alludes to them in the "Postscript; to be read first," which prefaces his book. He does claim for his volume, however, a unity of attitude and philosophy which is, in the main, borne out by the essays as they come.

This unifying idea he himself names "cultural pluralism." His contention is, in effect, that the "melting-pot" theory of America is untenable and undesirable. Rather, there must be co-operation of separate parts, differing from each other, but each contribut-

ing a share to the unity, which is American culture.

The author's favorite topics through the book are Americanization, including the consideration of the fear motive in the Ku Klux Klan; Democracy and Liberty.

The chapters vary considerably in manner. Some are tinged with sarcasm, which runs to bitterness; others, especially the analysis of Mr. Santayana's "Character and Opinion in the United States," are temperate in tone, but at the same time a bit obscure and retarded in movement.

All through his papers Mr. Kallen emphasizes explicitly or implicitly the greatness of citizenship as a vocation. This is surely one of the most important notes in the book.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, A CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION. By *Chas. Howard McIlwain*. Macmillan Co., New York, 1923. Pp. 198. Price, \$2.25.

The Pulitzer School of Journalism at Columbia University offers annually prizes for the best work of the year in various fields. One of these annual awards is given for the best book on the history of the United States. This prize, amounting to \$2,000, has been given this year to Charles H. McIlwain, Professor of History and Government at Harvard, for his book on the American Revolution.

The book is concerned with the constitutionality of the claims made by Adams and others in the American colonies before they were obliged to abandon this ground and become in reality revolutionists against both Parliament and Crown.

Previous to May, 1776, the basis of the revolt in America rested upon a denial by the Americans of the authority, under English constitutional law, of the Parliament at Westminster to bind Englishmen beyond the realm.

To be sure, the English revolution of 1688-89 had definitely placed the power of Parliament above that of the king. Englishmen in England had acquiesced in it. It was the contention of Adams and Hutchinson, however, that this revolutionary assumption of parliamentary superiority had never been consciously assented to in America, and, therefore, America was not bound by it. And on true political principles England could not accept for her a break in the continuous validity of precedent, such as the superior authority of Parliament.

America's charter and allegiance were solely to the Crown. Under the Crown her government was entirely her own affair.

Professor McIlwain ably argues Mr. Adams' case, and cites many proofs of his contention that previous to 1776 America was on perfectly tenable ground, according to English constitutional law. After stating the problem, he considers precedents—first under the caption "The Realm and the Dominion," next under "Natural and Fundamental Law; Taxation and Virtual Representation."

The fact that a number of historians of the Revolution disagree with his conclusion makes this technically written book on his side of the controversy the more valuable.

After 1776, of course, the American opposition to England loses its constitutional character and becomes truly revolutionary; from that time on it is based on political theory instead of constitutional law; it is an appeal to the world instead of to Englishmen alone. With that era Professor McIlwain is not here concerned.

The net result of the book upon the reader who is not a specialist in law is a vastly increased respect for the learning and judicial mentality of the founders of our republic.

MORE WILD FOLK. By *Samuel Scoville, Jr.* Century Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 185. Price, \$2.00.

Keen observation, long study, dramatic imagination, and a ready pen give the author of these fascinating stories rare power over his readers. However household one may be, the reading of these tragedies and adventures among "the creatures" is like ozone from far spaces.

The characters in the dramas range all the way from the tiny Flittermouse to the great hump-backed whale. They are not made to talk and think like human beings; but we follow the thrilling episodes in their natural struggles for food and safety with interest no less breathless for this fidelity to nature.

A large part of the charm of the book lies in the sudden, unexpected flashes of color. It is somehow easier to picture a scene in color than in form or action alone. For instance, among the coral reefs of the Southern seas, "silver tarpon shot through shoals of chubby cow-pilots, all green and gold and indigo, while turquoise blue parrot-fish raced here and there." Even in the freezing dark

of a polar winter, comes a momentary dash of color. "At that instant," he says, "the witch fires of the sky flared up and the whole landscape showed with strange clearness, etched in sepia brown and empurpled blue."

The grim fate that overhangs all wild life—the fear, the cruelty, the desperate courage—are all made graphically real, without comment. Here by proxy we may all have seeing eyes.

WAR; ITS NATURE, CAUSE AND CURE. By *G. Lowes Dickinson*. Macmillan, 1923. Pp. 155. Price, \$1.50.

Here is a moving appeal in the platform manner, from a fluent, downright Englishman. He makes a swift two-edged analysis of the causal events preceding the war. Cupidity for territory, he thinks, judging from the treaties of 1915 to 1917, was the real reason why all the governments, except America, made the war. His appeal is for a change of policy as regards tariffs and taxes and special privileges for nationals, in order to make the possession of territory a responsibility and not an advantage.

Mr. Dickinson has the grim, gloomy outlook on the future of civilization so prevalent in Europe today. One wonders why America seems the only country which is hopeful. Is it because we are blinded and Europe is the seer? Or is it that, fagged and disillusioned by war, Europe is in a pathological condition, while we, so comparatively untouched, see more normally? Whatever the reason, it behooves Americans to consider and weigh even the summary statements so sincerely made by Mr. Dickinson, if a healthier world order is to grow up.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS. By *Taranknath Das*. Huebsch, New York, 1923. Pp. 135. Price, \$1.25.

Mr. Herbert Adams Gibbons, says in the "New Map of Asia," "None can understand the foreign policy of Great Britain, which has inspired military and diplomatic activities from the Napoleonic wars to the present day, who does not interpret wars, diplomatic conflicts, treaties and alliances, territorial annexations, extensions of protectorates, with the fact of India constantly in mind."

The same idea goes all the way through this strongly anti-British book written by an Indian. Mr. Das bolsters up these statements by many citations from British speak-

ers and writers. He shows quite clearly a relation between English dominance in India, and many, at least, of her foreign policies for the last century.

In common with Ghandi and others, Mr. Das cherishes the ideal of an India freed from British control—a federated republic of the United States of India. He believes that the peace of the world would be infinitely better served with a free India, playing her own important role in European and world politics.

He quotes Mr. C. R. Das, proponent of the village community type of government, and president of the All India National Congress in 1922, as saying, "no nation on the face of the earth can be really free when other nations are in bondage."

The book is an authentic statement of the ideals of the Indian statesman. Apart from this, it is of special value to Americans in the study it makes of Imperialism, that disease of exaggerated nationalism, from which even democracies are not quite immune.

JOHN CITIZEN'S JOB. By *Henry H. Curran*. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 253. Price, \$1.50.

"Well, it might be worse," says Mr. Curran, regarding city government, "but, by George, it might be better." If John Citizen, he argues, would take a hand in the game of better government as he did in the war; if he would be as thorough in it; if he would not only vote, but be active in the primaries, be ready to take public office, and, above all, be industrious, intelligent, and socially-minded, there would be large returns in good government.

"It pays to help get a full dollar's worth of good government out of each dollar's tax."

There is a twinkle on every page. Each chapter is replete with pungent illustrative stories, often from the author's personal experience. The colloquial newspaper style is quite in key with his imaginary John Citizen, who is the returned dough-boy, and "snappy," inquiring business man of the hour.

One is quite attracted with the idea of John—yes, and Jane Citizen, too—both happily serving, in odds and ends of time, their community and the neighbors in it.

The Will to End War

By Arthur Deerin Call

This pamphlet of 39 pages tells of the cost of war—reasons for the will to end war—beginnings of the modern peace movement—the organizations of peace societies, periodicals, congresses—international plans and organizations—the two Hague conferences—the League of Nations and World Court.

The original statute of the International Court and the statute as finally adopted are both included.

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Order from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building Washington, D. C.

Any Book on
International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership IN The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional	\$25.00
Contributing	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual			\$2.00

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$..... PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A.....
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name

Address

.....

.....

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 11

November, 1924

The League at Work

History and Text of the
League Protocol

The United States of Europe

Militarism before the War

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	579
EDITORIALS	
The League Protocol—Fall of the British Government—Success of the German Loan—Unification by Force in China—Editorial Notes	581-587
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
Political Deadlock in Germany—The French Budget—The Anglo-Franco-German Commercial Treaty Negotiations—Russia Today—Breakdown of the Anglo-Egyptian Conference—Assassination of Macedonian Chiefs—Certificates of Identity for Refugees.....	588-597
IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL DATES.....	598
GENERAL ARTICLES	
The Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations.....	600
By Arthur Deerin Call	
The United States of Europe.....	607
By Sir Max Waechter	
Militarism at Work.....	611
By Heinrich Kanner	
Rights and Duties of States (Second Installment).....	619
By the Rt. Hon. Lord Phillimore	
Penny Wisdom in Germany.....	622
By D. Clausewitz	
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
History of the League Disarmament Work.....	624
Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.....	626
Note on the St. Lawrence Waterway Project.....	631
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	632
LETTER BOX.....	636
BOOK REVIEWS.....	637

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:

Annual Membership, two dollars;

Sustaining Membership, five dollars;

Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Life Membership is one hundred dollars.

All memberships include a free subscription to ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Senator from Illinois, Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. PHILIP NORTH MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN, 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., 1155 Hyde Park Boulevard Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, California.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, Ex-President Fairmont Seminary, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 W. 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS

HENRY C. MORRIS

PAUL SLEMAN

THEODORE STANFIELD

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D.

Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.

GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., Richmond, Indiana.

Dean CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.

Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.

GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. Bishop J. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.

GEORGE A. FINCH, Washington, D. C.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.

Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.

Geo. H. JUDD, Washington, D. C.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.

JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.

L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.

Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salida, Colo.

Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.

EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.

*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.

Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

Suggestions for a Governed World

(Adopted by the American Peace Society, May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions, and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable, with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment whenever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that.

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective; and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

NOVEMBER, 1924

NUMBER
11

EDITORIALS

THE LEAGUE PROTOCOL

THE League "Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes" is one of the most remarkable documents of modern times. It ranks along with the Covenant of the League of Nations, which it aims to interpret, fulfill, and amend. Its purpose is to set up a bullet-proof protection for all States, members of the League of Nations or not, against all war. Summarizing its main features, one readily senses the struggles and the compromises out of which it was born.

The first article immediately arrests attention, proposing, as it does, to amend the Covenant without consulting the Covenant, for the Covenant provides that amendments must be ratified by all the governments represented on the Council and by a majority in the Assembly. The Covenant does not provide for its own amendments by the adoption of protocols.

The nature of the amendment itself is startling enough: It discloses the plan as the refinement—under given circumstances—not of peace, but of war; for, according to its own terms, all of the members of the League are called upon to agree that they will not go to war "except in case of resistance to acts of aggression" or with the consent of the Council or Assembly of the League. This, if adopted, would constitute the Council and the Assembly, in a way, the knight errants of the world, ready at a moment's notice

to sponsor a world war if in their judgment it seem to be desirable. This, evidently the result of French influence, is what may be called "putting teeth into the League."

Other outstanding features of the plan are less drastic. There is the proposal that all the nations agree to the optional clause of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice; that Article XV of the Covenant be amended for the purposes of increasing the powers of the Council and advancing the processes of arbitration; that questions affecting domestic jurisdiction, if need be, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice; that every State promise not to double up its fist at another without the consent of the League; that the theory of the Bryan treaties—these are not mentioned by name—be put to work; that all States, members of the League or not, be urged to sign the protocol; that an international conference for the reduction of armaments be called by the League as a step precedent to putting this protocol into effect. Throughout this set of proposals it may be said the English influence was to the fore.

But the truly arresting thing about the protocol is the proposal to place the armies and navies and aircraft and other war materials of the nations at the job of policing each other and, under certain circumstances, of joining to strangle and defeat, by all the methods of war, a nation which has been adjudged to be an aggressor.

Any nation which refuses to arbitrate, to abide by a judicial or arbitral award, or which commits an act of war under the terms of the protocol, shall be deemed an aggressor without more ado; whereupon all of the other powers agree to go after the offender, altogether—politically, financially, economically, militarily. Of course, that is war; but it is only "police war," as one of the enthusiastic defenders of the League has put it.

Here, it would seem, is the old Treaty of Mutual Assistance, which had been discarded by many of the governments, including England and America, only in another form. In the building of the protocol the French evidently had their way. The spirit of Leon Bourgeois, overruled at the Paris Peace Conference, had triumphed here at last. They who thought that Article X and the other fighting articles of the Covenant were dying a natural death were, it would appear, mistaken. These articles here appear in full and virile liveliness.

And this is the answer of the Fifth Assembly to the problem presented to the League by the prime ministers of England and France. This is the proposed solution of what M. Herriot called "the most difficult task in the whole lifetime of this League of Nations." Elsewhere in the same address M. Herriot remarked:

"For you to realize the high task which you are about to undertake, intelligence is not sufficient. You need robust and steadfast faith."

To an American somewhat familiar with the Federal Convention of 1787, with the history of the way our country has provided for the settlement of controversies between States, and with the debates conducted in our land over the League of Nations, it readily appears that the framers of this remarkable protocol must have had a "robust and steadfast faith."

In any event, one thing stands out: America is no longer a serious factor in the League's plans for the further development of its ideals. Furthermore, the position of England and of the Scandinavian countries in particular seems to have been reversed. Mr. MacDonald, in his first address before the Assembly, used these words:

"History is full of invasions, full of wars and of aggressions, and there have always been pacts, always military guarantees, and always military security. The history of the world is a history which shows the nations always ready for war and always at war, and the one is absolutely essentially and organically connected with the other. History is full of the doom of nations which have trusted that false security."

And Lord Parmoor, addressing the Assembly a few days later, came back to the thought. He said:

"So far as military force is concerned, inequality will always be with us, and the same evil agencies which have wrecked the chances of the equality of treatment in the past will wreck any attempt at equality in the future, unless we have the courage to eliminate from our consideration the element of military and unequal force.

"I want now to express what I consider to be the only principle upon which we can proceed. I desire not the application of force, but the supremacy of and obedience to international law under the constituted authority of an international court. It is in law that we can find equality; it is in law that we can find justice and equity. In military force we can never find either the one or the other."

It is interesting to note that Lord Parmoor was a member of the Committee of Twelve which drafted the protocol.

There is no doubt of the sincerity of the men who are working upon this matter. They are able and conscientious men. They are forward-looking men—earnest, very earnest, men—who have caught the

vision of the new day, who have heard the cry of the world—as other men heard the cry of another age for liberty—the cry for peace. They are, however, essentially European men, concerned with the problem of setting up a new Europe. “The League of Nations takes upon itself the first task of creating once again a European system,” said Mr. MacDonald. Taking Europe as they find it, they think it a step in advance to develop the present system of multialliances into a more general European alliance, bringing to their aid as many of the outside nations as possible.

Notwithstanding these motives, the protocol has already aroused misgivings in England. The London *Times* sounded a warning in its issue for September 17, when it said:

“Lightly to throw the [British] Navy into the dialectics of a very involved discussion of international peace proposals is to exceed the authority of any representative of the British Government abroad.”

And again, on September 25, this same paper returned to the subject as follows:

“Never has Geneva seemed so strangely remote from the capitals of Europe as at this important moment. . . . A special atmosphere has been created in Geneva. It seems to be distinct from that atmosphere in which the harassed nations try to solve their own urgent political problems. Perhaps it is higher and better. Perhaps the fourth dimension will release us from the bondage of those three in the midst of which we incessantly struggle. After all, any decisions that may be taken in Geneva will have to be tested by the common and permanent standards. The facts of time and history cannot be evaded. . . . The chief British interest is peace, and the principal motive of the British peoples in entering the war ten years ago was to make peace secure and to vindicate the authority of international law. . . . British opinion is anxious because it seems that our precious possession, the navy, is somehow to be brought into this sphere of unknown contingencies, over which the British people will have no direct con-

trol. . . . The League scheme [protocol] appears to be an attempt to escape from immediate realities. . . . Let us rest for a little while on the excellent Dawes scheme.”

These words from the *Times* sound strangely familiar to one able to recall the objections to the League of Nations as raised from time to time in the United States. It sounds quite like the oft-repeated American doctrine to refuse all promises to go forth to war in circumstances the nature of which we cannot now foresee. England has no written constitution, but her foreign policies, when it comes to action, seem to be based upon principles some of which are quite familiar to American practice.

What the future of the protocol is to be, of course, no one can say. One thing is sure: the discussions about it will be most useful, for they cannot but help to clear away much of the fog enveloping the problems which it aims to solve.

FALL OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

AFTER nine months of maneuvering against an unmistakably hostile but hopelessly divided majority in the House of Commons, the Labor Government of Ramsay MacDonald fell on October 9. The Parliament, one of the most short-lived in recent British history, was immediately dissolved and new elections were ordered for October 29.

A minority government to begin with, and not even representing the largest single group in the House, the Labor Cabinet was, from the very start, at the mercy of its political opponents. It controlled only 193 seats, against 259 Conservative and 158 Liberal votes. It came into power because the two older parties refused to combine into a working majority. It remained in power as long as

the enmity between the two opposing parties remained irreconcilable. It fell the moment the other two parties showed signs of possible co-operation.

The MacDonald Government was overthrown on a more or less trivial issue. A resolution of censure was moved by a prominent Conservative member, accusing the government of undue leniency in the prosecution of the editor of a Communist paper. The Labor benches fought the resolution strenuously, but when the division came the government found itself outvoted by a majority of 166. After that nothing remained for the Prime Minister but to go to the King and ask for the dissolution of the Parliament.

But while the actual overthrow came on a comparatively unimportant issue, much graver issues were behind the action of the opposition parties. For months prior to the rising of the Parliament for a recess, at the beginning of August, these issues had been pressing forward. Under the influence of their more and more definite emergence, the enmity which had at the beginning of the year rendered the two older parties hopelessly estranged was rapidly dispersing. At the same time, the Prime Minister was becoming more and more defiant. It was, indeed, an angry and sullen Parliament that rose in August. It was a determined Parliament that re-assembled less than two months later, four weeks ahead of the expiration of the recess, and in the course of ten days overthrew the Labor Government.

When Ramsay MacDonald took over the reins of government at the beginning of this year, the most pressing problems that confronted the country were those concerned with foreign affairs. Important and delicate negotiations with France over the reparation question were in prospect. They overshadowed everything else. The new government made a bold and straightforward bid for a free hand in the conduct of these negotiations. The oppo-

sition parties showed rare wisdom in acceding to the government's request. What became known as the "Truce of God" was concluded by the parliamentary parties and the Prime Minister entered upon his negotiations confident of undivided support in Parliament.

These negotiations, which began with the Chequers meeting between MacDonald and Herriot and continued through the British Prime Minister's visit to Paris, and finally the tortuous London Conference, are the outstanding achievement of the Labor Government. The "Truce of God" justified itself.

But, as for the rest of the work accomplished by the MacDonald Government, it has not been of such a nature as to be conducive to amicable relations between the Ministerial and the Opposition benches. The most acrimonious debates were occasioned by the treaties negotiated and signed with Soviet Russia. These treaties constitute now the central issue of the electoral campaign.

The provisions of the Russian treaties, dealing with the salvaging of the British investments in Russia and with the possibility of new Russian loans guaranteed by the British Government, have aroused bitter opposition on the part of the business interests in Great Britain. Gratified as these interests were by the moderation of the budget, prepared by the Labor Chancellor of the Exchequer, they have been thrown into consternation by what they consider utter failure on the part of the MacDonald Government to protect adequately British business interests abroad.

This feeling applies also to the attitude of the British business community toward Prime Minister MacDonald's work in Geneva. It is felt that the creation of great industrial combinations on the continent, the way for which is being opened by the work of the League Assembly and the commercial treaty negotiations now in

progress between France and Germany, is apt to be highly detrimental to British interests.

In this atmosphere of hostile criticism along the lines which are of vital concern to every Englishman, the Labor Party has been forced by its political opponents into a new contest at the polls. Its position is far from enviable; the trumps in the game are massed on the other side.

SUCCESS OF THE GERMAN LOAN

ISSUED as a part of the application of the Dawes Plan, the 200-million-dollar German loan has been a tremendous success. It was oversubscribed in every market in which it had been apportioned. Wall Street rumors have placed the amount available for subscription in this country at ten times the 100 millions actually called for. Even the small amount placed on the Paris market has been readily taken up. All this is gratifying as a sign of readiness for international co-operation, but there is no doubt that extreme caution should be exercised in this, as well as in all matters connected with present-day international finance.

The loan has been necessary as an integral part of German reconstruction provided for by the plans elaborated by the Committee of Experts and the London Conference. As an investment proposition, it thus carried with it all the glamor that has attached to it by virtue of its international importance. But the fact that its need has been urged so unanimously is far from indicating that Germany is an excellent market for the investment of foreign capital—an idea which has become very widespread, if one can judge rightly by the enthusiastic oversubscription of the initial loan.

The Dawes Report has made quite clear the proposition that Germany's paying capacity abroad can be gauged only by the

excess of her exports over her imports. The risks involved in lending money to her are, therefore, tied up with precisely this aspect of her financial position. Last year Germany's exports and imports just about balanced in value. This year she bought from the world much more than she had sold to it. She made up the difference out of the accumulations of foreign currencies she still had. The prospect of her selling to the world more than she buys from it in the near future are not particularly promising. Her credit position is not, therefore, intrinsically very strong.

It is, however, quite strong sentimentally, which is far from being the same thing. In indulging in enthusiasm over investments in Germany, it is well to bear in mind the unfortunate experiences of those who had speculated so confidently in German marks.

Germany needed the 200 million dollars that she got, and needed it quite badly. She needs more credit, but she ought not to avail herself of it without caution. Immoderate lending to Germany will not be of any good, either to her or to the rest of the world.

UNIFICATION BY FORCE IN CHINA

THE fortunes of the civil war in China are definitely on the side of the Peking Government. The events of the past few weeks have given so many advantages into its hands that there is very little reason now to look for failure on its part.

The struggle around Shanghai has been decided in favor of the adherents of the Chih-li party—*i. e.*, the Peking Government. The Tuchun of Chekiang, the last active upholder of the Anfu Party, has suffered crushing defeat at the hands of his opponents. Distance and floods have rendered impossible any aid he might

have received from his Manchurian ally, while his foes received ample backing from their Peking overlords.

With the fall of Shanghai the fate of Sun Yat Sen and his whole movement in the south has been practically sealed. Internal difficulties have already weakened that movement to such an extent that it scarcely presents any grave danger to Peking.

There still remains Chang Tso-Lin, the dictator of Manchuria. His powerful and excellently equipped armies have been battling for weeks at the outer defenses of the Peking territory. As long as the Peking forces were divided between the Shanghai front and the defense lines against the Manchurian hosts, Chang Tso-Lin presented a real problem. Now he appears to be very much less of a problem.

The successes of the Peking Government are all the more startling in view of the fact that the Chi-li Party itself is known to be badly divided in its own ranks. It was, indeed, an achievement for it to have become welded together in the face of the very real dangers that threatened it several weeks ago. The concentration of all military authority in the hands of General Wu Pei-Fu has, apparently, borne ample fruit.

The civil war is not over as yet. Chang Tso-Lin and his armies, backed by Japan, are still a factor in the situation; but they are now vastly outnumbered by the armies of Peking. By concentrating all their military resources now on the Manchurian front, the Peking leaders have every reason to be confident of an ultimate victory over the Manchurian leader—their former ally, now their powerful and bitter opponent.

Ever since they came into power, four years ago, Wu Pei-Fu and his associates have pursued relentlessly a policy of unification for China. They believe in centralism as the only possible scheme for keeping the country from falling apart.

They are closer now to a realization of this policy than they have ever been before. Their task of unifying the country by sheer force is almost at an end; but the real test is still to come, and first of all in a continued unity within their own party.

IT SEEMS very unfortunate that so much of the pre-election discussion of our foreign policies centers about the Washington treaties. Thus far the constructive nature of the results achieved by the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments has been practically free from criticism in serious and responsible quarters. The vote of the Senate, when the treaties were before it for ratification, was almost unanimous in favor of them, and this vote came only after a searching discussion of the treaties. The country, too, at that time showed unmistakably its approval. The assertion that our navy is in reality below the strength assigned to it by the Naval Treaty ratio still remains to be proved, and, even if it is well founded, it does not in any way discredit the principles which are at the bottom of the treaty itself. During the three years that have elapsed since the Washington Conference nothing has been brought to light that would tend to belittle the importance of that outstanding move toward world peace, the whole credit for which belongs to the United States.

ANYONE reading such documents as the memoirs of the former Austro-Hungarian Chief of Staff, summarized elsewhere in this issue, can have but little patience with the movement toward exonerating Germany from guilt for the World War, which is now on the ascendent, both in this country and in Great Britain. The spokesmen for this movement take some of the diplomatic documents dealing with the weeks that pre-

ceded the outbreak of the war, and from these argue that Germany was not nearly as much responsible as some of the Allied countries—Russia and France, for example. German statesmen seize avidly upon these “discoveries,” made by hot-headed thinkers here and elsewhere, and immediately turn them to practical account. The result is a beclouding of present-day issues, rather than their clarification, which the exonerators of Germany urge as the reason for their activities.

AFTER the rosy prospects presented by the startlingly rapid success of Austrian reconstruction during the initial period of the League control, it is somewhat disconcerting to find that events in that country are not proceeding as smoothly as might have been hoped for. The Austrian Government and the Commissioner-General of the League are definitely at odds over the policies of the immediate future. The point at issue is the question of the budget. Under the reconstruction plan, the Austrian budget must be balanced within certain limits. This balance has been attained, and now the Austrian leaders wish to extend the limits originally set by the League plan. The policy they advocate is one of budgetary expansion, to be compensated for by increased taxation. The Commissioner-General, on the other hand, maintains that such an expansion would be hazardous and prefers to continue budgetary equilibrium on the basis of rigid economies. So far, he has had his way, and the general economic situation of the country, after the recent banking crisis, seems to justify his policy. The tendency of the Austrian leaders toward overexpansion seems, indeed, to be a rather weak element in the still precarious and quite uncompleted work of the international salvaging of their country.

RUSSIA is again in the clutches of a famine. The reports on the crop situation in that country no longer leave any doubt as to that. Only a few months ago the Soviet Government was still announcing a substantial crop for the current year, equal at least to that of last year, when Russia not only fed herself, but also exported considerable amounts of grain. Now it appears that the grain production of the country this year is less than the amount remaining in the country last year, even after the exportation of three million tons of grain. Not only is there famine in Russia now, but the outlook for next year is also dark, as there is a universal shortage of seed grain.

RESONSIBLE thinkers in Europe are turning their thoughts more and more in the direction of transforming their continent into the United States of Europe. The essay awarded the Filene prize in France was centered around this idea. The essay by Sir Max Waechter, the noted British jurist, the text of which the reader will find elsewhere in this issue, is attracting considerable attention. There is a growing agitation for a huge customs union, embracing all the important countries of the continent—a very important first step toward the creation of the United States of Europe.

THE breakdown of the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations leaves the British Government with an important unsolved imperial problem. It is quite easy to understand the British position with regard to the principal point of discussion, viz., the status of the Sudan. Apart from any obligations which the British Government may or may not have toward the Sudanese, a continued participation by Great Britain in the government of that country is essential to her, because Egypt is, to a large extent, controlled by the

Sudan. On the other hand, Egypt controls the Suez Canal, and this fact introduces an unfortunate geographic factor into its aspirations toward complete independence. Great Britain cannot abandon the protection of the canal to Egypt, since the latter can never be powerful enough to insure adequate protection. Egypt is

determined to shut its eyes to this very real situation, as well as to the fact that, as a matter of practical politics, it can scarcely hope to obtain from Great Britain greater concessions than those that have already been offered to it by Mr. MacDonald.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

POLITICAL DEADLOCK IN GERMANY

NO WAY has yet been found by the German leaders to lead them out of the political deadlock in which the country finds itself at the present time. The situation is the heritage of the crisis that arose out of the negotiations for the passage through the Reichstag of the bills required for putting into effect the Dawes Report. This was secured by the support of a section of the Nationalist Party, and at that time the People's Party, led by Herr Stresemann, the Foreign Minister, gave what was really a pledge to support the claims of the Nationalists for a share in the government of the country at some date unspecified, but understood to be in the near future. The Center and Democrats, the other two parties of the Coalition, did not share in this undertaking.

The present crisis is the outward sign of the covert attempts of the People's Party to bring the Nationalists into the government. The degree of success likely to attend these efforts is uncertain and is not likely to become clearer until the various parties have held their meetings to decide their policy. These meetings will be held during the coming week, beginning with that of the Democrats on Wednesday. A rapid solution is therefore improbable.

Parties in the Reichstag at Odds

The Reichstag, as at present constituted, gives no majority to any party, or even to any combination of parties, for the effec-

tive tackling of the political problems immediately ahead. The present government, composed of the People's Party, the Center, and the Democrats, is a minority government, dependent upon the good will of the Socialists to conduct any business at all. The degree of its dependence was revealed clearly enough in the debate on the Dawes Report. The Reichstag has now in immediate prospect such problems as the new agrarian duties, the protective industrial tariff, the negotiations for trade agreements with Great Britain, France, and Belgium, a whole crop of domestic industrial questions relating to wages and hours of labor, the international loan, and the inclusion of Germany within the League. If the People's Party of Herr Stresemann, in the process of making good its obligations to the Nationalists, were to go into opposition, the government could not carry on for a single day.

The other two parties of the Coalition, the Center, and the Democrats, are opposed in principle to co-operating with the Nationalists in a *bourgeois bloc*. They fear the anti-Republican influence that would be exercised by the Nationalists within the government, and they regard a coalition of the Right as a fresh challenge to class antagonisms. There is also an obscurity about the intentions of the Nationalists toward the execution of the Dawes scheme that fills them with suspicion.

A coalition of this kind might dispense with the Democrats, but not with the Center. On the other hand, a coalition of

the Center, Democrats, and Socialists, such as proved effective for some time after the Weimar National Assembly was merged with the new Reichstag, is now equally impossible. The People's Party has declared that, if the Center and Democrats continue to oppose the inclusion of the Nationalists in the government, it will retain its freedom of action, which may be understood to mean that it will withdraw its ministers from the cabinet.

The Chancellor's Coalition Schemes

In these circumstances the chancellor conceived the idea of a political community of interests in the form of a coalition to include the Nationalists on the one hand and the Socialists on the other. At the time of the passing of the Dawes bills the Socialists also were given to understand that their claims to share in the carrying out of the plan would be met, and the chancellor's scheme, if it were possible, would thus meet the claims of both. But it is more than doubtful whether co-operation in any form is possible between Nationalists and Socialists. The agrarian duties alone would prove an acid test, to say nothing of control in the Prussian government, diet, and administration, which is the real goal of the Nationalists.

In its present form the government is powerless, and there appears to be little prospect of either *bourgeois bloc* or community of interests being realized. The present Reichstag, which was elected under the shadow of the inflation period, is now believed to be totally unrepresentative of the nation. In particular, it is thought that the conditions which made possible the return of over 60 Communists and over 30 Fascists have vanished. It is an argument for dissolution that it would rectify this artificial state of affairs. The Socialists would certainly welcome an election, since they could hardly help improving their position, and the Center Party would certainly not emerge a loser.

Against an election are the serious effects it might have on the loan negotiations, the trade agreements, and the question of inclusion in the League, to say nothing of the fact that the election funds of all the parties were exhausted last May and have not yet been adequately replenished. Since the term of the present

Prussian Diet expires in the spring, it would appear on the surface to be more satisfactory to wait until then. But there are many other pressing matters, and the Nationalists are impatient for power.

THE FRENCH BUDGET

ON September 30 the French Minister of Finance, M. Clémentel, made a detailed statement before the Finance Commission of the Chamber of Deputies regarding the plans of the Herriot Government for the balancing of the 1925 budget. He informed the commission that the deficit on the 1924 budget would probably amount to only about 2,500,000,000f. The 1925 budget would be drawn up with a view to clearing up the French financial situation.

The principal feature would be the incorporation in the general budget, not only of permanent expenditure, but also of the non-permanent expenditure of the "special budget of recoverable expenditure," which, for the past two years, had existed separately alongside the general budget, and amounted to a total of 7,677,000,000f. The estimated expenditure for 1925 in what had before been known as the general budget amounted to 25,691,000,000f. Economies resulting from the discussions with the various departments held under the presidency of M. Herriot had reduced this figure to 24,079,000,000f. This was less by 83,000,000f. than the total expenditure of the general budget of 1923, including the supplementary credits. The effect of certain laws passed at the end of the last Parliament, which involved new charges on the Treasury, such as those increasing the allowances for the families of State employees and civil and military pensions, was more than balanced by reductions made by the government in other directions.

Credits, continued the minister, had been calculated on the basis of real expenditure to be faced. For payments to be made abroad the average rate of exchange of the pound and the dollar for the months of April, May, June, and July had been taken. No supplementary credits other than those which might arise from accidental circumstances were to be anticipated.

After the fusion of the two budgets, expenditure amounted to 32,456,000,000f., including 700,000,000f. for improvements in the pay of State officials.

Old Taxes Will Be Extended

In spite of the possibility of a surplus yield, owing to the progressive revival of economic activities in the devastated regions, he had assumed, in estimating revenue, that the total taxable value would remain in 1925 at the same average level as in the first eight months of 1924. On this basis the revenue would reach 29,854,000,000f. In order to meet the deficit of 2,602,000,000f. he proposed fiscal measures of which the total net yield would be 1,777,000,000f. The rest would be made up out of receipts from Germany under the Dawes plan.

Dealing with his proposed measures, M. Clémentel said he had decided to take steps to prevent defrauding of the treasury. None of his measures would injure the market or the exchanges. On the question of the escape of bearer securities from taxation, he was adopting a scheme, proposed before the war, by which the legal transfer of inherited property, so far as bearer securities deposited in foreign countries were concerned, would have to be preceded by the issue of a document by the president of the civil tribunal recognizing the ownership of such securities. He hoped that this arrangement would be completed by international agreements, which he was seeking to make.

In regard to assessment, the general income tax would be assessed on the basis of the house rent and the observable expenditure of the taxpayer; lawyers, doctors, and other professional men would be required to keep a book of receipts and expenditure; a tariff scale applying to gifts would be instituted, so as to discourage gifts made for the purpose of escaping death duties. The government had decided to hasten the recovery of taxes on war profits by proposing the immediate payment of interest on assessments which were the subject of appeal. Measures would be taken, in all cases where it was possible, to assess on the income actually received. All taxpayers whose business turnover exceeded 200,000f. would in future be taxed on their actual profits and

not on an estimate of profits made from the turnover.

The turnover tax would in future be applied to export trade, which had hitherto not been liable. This non-liability had been interpreted abroad as an encouragement to "dumping," and some countries had imposed duties on French goods in consequence. Part of the yield of the tax would be used to endow a national office of insurance and reinsurance for export trade.

New Taxes to Be Introduced

The following new taxes are proposed: First, a small tax of 0.05f. per 1,000f. on monetary exchange transactions, to be collected on similar lines to the tax on bourse transactions; secondly, a tax on insurance companies of 1f. per 1,000f. on the total amount of insurance premiums; and, thirdly, a tax on the increased values realized by the sale of house property and good will acquired since 1919. This latter tax would affect particularly the too-rapid increase in the value of good will, which had had a considerable effect on the cost of living. The amount of the tax would increase progressively, the relative importance of the increase, as well as the length of the period during which it had occurred being taken into account. Increases in values of under 10 per cent will not be taxed.

These taxes would affect only accumulated wealth and revenues from it, not increasing in any way the amount levied on commodities. They would enable the budget to be balanced, which was essential to the stabilization of the currency and the reduction of the cost of living. But the existing deficit with which the government was confronted on taking office, but for which its policy was in no way responsible, prevented this year the rearrangement of the taxation system which the government considered desirable. To indicate the path which it was desired to pursue, however, he proposed the abolition of the business turnover tax for wheat and flour and the abolition of the salt duty.

The incorporation in the general budget of the "special budget" allowed them to put down as revenue, in addition to the 1,777,000,000f. from new taxes, the sums received in diminution of the recoverable expenses—50,000,000f.—and the German

payments under the experts' scheme, in so far as these exceeded the expenses of the army of occupation and the various organs of control or of administration under the treaty. France's share was estimated at 800,000,000f. Altogether, the total revenue thus calculated would be 32,481,000,000f. and would exceed the expenditure by 25,000,000f. Thus, for the first time in 11 years, the annual expenditure would be met completely from budgetary receipts. This balance would be maintained in the future, and the government would, therefore, have to avoid any steps likely to involve the treasury in fresh expenditure without at the same time providing new sources of revenue to meet it.

1925 Budget Will Mark End of Old Financial Policy

It was from this standpoint that the finance law for 1925 would be drawn up. It marks the end of the policy of floating loans to meet normal current expenditure, a policy by which France threatened to be engulfed. Once the deficits on former budgets have been regulated by a liquidation loan, future appeals to investors should be confined to those made with a view to the consolidation of the floating debt and the completion of the restoration of the devastated regions.

The government was at the moment engaged on a careful review of liquidated or pending claims for war damage. It appeared that the estimate of sums still to be paid could be greatly reduced and the figures for certain payments would be revised to the advantage of the treasury. Schemes were in preparation which, by offering claimants a choice between various methods of settlement, would accelerate the liberation of the State from these burdens and reduce the total cost. It was unlikely that the total annuity corresponding to the capital sum still to be paid for war damages would exceed 1,500,000,000f.

In conclusion, M. Clémentel appealed to the Finance Commission to assist him to enable the budget to be voted on before December 31. It was a "clearing-up" budget, which, if it included new burdens, nevertheless put the truth before the country at last, and showed the people that by sustained work and economy the financial and economic restoration of France could be assured.

Replying to various questions, M. Clémentel said that he intended to concentrate on a stabilization of the exchanges and reminded his questioners that he had at his disposal the necessary reserves to fight speculation in foreign currency. He said that after balancing the budget he would pursue a policy aiming at the gradual elimination of debt, using for this purpose the moneys received from Germany.

THE ANGLO-FRANCO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

GERMANY is now engaged in negotiating a number of very important commercial treaties, among which those with Great Britain and France hold the first place. Under the Treaty of Versailles, France enjoys extensive trade privileges, which, however, cease to be operative at the beginning of 1925, and the French Government is making strenuous efforts to secure a continuation of some of these privileges. Its possible success in this direction is causing considerable apprehension in Great Britain.

Great Britain Worried by French Negotiations

At the close of the London Conference, it became known that the French Government had submitted a draft commercial treaty to the German Government and had demanded a number of exclusive concessions which, if granted, might seriously prejudice certain branches of British trade.

For example, the French were asking that products from Alsace and Lorraine might continue to enter Germany free of duty, and were seeking by customs and other agreements to dominate the European iron and steel trade. This news created considerable anxiety in Great Britain, and, apparently in order to allay these fears, Mr. MacDonald issued an announcement to the effect that he was in communication with representatives of the industries which would be affected by possible European industrial combinations and that a committee was to be constituted to advise the Foreign Office on the subject.

The extent of British trade with Germany is now greater than is generally

realized. In spite of many difficulties, between January and June this year, British goods were exported to Germany to the value of nearly £23,000,000, compared with £20,800,000 during the same period in 1923 and £14,200,000 in 1922. In fact, Germany is Great Britain's second most important market outside the Empire.

Under the Peace Treaty the products of the Alsace and Lorraine mills have been allowed to enter Germany free of import duty, and the French naturally desire this privilege to be continued; but Germany is disinclined to accede to the request. If that attitude is maintained, the British exporter will be on the same basis as his French competitors. What British exporters fear is that France will obtain some special privilege, and, in the absence of a most favored nation clause, this would be a definite handicap to them.

France Seeks to Strengthen Her Bargaining Position

In the meantime France is doing everything in her power to make her own position in the negotiations with Germany as strong as possible. On the eve of the negotiations, the French Government imposed a 26 per cent reparation tax on imports from Germany, to which it is entitled by the Peace Treaty—a procedure already employed by Great Britain.

Against this action on the part of the French Government, the German Government has made a verbal protest, maintaining that such a tax was not foreseen in the London Agreement, and claiming that the British tax is an exception justified by the fact that Great Britain will receive little or no deliveries in kind. The French reply declines to admit this. In order to prove that the possibility of the government's levying a tax on German imports was foreseen in the London Agreement, the French note quotes a phrase from Annex II to the agreement, referring to "the receipts derived from the British Recovery Act, or analogous measures taken by other Allied governments." The German verbal note makes it clear that the German Government has no objection to the levy of the tax during the transitional period, but declines to admit its propriety as a permanent imposition.

It is quite likely that the French tax is merely a device resorted to in order to

put pressure on the Germans during the negotiations. Without this the German position might be the stronger of the two. Germany, even last year, imported an enormous quantity of French goods, among which wine, perfumes, and silk fabrics figure largest.

Now that the mark is stable, Germany's purchasing power has increased and the imports from France for this year are very large. Heavy duties on these imports would hit French trade very hard; and M. Clémentel's budget figures show very clearly that France cannot afford to take this risk. The textile and metallurgical industries of Alsace are also waiting anxiously for a larger market in Germany than they have had since the peace. Altogether, France wants the German market very badly.

In return she has not got much to bargain with except the Lorraine iron ore, which is wanted in the Ruhr. So the 26 per cent reparations tax has apparently been invented to provide M. Raynaldy, the Minister of Commerce, with something else to give away.

RUSSIA TODAY

QUALIFIED observers returning from Soviet Russia report that since Lenin's death the extremist elements in the Communist Party have been steadily gaining control of the situation in that unfortunate land. With the passing away of Lenin, the curtain fell upon the split in the Communist Party. The outside world knows nothing beyond such inferences as it can draw from the absence of Trotsky from Moscow, the new elections of the House committees, the "cleansing" of the universities, and similar—all sure symptoms of the predominance of the extremists.

Elections to the House Committees

Very characteristic of Bolshevik methods were the elections of the *Domo-pravleniá*, or House committees. As the material position of the laboring class was the reverse of improved since the Revolution, the authorities decided to pamper the proletariat politically. An opportunity was afforded by the election of new House committees, which came due in April.

Every house or block of flats is administered by a committee of residents annually elected. In 1923 a substantial number of educated men and women were serving on these committees. This, of course, was most distasteful to the Soviet authorities, and, consequently, the lists were revised shortly before the elections, and the names of all who were not proletarians were erased. In one house with 170 residents nearly 150 names were thus removed, and in another with 120 residents not one educated person was left on the register.

The remaining minorities, qualified by being proletarians, promptly elected their own committees, with chairmen and other officials, and took over the management, which they signaled by taking away from the "bourgeois" members much of the minute space left to them. The disqualified "bourgeois" appealed to the courts, which, doubtless to uphold the honor of the Soviet Government, promptly ordered the restoration of the erased names. Thus was justice satisfied. But the elections were not quashed, and today every *Domoplatenie* in Moscow consists exclusively of proletarian members, or at least Communists.

Students Expelled from Universities

Another characteristic, but more tragic, symptom was the "cleansing" of the universities. A commission of Communists interrogated every student of both sexes and weeded out all who could not prove proletarian or peasant origin. It was not right, they said, that any "bourgeois," or non-proletarian, should enjoy the benefits of education. Consternation reigned throughout the country. The Western world can have but a faint conception of the sacrifices and struggle of Russian students in their ambition to secure a diploma. To the vast majority, if not to all, it was the one object left in life. For it they had worked ten hours a day, or even more, for three, five, or even seven years, keeping body and soul together on a meager ration of coarse bread and salt herring, sleeping huddled together in bare rooms, attics, and cellars.

But the machine was remorseless, and on the very eve of attainment of their single ambition in life upwards of 5,000 students of both sexes found themselves expelled, with but the street and starva-

tion before them. This was followed by bloodshed in Petrograd—now, in its ruined conditions, not inappropriately called Leningrad—and an epidemic of suicides: over 60 cases were reported in Moscow in one week. The whole thing is characteristic of the shortsightedness of the extreme element, which rides roughshod over economics and humanity alike, for by this "cleansing," of which they boast, they have raised a storm of hatred, such as foreigners can scarcely understand, in a body of desperate youths just at that age when Russians generate the maximum of energy.

Some, knowing the fate in store for them, took a certain satisfaction in defying the commission to its face. One was asked, it is related, "What are your political views?" He replied: "I am the same as Comrade Trotsky, a Social Democrat." "And of what origin are you?" "Of the same origin as Comrade Tchitcherin, noble." "And what is your attitude towards alcohol?" "The same as that of Comrades Rykoff and Dzerzhinsky." "And what is your attitude towards women?" "The same as Comrade Lunacharsky." It is, perhaps, advisable to add that the weakness of these three "Comrades" in these respective spheres of activity is notorious.

Finally they asked him: "And by what road do you propose to travel in the event of being 'cleaned' out from the university?" "By the same and only road that was open to expelled students in the days of the Tsar, . . . to the cells." The commissioners winced, for the resemblance between their tyranny and the milder form under the Tsars is a sore point with them.

The fate of this bold youth is not known. It was probably worse than that of a keen young chemist, born on the torrid frontiers of Persia, who was banished, on the eve of the completion of his course, to an island in the White Sea for three years because his father had been a land-owner.

Teachers in a Sorry Plight

The position of the teaching staffs is only less precarious, because they are for the moment indispensable, but they all feel that their days are numbered. Their own students report upon them to the political authorities, and their least

anxiety is the constant anticipation of a fortnight's notice. Even the pittance that they earn, about as much as they paid their domestics before the war, was recently paid them with but half in cash, the other half in the form of a promissory note—and this is a city where the cost of living is about double that of London.

Beggars and Propaganda Much in Evidence

In no city in the world can there be so many cripples, beggars, and maimed as in the streets of Moscow, some exhibiting horrible monstrosities and mutilations, others well dressed, speaking with an educated voice, and often addressing foreigners in good French. But there is still a substantial population of "bourgeois"—schoolmasters, officials, engineers, and others. Sometimes these endeavor to repay themselves for the loss of all their possessions at the expense of the State, but the Soviets have a short method with such cases. In one night 11 architects found or reported guilty of misappropriation in connection with government works were taken from their beds and shot. It is this ruthless efficiency which has cleared the streets of Moscow and Leningrad of the bandits, who made an evening stroll unsafe but a short time ago.

After the mutilated beggars the visitor to Moscow is perhaps most struck with the blatant and perpetual propaganda which assails his eyes on every side. It is worse than an old-fashioned election day; but, of course, there is only one party. On every side, in every shop, an tramcars, on hoardings, there are busts and portraits of Lenin and Karl Marx. On the wrappers of every little purchase you make on your very crockery in the restaurants, are proclamations of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And in the few remaining restaurants, including the Luxe, on the Tverskaia, where the foreign Communists foregather, including English girls with cropped hair, arm-in-arm with Mongols and Chinamen, the walls are placarded with appeals to the waiters not to accept tips "for tea." "To take tips is to accept bribes from the 'bourgeois'"; "Whoso taketh tips is unworthy to be a member of his *Profsoyuz* (trade union)"; "It is unworthy to pick up the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table"; "A tip is an insult to an

honorable proletarian." Yet no one has yet stated that he has met a waiter who admitted that he was fit to be a member of his *Profsoyuz*, and all waiters eagerly look for an "insult" under the coffee-cup.

BREAKDOWN OF THE ANGLO-EGYPTIAN CONFERENCE

AFTER about one week of conversation between the former British Prime Minister, MacDonald, and the Egyptian Premier, Zaghlul Pasha, the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations broke down on October 3. An official communique issued on that day stated that Zaghlul Pasha is returning to Egypt, "in view of the inclement weather and in anticipation of the meeting of the Egyptian Parliament in November."

Premier MacDonald's Explanation

In a dispatch from Mr. MacDonald to Lord Allenby, the British High Commissioner for Egypt and the Sudan, made public by the Foreign Office, we find the following official explanation of the reasons which rendered the conference short and abortive:

In the course of my conversations with the Egyptian Prime Minister His Excellency explained to me the modifications in the *status quo* in Egypt on which he felt bound to insist. If I have correctly understood him they were as follows:

(a) The withdrawal of all British forces from Egyptian territory.

(b) The withdrawal of the financial and judicial advisers.

(c) The disappearance of all British control over the Egyptian Government, notably in connection with foreign relations, which Zaghlul Pasha claimed were hampered by the notification of His Majesty's Government to foreign powers on the 15th March, 1922 that they would regard as an unfriendly act any attempt at interference in the affairs of Egypt by another power.

(d) The abandonment by His Majesty's Government of their claim to protect foreigners and minorities in Egypt.

(e) The abandonment by His Majesty's Government of their claim to share in any way in protecting the Suez Canal.

Anti-British Public Statements by Zaghlul

As regards the Sudan, I drew attention to certain statements which His Excellency had made as president of the Council of Ministers before the Egyptian Parliament during the course of the summer. On the 17th May, according to my information, Zaghlul Pasha stated that the fact that a foreign officer was commander-in-chief of the Egyptian army and the retention in that army of British officers were inconsistent with the dignity of independent Egypt. The expression of such sentiments in an official pronouncement by the responsible head of the Egyptian Government has obviously placed not only Sir Lee Stack as Sirdar, but all British officers attached to the Egyptian army in a difficult position.

I also had in mind that in June Zaghlul Pasha was reported to have claimed for Egypt complete rights of ownership over the Sudan, and characterized the British Government as usurpers.

His Excellency observed that in making the above statements he was merely voicing the opinion not only of the Egyptian Parliament, but of the Egyptian nation, and I gathered that he still adhered to that position. Such statements have made it appear that loyalty to the Egyptian Government is something different from and inconsistent with loyalty to the existing administration of the Sudan. As a result, not only has there been an entire change in the spirit of Anglo-Egyptian co-operation which has in the past prevailed in the Sudan, but also Egyptian subjects serving under the Sudan Government have been encouraged to regard themselves as propagandists of the Egyptian Government's views, with results that, if persisted in in the absence of any agreement, would render their presence in the Sudan under the existing régime a source of danger to public order.

I promised in the course of our first conversation to be perfectly frank with His Excellency. Then, and subsequently, I left him under no illusion as to the position which His Majesty's Government are compelled to take up in regard to Egypt and the Sudan. Though I have by no means abandoned hope that on further consideration the basis of an agreement acceptable to both countries can be found, the attitude adopted by Zaghlul Pasha has rendered such agreement impossible for the present.

The Status of the Suez Canal

I raised the question of the canal straight away, because its security is of vital interest to us, both in peace and in war. It is no less true today than in 1922, that the security of the communications of the British Empire in Egypt remains a vital British interest, and that absolute certainty that the Suez Canal will remain open in peace as well as in war, for the free passage of British ships is the foundation on which the entire defensive strategy of the British Empire rests. The 1888 convention for the free navigation of the canal was an instrument devised to secure that object. Its ineffectiveness for this purpose was demonstrated in 1914, when Great Britain herself had to take steps to insure that the canal would remain open. No British Government in the light of that experience can divest itself wholly, even in favor of an ally, of its interest in guarding such a vital link in British communications. Such a security must be a feature of any agreement come to between our two governments, and I see no reason why accommodation is impossible, given good will. The effective co-operation of Great Britain and Egypt in protecting those communications might, in my view, have been insured by the conclusion of a treaty of close alliance. The presence of a British force in Egypt, provided for by such a treaty, freely entered into by both parties on an equal footing, would in no way be incompatible with Egyptian independence, while it would be an indication of the specially close and intimate relations between the two countries and their determination to co-operate in a matter of vital concern to both.

It is not the wish of His Majesty's Government that this force should in any way interfere with the functions of the Egyptian Government or encroach upon Egyptian sovereignty, and I emphatically said so. It is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to assume any responsibility for the actions or conduct of the Egyptian Government or to attempt to control or direct the policy which that government may see fit to adopt.

A Warning on the Sudan

So far as my conversations with Zaghlul Pasha turned on the question of the Sudan, they have only served to show his persistence in the attitude disclosed in his previous public utterances. I must adhere to the state-

ments I made on the subject in the House of Commons. About that, neither in Egypt nor in the Sudan should there be any doubt. If there is, it will only lead to trouble.

In the meantime, the duty of preserving order in the Sudan rests, in fact, upon His Majesty's Government, and they will take every step necessary for this purpose. Since going there they have contracted heavy moral obligations by the creation of a good system of administration; they cannot allow that to be destroyed; they regard their responsibilities as a trust for the Sudan people.

His Majesty's Government have no desire to disturb existing arrangements, but they must point out how intolerable is a *status quo* which enables both military and civil officers and officials to conspire against civil order, and unless the *status quo* is accepted, new arrangement may be reached; the Sudan Government would fail in its duty were it to allow such conditions to continue.

His Majesty's Government have never failed to recognize that Egypt has certain material interests in the Sudan which must be guaranteed and safeguarded, these being chiefly concerned with her share of the Nile water and the satisfaction of any financial claims which she may have against the Sudan Government. His Majesty's Government have always been prepared to secure these interests in a way satisfactory to Egypt.

With the fall of the Labor Ministry, this difficulty and thorny problem of an adjustment with the Government of Egypt remains over for Mr. MacDonald's successor in office.

ASSASSINATION OF MACEDONIAN CHIEFS

THE Macedonian movement, which has been a matter of great apprehension to the Government of Yugoslavia for the past few years, has just been much shaken by the assassination of its outstanding leaders. On August 31 Todor Alexandroff, the head of the whole movement, was murdered by his Communist opponents, while several days later a similar fate befell two prominent members of the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization and two of the leaders of Macedonian Federalists, all of whom were killed in Bulgaria.

Macedonian Negotiations with Moscow

Frequent accusations have been made against the Alexandroff movement, to the effect that it is connected with Moscow and Communism. Alexandroff himself has denied these accusations. In a statement made shortly before his death, he admitted that he and his representatives had conducted negotiations with the Soviet mission in Vienna, as well as with the Bulgarian Communists. He declared emphatically, however, that these negotiations did not succeed, because he and his followers could not accept the terms laid down by Moscow. These terms consisted in a promise to assist in the communization of both Bulgaria and Macedonia. On the contrary, Alexandroff claimed that he had served notice on the Communist Party of Bulgaria that he and his organization would oppose a Soviet *coup d'état* in Bulgaria.

At the same time Alexandroff was prepared to continue as actively as ever his struggle for the liberation of Macedonia. He held that the régime established in Macedonia by the Serbians and the Greeks is more intolerable than that under which the country had lived as a part of Turkey.

Alexandroff's Demands and Declaration of Policy

In the same statement Alexandroff described as follows his demands and the policy he was pursuing:

We do not want the dissolution of Yugoslavia; on the contrary, we desire that Yugoslavia become a Federal, free and strong State; and in the name of the organization I formally declare that the organization will cease its armed struggle if the following conditions are fulfilled:—

1. The dissolution of subsidized official Serbian bands of Stoyan Micheff, Zikliff, and other traitors throughout Macedonia and the prosecution of the members of these bands for the crimes which they have committed (rape, assassination, and brigandage).

2. The application of the clauses included in the Peace Treaty for the defense of the rights of National Minorities under the control of the League of Nations and under the guarantee of the great powers.

3. An amnesty of all arrested Macedonians and the permission to return to Macedonia to refugees and emigrés, also under the control

of the League of Nations and the guarantee of the great powers.

4. The liberty of elections in the Skupsh-tina and the granting to the Macedonians of the right to form legal political parties.

These are our fundamental requests, and if our demands are executed in a strict, loyal, and honest manner, we engage ourselves to put aside our arms and to cease our armed struggle.

We also insist in the same way as other people included in Yugoslavia on the reconstruction of Yugoslavia into a federal State in which Macedonia would enter as a member of the Federation on equal rights with the other members of the Yugoslav Federation. Taking into consideration the inevitable decomposition in the near future of Greece, we ask the incorporation into the Autonomous Macedonia of the Macedonian territory which is now under the Greek dominion. When all the above-mentioned conditions are sincerely and honestly executed, the part of Macedonia which is in the hands of Bulgaria must also be incorporated into the Autonomous Macedonia. I am convinced that it is only in this way and acting as I have indicated that it will be possible to avoid Bolshevism in the Balkan peninsula, that peace will be insured in the Balkans, and that a strong and durable Yugoslavia will be created. The duty of the Western European democracies, in which we still have faith, is to save Macedonia from death and the Macedonian population from destruction, or, which is the same thing, from Bolshevism.

Communists Dissatisfied with Alexandroff's Policy

There was a growing dissatisfaction in the ranks of Alexandroff's followers with the above policy. The Communist propaganda was making rapid inroads, and more and more of his followers were inclining to the view that aid should be sought in Moscow, whatever the price demanded by the Communists. The growing controversy finally resolved itself into the murder of Alexandroff himself and of some of his more active adherents.

Todor Alexandroff, who was born in 1882, was one of the most picturesque leaders in the Balkans. He began life as a schoolmaster, but soon forsook this profession for the more warlike one of *komitadj*i (political brigand). He took

part in the continuous struggle which the Macedonians waged against the Turks, but in 1913 his health gave way and he went to France. During the European War he belonged to the Macedonian Division which operated against the Allies on the Struma front and worked for the Germans as a spy. After the war he sank into comparative obscurity, but when the Treaty of Neuilly was signed, in November, 1919, dividing the greater part of Macedonia between Yugoslavia and Greece, Alexandroff resumed his crusade for an autonomous Macedonia. Together with General Protogueroff, who now succeeds him, and Peter Chaüleff, Alexandroff directed the policy of the revolutionary organization and roamed the countryside to keep the revolutionary spirit alive.

CERTIFICATES OF IDENTITY FOR REFUGEES

ON JUNE 10, 1924, the League of Nations inquired of the Department of State whether the Government of the United States would consider a plan proposed by Dr. Nansen to provide identity certificates for Armenian refugees.

This plan contained similar rules to those laid down in the Geneva Arrangement relating to Russian refugees, and the certificates are substantially identical with the certificates now employed for the latter, which are considered, for all pertinent purposes, by the Department of State to fall within the category of documents in lieu of passports.

On August 5 the American Minister at Bern, the Honorable Hugh S. Gibson, was instructed to transmit a communication to the Secretary General of the League of Nations in reply to its note dated June 10. The text of the State Department's communication is as follows:

The Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America has received the communication of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, dated June 10, 1924, transmitting a plan for the issue of certificates of identity to Armenian refugees in order that they may establish their identity and travel freely in pursuance of their normal occupations.

The American Government is not in a position to issue travel documents to aliens. It

does not require certificates of identity of aliens sojourning within its territory or of those desiring to depart therefrom. For entry into the United States, alien immigrants are required to present an immigration visa issued by the appropriate American consul. The American consuls will accept from aliens unable to present passports in connection with their applications for immigration visas appropriate documents of identity in lieu of passports. The Nansen certificates issued to Russian refugees have been considered to fall within the category of documents in lieu of passports. Similarly, non-immigrant aliens are granted passport visas upon personal affidavits or other documents in lieu of passports when they are unable to present passports. Aliens resident in the United States who desire to depart temporarily may obtain from the Commissioner-General of Immigration, Washington, D. C., permits to return, valid for six months, capable of further extension in the discretion of the Commissioner-General of Immigration.

In a note dated September 12, 1924, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, referring to the State Department's communication of August 5, stated in part that Dr. Nansen, to whom this communication had been transmitted, desired to record his high appreciation of the recognition by the Government of the United States of the identity certificates for Russian refugees and ventured to assume that, as the identity certificates for the Armenian refugees was to all intents and purposes an analogous document, the Government of the United States would find it possible to afford recognition to that document also. On October 9 the American Minister at Bern was instructed telegraphically to inform the Secretary General of the League of Nations, in reply, that the Department of State would be willing to consider, for all practical purposes, the identity certificates for Armenian refugees as appropriate documents in lieu of passports.

IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL DATES (September 16-October 15)

September 17—At a war council in Peking, Wu Pei-Fu is appointed commander-in-chief of the Chihli armies.

September 18—Part of the Chekiang forces go over to the enemy; refugees arrive in the city of Shanghai; no fear expressed for the safety of the foreign settlements.

September 19—The Spaniards, with 40,000 troops, open an offensive with the object of relieving Sheshuan, and heavy fighting occurs.

September 23—Zaghul Pasha, the Egyptian Premier, arrives in London for a conference with Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister.

The Government of India suffers two rebuffs in the Assembly: Dr. Gour's bill for repealing the criminal law amendment act, which gave the executive power to declare associations unlawful, is passed, and the Assembly

sends a select committee a bill prescribing the precautions to be observed by officers charged with the duty of suppressing riots.

The German Government decides to take steps to obtain the admission of Germany to the League of Nations.

The British, American, and Japanese authorities disclaim any intention to intervene in the civil war in China.

September 24—Conversations in Berlin between British and German representatives preparatory to the negotiation of a commercial treaty are broken off, it being impossible to find a basis for agreement.

September 25—Mr. MacDonald and Zaghul Pasha meet in Downing street for a preliminary discussion of the attitudes of the British and Egyptian Governments.

The Peking Government concentrates a force of 200,000 men on

the Manchurian front for the campaign against Chang Tso-lin.

September 28—A deadlock is reached in the discussion of the draft Arbitration, Security, and Disarmament Protocol by the First Committee of the League of Nations Assembly because of the Japanese objections to the wording of one of the articles, and the matter is referred to a subcommittee.

The United States Army airmen, Lieutenants Nelson and Smith, arrive at Seattle, completing their flight around the world.

September 29—Mr. J. H. Thomas, the British Colonial Secretary, returns from his visit to South Africa and states that the question of separation is not a live issue there.

The German representatives in London, Paris, Rome, and the other countries represented on the Council of the League of Nations present a note from their government, asking for replies to certain questions connected with the possible application of Germany to join the League.

September 30—M. Clementel, the French Minister of Finance, explains to the Finance Commission of the Chamber of Deputies how he proposes to balance the budget properly for the first time in eleven years.

October 2—Two resolutions are passed at the closing session of the Fifth League of Nations Assembly at Geneva, one approving the arbitration protocol and the other requesting the League Council to call a disarmament conference next year.

Twenty-third International Peace Congress convenes in Berlin.

October 3—Hussein, King of Hejaz, abdicates, and his son, the Sherif Ali, Emir of Medina and heir apparent, is elected king.

October 7—It is arranged that the Rhine and Ruhr railways shall pass under German control again, in

accordance with the Dawes plan, on November 16.

October 8—The French Finance Minister's budget estimates are endangered by the insistence of the civil servants on a minimum salary of 6,000 francs a year.

October 9—Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister, recommends to King George a dissolution of Parliament, and the King signs the proclamation.

Mr. MacDonald announces in the House of Commons the dissolution of Parliament and a general election; in the House of Lords the Irish Free State Bill passes and receives the royal assent by commission; the members of the House of Commons go to the House of Lords to hear the King's speech read and the commission proroguing Parliament.

October 10—The contract is signed at the Bank of England for the loan of 800,000,000 gold marks to the German Government, the bonds to mature in twenty-five years, bearing 7 per cent interest and issued at 92.

October 11—Premier Herriot of France decides that, in order to meet the demand for a 6,000-franc minimum salary for civil employees, 20,000 of the present workers must be dismissed.

October 12—The giant dirigible, the ZR-3, built by the Zeppelin works at Friedrichshafen, Germany, for the United States Navy, starts on her trans-Atlantic flight to Lakehurst, New Jersey.

October 14—The \$110,000,000 German Government external loan of 1924 7 per cent bonds, the share of the United States in the reconstruction loan agreed upon under the Dawes plan, is over-subscribed.

October 15—The airship ZR-3 arrives at Lakehurst, New Jersey, completing a flight of 5,060 miles in eighty-one hours.

THE FIFTH ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, October 2, 1924.

THE League of Nations is a "virile fact" of our modern world. More than any other single agency, its Secretariat, headed by an amiable and titled British gentleman, seems to that. This Secretariat consists of some 800 salaried persons, glorifying their offices usually with intelligence, often with ability, sometimes with distinction, and always with energy. The League, its Council, its Assembly, its commissions, its various bureaux, cannot be visualized separate from the Secretariat, for this is the engine, the push and pull of the League. The motive power of this engine is as complex as human nature. Indeed, it is human nature, varying from most ordinary political or personal selfishness, all the way up to a fanatical zeal, with brains and timber of finest quality in between.

The Secretariat

The unique position of the members of the Secretariat is set forth in Article 6 of the Covenant, where it is provided that officials of the the League—men or women—"when engaged on the business of the League shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities," and "the members of the Secretariat act, during their period of office, in an international capacity and are not in any way representatives of their own country."

Governments not represented upon the Secretariat probably find comfort in this latter provision; otherwise they might suspect the control of the League to be in the hands of the British, because, as it happens, not only is Sir Eric Drummond, of England, the Secretary-General, it is interesting to note that the head of the financial administration is a Canadian, the head of the economic and financial section and of the special organization on transit is Sir James Arthur Salter, and the head of the department of opium traffic and of the department of social questions is Mrs. Rachel Crowdy, of England. The chief accountant, one of the two head interpreters, the superintendent of the

précis-writing department, the secretary of the drafting committee, the verbatim reporter, and the head of the department of registry are some of the other representatives from England at the head of permanent branches of the work. The assistant director of the information section, the leading member of the section on administration and minorities questions, the head of the department on "establishment," and the librarian are Americans.

In addition to the Secretariat, but closely and permanently affiliated with it, are certain technical organizations working on draft treaties, investigations, reports, functioning as experts where experts are needed.

With such an organization, even were there no other factors—of course, there are other factors—the verve and persistence of the League would go on as a matter of course. This is all very apparent here in Geneva during the work of the Fifth Assembly. The machinery is oiled and in excellent working condition. By the time Prime Minister MacDonald's impromptu speech on September 4 had been translated for the Assembly orally into French, a mimeographed copy was placed in my box at the press bureau, a typical example of the efficiency of the Secretariat.

No one here knows everything that is going on, however, because the activities are too various. It is quite as if our State, War, and Navy Departments at Washington were scattered throughout the hotels and meeting places of down-town, interested people from every part of the world feverishly demanding tickets of admission to this or that part of the show, the rooms too small, the tickets too few, and disappointment correspondingly general. The League is scattered all over the place, even leaking out into the suburbs.

The Assembly

There is the Assembly. This is supposed to be the main show of the League. It is held in the main tent—*La Salle de la*

Reformation—not much of a place, poorly lighted, innocent of ventilation, with abominable acoustics, and seating about as many as an ordinary American church. Plans are on the way for a new convention hall. It is sorely needed.

This is the fifth meeting of the Assembly. The first was held in November and December, 1920. The rest of these annual gatherings have been held during September, sometimes, as this year, running a few days into October. The "stated interval" provided for in the Covenant has thus far been interpreted as meaning each year. The Assembly may meet at any time, but the annual meeting is still deemed sufficient.

Under the terms of the Covenant, "The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of the action of the League or affecting the peace of the world." One gathers the impression that they are leaving nothing untouched here, at least in the speeches poured forth upon the Assembly.

There is no difficulty involved in knowing what these speeches are about. Two languages are employed—French and English. After each address it is immediately translated into the other language. Stenographers rush it to the mimeographers, and copies in French and English are soon available. Later, every word uttered in the Assembly is printed for the convenience of the press, the delegates, or others interested. The Assembly is open diplomacy *par excellence*.

Devotion to the League

There is one refrain running through nearly all the speeches—"Isn't the League of Nations wonderful?" M. Hymans, acting president of the Council, in the first speech of the Assembly, began the praises of the League for its constitution of the Permanent Court of International Justice, for the reconstruction of Austria and of Hungary; M. Motta, of Switzerland, chosen president of the Assembly, in his opening address carried the praise further by calling attention to the London Conference as a most happy augury for the League. The many speeches which followed through the succeeding days began and ended with encomiums, the most pronounced of which, perhaps, was the one

by Ramsay MacDonald, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Mr. MacDonald had been prepared for. He did not appear until the sixth plenary session. In the meantime interest in his coming increased. When, in simple business gray, he ascended the high platform on that 4th of September, the floor and the galleries were tense with anticipation. There was a general applause. Mr. MacDonald began:

"Mr. President, I am very glad that it has been my good fortune to have an opportunity of taking part in the work of the League of Nations. The League of Nations, both as an organization and as a spirit, is struggling under somewhat adverse circumstances, and I am here today as a pledge that the country I represent, Great Britain, will use every means in its power to widen the influence and to increase the authority of the League of Nations.

"Ah, my friends, the emotions that come to one, as one stands here, facing delegates from over half a hundred nations, many of them devastated, all of them impoverished, owing to the war; facing delegates battling against those adverse circumstances, and yet hoping against hope very often, determined sometimes when determination appears to be little better than folly, that by our intelligence and by our good will we shall, through the League of Nations, lay securely and finally the foundations of peace upon earth.

"The late war was commended in my country as being a war to end all wars. Alas, the human eye sees but few prospects that that hope and that pledge are to be fulfilled! I do not know what the Divine mind sees—the Divine mind that sees the future as clearly as you and I can see the present—but I hope it sees more calm confidence in the future and more happiness in it than the human mind, which has to nourish its faith upon appearances. If the future is to justify our confidence and our happiness, it will be owing solely to the deliberations, the negotiations, the work, and the agreement of the League of Nations."

If one may judge by the many other speeches before the Assembly, these are the views of a large majority of the delegates. M. Edouard Herriot, Prime Minister of France, in his address the follow-

ing day, however, expressed the feeling in a slightly different key. His opening words were:

"It is with deep feeling of respect for this most august assembly that I come up to this platform to speak in the name of France. France has ever shown her desire for peace, and not only peace for herself, but peace for all nations, especially those who are gathered together here in the presence of their most distinguished representatives—peace with honor, peace which will enable us to live the life we desire. And the smallest country has the same right to our consideration as the largest, because all nations are equal here. This is a family of nations banded together to combat the scourge of war, and France offers her sincere help to her sister nations who are met here together.

"We know too well the suffering that war brings. We know that war brings more than suffering; it also brings violence; it brings injustice.

"We are faithful to the letter and to the spirit of that covenant which the nations signed at the end of the last terrible conflict. That covenant, which bears such illustrious signatures, is a pact between the nations for co-operation, a pact for justice, and a pact for law and peace. We stand by all the articles of that covenant, because we consider that you cannot dissociate one article from another without mutilating the covenant itself. I desire to do justice to the work which has already been done. Perhaps I, as a newcomer, appreciate rather better than those who have often been here before the great work which the League of Nations has already done in the last four years. It has indeed done yeoman service. It has peacefully settled the most difficult and delicate disputes, and its authority has been uncontested.

"I know that the League has not yet come to its full power, but we are sure that it will develop as any other organization, and we of France desire that we should appreciate and stand by what has been done already, and should assist the development of an organization which has already done so much."

There is no doubt that these two addresses by the prime ministers of Europe's two most powerful governments set the

high-water mark of the changing tides in the hopes of the friends of the League. Other leaders in the work—Cecil, Balfour, La Fontaine—seem to have passed from the stage in Geneva. A new setting on a larger scale was needed. MacDonald and Herriot furnished this setting. With the shifting of the scenes, there is a new gladness, a greater assurance, especially in the Secretariat of the League. The talk is of large matters, some of it of very large matters.

The Outstanding Problem

The main question, bruited in the press and heard most around the corridors, is, How can the League combine arbitration, security, and disarmament unto the abolition of war? This is the question which, precipitated by the proposed Treaty of Mutual Assistance, was thrown into the open arena by the speeches of the prime ministers. This is the spring whence comes the *flux de paroles* so bewildering to the casual onlooker here in Geneva, anxious to know what it is all about.

The steps leading up to this development began, of course, in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League and in the Permanent Advisory Commission on Military, Naval, and Air Questions set up in 1920 under Article 9. There was then organized also in 1920 a Temporary Mixed Commission on Armaments, which commission drew up the so-called Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance. The Council of the League submitted this draft treaty to the governments and asked them to communicate their views in regard to it. In the meantime a group of American gentlemen, after considerable study, drew up a Draft Treaty of Disarmament and Security which attracted the attention of the League and aroused no little interest in other quarters. Out of these two draft treaties, one the product of the League's Temporary Mixed Commission and the other a proposal of a few Americans, grew the major question of the Fifth Assembly, the question of harmonizing the reduction of armaments, security, arbitration, and peace.

In spite of the air of cordiality around Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Herriot, their handshaking, their smiles and exchanges of good feeling, their addresses revealed two high-minded men holding directly op-

posite views upon the main issue. It has frequently been pointed out that the foreign policies of France and England are fundamentally different; that the Frenchman thinks in terms of history rather than in terms of principles, of concrete realities rather than universal sentiments, while the Englishman harks continually to his philosophy. This difference stood out as one listened to these two addresses. Both Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Herriot favor arbitration, stand by the Covenant of the League of Nations, believe that a conference should be summoned by the League for the limitation of armaments, and long to do something for the advancement of international peace. But there is a gulf between them as wide as the temperaments and the philosophies of the two peoples. The British Premier is utterly opposed to the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and to the whole theory of military alliances, on the ground that such things can never bring security. The French Premier believes with Pascal, that justice cannot be divorced from might, that justice without might is impotent, as might without justice is tyranny. The English see no hope for disarmament except general disarmament. The French see no reason why there cannot be partial and local policies of disarmament, proceeding from situations to general principles rather than from general principles to situations. The French are little interested in principles so universal that they are incapable of application to a concrete situation here and now. Therefore they are not so skeptical of alliances as the English.

Hence it was the French Premier who pointed out that arbitration and disarmament cannot be divorced from security. And the Frenchman knows what he means by security.

After further discussions and many conferences, however, the French and English delegations were able to agree upon the following resolution:

"The Assembly, noting the declarations of the governments represented, observes with satisfaction that they contain the basis of an understanding tending to establish a secure peace and decides as follows:

"With a view to reconcile in the new proposals the divergences between certain points

of view which have been expressed, and, when agreement has been reached to enable an international conference upon armaments to be summoned by the League of Nations at the earliest possible moment;

"(1) The Third Committee is requested to consider the material dealing with security and the reduction of armaments, particularly the observations of the governments on the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance prepared in pursuance of Resolution XIV of the Third Assembly and other plans prepared and presented to the Secretary-General since the publication of the draft treaty, and to examine the obligations contained in the Covenant of the League in relation to the guarantees of security that a resort to arbitration and a reduction of armaments may require;

"(2) The First Committee is requested (a) to consider, in view of possible amendments, the articles in the covenant relating to the settlement of disputes;

"(b) To examine within what limits the terms of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the statute establishing the International Court might be rendered more precise and thereby facilitate the more general acceptance of the clause:

"And thus strengthen the solidarity and the security of the nations of the world by settling by pacific means all disputes which may arise between States."

Thus the whole question of armaments, arbitration, and security came before the Assembly. It is familiar to our readers that the work of the Assembly is divided among six committees, the First dealing with constitutional questions, the Second with technical organizations, the Third with the reduction of armaments, the Fourth with the budget and financial questions, the Fifth with social and general questions, and the Sixth with political questions. Because of its own terms, this resolution was naturally referred to the Third Committee.

This committee went at its business with energy and determination. It agreed that the three terms arbitration, security, and disarmament must be taken together. Since arbitration falls within the province of the First Committee, it was decided to form a liaison between the Third and the First committees.

It was then further decided to refer the whole matter of drafting a protocol to a special committee of twelve, with the

hope that such a committee would be able to draft such a protocol embodying and harmonizing the views which had been expressed by Messrs. MacDonald, Herriot, and others. The chairman chosen for this committee was the very able and active M. Benes, of Czechoslovakia. The other members were Boncour of France, Branting of Sweden, Henderson of England, Lange of Norway, Matsuda of Japan, Lord Parmoor of England, Pouillet of Belgium, Schanzer of Italy, Skrzynski of Poland, Titulesco of Rumania, and Villegas of Chile. These are the men who drafted the protocol entitled "Reduction of Armaments," published in the *Journal of the Assembly* September 23, 1924.

This protocol was referred to in the leading article of the *Journal de Genève* the next morning as the "chart of the new Europe." Revised by the Third Committee, it was presented to and adopted by the Assembly today, October 2.

The Protocol

As we have seen, the problem of the Committee of Twelve was to harmonize MacDonald and Herriot. This was interpreted as meaning to bring arbitration, security, and disarmament into a homogeneous whole, "to insure the maintenance of general peace in the world," and to guarantee "the security of nations whose existence, independence, or territories may be threatened"—the resulting protocol that is bound to bring to the fore plenty of very serious problems.

As a matter of fact, there are already problems enough looming on the horizon. Article five's provision, that even domestic questions may be tampered with by the Council or the Assembly, has aroused Australia and Canada, who are thinking of the immigration problem. I am naturally wondering how this will be received in our own country.*

The protocol seems top-heavy, unwieldy, and vague. It is a long jump ahead, perhaps too long. Paul Boncour, of France, seconded by M. Politio, of Greece, announces that it provides for the automatic application of all the sanctions

of force by all the nations against an aggressor. That is a large order, a breath-taking order. Senator Dandurand, of Canada, frankly expressed to the Assembly his views of some of these difficulties, saying that Canada lived far from the inflammable material of Europe, and had always sought an interpretation of Article 10 of the Covenant which would leave to her Parliament the decision as to the measure of participation in a conflict. He recalled the fact that last year an amendment to Article 10 in this sense secured the support of the Assembly with the exception of one dissenting vote, which sufficed to reject it. It is, indeed, singular to reflect that in two successive years the League has pursued two opposite policies in regard to Article 10—last year it sought to weaken its effect, this year to make it more effective. There are many here who greatly regret that it has not confined itself to repeating last year's attempt to make participation in League sanctions dependent in each case upon parliamentary approval. By that way alone, it is felt, could the United States ever approach the League. As it is, this year's proceedings have led the League farther away from the New World and implicated it more closely in Europe. The hasty concession to Japan in allowing matters of "domestic jurisdiction" to come in certain circumstances before the Council of the League is considered a short-sighted expedient, which may ultimately prove a disastrous obstacle to universality.

In any event, however, the protocol has placed the whole question of organizing the nations for peace clearly once more in the realm of practical national and international politics. That ought to mean a net gain for the cause most to the front here in Europe, a cause which ought to be upmost throughout the world.

A Reminder of International Law

The conception that international law has a bearing on the problems of peace and war has not been lost sight of here. On September 8 Baron Marks von Wurtemberg, of Sweden, called attention to the duty of the League to develop international law along the right lines and to develop a definite plan of action to that end. The matter had been presented to the first Assembly without effect, but the

* The reader will find the text of the protocol in the *International Documents* section of this issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, and a discussion of it in the editorial columns.

Baron thought the time had come for some definite effort to aid and encourage the conclusion of agreements between States based on the principles of international law, such as regards the extent of territorial waters and their legal status, the rights of foreigners, diplomatic immunity, and other matters. Attention of the Assembly was called to the Congress of Jurists set up by the American republics for the purpose of contributing to the gradual and progressive codification of international law in the western Hemisphere, to the work which has been done also at The Hague, at Brussels and elsewhere, to the same end.

The result has been that the Assembly recognized the Swedish Minister's position and approved his resolution. This resolution contemplates the calling of international conferences by the League, after preliminary consultation with governments and experts, for the purpose of incorporating, in terms of international law, items which lend themselves to this procedure. To this end the Assembly has requested the Council to do four things:

"(1) To invite the members of the League of Nations to signify to the Council the items or subjects of international law, public or private, which in their opinion may be usefully examined with a view to their incorporation in international conventions or in other international instruments as indicated above;

"(2) To address a similar invitation to the most authoritative organizations which have devoted themselves to the study and development of international law;

"(3) To examine, after the necessary consultations, the measures which may be taken with respect to the various suggestions presented, in order to enable the League of Nations to contribute in the largest possible measure to the development of international law; and

"(4) To present a report to the next Assembly on the measures taken in execution of this resolution."

In my own humble judgment, the League of Nations has done a no more intelligent and hopeful thing than this.

Other Work of the Assembly

While the Protocol has held the center of the picture, there are other features of

the Assembly worthy of note. In the afternoon of October 2 the election of the *non-permanent members* of the Council for the coming year was held. The sitting members were all re-elected. They are *Czechoslovakia, Brazil, Uruguay, Belgium, Sweden, and Spain*. China was a candidate, and on her failure to secure election her four representatives rose from their seats and walked out of the hall. The Chinese delegation had already let it be known that the *Peking Parliament* had passed a special resolution to the effect that, if China did not regain the seat on the Council which she lost last year, *she would withdraw from the League*. She will probably not withdraw. At one time during the debate in committee over domestic questions Japan threatened to leave the League if she could not have her way.

But, in the main, the feeling of the Assembly is milder and more hopeful than even a year ago.

Most of the resolutions adopted by the Assembly begin with a note of satisfaction. For example, the Assembly noted with satisfaction the report of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit on the work accomplished by the organization for communications and transit between the fourth and fifth Assemblies; expressed its gratification at the success of the second General Conference on Communications and Transit and hoped that, as far as possible, the States whose governments have voted the conventions adopted will, before the closing of the protocol of signature, sign the conventions and will proceed to the necessary ratifications as soon as possible; and invited the governments concerned to facilitate, as in the past, the work of the Committee for Communications and Transit and its subcommittees, with a view to the general improvement of the régime of transport and to the development of international law in the domain of international communications, in conformity with Article 23 (e) of the Covenant.

The Assembly drew the attention of the Council to the extreme urgency of giving effect to the proposal already submitted to the Council, for a revision of the London Convention of 1912, particularly in view of the enormous development in

radio-telephony; and recommended that the States members of the League of Nations should grant to Esperanto, as a practical auxiliary language for international communications side by side with the national languages in use, the treatment and the charges in force for a language *en clair* in telegraphic and radio-telegraphic communications.

Besides, there has been great labor in behalf of minorities—a very thorny problem; of refugees, particularly in Greece; of the financial reconstruction of Hungary, to which I shall have to devote a special article; of the advancement of laborers, to which I shall have to devote another special article; to the amelioration of customs formalities, of which there are altogether too many for the peace of any business or traveling person. Traffic in women and children, which seems a very mysterious matter; in opium and other dangerous drugs, much less mystifying, have come in for a large share of attention.

The work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation has resulted in the formation of national committees on intellectual co-operation. This work is being pushed as fast as the limited financial resources allow. The committee is looking after the rights involved in scientific properties, after the co-ordination of bibliographical work, especially in the domain of physics; after the international exchange of publications, after the interchanging of students, the traveling facilities of duly qualified teachers and scholars, the equivalence of university degrees, and the foundation of scholarships for certain purposes. The committee has instructed the Secretariat to investigate the means by which efforts to promote contacts and to educate the youth of all countries in the ideals of world peace and solidarity may be further developed and co-ordinated. Two other developments growing out of the efforts of the committee is the *International Institute*, which the French Government is planning to found and to put at the disposal of the League as an

agency for carrying out the intricate work involved by the decisions of this Committee on Intellectual Co-operation; and, second, the *International Institute for the Unification of Private Law* at Rome, which the Italian Government is planning to found and to put at the service of the League.

So the story might run on for a long time, covering the work to promote closer municipal relations, the protection of young women traveling alone, legal assistance for the poor, the abolition of slavery, pensions for retiring members of the Permanent Court of International Justice, the reorganization of the League's South American Bureau, the promotion of child welfare, the budget of the League, amendments to the Covenant, which are found to come hard; the complaints and protests and petitions and panaceas and threats and sermons and prayers and hopes and fears and cries of our staggering, but ever hopeful, herd.

The kindly minister of the American Church in Geneva has had "printed for private circulation" the following "prayer for the spiritual union of mankind," by Fosdick:

"Eternal God, Father of All Souls, grant unto us such a clear vision of the sin of war that we may earnestly seek that co-operation between nations which alone can make war impossible.

"As man by his inventions has made the whole world into one neighborhood, grant that he may, by his co-operations, make the whole world into one brotherhood.

"Help us to break down all race prejudice; stay the greed of those who profit by war and the ambitions of those who seek an imperialistic conquest drenched in blood.

"Guide all statesmen to seek a just basis for international action in the interests of peace. Arouse in the whole body of the people an adventurous willingness, as they sacrificed greatly for war, so also for international good will to dare bravely, think wisely, decide resolutely, and to achieve triumphantly. Amen."

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

By SIR MAX WAECHTER, D. L., J. P.

THERE is nothing so bad that some good cannot be extracted from it, and from the most terrible human experiences lessons can be learned that will be of advantage to us in time to come, if we will only learn them and act upon what they teach us. The World War of 1914-1918 was one of the most terrible experiences for the whole world. The trouble and suffering that it brought in its train were not confined to the belligerent nations; there were few of the neutral countries that did not eventually feel something of its devastating effects. How to prevent a recurrence of those four black years—that is the question to which all the best minds of all nations should address themselves, and particularly does that duty devolve upon the peoples of Europe.

The war of 1914-1918 called forth far more formidable means of destruction. The science of chemistry was added to saber, shot, and shell. The mastery of the air increased the horrors of warfare as the human race had hitherto known them. For the dash of cavalry charge was substituted the dreary mud and water of the trenches, with the occasional "over the top," which meant almost certain annihilation for the majority of those ordered to the attack. The developments in aerial flight and chemical methods for obliterating not only armed forces, but unarmed citizens, open up possibilities for the destruction of life and property against which little can be done save reprisals of a similarly horrible kind. All experts are agreed that the next war, if and when it comes, will surpass in its direful consequences all that happened in the last terrible conflict. It is, therefore, to the interest of the peoples of the entire world that no effort be spared to arouse them to a vivid sense of the dangers that will befall them if they should unwarily allow things to drift towards another armed conflict among nations.

A Question Primarily For Europe

I have said that this question particularly concerns the peoples of Europe. It is in Europe that the dangers of war are

greatest today. Moreover, the European nations underwent the horrors of the last war to a far greater extent than any other part of the world. It is in Europe, then, that a beginning should be made as speedily as possible for a federation of nations for peace and security. We need in Europe particularly conditions that will insure a lasting peace in order that there shall be no repetition of 1914-1918. Those conditions exist in the community of interests between the different European nations, if only the peoples will grasp that essential fact, and rely in future on that community of interests and not on formal treaties and conventions, which, as the last war showed, can simply be ignored by any one nation if it makes up its mind to go to war.

There is one way of strengthening this community of interests between the peoples of Europe and that is by uniting all the European Powers in one federation, on the model of the United States of America, and binding them together by a system of free trade and free intercourse throughout the continent. Such a federation, I am convinced, is the only possible alternative to war. I felt this most keenly in the last stages of the World War, and the overthrow of all the old obsolete and semi-feudal autocracies has unquestionably prepared the way for and made easier a European Federation of Nations.

Pre-war Visits to the Continent

About ten years before the World War broke out I visited Germany on business. I found to my astonishment a strong warlike feeling apparently pervading the whole nation. Probably it was produced by the press of that country, which, with one or two exceptions, was entirely dominated by the War Party. The idea of the War Party was to smash France completely, seize some of the channel ports, and then deal with England. The latter was the main object. I made up my mind to do all I could to prevent, if possible, the carrying out of this plan. As I then did not know enough about the various European States, I visited every one of

them with the object of studying their political and economic conditions and their national mentality.

As a result of my visits I discovered that the whole of Europe was a complete chaos politically, and that the mentality of the people differed in every State. I realized that this was a very serious state of affairs, and that the evil must be attacked at the root. Permanent peace was impossible as long as this state of things existed. After thinking the matter over from every aspect, I came to the conclusion that the only guarantee of permanent peace was a federation of Europe on lines similar to the United States of America. It took me some time to find out the way in which the idea could be realized, and as soon as I found what I thought was a practical solution I took action. I consulted the King, then Prince of Wales. He listened with great interest and urged me to lay the whole scheme before King Edward VII.

European Federation Favored by King Edward VII

When I placed the plan before King Edward VII he exclaimed, "This is the only plan which can possibly save the world!" He encouraged me to go forward with it. He continued to be highly interested in it; in fact, before his premature death he made the scheme practically his own and suggested the steps to be taken. This was in 1909, when I met him in Marienbad. After a discussion we decided that propaganda for this object should be started in England.

In 1913 I founded the European Unity League as a means of promoting the idea of the federation of Europe in the United Kingdom and throughout the continent. In a comparatively short time more than 20,000 members of the League had been enrolled, and the General Council of the League consisted of more than 300 of the most prominent men in the British Empire, including 48 peers, 51 admirals, 52 generals, and 162 members of Parliament, among them our present Prime Minister, Mr. James Ramsey MacDonald.

As soon as the plan was properly formed I again visited every continental country. I saw the sovereigns, many ministers, and other prominent men, and found them all ready to adopt the plan and join a Euro-

pean federation, with the sole exception of Germany. The German Emperor showed in every way that he thoroughly approved of my plan, but I could not induce him to take action. He was by nature a pacifist, but unfortunately he was constantly surrounded and influenced by the War Party, and he could not see his way to break with them.

The World War put a stop to the work of the European Unity League. That was inevitable, but no less unfortunate, for if the work of that League had had a few years in which to grow in power and influence, might it not have been the means of preventing that catastrophe from which Europe, at any rate, is likely to suffer for many years to come?

In Europe Today

More than five years have past since the Armistice of November, 1918. Europe is still unsettled. No good purpose will be served by discussing the cause of the present unsettled state of Europe. There is no one cause: the causes are many; but, whether one or many, suspicions and antagonisms are again raising their heads among the nations of Europe, armed forces are being increased and strengthened, and the probable outcome of another war is discussed and considered by experts of all kinds. Unfortunately, I am prevented by my health from taking up active propaganda again for the United States of Europe, but no chance of its succeeding now must be neglected. Therefore I bring forward once more the Federation of European Nations—the United States of Europe—as the most practical and urgent proposal for rendering the possibility of another war so remote that the League of Nations may have the opportunity so to consolidate its position in the world that we may shortly approach the time when we can safely look forward to war being abolished.

The United States of Europe the Only Guarantee Against War

Such a federation of Europe is the only possible alternative to the dangers of further armed conflicts. Nothing else can guarantee Europe against the possibility of future war quite as disastrous as, if less extensive than, the last great armed struggle. The statement that the United States

of Europe is the only alternative to war may seem presumptuous, but in the course of my investigations, from ten to fifteen years, I put the question to hundreds of statesmen and important people whether they could suggest another way of securing a desirable peace, and none of them was able to suggest an alternative course. I contend, then, that the United States of Europe is the only plan capable of avoiding the danger of future wars and preparing the way finally for their abolition.

Such an association of nations would have other and more immediate advantages. It would quickly bring about greater prosperity in Europe, most badly needed today. By freedom of trade and intercourse throughout Europe, as in the United States of America, it would do much to break down barriers that now exist. By the gradual adoption of a universal monetary system it would put an end to the chaos of the exchanges, which otherwise may continue for a generation or two, if not longer. By the steady reduction of armaments which is bound to follow, since no State will go on paying for armaments which are demonstrably unnecessary, money will be released for far more productive and beneficial purposes.

It must, of course, be understood that a permanent European federation can only be achieved on an absolutely equitable basis by the consent of all the nations concerned, and that no preference or privileges shall be granted to any one State. Such a scheme of federation between the nations of Europe can be formulated and established, with all its details worked out, only after full public discussion and free negotiation, which should be undertaken in a spirit of "give and take" and with the determination to secure the desired result.

Pre-war Plan to Make War Impossible in the Future

As long as the chaotic political and mental conditions in Europe exist, there is no possibility of a permanent peace, which can only be brought about by the federation of Europe. Therefore the federation of Europe on similar lines to the U. S. A. is a necessary preliminary to make war impossible.

As soon as the federation of Europe has

been completed, Europe and the U. S. A. should stop war completely. They should establish a permanent International Arbitration Court, which would deal with any difficulties existing between the different States.

Europe and America jointly would then invite every country in the world to join the movement to make war impossible. The probability is that they would all agree to join, but if any country declined to do so it should be notified that, in case they should go to war instead of referring the question to the International Arbitration Court, they would be heavily punished—probably by complete isolation.

For the federation of the States the following plan could be adopted:

All the States should meet and draw up the constitution of the federation on the basis of one tariff, one coinage, and one language, which should be taught in every school as a second language. The choice of this language to be adopted would be decided by the first European parliament.

The abolition of frontiers, and free intercourse between the different States.

The presidency of the federation to be held by the great powers in rotation, whether monarchies or republics.

The Late President Harding's Approval

During the summer of 1922 Sir Francis Trippel visited the United States of America at the joint invitation of the American and British boards of governors of the Sulgrave Institution. On May 31 he had the honor of being received by the late President Harding at the White House in Washington, and in the course of conversation took the opportunity of explaining to the President my pre-war plan for making war in Europe impossible in the future.

President Harding was greatly interested in it, discussed it at some length, and agreed that it might be the only possible way of securing international peace on the European continent.

On a subsequent occasion, when Sir Francis Trippel again met the President at the White House, the latter referred to the scheme, and was then more emphatic, asserting that unification of Europe was the only means of preventing another disastrous war.

The League of Nations

It may naturally be asked, Why attempt a federation of European States when the Versailles Treaty has called the League of Nations into being, and that body is working for peace and arbitration and the settlement of disputes between nations without the use of armed force? That question calls for a frank reply. I do not consider that the League of Nations can possibly become strong and influential enough to carry out its high and noble mission until there exists something like unity in Europe. Can it be said with truth that the League of Nations is powerful enough today to secure international peace? I wish that it were, but I am afraid it is not. There are two great nations of Europe outside of it, Germany and Russia, the one not yet admitted, the other openly scoffing at it. While the Republican Party is in power in the United States there is little chance of that great country coming into the League. Further, we know that France in the occupation of the Ruhr and Italy over the bombardment of Corfu caused it to be distinctly understood that they would regard the intervention of the League of Nations in those matters as anything but a friendly act. Inasmuch as the danger of war is greatest in Europe today—what it may be years hence we do not know—it is obvious that the League of Nations, as at present constituted, is not powerful enough to eliminate that danger.

It must be remembered, too, that the League of Nations is not at all a new idea. There was the "Grand Design" of Henry IV of France, one of the most successful of royal mediators, with a council composed of commissioners from the various States to discuss differences and pacify quarrels; there were the proposals of Grotius for arbitration; Perni's proposals for a European Parliament; and after the fall of Napoleon the Peace of Vienna adopted it. It failed then because the nations of Europe were not ready for it; and even if it had succeeded at that time and continued, it could not have remained a league of nations in any real sense of the term, for it would not have been much more than a league of governments, many of them autocracies politically a century or more behind the times.

Europe Now More Democratized

There can be no question that the nations of Europe are far more democratic in their political constitutions today than at any other previous period of their history. This democratic development should undoubtedly help forward the establishment of the United States of Europe, not by an understanding between autocratic governments above, but by a genuine federation of European peoples below. Over and over again has the federation of the Balkan States been urged as a means of relieving those unhappy regions from being the cockpit of Europe; but dynastic and governmental interests have hitherto stood in the way. Let that idea recommended for the Balkan States be applied to the whole continent of Europe. Let it be taken up at the "No More War" demonstrations held in the important centers of all countries at the end of July each year. Let it be promulgated at the agitation against war which the International Federation of Trade Unions is organizing for next September. Let the peoples of Europe do everything they can, politically and industrially, to promote the United States of Europe as a real and lasting guarantee of European peace.

The peace of Europe, once secured, will do an immense deal to make it likewise secure for the whole world. The United States of America will no longer regard the continent of Europe as an armed camp which merits neither sympathy nor fraternity. The consolidation of the European States will furnish a guarantee against all fear of Asiatic invasion such as nothing else can provide. Moreover, the Far East will respect a federation of the States of Europe united in a peaceful endeavor for the general welfare of all, desiring no imperialist encroachments on other parts of the earth's surface, as modern Europe has not been respected by Asia up till now. And, above all, the United States of Europe will contribute in every way to the success of the League of Nations. Without it the League of Nations may remain ineffective for years to come, and may even suffer a severe setback by a recrudescence of warfare, if only on a minor scale. Because, therefore, though difficult, it is easier to accomplish effectively than a world-wide League of Na-

tions; because it will materially help forward the work of peace and arbitration which the League of Nations was established to carry through; because it gives to the peoples a more secure guarantee of general peace than any other scheme proposed, the United States of Europe should

be taken up enthusiastically and determinedly by all that racial and national antagonisms and antipathies shall give way to cordial sympathy and fraternal endeavor to make the best of this world for the peace and security of the generations which will follow us.

MILITARISM AT WORK

FIELD MARSHAL CONRAD'S DISCLOSURES ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF THE WORLD WAR *

By Dr. HEINRICH KANNER, of Vienna

Conrad von Hötzendorf

AMONG all the military men who were destined to make world history during the World War, perhaps no one was such a typical representative of militarism in its most objectionable form as the chief of the Austro-Hungarian general staff, Field Marshal Conrad v. Hötzendorf.

Militarism in this form gives a decisive influence in politics to the military men, who are always anxious to have war, and thus compels the leading military men to take part in politics, regardless whether or not they bring an inborn interest for politics into the profession. A military man who is politically inclined by nature will gladly grasp the opportunity of taking part in politics as soon as he has reached a leading position in the military hierarchy of a militaristic State, and even after he has lost this position he will continue to take part in politics. This is the general who is either a politician or a pothouse politician.

There have always been such generals in the German Empire. In the time of Bismarck, who knew how to keep the soldier out of politics, one only needs to mention General Count Waldersee, who was even considered Bismarck's rival. In later times, before the World War, General Reim must be mentioned. Ludendorff also is of a political nature. He used the power vested in him by his position as senior quartermaster general during the World War to exercise a real political dictatorship not only over Germany, but also over Austria-Hungary. But now, after his power is taken from him, he continues to carry on in politics, the best proof that he is a politician, though a bad one—one might even say a pothouse politician.

His former Austro-Hungarian colleague, Conrad von Hötzendorf, is of quite a different nature. As shown by his recently published memoirs,* he was intensively busy in politics as long as he was chief of the general staff, thereby committing a great political crime. But he has taken part in politics rather reluctantly, as he confesses in his memoirs, and only because engrossed in the then prevailing conception of militarism, he thought that this was part of the duties of the chief of the general staff. When he lost his position and was retired, he no longer felt inclined to take part in politics, much to the satisfaction of his fellow-citizens. He has not a natural disposition for politics. This is the very reason why the political passion, one might almost call it fanaticism, that he developed in his high office—and on account of which he at times even forsook the office—this passion developed in and for the military service. This purely officious political passion is so much the more characteristic of the system of militarism that engages military men as soon as they have been promoted into a leading position in political endeavors where they lack the necessary training and possibly even the natural inclination.

The System

Therefore Conrad is a pure product of militarism, and his memoirs are, though unintentionally, so much more valuable as a contribution to the knowledge of this system, which spelled ruin for the two Central Powers.

*A translation from *Der Friedenswarte*.

* My Military Service, 1906-1918. Vienna, Rikola publ., 4 volumes.

He writes of the time (November 18, 1906) when, through the grace of the heir presumptive, he was called from line service to the head of the general staff, as follows:

"The first and most important thing on entering into my new duties seemed to me to establish harmony with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, because I considered most important the close connection between international politics and preparation for war, which is the duty of the chief of the general staff."

And then:

"Having been occupied with purely military questions for years, it was extremely disagreeable to me to have to solve political problems now, yet it seemed to me to be the preeminent duty of my position." (Vol. 1, p. 39).

Difficulties Involved

However, he places at the beginning of his description of his activity the remark which sums up all his experiences:

"My whole activity as chief of the general staff during peace was permeated by conflicts resulting from the fact that my fundamental ideas about politics and their execution were opposed to those of the leading personalities (powers that be)" (I, 13).

Thus the harmony with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs was an ideal that could not be easily obtained. For Conrad was always in conflict with the leading personalities in politics, among whom there were not only the Austro-Hungarian Secretary of Foreign Affairs, but also the Emperor of Austria and the German Emperor, who was much more important than all others in the question of war or peace, the only question that had any influence upon Conrad.

This conflict lasted throughout the whole time of peace, for Conrad's only goal was war, and only when this goal was reached the ideal "harmony" between Conrad and the other leading personalities was reached. Conrad had been victorious, to be sure, only over the other leading personalities of the Central Powers, but not over their enemies, much to the detriment of these personalities.

In the fourth volume of his memoirs, just published, Conrad relates the events

during the critical days, and by his many details contributes much valuable information elucidating the history immediately preceding the World War.

The news of the assassination of the Crown Prince and his wife was given to Conrad on June 28, 1914, in the afternoon, in Karlstadt (Croatia), by two telegrams of the Governor of Bosnia, Quartermaster General Patiorek. In the telegrams nothing was said about the assassination except that the assassin was a Bosnian of Serbian nationality. Nothing else. No word that anyone from the Kingdom of Serbia had anything to do with the murder, no news about the participation of royal Serbian officers and officials in the preparation of the murder, no news about the Serbian origin of the death-dealing revolver and the bombs that had been tried first. The latter was found out later by the testimony of the assassin, when it also became known that the Serbian Government did not know anything about it.

Originator of the War

In spite of all this, Conrad immediately knew the consequence of this murder. As he says:

"The assassination was the declaration of war of Serbia to Austria-Hungary. It could only be answered by war." (IV, 17f.)

Easy to understand! This had been his continuous demand for the last six years. For Conrad any, even the most unjust, pretext was good enough for this fatal decision. That military procedure against Serbia might lead to other armed entanglements—yes, even to a general European war, and to a world war—was well known to Conrad. On account of and for these possibilities, he had concluded a military alliance with the Chief of the German general staff at the beginning of the year 1909, an alliance which was revised and renewed in May, 1914—*i. e.*, a few weeks before Serajevo. If Conrad laid his plans for a war against Serbia on the afternoon after the assassination, at a time when no one besides him had thought that far, then he must have been aware of the consequences of this step—*i. e.*, the World War. Therefore, he must be considered first among the originators.

In his brain, on the 28th of June, 1914,

when the whole world was still living in peaceful illusions, this accursed thought appeared for the first time. Since this brain was the birthplace of this thought, it is only fitting to devote some attention to this brain, or rather to the logical operation that led Conrad to his conclusion.

The Utilization of Fallacy

Conrad says: "The assassination was the declaration of war by Serbia against Austria-Hungary" (IV, 17, 18). In the first place, this sentence is begging the question. The subject of the sentence, the assassination, was the deed of a "Bosnian of Serbian nationality," of whom Conrad knew absolutely nothing more, not even whether the Serbian Government or only Serbian nationals had anything to do with him. The predicate of the sentence, "the declaration of war by Serbia against Austria-Hungary," interpolates, under the ambiguous designation "Serbia," the Serbian Government as author of the assassination.

Furthermore, in the quoted sentence the words "declaration of war" are used metaphorically only. Therefore the conclusion, "it could only be answered by war," can only be meant metaphorically. Austria-Hungary's answer to Serbia's metaphorical declaration of war could only be a metaphorical war, either a diplomatic war (demand for explanation, satisfaction, etc.) or a police war (expulsion of the Serbs), or an economic war (embargo on importation). The world might have understood this. But Conrad's answer to the metaphorical declaration of war of Serbia was the real war of Austria-Hungary. He is not able to distinguish between reality and metaphor in the language, and he considers this flash of wit so important that he hands it down to posterity. With such logical stupidity, if some one would call a slender girl a pine tree, Conrad would draw the conclusion that pine cones are growing on the girl's body.

Gaining Over the Statesmen

After Conrad had conceived this bright thought he returned to Vienna, and in the evening he had a conference with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, of whom he de-

manded "immediate" mobilization against Serbia.

But at that time Berchtold did not think that far. Like the whole civilized world, he only thought of diplomatic reprisals against Serbia, a metaphorical war. He told Conrad that the real motive for a mobilization was lacking; that he had planned a different mode of procedure—*i. e.*, to demand of Serbia that certain clubs should be dissolved, that the chief of the police should be discharged, etc.

Conrad, however, knows more about politics than the secretary, who has been appointed to carry it on. He advises the secretary: "That has no effect; might alone will be effective." After he had talked with derision to Berchtold about his fear of a revolution in Bohemia, he tries to deceive him about the danger of his demand: "To Russia we must point out the anti-monarchical element of the assassination (in case of a mobilization against Serbia), and King Charles of Rumania cannot open hostilities against us on account of it" (IV, 33-34). He wishes to make Berchtold, who had grown afraid, believe that, while he himself does not believe it. The simpleton betrays that himself; for, eager to let his mental superiority shine on every page of his book and before everybody, he tells that on the very day before his conversation with Berchtold he had said to his military colleagues on the general staff that in a war with Serbia "the danger was imminent to look upon Russia and Rumania as enemies" (I, 39). Thus the soldier meddles in politics, but not to tell the secretary the truth, his own conviction, but to tell him the opposite, to lead him astray politically, to silence by his authority the last remorse of the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, to deceive him into the war. This was why the high officers demanded influence in foreign politics. This is the deeper meaning of militarism.

Influence Upon Berchtold

In opposition to his predecessor, Count Aehrenthal, Berchtold had always lent an open ear to Conrad's political suggestions. Although a diplomat by his office, he was an advocate of might in his fundamental conception, and during the preceding two years of his secretaryship he had tried to

use every opportunity to solve the south-Slavic problem with blood and iron, and was kept from doing this only by external influence, especially by that of the German Emperor. These failures of his policy of violence had scalded him. After the conclusion of the two Balkan wars he had been compelled, under Tisza's influence, to work out a plan for a peaceful Balkan policy, and had just set about to win Germany for this plan. The assassination in Serajeva did not throw the lazy thinker off his track.

However, Conrad's few words about violence, about the chance with Russia and Rumania, were sufficient to revive his old inclination toward the policy of violence. Too bad that he had not thought of it himself. Conrad had perceived the new bloody possibilities quicker than he. Immediately he renounced his peaceful plan, that did not suit his character, and adopted Conrad's war plan, which was more congenial to him; but with the sole reservation to wait for the conclusion of the legal investigation and not to mobilize "immediately." As he had already told Conrad on July 1, the Austrian Prime Minister, Count Stürgekh, and the Hungarian Prime Minister, Count Tisza, were at first opposed to it; but they were quickly converted, as we know—Stürgekh during the same and Tisza during the following week.

Berchtold had also submitted Conrad's plan to Emperor Francis Joseph. The Emperor agreed with Berchtold's statement and was in favor of waiting for the investigation, as Berchtold reported to Conrad on July 1. Francis Joseph had only one doubt. During the last years William II had often stopped him when he was about to attack the Serbs. But without William II's help Francis Joseph could not risk a war against Serbia, as Russia probably would be drawn into it. Who could know what attitude William II would take to the war this time?

Count Berchtold knew what to do. He persuaded the Emperor to send a personal letter to William II, asking this very question. This was done July 4. Berchtold's confidant, Councilor Count Alexander Hoyos, traveled to Berlin with the personal letter July 5. The Austro-Hungarian ambassador, Count Szögyeny,

handed it to the German Emperor, July 6. Szögyeny and Hoyos had a conference with the German Chancellor, von Bethmann, and the Undersecretary of State, Dr. Zimmermann. July 7 Hoyos returned with the answer.

In the meantime, July 6, Conrad had another conference with Berchtold, who faithfully reported what had happened and accepted his advice. In the first place, Berchtold told Conrad the agreeable news, that the German Emperor had said "Yes;" but that he still had to confer with Bethmann. Conrad, who the day before had worked on Francis Joseph, rejoiced at the situation. "The Emperor" (Francis Joseph) "will favor the war with Serbia," he said.

But Berchtold had another little attack of weakness. Not only did he feel intellectually dependent upon Conrad, but also upon the all-powerful and brutal Hungarian Prime Minister, who was still opposed to the war. Berchtold wished to gain time. He shrunk back from Conrad's unrelenting "immediately" and tried again to obtain a short delay of the war. For this purpose he referred to the approaching harvest, which should be awaited, because it would furnish the supplies for a year, and tried to appease Conrad by the proposal of a "trial mobilization"—that is a mobilization which was not to lead to war, but only to support the diplomatic negotiations. Conrad did not yield; he demanded "a full mobilization" against Serbia.

Berchtold now began to talk plainer; referred to Tisza's opposition and again called Conrad's attention to the danger threatening from Russia and Rumania. Conrad treated this danger lightly, and the section chief, Count Forgach, a principal instigator of war, who took part in this conference, helped him by leading the conversation back to the more enjoyable topic, Germany's assistance.

However, Count Berchtold, who was thoroughly afraid of Tisza, now raised another objection; "But the Germans will ask us what will happen after the war (to Serbia)?" "Then say that we do not know ourselves," the General, who was never bothered by doubts, snapped back.

In the morning of July 7—Hayas had hardly returned from Berlin—Conrad

heard that he was bringing a favorable reply from Berlin and, upon inquiry, he received from Berchtold, who acted like his reporter, the information that "Germany would unconditionally side with Austria-Hungary. Even though the action against Serbia would start the Great (European) War, Germany advised Austria-Hungary to attack" (IV, 42).

That same July 7 a cabinet meeting took place, to which Berchtold was invited. Here he learned, in addition, that the German Chancellor, as well as the German Emperor, advocated "an immediate attack upon Serbia," and "from an international point of view considered the present moment more favorable than a later one" (IV, 55 f.). Thus Conrad carried his point; in his controversy with Berchtold concerning now or later, Berlin had completely taken his side. Perhaps he felt that his victory was too complete.

When Tisza, who was not in favor of the war, in spite of Berlin, and for whom Conrad had more respect than for indolent Berchtold, put the thumbscrews on him during the cabinet meeting by sharply pointed questions, Conrad admitted that in the case of a war against Russia, Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro, Austria-Hungary's chances would not be very good (IV, 55). Conrad did not dare to answer the Hungarian dictator with a few meaningless phrases, as he had done a few days before with Count Berchtold when discussing the same question.

Whether the chances for his State were favorable or unfavorable, that did not change Berchtold's desire for war. Under no condition would he give up this chance of waging the long-desired war against Serbia, no matter what happened afterwards. In spite of Bethmann's and William II's consent, Berchtold, under pressure from Tisza, could not make up his mind to attack "immediately," "to invade Serbia without diplomatic preparation," as Tisza depreciatingly had called it. He planned a compromise with Tisza which later came to pass and which was a short-timed (24 or 48 hours) ultimatum to Serbia with impossible conditions. It was to be sent after the harvest and after the investigation of July 22.

The day following the cabinet meet-

ing he, in duty bound, made his report to Conrad. Conrad was dissatisfied. "Rather today than tomorrow," he answered. But he finally gave his consent. And now Berchtold, who was not yet sure of Tisza, tried to make another bargain with Conrad. Timidly he asked if the occupation of "sufficient" territory in Serbia would be satisfactory. Then the bloodthirsty lion was reawakened in the General. He would not stop until he had "beaten" the whole Serbian army. That was the end.

Only in one point Conrad again had to give in to the irresistible Tisza—in fixing the scope of the war. Conrad had always favored the complete annexation of the Serbian kingdom into the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Tisza was absolutely opposed to it because then the Magyars could no longer predominate in Hungary. Conrad had to yield. They agreed upon an adjustment of the boundaries in favor of Austria-Hungary and a reduction of Serbia only in favor of other adjacent States. But Conrad consoled himself and his congenial Secretary of War with the assurance that after the war (victorious, of course) no one would pay any attention to these promises (IV, 92).

Austria-Hungary's Imperfect Military Preparation

July 14, Tisza had fallen when he had noticed Francis Joseph's desire for war; on the 23rd the forty-eight-hour ultimatum, with the intentionally impossible demands, had been handed to Belgrade. On the 25th the Austro-Hungarian ambassador broke off diplomatic relations with the Serbian Government and a part of the Austro-Hungarian army was being mobilized against Serbia. Conrad had reached his goal, although with a delay of three weeks and a diplomatic palliative. Nothing stood in the way of his warfare against Serbia.

But now the rôles of Berchtold and Conrad were changed. The secretary, who had accomplished his task and did not any more have to fear objection and resistance from Vienna, from Berlin, or Budapest, became bold and dashing, for he had protected his responsibility in every way. Conrad, however, who now had to do his work and take the re-

sponsibility upon himself, became timid and doubtful. That was seen already on the next day, the 26th.

The German government, which from the beginning had insisted upon an immediate attack, without diplomatic preparation, was rather worried by the three weeks' delay and the diplomatic action of Berchtold. They were afraid that Austria-Hungary, "always slow to proceed," would take too much time in military execution, and that the foreign powers in the meantime would make use of Berchtold's diplomatic action to offer mediation, which would compromise the war against Serbia. Therefore the Vienna Government was told on the 26th that, "in order to avoid interference from other Powers, the greatest speed in military operations and an immediate declaration of war on Serbia were considered desirable."

In order to prepare an answer to this note, Berchtold, lazy and sly as he was, invited the German ambassador, Tschersehky, and also his former oppressor, Conrad, to a conference. Then and there the "Katzenjammer" began. Conrad told the two diplomats that he could not attack before August 12; whereupon the German Secretary of State, v. Jagow, having read the ambassador's report, expressed his "regret" to the Austro-Hungarian Government.

Berchtold, now a brave supporter of Germany, wished immediately to issue the declaration of war to Serbia, in order to prevent any attempts at mediation by this paper *fait accompli*. Conrad asked him in private to postpone the declaration of war till August 12. But when Berchtold did not yield to his former oppressor, who had become weak, the latter asked for "a few days' respite" at least. "It is not so urgent," said the former firebrand, who had wished to start the attack—with his mouth—on June 29. The declaration of war followed, two days later, after Conrad's consent had been obtained.

While on June 29 he unhesitatingly considered Russia and Rumania as enemies, he now urged Berchtold to "spare" Rumania, "to clarify the relation with Russia as soon as possible," and "to put off as long as possible" that tiny country of Montenegro (IV, 131 f.). As the poet says, "the guilty man was horror-

stricken." Conrad complains again and again that Austria-Hungary went into the war "with the most faulty diplomatic preparation possible" (IV, 112). But no word of explanation or justification for the imperfect military preparation; that was indeed his own crime.

From the Serbian to the World War

On July 27 news arrived about Russian mobilization in the military districts on the Austro-Hungarian boundary. As customary, Berchtold asked Conrad, his mentor, what could be done. Now, as he re-entered foreign diplomatic activities, Conrad was again on top. He was always ready with advice for others. This time he not only advised Berchtold, but also the German Government. On July 28, in order to make sure, he repeated his plans by telephone.

In the first place, he advised Berchtold to ask the German Government to notify Russia that, if she mobilized against Austria-Hungary, "Germany would immediately start to mobilize against Russia." Conrad also wrote the text of the note that Germany was to send to Russia. The note was written in this peremptory tone (IV, 133). The military men of the Central Powers seem to have considered their quill-driving diplomats even incapable of writing. It is well known that Moltke, in Berlin, wrote the text of the fatal communication to Belgium which drew Belgium into the war. On the 28th Berchtold obediently adopted the idea of his military mentor, only in a slightly milder form; but his plan came too late. Berlin had already taken another step in Petrograd on the 26th. Furthermore, Conrad advised Berchtold to ask the King of Rumania, through Berlin, to make a similar declaration in Petrograd (IV, 134); but Berlin recognized the futility of such a suggestion to Carol.

Third, Conrad asked Berlin that Germany at once should answer Russia's mobilization against Austria-Hungary by her own mobilization; Austria-Hungary would mobilize against Russia only after Germany had done so (IV, 134). Berlin, however, did not agree to this demand, for the German Emperor, having read the Serbian reply, had been seized by a

desire for peace and had started an offer of mediation on July 28. Now this had to be frustrated, and for this purpose Conrad and Berchtold worked harmoniously with Moltke during the next days.

On July 28 Berchtold received the first peaceful advice from Berlin. It seems to have again weakened Berchtold. Conrad had to quiet him anew and encourage him. On July 27 and 28 Conrad intended to mobilize the Austro-Hungarian army (against Russia) only after Germany had mobilized against Russia; but on July 29 he conceived the plan of demanding an immediate general mobilization of the Austro-Hungarian army without waiting for Germany's mobilization; and this right in the midst of Germany's offer of mediation, which had been renewed and made stronger on July 29. Germany's aversion against an immediate mobilization was well known.

In the meantime, on July 30, at noon, a third, the most energetic telegraphic offer of mediation, had arrived from Berlin, wherein Bethmann advocated a new English peace plan. In the afternoon Conrad and Berchtold went to the Emperor; they decided to reject the English peace proposition and to order the general mobilization (IV, 151).

The Decisions for War

How correctly he had entered into the ideas of the war party was proved by a dispatch from the Berlin ambassador, which arrived shortly after these resolutions. In it Moltke advised Conrad to proceed at once with the general mobilization. It was also proved by another telegram, which had been sent from Berlin on July 30, in the evening, but had been delivered to Conrad only on July 31, in the morning. In it Moltke recommended in plain words "to reject England's renewed attempts to maintain peace," and to mobilize against Russia. The European war was necessary to save Austria-Hungary. "Germany will join unconditionally," "Germany will mobilize," Moltke told Conrad at the same time in a private telegram (IV, 152).

The same morning Berchtold had received information from Berlin that Germany would send an ultimatum to Russia. When Conrad read his telegram to

Berchtold, in the morning of July 31, Berchtold, who lately had been tormented by doubts, regained his good humor. Gaily he exclaimed, "That is well done! Who is the leader, Moltke or Bethmann?" He declared that he was satisfied and decided, jointly with Conrad, to ask Francis Joseph to issue the formal decree for the general mobilization that had been decided upon on the day before. This decree was given from the Imperial Chancery to the War Department at 12:23 o'clock p. m. (IV, 153-155). Even earlier than that, at 8 o'clock in the morning, Berchtold and Conrad, simultaneously and in mutual understanding had notified the German Chancellor and the chief of the German general staff of the decision for a general mobilization (against Russia), and of the carrying out of the war against Serbia (*i. e.*, the rejection of all mediation and peace proposals). Thereupon the last decision was made in Berlin. At 1 o'clock Berlin declared that "the danger of war was imminent," which meant the getting ready for mobilization; at 3:30 o'clock the twelve-hour ultimatum was sent to Petrograd. The military men had their way—Conrad in the war against Serbia, Moltke in the European war.

Attitude Toward Russia

Conrad's memoirs show the important fact that the military leaders, Conrad as well as Moltke, during that critical period did not at all look upon the Russian mobilization as being identical with war, as later the defenders of William II tried to represent it, and that decidedly they were not of the opinion that the answer to the Russian mobilization ought to be an ultimatum and the declaration of war. In the evening of July 30, before the above-mentioned telegram, which reached Vienna only on July 31, Moltke contemptuously speaks of the "customary Russian mobilizations and demobilizations" in a telegram which reached Conrad on the 30th, in the evening, and instructs him "not to declare war on Russia," although the Russian Government officially had notified the Central Powers of the Russian mobilization against Austria-Hungary. Conrad answered Moltke in the affirmative. Con-

rad had not needed these instructions from Moltke. Conrad had already voiced the same opinion to Berchtold.

When Conrad, on the morning of July 30, proposed the general mobilization of the Austro-Hungarian army (against Russia), Berchtold and Stürgeckh became doubtful again; they feared that Austria-Hungary could not stand financially a war against Serbia and Russia at the same time. Conrad's answer was: "The Russians may come to a standstill." When Count Berchtold, in the afternoon of this day, during the conference with the Emperor, again voiced the fear that if the Austro-Hungarian army were in Galicia a war with Russia would be inevitable, Conrad replied: "If the Russians do not do anything to us, we do not need to do anything to them."

Furthermore, Conrad conceived the text of a note to be sent to Russia by Berchtold; therein he stated emphatically that Austria-Hungary had mobilized "without any intention to attack or to threaten Russia" (IV, 147-152), a conception which Berchtold adopted as his own in a different form.

Concluding Remarks

We break off here. In his fourth volume Conrad gives an account of his activity until September 30, 1914. But our report may suffice to show our readers the militarism at work. The idea of waging war against Serbia originated with one man, the chief of the general staff—Conrad. Step by step Conrad urges his government on, while his Berlin colleague, Moltke, "encourages" the German Government, which in the last moment shrunk back from an impending European war, and drives it to the fatal last decision.

In Berlin, Moltke is ruling during the critical days, not Bethmann, just as in Vienna Conrad, not Berchtold. The interference of the military men in Vienna and in Berlin, their encroachment upon politics, leads to war first against Serbia, and then against all Europe. The militarism of the Central Powers completely ceases to live.

Conrad's disclosures are an extremely valuable contribution to the question of guilt, surely without the author's intention. The defenders of William II's ré-

gime have been complaining for almost ten years that the Central Powers have been attacked in the World War by the Entente Powers. Conrad's undisguised statement shows, on the contrary, that the then governments of the Central Powers, immediately after the assassination in Serajevo, had planned an invasion of Serbia, as Tschirschky himself has called it, by immediate attack, without diplomatic warning. The defenders of the old régime of the Central Powers accuse Russia that it had forced the Central Powers into war by its general mobilization, which had to be regarded as a declaration of war.

However, Conrad's documentary statement shows that, according to the opinion of the chiefs of the general staffs of the Central Powers, the Russian mobilization did not have to lead to war, but could have been settled peacefully by demobilization; and indeed the Czar had assured the Emperor of this on his word of honor. Furthermore it is shown that Germany's mobilization, which was announced to be equivalent to a declaration of war, was an accomplished fact in the evening of July 30, while the Russian general mobilization, which was supposed to be the reason for it, became known in Berlin only in the forenoon of July 31. Finally, it is proved that the German mobilization really was caused by Austria-Hungary's rejection of the last English-German peace proposal, in the afternoon of July 30, and that this rejection was recommended not only by Berchtold and Conrad, but also by Moltke, in opposition to Bethmann; and, further, that Moltke considered the fighting of a European war necessary for the conservation of Austria-Hungary.

These disclosures of Conrad are either entirely covered with silence by the militaristic German press or given in a form that is not conclusive to the uninitiated reader. It is so much more important for the pacifists to spread abroad the politically valuable contents of this work, which is difficult to read. Without the author's intention, merely on account of the facts which it reports, unadulterated, it is one of the most important indictments of the system of militarism yet made.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES

By the RT. HON. LORD PHILLIMORE

NOTE.—This is the second half of Lord Phillimore's lecture delivered at the Academy of International Law, The Hague.

THE conditions that might be considered as leading to intervention are three: religion, nationality, humanity. It is historical enough that a common faith has caused the people of a State to act in sympathy with their oppressed or persecuted coreligionists. It dates back to the time of the Crusades. Afterwards we find, in the 16th century, numberless interferences because of religion; for example: the Spaniards aiding the Holy Catholic League of France; Elizabeth, Queen of England, giving aid to the Reformers of the Netherlands. Later—much later—in order to take only a striking example, we have, in the 19th century, France, England, and Russia intervening with one accord between the Sultan of Turkey and his subjects in revolt, the Greeks, and the sinking of the Turkish fleet at Navarino.

I do not insist on interventions as results of a former treaty, like the interventions of Russia in Turkey after the Treaty of Kainardji, 1774, up to the war of 1887, and the Treaty of Berlin in 1878,¹ nor on the stipulations between Sweden and Poland in the Peace of Oliva, 1660, for the mutual protection of "Dissenters" and Catholics, with all the treaties that followed,² because they are not examples of intervention taking its justification from the ordinary law.

Between States, like individuals, a contract has the force of law. A reciprocal treaty, as far as the contracting parties are concerned, gives rise to special laws and duties.

When a treaty has once been concluded, there is no longer need to fund oneself on ordinary international law. The claims are deduced from the rights which the contract gives. Still, if one philosophizes a little, how does it happen that there are treaties of this sort? The only

reason for them is that human sympathy has outrun logic.

As with religion, so with the sentiment of nationality. The two wars of Sardinia against Austria, the one in 1848, which did not succeed, and that in 1859, when King Victor Emmanuel received aid from France and had such great success, had for motives, at least on the part of Sardinia, sympathy for the other Italians, oppressed men of the same race.

The English got into war with the Boers of Transvaal (1899-1902) because they thought that British subjects who inhabited the Transvaal were deprived of the ordinary rights of citizens.

How many times has the hatred felt by the Irish who have emigrated to the United States for the British Empire given cause to difficulties and misunderstandings between the two countries? Did not the House of Representatives even vote several years ago a resolution in favor of the separation of the two countries? Was it not the fear that Serbia would form a rallying point for the Slav peoples, who said that they were oppressed by the Magyars and the Austrians, which whetted the demands of the Austro-Hungarian Empire till she drove Serbia to extremes and caused the beginning of the World War?

Now, in the peace treaties that have followed the World War, we see everywhere this concession to religious and nationalist sympathies. Let us take, for example, the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, of September 10, 1919, between the principal allied powers and Czechoslovakia:

"Czechoslovakia undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Czechoslovakia, without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race, or religion. All inhabitants of Czechoslovakia shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion, or belief, where practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals. (Article 2). All Czechoslovak Nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights, without distinction as to race, language, or religion.

¹ Phillimore's "Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace," pp. 54-57.

² Phillimore's "Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace," pp. 55, 56.

"Differences of religion, creed, or confession shall not prejudice any Czechoslovak National in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as, for instance, admission to public employments, functions, and honors or the exercise of professions and industries.

"No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any Czechoslovak National of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the press, or publications of any kind, or at public meetings. (Article 7).

"Czechoslovak Nationals who belong to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Czechoslovak Nationals. (Article 8).

"Czechoslovakia agrees that the stipulations of chapters I and II, so far as they affect persons belonging to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities, constitute obligations of international concern and shall be placed under the guaranty of the League of Nations.

"Czechoslovakia further agrees that any difference of opinion as to questions of law or of fact arising out of these articles, between the Czechoslovak Government and any one of the principal allied and associated powers, or any other power a member of the Council of the League of Nations, shall be held to be a dispute of an international character under Article 14 of the covenant of the League of Nations. The Czechoslovak Government hereby consents that any such dispute shall, if the other party hereto demands, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The decision of the Permanent Court shall be final and shall have the same force and effect as an award under Article 13 of the covenant."

Sir Edward Creasy, the publicist, not only justified interference; he made it a duty in the following exceptional cases:

"3. When one intervenes in favor of an oppressed people, which has never blended its nationality with that of its oppressors, who regard it as a foreign race subjected to the same sovereign authority, but treated differently in other respects."³

For the third motive of intervention, pure human sympathy, it is founded, I suppose, on the principle expressed by the

slave Davus in the comedy of "Terence": "*Homo sum humani nihil a me alienum puto.*"

That is what Fiore aims at when he uses the phrase: "Every act that ought to be considered unjust and illegitimate according to the common law."

Hall has almost the same idea.¹⁴

But, in my opinion, one should not admit intervention for such a cause. It would be boundless. Besides, this is theory, not practice. I do not remember any historical example. That which approaches it most is the war between the United States and Spain, which would not have been provoked by the mere sinking of an American warship in the port of Havana if public opinion in the States had not been already exasperated by what seemed the maltreatment bestowed upon their neighbors, the inhabitants of Cuba, by the government of the mother country.

An intervention of this kind is not supported either by "international custom" or by "the doctrine of the greatest publicists," and I ask you to reject it from jurisprudence.

What remain are interventions because of religious or nationalist sympathy, and it seems to me that, after what I have told you, it is necessary to admit, always with many precautions and within narrow limits, that these interventions in domestic or internal affairs are lawful.

Now, for the intervention of a third State in the disputes between two or more other States. This intervention is either claimed by one of the disputing parties or made spontaneously for the sake of general security.

You will find this subject largely discussed by the writers of the 19th century, but for my part I am not going to retain you long, because since the formation of the League of Nations this, for most of the world, is a matter of convention, being governed by the covenant.

"Article 11

"Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the

³ Calvo, "Le Droit international," section 119.

¹⁴ Pars. 91, 95.

peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise, the Secretary General shall on the request of any member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

It is also declared to be the friendly right of each member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or, the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends."

Also by

"Article 17

"In the event of a dispute between a member of the League and a State which is not a member of the League, or between States not members of the League, the State or States not members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16, inclusive, shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

"If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a member of the League, the provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

"If both parties to the dispute, when so invited, refuse to accept the obligations of

membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute."

It may be said that this article has no force for a State which has not consented to the covenant; but, looking at the other side, one might say that an ally could always come to aid its associate, and that in this matter all the States which are members of the League of Nations have made a real league of alliance.

Still for the League to use this article to interfere, "ésqualité" in a dispute, let us say between Germany and Russia, or between the United States and Ecuador or Mexico (as long as these nations remain outside of the League), would be a grave thing, for which the covenant, *res inter alios acta*, would not be an adequate justification, and which would not be founded in justice, except in the rather improbable case that the dispute threatened peace or security of some members of the League, in which case one would fall back on the ordinary law.

For the States bound by the covenant there is no difficulty; the question falls under the law of contract.

I have been forced, gentlemen, to consecrate the whole of this second lecture to the right of independence, with its corrective on the other side, the right of intervention in the cases above mentioned. For the rest of the chapter on rights I must wait until the next lecture.

Yesternight Death held his revels,
And his wine was scalding blood;
And his score of thirsty Devils
Set it streaming like a flood;
Deep they drank, until a whirling
Madness seized them in its gale;
And their raging songs came hurling
Molten notes of iron hail.

Heaven heard the drunken bestials,—
Angels saw their work of woe;
Lowly mourned the grand celestials
Mighty Death should sink so low.
Earth grows desolate and lonely,—
Mortals waste beneath the blight;
Hearts that once breathed blessings only,
Curse the revels of that night.

—George Birdseye.

PENNY WISDOM IN GERMANY

By D. CLAUSEWITZ

(NOTE.—In the following article a German writer describes, in a rather whimsical manner, some of the things that happened in Germany when the *rentenmark* was introduced in the place of the absurdly depreciated currency and prices began to be reckoned in plain marks and pfennigs instead of in billions and quadrillions of marks.)

“THREE cakes a mark!” “Three for 10 pfennigs!” “50 pfennigs a dozen!”

Soap, boot-laces, oranges. The Christmas angels had dressed up as street mongers and blew along the streets from all corners and about all places. Amazed like children, the figure-crushed inhabitants of great cities were crowding round the street-monger angels and bought, bought, bought. That all seemed really given away for nothing.

Soap—three cakes of real soap all at once! One scarcely dared. That had represented half a week's salary until now. When a cake was finished, one had always tried whether one couldn't do without for a whole week, until one made up one's mind again, after all. And then it was at best only common soap and one cake. And now three cakes, all at once, of toilet soap—fabulous!

Boot-laces! Ye gods! Even Mr. Morgan, I believe, has not got as much money as we had to pay for one pair of boot-laces. At the end we had gone the pace, really.

The Austrians—pooh! At 70,000 crowns they became stabilized, gave up the race. We did not stop at such trifles. We beat the crown, the Polish mark, and even the Soviet ruble; and the last-mentioned surely did accomplish everything possible in the way of falling. We beat the ruble hollow. For the amount we had to pay for one pair of boot-laces one could always get a rump steak still in Moscow, or a pair of boots in Warsaw, and in Vienna a motor car. And now three laces for 10 pfennigs! Is it possible? Marvelous!

And the oranges! Were they not a luxury? One did not even dream of them! A dozen of oranges! One would have deserved being placed under guardianship for such an idea. It was just like a pound of caviar for breakfast! Oranges were generally allotted to those from month-to-

month increasing kinds of things that did not count, that were beyond the range of possibility and were not even given a thought.

And now one thought and pondered a good while—a very long while—until, timidly and bashfully, one bought a half dozen, quickly hiding them away in the pocket of one's overcoat. There should, at least, nobody be the wiser for one's criminal prodigality.

So we were living in a fool's paradise, where all sorts of delicious and necessary things are growing on the trees, and whoever lusted took. They did scarcely cost anything.

But alas! how long!

For four years we have been hunted about on cipher-ladders, until we had become either perfect jonglers or insane, and at the end we discovered that the naughts were in the wrong places—*i. e.*, that they should be placed behind the comma and not before.

This is the reason why we went over to the dollar. One calculated in dollars, one had got dollars, one shuffled in dollars until, until—yes, then we discovered again that the dollar, too, was depreciating. What one could get for half a dollar in the summer did suddenly cost two or three of these pleasingly clean greenbacks.

Now the naughts have fallen off the prices like withered leaves, and the dollar remains where it is and we scarcely want it any more, and the figures seem so delightfully small. One may again . . .

And there one must, of course, discover something else again, namely, one has not got. One has not got the precious *rentenmark* wherewith one may buy anything. One calculates and turns one's pockets inside out and wonders. One always wonders. But one has got it. That is the only certainty. One has only got the pfennigs, which have now also come back again. For a while they were still represented by notes with milliards printed on; but we had lost all respect for them. They were dirty and torn, like tattered soldiers of a vanquished army—held up to public contempt. They will soon have disappeared. Their place is being taken by the good old honest pfennig—partly by the worthy copper pfennig of the peace time, partly by its new brethren, which are still quite shiny.

We, however, are daily making new discoveries. For instance a dozen or oranges 50 pfennigs. All right! But every day makes 15 marks a month. Tramway, 15 pfennigs. All right! But twice a day is 9 marks a month. That is 24 marks already, and that you can't afford, my dear fellow, because your boss, who so kindly paid you in advance, as much as you wanted—millions, milliards, billions, and more and more—is now dead off. He pays you 15 marks a week, wherewith you have to make shift, and you may be glad if you are not retrenched on the 1st proximo.

The privy-councillor, it is true, is now, at last, receiving again a better pay than the street-sweeper; but what he receives is not overwhelming, all the same. It is certainly not enough for oranges; and so he trots again past the orange cart, together with the street-sweeper, and neither

pays any heed to the southern delicacies. These delicacies are again amongst those kinds of things that do not count, that are beyond, etc., etc. And the street mongers don't look any more like angels, but again like ordinary street mongers.

But cheer up, O German soul! This state of things has also its advantages. In the cigarettes you can afford to buy, there is no nicotine any more, since a good long time already. The coffee you may drink will not cause you any palpitations of the heart. The 10-pfennig beer, my dear fellow, contains no traces of alcohol, which is so obnoxious to the system; nor will you be afflicted with shortness of breath, owing to obesity, even if you should sometimes gasp for breath.

You learn to appreciate the pfennig. You respect it and grow worthy of the "Taler," even if you do not get one. One must not be so materialistic.

SKY BATTLES

The hosts of rain rush into war tonight;
 Its cavalry charges, mounted on the wind,
 Its far artillery rolls and roars, behind,
 Before, on every side—from depth to height,
 The sky is all confusion, conflict, flight,
 And close pursuit, like madness in the mind.
 The arrows of the lightning, golden-twined,
 Now here, now there, shoot in sky-branching flight.

But would all battles were as is the rain's,
 Which wakes to life, nor strews the field with dead—
 Covering blue-topped hills, fresh groves, wide plains
 With springing hosts of flowers and grass instead,
 While every drop that greets the morning's eyes
 Shines like a jewel lost from paradise.

—Harry Kemp.

From Smart Set, October, 1914.

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

HISTORY OF THE LEAGUE DIS- ARMAMENT WORK

Statement Prepared for the Fifth Assembly of
the League by the First and Third
Committees

The problem of the reduction of armaments is presented in Article 8 of the Covenant in terms which reveal at the outset the complexity of the question and which explain the tentative manner in which the subject has been treated by the League of Nations in the last few years.

"The members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations."

Here we see clearly expressed the need of reducing the burden which armaments imposed upon the nations immediately after the war and of putting a stop to the competition in armaments, which was in itself a threat to the peace of the world. But, at the same time, there is recognized the duty of safeguarding the national security of the members of the League and of safeguarding it, not only by the maintenance of a necessary minimum of troops, but also by the co-operation of all the nations, by a vast organization for peace.

Such is the meaning of the Covenant, which, while providing for reduction of armaments properly so called, recognizes at the same time the need of common action by all the members of the League, with a view to compelling a possible disturber of the peace to respect his international obligations.

Thus, in this first paragraph of Article 8, which is so short but so pregnant, mention is made of all the problems which have engaged the attention of our predecessors and ourselves and which the present Assembly has specially instructed us to solve, the problems of collective security and the reduction of armaments.

Taking up Article 8 of the Covenant, the First Assembly had already outlined a pro-

gram. At its head it placed a pronouncement of the Supreme Council:

"In order to diminish the economic difficulties of Europe, armies should everywhere be reduced to a peace footing. Armaments should be limited to the lowest possible figure compatible with national security."

The Assembly also called attention to a resolution of the International Financial Conference of Brussels, held a short time before:

"Recommending to the Council of the League of Nations the desirability of conferring at once with the several governments concerned with a view to securing a general reduction of the crushing burdens which, on their existing scale, armaments still impose on the impoverished peoples of the world, sapping their resources and imperilling their recovery from the ravages of war."

It also requested its two advisory commissions to set to work at once to collect the necessary information regarding the problem referred to in Article 8 of the Covenant.

From the beginning, the work of the Temporary Mixed Commission and of the Permanent Advisory Commission revealed the infinite complexity of the question.

The Second Assembly limited its resolutions to the important, but none the less (if one may say so) secondary, questions of traffic in arms and their manufacture by private enterprise. It only touched upon the questions of military expenditure and budgets in the form of recommendations and, as regards the main question of reduction of armaments, it confined itself to asking the Temporary Mixed Commission to formulate a definite scheme.

It was between the second and third assemblies that the latter commission, which was beginning to get to grips with the various problems, revealed their constituent elements. In its report it placed on record that—

"The memory of the World War was still maintaining in many countries a feeling of insecurity, which was represented in the candid statements in which, at the request

of the Assembly, several of them had put forward the requirements of their national security, and the geographical and political considerations which contributed to shape their policy in the matter of armaments."

At the same time, however, the commission stated:

"Consideration of these statements as a whole has clearly revealed not only the sincere desire of the governments to reduce national armaments and the corresponding expenditure to a minimum, but also the importance of the results achieved. These facts," according to the commission, "are indisputable, and are confirmed, moreover, by the replies received from governments to the recommendation of the Assembly regarding the limitation of military expenditure."

That is the point we had reached two years ago; there was a unanimous desire to reduce armaments. Reductions, though as yet inadequate, had been begun, and there was a still stronger desire to insure the security of the world by a stable and permanent organization for peace.

That was the position which, after long discussions, gave rise at the Third Assembly to the famous Resolution XIV and at the Fourth Assembly to the draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance, for which we are now substituting the protocol submitted to the Fifth Assembly.

What progress has been made during these four years?

Although the Treaty of Mutual Assistance was approved in principle by eighteen governments, it gave rise to certain misgivings. We need only recall the most important of these, hoping that a comparison between them and an analysis of the new scheme will demonstrate that the first and third committees have endeavored, with a large measure of success, to dispose of the objections raised, and that the present scheme consequently represents an immense advance on anything that has hitherto been done.

In the first place, a number of governments or delegates to the Assembly argued that the guarantees provided by the draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance did not imply with sufficient definiteness the reduction of armaments which is the ultimate object of our work.

The idea of the treaty was to give effect to Article 8 of the Covenant, but many persons considered that it did not, in fact, secure the automatic execution of that article. Even

if a reduction of armaments was achieved by its means, the amount of the reduction was left, so the opponents of the treaty urged, to the estimation of each government, and there was nothing to show that it would be considerable.

With equal force many States complained that no provision had been made for the development of the juridical and moral elements of the Covenant by the side of material guarantees. The novel character of the charter given to the nations in 1919 lay essentially in the advent of a moral solidarity which foreshadowed the coming of a new era. That principle ought to have, as its natural consequence, the extension of arbitration and international jurisdiction, without which no human society can be solidly grounded. A considerable portion of the Assembly asked that efforts should also be made in this direction. The draft treaty seemed from this point of view to be insufficient and ill-balanced.

Finally, the articles relating to partial treaties gave rise, as you are aware, to certain objections. Several governments considered that they would lead to the establishment of groups of powers animated by hostility toward other powers or groups of powers, and that they would cause political tension. The absence of the barriers of compulsory arbitration and judicial intervention was evident here as everywhere else.

Thus, by a logical and gradual process, there was elaborated the system at which we have now arrived.

The reduction of armaments required by the Covenant and demanded by the general situation of the world today led us to consider the question of security as a necessary complement to disarmament.

The support demanded from different States by other States less favorably situated had placed the former under the obligations of asking for a sort of moral and legal guarantee that the States which have to be supported would act in perfect good faith and would always endeavor to settle their disputes by pacific means.

It became evident, however, with greater clearness and force than ever before, that if the security and effective assistance demanded in the event of aggression was the condition *sine qua non* of the reduction of armaments, it was at the same time the necessary complement of the pacific settlement of international disputes, since the non-

execution of a sentence obtained by pacific methods of settlement would necessarily drive the world back to the system of armed force. Sentences imperatively require sanctions or the whole system would fall to the ground.

Arbitration was therefore considered by the Fifth Assembly to be the necessary third factor, the complement of the two others with which it must be combined in order to build up the new system set forth in the protocol.

Thus, after five years' hard work, we have decided to propose to the members of the League the present system of arbitration,

security, and reduction of armaments—a system which we regard as being complete and sound.

That is the position with which the Fifth Assembly has to deal today. The desire to arrive at a successful issue is unanimous. A great number of the decisions adopted in the past years had met with general approval. There was a thoroughly clear appreciation of the undoubted gaps which had to be filled and of the reasonable apprehensions which had to be dissipated. Conditions were therefore favorable for arriving at an agreement.

An agreement has been arrived at on the basis of the draft protocol which is now submitted to you for consideration.

PROTOCOL FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

Text Approved by the First and Third Committees and Revised by the Drafting Committee

Submitted to the Assembly on October 1, 1924,
by the First and Third Committees and
Adopted Unanimously the Next Day

Animated by the firm desire to insure the maintenance of general peace and the security of nations whose existence, independence or territories may be threatened; recognizing the solidarity of the members of the international community; asserting that a war of aggression constitutes a violation of this solidarity and an international crime; desirous of facilitating the complete application of the system provided in the Covenant of the League of Nations for the pacific settlement of disputes between States and of insuring the repression of international crimes; and for the purpose of realizing, as contemplated by Article 8 of the Covenant, the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations, the undersigned, duly authorized to that effect, agree as follows:

Article 1

The signatory States undertake to make every effort in their power to secure the introduction into the Covenant of amendments on the lines of the provisions contained in the following articles.

They agree that, as between themselves, these provisions shall be binding as from the

coming into force of the present protocol and that, so far as they are concerned, the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations shall thenceforth have power to exercise all the rights and perform all the duties conferred upon them by the protocol.

Article 2

The signatory States agree in no case to resort to war either with one another or against a State which, if the occasion arises, accepts all the obligations hereinafter set out, except in case of resistance to acts of aggression or when acting in agreement with the Council or the Assembly of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant and of the present protocol.

Article 3

The signatory States undertake to recognize as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the cases covered by paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the statute of the court, but without prejudice to the right of any States, when acceding to the special protocol provided for in the said article and opened for signature on December 16, 1920, to make reservations compatible with the said clause.

Accession to this special protocol, opened for signature on December 16, 1920, must be

given within the month following the coming into force of the present protocol.

States which accede to the present protocol, after its coming into force, must carry out the above obligation within the month following their accession.

Article 4

With a view to render more complete the provisions of paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Article 15 of the Covenant, the signatory States agree to comply with the following procedure:

1. If the dispute submitted to the Council is not settled by it as provided in paragraph 3 of the said Article 15, the Council shall endeavor to persuade the parties to submit the dispute to judicial settlement or arbitration.

2. (a) If the parties cannot agree to do so, there shall, at the request of at least one of the parties, be constituted a committee of arbitrators. The committee shall, so far as possible, be constituted by agreement between the parties.

(b) If within the period fixed by the Council the parties have failed to agree, in whole or in part, upon the number, the names, and the powers of the arbitrators and upon the procedure, the Council shall settle the points remaining in suspense. It shall with the utmost possible dispatch select in consultation with the parties the arbitrators and their president from among persons who by their nationality, their personal character, and their experience appear to it to furnish the highest guarantees of competence and impartiality.

(c) After the claims of the parties have been formulated, the committee of arbitrators, on the request of any party, shall through the medium of the Council request an advisory opinion upon any points of law in dispute from the Permanent Court of International Justice, which in such case shall meet with the utmost possible dispatch.

3. If none of the parties asks for arbitration, the council shall again take the dispute under consideration. If the Council reaches a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the representatives of any of the parties to the dispute, the signatory States agree to comply with the recommendations therein.

4. If the Council fails to reach a report which is concurred in by all its members,

other than the representatives of any of the parties to the dispute, it shall submit the dispute to arbitration. It shall itself determine the composition, the powers, and the procedure of the committee of arbitrators and, in the choice of the arbitrators, shall bear in mind the guarantees of competence and impartiality referred to in paragraph 2 (b) above.

5. In no case may a solution, upon which there has already been a unanimous recommendation of the Council accepted by one of the parties concerned, be again called in question.

6. The signatory States undertake that they will carry out in full good faith any judicial sentence or arbitral award that may be rendered, and that they will comply, as provided in paragraph 3 above, with the solutions recommended by the Council. In the event of a State failing to carry out the above undertakings, the Council shall exert all its influence to secure compliance therewith. If it fails therein, it shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto, in accordance with the provision contained at the end of Article 13 of the Covenant. Should a State in disregard of the above undertakings resort to war, the sanctions provided for by Article 16 of the Covenant interpreted in the manner indicated in the present protocol, shall immediately become applicable to it.

* 7. The provisions of the present article do not apply to the settlement of disputes which arise as the result of measures of war taken by one or more signatory States in agreement with the Council or the Assembly.

Article 5

The provisions of paragraph 8 of Article 15 of the Covenant shall continue to apply in proceedings before the Council.

If in the course of an arbitration, such as is contemplated by Article 4 above, one of the parties claims that the dispute, or part thereof, arises out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the arbitrators shall on this point take the advice of the Permanent Court of International Justice through the medium of the Council. The opinion of the Court shall be binding upon the arbitrators, who, if the opinion is affirmative, shall confine themselves to so declaring in their award.

If the question is held by the Court or by the Council to be a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the State, this decision shall not prevent consideration of the situation by the Council or by the Assembly under Article II of the Covenant.

Article 6

If, in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 15 of the Covenant, a dispute is referred to the Assembly, that body shall have for the settlement of the dispute all the powers conferred upon the Council as to endeavoring to reconcile the parties in the manner laid down in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of Article 15 of the Covenant and in paragraph 1 of Article 4 above.

Should the Assembly fail to achieve an amicable settlement:

If one of the parties asks for arbitration, the Council shall proceed to constitute the committee of arbitrators in the manner provided in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 2 of Article 4 above.

If no party asks for arbitration, the Assembly shall again take the dispute under consideration and shall have in this connection the same powers as the Council. Recommendations embodied in a report of the Assembly, provided that it secures the measure of support stipulated at the end of paragraph 10 of Article 15 of the Covenant, shall have the same value and effect, as regards all matters dealt with in the present protocol, as recommendations embodied in a report of the Council adopted as provided in paragraph 3 of Article 4 above.

If the necessary majority cannot be obtained, the dispute shall be submitted to arbitration and the Council shall determine the composition, the powers, and the procedure of the Committee of Arbitrators as laid down in paragraph 4 of Article 4.

Article 7

In the event of a dispute arising between two or more signatory States, these States agree that they will not, either before the dispute is submitted to proceedings for pacific settlement or during such proceedings, make any increase of their armaments or effectives which might modify the position established by the Conference for the Reduction of Armaments provided for by Article 17 of the present protocol, nor will they take any measure of military, naval, air, industrial or

economic mobilization, nor in general any action of a nature likely to extend the dispute or render it more acute.

It shall be the duty of the Council, in accordance with the provisions of Article 11 of the Covenant, to take under consideration any complaint as to infraction of the above undertakings which is made to it by one or more of the States parties to the dispute. Should the Council be of opinion that the complaint requires investigation, it shall, if it deems it expedient, arrange for inquiries and investigations in one or more of the countries concerned. Such inquiries and investigations shall be carried out with the utmost possible dispatch and the signatory States undertake to afford every facility for carrying them out.

The sole object of measures taken by the Council as above provided is to facilitate the pacific settlement of disputes and they shall in no way prejudice the actual settlement.

If the result of such inquiries and investigations is to establish an infraction of the provisions of the first paragraph of the present Article, it shall be the duty of the Council to summon the State or States guilty of the infraction to put an end thereto. Should the State or States in question fail to comply with such summons, the Council shall declare them to be guilty of a violation of the Covenant or of the present protocol, and shall decide upon the measures to be taken with a view to end as soon as possible a situation of a nature to threaten the peace of the world.

For the purposes of the present article, decisions of the Council may be taken by a two-thirds majority.

Article 8

The signatory States undertake to abstain from any act which might constitute a threat of aggression against another State.

If one of the signatory States is of opinion that another State is making preparations for war, it shall have the right to bring the matter to the notice of the Council.

The Council, if it ascertains that the facts are as alleged, shall proceed as provided in paragraphs 2, 4, and 5 of Article 7.

Article 9

The existence of demilitarized zones being calculated to prevent aggression and to facilitate a definite finding of the nature provided

for in Article 10 below, the establishment of such zones between States mutually consenting thereto is recommended as a means of avoiding violations of the present protocol.

The demilitarized zones already existing under the terms of certain treaties or conventions, or which may be established in future between States mutually consenting thereto, may, at the request and at the expense of one or more of the conterminous States, be placed under a temporary or permanent system of supervision to be organized by the Council.

Article 10

Every State which resorts to war in violation of the undertakings contained in the Covenant or in the present protocol is an aggressor. Violation of the rules laid down for a demilitarized zone shall be held equivalent to resort to war.

In the event of hostilities having broken out, any State shall be presumed to be an aggressor unless a decision of the Council, which must be taken unanimously, shall otherwise declare:

1. If it has refused to submit the dispute to the procedure of pacific settlement provided by Articles 13 and 15 of the Covenant as amplified by the present protocol, or to comply with a judicial sentence or arbitral award or with a unanimous recommendation of the Council, or has disregarded a unanimous report of the Council, a judicial sentence or an arbitral award recognizing that the dispute between it and the other belligerent State arises out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the latter State; nevertheless, in the last case the State shall only be presumed to be an aggressor if it has not previously submitted the question to the Council or the Assembly, in accordance with Article 11 of the Covenant.

2. If it has violated provisional measures enjoined by the Council for the period while the proceedings are in progress as contemplated by Article 7 of the present protocol.

Apart from the cases dealt with in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the present Article, if the council does not at once succeed in determining the aggressor, it shall be bound to enjoin upon the belligerents an armistice, and shall fix the terms, acting, if need be, by a two-thirds majority and shall supervise its execution.

Any belligerent which has refused to accept the armistice or has violated its terms shall be deemed an aggressor.

The Council shall call upon the signatory States to apply forthwith against the aggressor the sanctions provided by Article 11 of the present protocol, and any signatory State thus called upon shall thereupon be entitled to exercise the rights of a belligerent.

Article 11

As soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply sanctions, as provided in the last paragraph of Article 10 of the present protocol, the obligations of the said States, in regard to the sanctions of all kinds mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 16 of the Covenant, will immediately become operative in order that such sanctions may forthwith be employed against the aggressor.

Those obligations shall be interpreted as obliging each of the signatory States to cooperate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in resistance to any act of aggression, in the degree which its geographical position and its particular situation as regards armaments allow.

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 16 of the Covenant, the signatory States give a joint and several undertaking to come to the assistance of the State attacked or threatened, and to give each other mutual support by means of facilities and reciprocal exchanges as regards the provision of raw materials and supplies of every kind, openings of credits, transport, and transit, and for this purpose to take all measures in their power to preserve the safety of communications by land and by sea of the attacked or threatened State.

If both parties to the dispute are aggressors within the meaning of Article 10, the economic and financial sanctions shall be applied to both of them.

Article 12

In view of the complexity of the conditions in which the Council may be called upon to exercise the functions mentioned in Article 11 of the present protocol concerning economic and financial sanctions, and in order to determine more exactly the guarantees afforded by the present protocol to the signatory States, the Council shall forth-

with invite the economic and financial organizations of the League of Nations to consider and report as to the nature of the steps to be taken to give effect to the financial and economic sanctions and measures of co-operation contemplated in Article 16 of the Covenant and in Article 11 of this protocol.

When in possession of this information, the Council shall draw up through its competent organs: 1, plans of action for the application of the economic and financial sanctions against an aggressor State; 2, plans of economic and financial co-operation between a State attacked and the different States assisting it; and shall communicate these plans to the members of the League and to the other signatory States.

Article 13

In view of the contingent military, naval, and air sanctions provided for by Article 16 of the Covenant and by Article 11 of the present protocol, the Council shall be entitled to receive undertakings from States determining in advance the military, naval, and air forces which they would be able to bring into action immediately to insure the fulfilment of the obligations in regard to sanctions which result from the Covenant and the present protocol.

Furthermore, as soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply sanctions, as provided in the last paragraph of Article 10 above, the said States may, in accordance with any agreements which they may previously have concluded, bring to the assistance of a particular State which is the victim of aggression their military, naval, and air forces.

The agreements mentioned in the preceding paragraph shall be registered and published by the Secretariat of the League of Nations. They shall remain open to all States members of the League which may desire to accede thereto.

Article 14

The Council shall alone be competent to declare that the application of sanctions shall cease and normal conditions be re-established.

Article 15

In conformity with the spirit of the present protocol, the signatory States agree that the

whole cost of any military, naval, or air operations undertaken for the repression of an aggression under the terms of the protocol, and reparation for all losses suffered by individuals, whether civilians or combatants, and for all material damage caused by the operations of both sides, shall be borne by the aggressor State up to the extreme limit of its capacity.

Nevertheless, in view of Article 10 of the Covenant, neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the aggressor State shall in any case be affected as the result of the application of the sanctions mentioned in the present protocol.

Article 16

The signatory States agree that in the event of a dispute between one or more of them and one or more States which have not signed the present protocol and are not members of the League of Nations, such non-member States shall be invited, on the conditions contemplated in Article 17 of the Covenant, to submit, for the purpose of a pacific settlement, to the obligations accepted by the State signatories of the present protocol.

If the State so invited, having refused to accept the said conditions and obligations, resorts to war against a signatory State, the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant, as defined by the present protocol, shall be applicable against it.

Article 17

The signatory States undertake to participate in an International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments which shall be convened by the Council and shall meet at Geneva on Monday, June 15, 1925. All other States, whether members of the League or not, shall be invited to this conference.

In preparation for the convening of the conference, the Council shall draw up, with due regard to the undertakings contained in Articles 11 and 13 of the present protocol, a general program for the reduction and limitation of armaments, which shall be laid before the conference and which shall be communicated to the governments at the earliest possible date, and at the latest three months before the conference meets.

If by May 1, 1925, ratifications have not been deposited by at least a majority of the permanent members of the Council and ten other members of the League, the Secretary-

General of the League shall immediately consult the Council as to whether he shall cancel the invitations or merely adjourn the conference until a sufficient number of ratifications have been deposited.

Article 18

Wherever mention is made in Article 10, or in any other provision of the present protocol, of a decision of the Council, this shall be understood in the sense of Article 15 of the Covenant, namely, that the votes of the representatives of the parties to the dispute shall not be counted when reckoning unanimity or the necessary majority.

Article 19

Except as expressly provided by its terms, the present protocol shall not affect in any way the rights and obligations of members of the League as determined by the Covenant.

Article 20

Any dispute as to the interpretation of the present protocol shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Article 21

The present protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be ratified.

The deposit of ratifications shall be made at the Secretariat of the League of Nations as soon as possible.

States of which the seat of government is outside Europe will be entitled merely to inform the Secretariat of the League of Nations that their ratification has been given; in that case they must transmit the instrument of ratification as soon as possible.

So soon as the majority of the permanent members of the Council and ten other members of the League have deposited or have effected their ratifications, a *procès-verbal* to that effect shall be drawn up by the Secretariat.

After the said *procès-verbal* has been drawn up, the protocol shall come into force as soon as the plan for the reduction of armaments has been adopted by the conference provided for in Article 17.

If within such period after the adoption of the plan for the reduction of armaments as shall be fixed by the said conference the plan has not been carried out, the Council

shall make a declaration to that effect; this declaration shall render the present protocol null and void.

The grounds on which the Council may declare that the plan drawn up by the International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments has not been carried out, and that in consequence the present protocol has been rendered null and void, shall be laid down by the conference itself.

A signatory State which, after the expiration of the period fixed by the conference, fails to comply with the plan adopted by the conference, shall not be admitted to benefit by the provisions of the present protocol.

In faith whereof the undersigned, duly authorized for this purpose, have signed the present protocol.

Done at Geneva, on the — day of October, nineteen hundred and twenty-four, in a single copy, which will be kept in the archives of the Secretariat of the League and registered by it on the date of its coming into force.

NOTE ON THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT

(NOTE.—On September 10, 1924, the Department of State communicated to the British Embassy the following note regarding the instructions to be given to the Joint Board of Engineers for the investigation of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway project.)

EXCELLENCY :

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of August 18, 1924, in which you communicate the views of the Canadian Government concerning the recommendations for instructions to be given by the United States and Canada to the enlarged Joint Board of Engineers appointed for the investigation of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway.

It is observed that the Canadian Government is prepared to accept the recommendations formulated by the technical officers designated for that purpose by the two governments, and to adopt them as instructions to be given to the Canadian members of the enlarged Joint Board of Engineers, but that it is unable to accept the proposed amendment of section 6b of the recommendations which was communicated in my note of July 2, 1924, to the British chargé d'affaires ad interim, by virtue of which the Joint Board of Engineers would be instructed to give

consideration to the question of the extent to which the unequal diversions from Lake Erie and the Niagara River for power compensate for loss of power attributable to diversions from Lake Michigan.

The Government of the United States is quite willing to have the Joint Board of Engineers develop the facts with respect to any phase of the St. Lawrence problem with a view to arriving at an equitable adjustment of the rights and interests of the two countries therein, but it is not convinced that it would be wise to consider the power value of diversions from Lake Michigan without, at the same time, considering the power value of other diversions.

In view of the fact that the recommendations formulated by the technical officers have, with the exception of section 6, met with the approval of the United States and Canada, this government is prepared to instruct the American representatives on the Joint Board of Engineers to proceed with the consideration and investigation of the matters covered by the recommendations of the technical officers, with the exception of the questions in section 6, if the Canadian Government should be willing to issue similar instructions to its representatives.

This government is further prepared, if such a course should meet with the approval of the Canadian Government, to instruct its technical officers again to confer with the technical officers representing Canada for the further consideration of the questions embraced in section 6 of the recommendations with a view to their modification in a form acceptable to both governments.

I should be pleased to receive at the early convenience of the Canadian Government a further expression of its views on the subject.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) CHARLES A. HUGHES.

A RED CROSS TRUCE WAS PROCLAIMED ON April 19 by the children of Prague, Czechoslovakia. The celebration coincided with a Congress of Youth Movements there. The representative of the International Red Cross Committee was M. Lescaze. He is a member of the Committee of the International Secretariat of Youth Movements for the Relief of children in distress and a scout master at Geneva.

News in Brief

THE ALSACE-LORRAINE RAILWAY SYSTEM was in 1923 finally consolidated with the French systems, and it is now controlled by the Ministry of Public Works at Paris. This system has a total length of 1,386 miles and supplies a territory of about 5,600 square miles.

AN IMPORTANT CONFERENCE of maritime health officers was held in Panama in February. One of its achievements was the organization of a permanent council of international observers of public health and sanitation methods, to be located in Panama and presided over by a representative of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. Each observer is to serve for one year, when he is to be replaced by another public health officer from his country.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE on the Science of Politics will hold its second annual meeting at Chicago, September 8-12, 1924. The announcement states that the absence of an adequate technique and method constitutes the chief obstacle to scientific progress in the field of politics. Therefore the purpose of this conference is to concentrate attention upon those problems by which "political science may emerge into a science of politics. To this end the descriptive, historical, and comparative methods are of themselves inadequate, save as they ascertain and organize material facts of evidential value." The chief concern of the political scientist must be the determination of what facts may be material to a specific project of research, and the collection and interpretation of such facts.

ONE OF THE MOST MOMENTOUS PROBLEMS in Russia today, according to Dr Nansen, is the number of homeless, untaught children living criminal lives in that country. Hundreds of them flock to the towns, whence they beg and thieve their way to Moscow. It is estimated that over 15,000 such child beggars and criminals live in the deserted houses and cellars of that city. Peddlers of cigarettes,

pickpockets, prostitutes, and dealers in vodka and cocaine are to be found in these gangs of children, led by boys often not over fifteen years of age. "This shows," says a paper of Moscow, "the decadence in our home life, in our education, the growing unemployment, and the general demoralization of our people."

TO HELP RUSSIAN PEASANTS in the famine districts, Dr. Nansen's relief organization is establishing two model reconstruction stations—one in Russia and one in the Ukraine. The peasants are nearly destitute of live stock and agricultural implements. These stations will be furnished with tractors and necessary equipment of other sorts to farm a considerable extent of country. The stations will be run on a strictly commercial basis, under the direction of a foreign agricultural expert. They will work for and with the peasants, receiving pay in corn after the next harvest. Profits are all to be expended in further relief in famine districts.

ANATOLE FRANCE has addressed the following letter to an association of American women who visited France in order to bring over a sum of money collected in America for the reconstruction of the devastated areas: "I have been told that you will not refuse the greetings of an old man who, after sharing in all the errors of his time, has at last come to recognize that a true government exists through the people and for the people. You come from a rich and industrious land to a land which is oppressed by a fatal glory and which is suffering from its misfortunes more deeply than its pride will allow it to admit. You come to help in the reconstruction of our devastated area. I bid you welcome! But even when the ruins wrought by war have been removed, all will not have been done. You are women, and women are braver than men. Save mankind! You women must attack the monster which is threatening it. You must make war on war, and the war that you make must be a war to the death. Hate war with an inappeasable hatred! Hate it and recognize its criminality. Hate it, even though it appears in all the glory of victory; hate it although it is crowned with laurel. Let your hatred destroy it! Kill it! Do not say that this is impossible, that there have been wars as long as there have been men, and that the nations will always be

hostile to each other. They will be hostile so long as they continue to exist. But nations do not live forever. O, women mothers! Our grandchildren will see the United States of Europe, the world republic! Noble women, go through the world and find your inspiration in these words. Then you will save Europe and will bring happiness to the world."

IT IS THOUGHT THAT THE ADOPTION of the metric system of weights and measures is now more likely to be accomplished in this country. The metric system is now standard in most of the civilized world, except Great Britain and the United States, and the standards in these two countries are unlike each other. The matter is now before Congress in the Britten-Ladd Metric Standards Bill, which proposes the establishment of metric units of measurement in the United States after 1933. The adoption of this system is urged by the National Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council, and many other organizations, including the World Conference on Education, which met last June in San Francisco. As long ago as the year 1866, Charles Sumner urged, in the United States Senate, the adoption of the metric system, saying: "It will help undo that primeval confusion of which the Tower of Babel was the representative."

A 60,000-TON FLOATING DRY DOCK, built at the Walker-on-Tyne yard of Sir W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., Limited, for the Southern Railway Co. of England, was safely berthed at Southampton on April 21. It is the largest floating dry dock in existence and capable of docking the biggest ship afloat. Its principal dimensions are: Lifting power, 60,000 tons; over-all length, 960 feet; over-all height of the side walls, 70 feet 6 inches; clear width of entrance, 134 feet; draft of water over keel blocks, 38 feet; depth of water required at site, 65 feet. The weight of steel used in constructing the hull is approximately 16,200 tons; adding to this the weight of machinery, fittings, and timber, the net weight of the completely equipped dock is about 18,000 tons. The area of the pontoon is 142,000 square feet, or about $3\frac{1}{4}$ acres.

ARGENTINA IS THE LARGEST FOREIGN MARKET for American windmills. Uruguay and Chile

are fairly large users of such articles, but cannot in any way be compared with Argentina in that respect.

THE GERMAN FOREIGN TRADE BALANCE in the month of April was the most unfavorable thus far in 1924. The value of the exports for that month amounted to but 60 per cent of the value of the imports.

THE FLUCTUATION AND DEPRECIATION of the French franc is hampering business activity in France to some extent. Unemployment has slightly increased. Foreign trade, however, is brisk, with exports exceeding imports.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY, which is a large buyer of graphites, is more and more turning for its supply to the French colonies. It seems timely, therefore, to call attention to the fact that Tongking (French Indochina), which is extremely rich in all kinds of ore, possesses also excellent graphite deposits. One mine, in course of exploitation, near Lackay (on the border between Tongking and the Chinese province of Yunnan), is planning the construction of two plants, one at Lackay, for standardizing the graphites at 85 per cent carbon, and the other at Haiphong (the principal seaport of Tongking), for refining. In the meanwhile, and quoting for ore, copper, lead, zinc, antimony, and phosphates of lime, the transport of raw graphite would be from 7 piastres (silver dollar equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ American dollar) to 11 piastres per ton. After the construction of the Lackay plant and after the graphites of Tongking have found a market, the movement of graphite between Lackay and Haiphong is estimated to be from 2,000 to 3,000 tons yearly. But the Lackay graphite mines are not the only ones, nor the richest, which Tongking possesses. Much richer strata and purer graphites have also been discovered in the hills north of Yenbay, on the right bank of the Red River (which flows down from Yunnan, passes Hanoi, and reaches the Gulf of Tongking at Haiphong).

AUSTRALIA, THAT ISLAND IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC which the average citizen is in the habit of associating with kangaroos, boomerangs, and wild men, is at present one of our best foreign customers. It stands eighth on the list of all countries to which we export, and it is more important from the American exporters' point of view than such countries as China, Mexico, Brazil, Argen-

tina, the Philippines, Spain, or the Netherlands. During the nine months ended March 31, 1924, we exported to Australia goods valued at \$95,987,000, as compared with \$68,892,000 for the corresponding period of 1922-23. While this appears to be an extraordinary jump, it may be regarded as normal and an indication of what may be expected in our future trade relations with that area. The Australian market is particularly important to our industrial community, since it takes largely manufactured products of the variety in common use throughout the United States. This fact makes it unnecessary for the manufacturer to make a special type article for the Australian trade or to give the market requirements any particular study before entering it. Practically everything in the manufactured line that is sold in our domestic market is or can be sold in Australia. During 1923 we sold by far more automobiles to Australia than to any other foreign country, and in addition large quantities of all kinds of machinery, fats and oils, textiles, rubber goods, tires, etc., as well.

TWO DRAFT CONVENTIONS ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN and young persons were adopted at the First International Labor Conference held in Washington in 1919. The first of these conventions proposed the establishment of a minimum age for employment of 14 years, while the second dealt with the prohibition of night work for young persons. A review of action taken throughout the world on these conventions is significant at the present time.

The minimum age convention has been ratified by 8 countries: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Esthonia, Great Britain, Greece, Rumania, and Switzerland.

Ratification has been authorized by the competent authorities in Finland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands and Poland.

Ratification has been recommended in Argentine, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Franec, Germany, Lithuania and Spain.

Legislative acts in accordance with the convention are already enforced in Belgium, Canada, Bulgaria, Denmark, Great Britain, India, Japan, Poland, Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom and Switzerland.

The Night Work Convention has been ratified by ten countries: Bulgaria, Denmark, Esthonia, Great Britain, Greece, India, Italy, Netherlands, Rumania and Switzerland.

Ratification has been authorized in Austria, Finland and Poland.

Ratification has been recommended in Argentine, Belgium, Brazil, Chili, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Lithuania and Spain.

Eight countries have already in force legislation on the subject: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Serb-Croat-Slovak Kingdom and Switzerland.

THE TOTAL FUNDS SUBSCRIBED by the "Comité français de secours aux enfants" for German relief, up to April, amounted to 17,660 francs. On March 25 a contribution of 3,000 francs was turned in for the French canteen No. 9 at Odessa, in the Ukraine.

THREE CONFERENCES OF PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICIALS have been held in 1924. From February to April representatives of eighteen nationalities made in Great Britain theoretical and practical studies of public health, with special emphasis on the medical institutions of that country. From April 24 to May 30, officials from twenty nationalities did the same sort of work in the Netherlands, and later in the summer in Denmark. These conferences followed one which took place in New York on the initiative of Surgeon-General Cumming, of the United States, in September, 1923.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PAVIA will celebrate its eleventh centennial next May. It was in May of the year 825 that Lothaire, King of Italy, organized the Schola Papiensis and made Pavia the seat of higher learning in Lombardy. The university and the city intend to erect a monument to the many celebrated men who have been trained there during the centuries. Among the most eminent was Lanfranco, of Pavia, who later became Benedictine à Bec, and who, at his death, in 1089, was Prime Minister of England and Archbishop of Canterbury.

AN ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM rendered necessary in the financial reconstruction of Austria is a drastic reduction in the number of officials, now that the territory of the country is so greatly reduced. It was, therefore, agreed between the provisional delegation and the Austrian Government that by degrees 100,000 officials should be dismissed. The number of dismissed on July 7, 1923, the time of the last report, was 44,871.

THE CURRENCY OF THE FREE CITY OF DANTZIG has finally been effected through the Bank of Dantzig, which was founded in January, 1924. The base of the currency is the gulden, twenty-five of which make a pound sterling.

THE COLD, WET SUMMER has seriously affected the grain crop in France. This will inevitably cause a scarcity in home-produced flour. Poor harvests are general in Europe, so that Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Belgium, and Holland have, it is said, been buying steadily for some weeks. French importers have done little buying because of recent fiscal measures by the government, such as the tax on flour and increase of duty on foreign corn. A sharp increase in the price of bread is dreaded unless the government immediately modifies the decree regulating the application of the law on flour taxation.

THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT subjects the manufacture of certain silks intended for exportation to rigid supervision. In order to obtain the necessary authorization, the goods must conform to rigid standards.

THE GOVERNMENT OF PERSIA has recently undertaken the control and gradual reduction of opium cultivation in that country.

THE NEXT CONGRESS of the International Chamber of Commerce will be held in Brussels in 1924.

THE PROSPECT OF AN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE of Intellectual Co-operation in Paris is one of the outcomes of the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations. The necessary money and accommodation for the proper working of the institute was offered by the French Government to the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, and later accepted by the Assembly. The provision is made that this institute shall be actually international, its funds administered and its policy directed by the committee of the League. A few days after the acceptance of the French offer, the Italian Government offered the sum of one million lire to found an international institute at Rome for the study of private international law. This institute is to be subject to the same sort of government as the institute at France.

FOUR SPECIALISTS IN MALARIA—Sir David Prain, Professor Martinotti, Professor Giemsa, and Professor Perrot—are about

to inquire into the world's quinine requirements, the means of increasing the output, and the extension of chincona cultivation. Cost, distribution and sale prices also come within the scope of the inquiry.

LETTER BOX

HASTINGS, ENGLAND.

To the Editor ADVOCATE OF PEACE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND COLLEAGUE:

A recent issue of your magazine, so rich in its varied contents, has just reached me, and I am particularly interested in the valuable articles on the "Women's International Congress" and on "Women and Peace." In reading them it occurred to me that a letter of mine, "Why I Shall Vote for a Woman Candidate," which appeared in the *Sussex Evening Argus* of December 3, may prove of equal interest to Americans, as indeed to all citizens in the countries where women have already acquired the political franchise. Briefly, my reasons are as follows:

(1) Because undoubtedly by far the greatest and fundamental problem of today is that of a settled world's peace, in comparison with which all other problems are but secondary in urgency, and without which many of these problems could not even be approached.

(2) Because undoubtedly the maternal instinct is much stronger than the paternal, the mother being more anxious for the life and health of her son and more disconsolate at his loss. Statistics of illegitimate children show that, roughly speaking, only about 4 per cent of them are willingly acknowledged by their fathers.

(3) Because, therefore, women in Parliament are almost sure to form a more solid factor for peace than the men, and in peaceful conditions we may hope that class and other struggles will gradually right themselves.

Of course, there are other moral and economic grounds making the return of more

women to Parliament most desirable, but the above reasons seem to me sufficient in themselves.

That is why I have voted for Mrs. Ogilvie Gordon, not as a Liberal candidate, but as a woman, and a very worthy and distinguished woman, too. If she were a Conservative or a Labor Candidate, I would have voted for her all the same, as all other problems are dependent on peace and security in the first place.

I have received objections to the effect that if my above reasons were generally accepted and acted upon, then in such a country as England, with a great preponderance of women, and in all similar countries with a female majority, women would, sooner or later, form the majority in legislative assemblies, and then, who knows, realizing their power, they might turn the tables and legislate against the other sex, as man has done in the past towards woman.

To these forebodings of a possible development in the future I reply:

Firstly, the objection implies the assumption that all women would think and act unanimously and present a united front against men, which is, of course, inadmissible. Women, not less, and perhaps even more, than men will always differ between themselves, and it is scarcely conceivable that such a point will ever be reached when man's influence on womankind will entirely disappear and he will become the victim of feminine political oppression.

Secondly, should, however, the unexpected happen and woman, by her emancipation, progress so much that she becomes both intelligent and strong of will enough to prove and assert her superiority, while man at the same time will retrogress to such a degree that he will no longer be able to hold his own, then I do not see why the universal natural law of gravitation, by which the greater body controls the movements and the very existence of the smaller, should not act equally in human affairs, in sex relationships. In such case the ascendancy of the new female sovereignty would be natural and legitimate. In fact, it frequently takes place even now, whenever a strong woman comes into contact with a weak man.

With fraternal greetings,

Sincerely yours,

JAAKOFF TRELOOKER.

P. S.—I regret to say that Mrs. Gordon was not returned, being defeated by Lord Eustace Percy, the Conservative member, who already represented Hastings in the last two Parliaments, but she polled a larger number of votes than the third candidate, representing Labor. There is little doubt that if Labor had not split the Liberal vote, Mrs. Gordon would have been elected.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CONTRAST. By *Hillaire Belloc*. Mc-Bride and Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 267. Price, \$2.50.

Can it be true that Great Britain is becoming aware of us? She has long known we existed, of course, running about the garden in our pinafores, but, like the proverbial small child of the family, we have not been much noticed. Our views, when they were not impertinent, were quite inconsequential. We were not supposed to disturb the adults of the European family. The fact that we rather preferred to play by ourselves was all to our credit, but in truth we have been somewhat ignored by the superior elder sisters of our household.

Suddenly we are discovered! We are grown up! We have established a ménage of our own! We are getting on in the world! Furthermore—astonishing fact—we are not running our household according to the usage of the remainder of the family. We are *different*. There you have it in a nutshell. Mr. Belloc has discovered what we have known for a long time. We are different. More, there is a "contrast" between us and our sisters.

His book on the subject is delightfully emphatic and tremendously analytical. Europeans ought to read it and Americans will find it stimulating.

The causes of our differences from Europe Mr. Belloc lays principally to subtle influences working unconsciously within us. We are inclined to admit the essential accuracy of this analysis. But he does not seem to recognize one fact which makes for our most

outstanding difference from Europe. We were determined, from the beginning, to be different. Was there ever a shrewd child, slipping quietly about among the adults of a large family, who did not observe the faults and consequent troubles of her elder sisters? If the child be shrewd enough she will resolve that never, no never, will she be and do "just that." And so it is with us more than "an American instinct of suspicion" which keeps us free from European political entanglements. It is a fundamental axiom in our polity. All our lives we have seen the results of intermeddling in Europe. We came away from it. We moved over to another street to avoid it. We love our sisters, but we hope we need not often take sides in their many quarrels. We do not wish to live in the same house with them.

It is not accident that makes us "different." It is design. Our desire to seek peace and pursue it is of long standing. We have faults of our own, many and grievous, and we would not add to them that of priggishness. But in this matter of keeping out of political entanglements we wonder what would be the result if the elder sisters, now that they have discovered that we are here, and that we are different, should, perhaps, try to emulate that one tiny virtue.

READINGS IN ENGLISH SOCIAL HISTORY, FROM PRE-ROMAN DAYS TO A. D. 1837. *R. B. Morgan, Editor*. Cambridge University Press, England, 1923. Pp. 585. Price, 16s.

The days are long past when a parrot-like knowledge of the list of kings, the dates of their reigns, and the wars they fought, can be called a knowledge of history. We have begun to learn that the really significant events of history are quite other. What really matters and what always did matter, had we known it, was the people; what they were doing and thinking; how they were living; on what basis they were classified, and what was going on to modify or serve their well-being of body, mind, and spirit.

Historians usually now go back to sources and give us their summary of findings on the past of the nation or people under consideration. Here we have a most interesting collection of original sources, selected, classified, and translated, when necessary, into modern English. We may, ourselves, read what the men of the past said about themselves, or their immediate predecessors.

We are also given an opportunity to read what the Romans said about Britain; what a Frenchman thought of the Anglo-Saxons; a Spaniard summed us up in 1730, and a German later.

The selections are classified under the heading of the ruling house of the time. Otherwise the history is entirely the every day life of the people, not at all the political history, a knowledge of which is presupposed.

Tradesmen, farmers, squires, lords, and gentlemen, pass in review before us. We read chat of theatres, schools, games, and parties. The great plague and the fire of London, are described by eye-witnesses. We find old songs and carols here, laws and rules of conduct, poll-tax returns containing some odd information, and other homely facts.

The extracts from the Paston letters are particularly delicious. There is a love letter, weighted with formalities, but with a sparkling affection impossible to smother in form. A delightful letter from an Eton schoolboy, written before the discovery of America, is just the same sort which a boy writes home today. He mentions allowance received and bills paid. A certain box of fruit which was promised has not yet come. He wishes his elder brother would go and meet a certain beautiful girl of whom they have been writing before, "and especially behold her hands." At the end, lessons. Marks a little low, but, "I lack nothing but versifying, which I trust to have with a little continuance."

There are also some particularly interesting bits from William Harrison in the sixteenth century, which are taken from Holinshead's Chronicles.

The book is fully embellished with illustrations copied from old prints, drawings, and tablets.

The collection, as a whole, presents the portrait of a sturdy, independent, whimsical, people; a people, moreover, who are hardy, though they love good living; a people strongly individualistic, but just, and lovers of fairplay.

INTERNATIONAL LAW. By *Charles G. Fenwick*. Century Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 641. Price, \$4.00.

The international law of today is quite another thing from the international law that

existed before 1914. Not only the World War, but the advent of aircraft, submarine vessels, radio, and chemical discoveries have drawn new fields into the scope of law between nations.

Without being too technical for the reader of average intelligence, Professor Fenwick, of Bryn Mawr, has produced a worthy analysis of present international law. Indeed, the table of contents, 13 pages of fine print, itself presents a skeleton analysis of the subject, portions of which must automatically arrest the attention of one who is interested in almost any phase of international operations. That, in these days, should mean every citizen.

Marginal references and footnotes on every page, appendices and a remarkably full index at the end, complete the usefulness of this volume as a reference text.

MAN AND MYSTERY IN ASIA. By *Ferdinand Ossendowski*. E. P. Dutton, New York, 1924. Pp. 343. Price, \$3.00.

The distinguished Pole, who here publishes the record of his early journeys in Siberia and the wastes of north Asia, is now a professor in two academies in Warsaw. During the Washington Conference he acted as advisor to the Polish embassy on Far Eastern questions. He has written many articles and pamphlets, in several languages, and some books previous to this one. Mr. Ossendowski is a geologist, an expert on coal. There have come to him, therefore, in years past opportunities to explore the great plains and wildernesses of Russia, especially Siberia.

Many of the narratives here given were in the notes or the published Russian books, which were literally all that were saved by his mother when, in 1920, she escaped from Bolshevik Russia. They are written with the skill of a journalist who has an instinct for drama, as well as the trained eye of the scientist.

The inevitable melancholy of the orient pervades the book. Some of the stories told are gruesome, some blood-curdling, others merely entertaining accounts of interesting discoveries or of thrilling hunts. We have depressing accounts of the degeneration found in the outposts of civilization, offset by tales of occasional majestic spirits stumbled upon, here and there, in unexpected places.

There are poetry and humor, all tinged with a sadness which makes Mr. Ossendowski's work like that of no other writer we know.

RED BEAR OR YELLOW DRAGON. By *Marguerite E. Harrison*. George H. Doran Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 296. Price, \$3.00.

"Snap Shots Around the World" might easily have been the title of this racy book of adventure in travel. As a newspaper correspondent, Mrs. Harrison has before this had some vivid experiences in a Russian prison. She has, therefore, a background of knowledge of the Soviet Republic. It is always interesting, of course, to get the reactions of an intelligent and experienced person to bits of information and gossip picked up in travel.

As a book of such adventure and gossip, this is a distinct success. As a solution of the major problems which the author set herself in the first chapter, it is quite unsatisfying. "What was the real attitude of Japan toward naval disarmament?" she asked herself after the Washington Conference. "How far could the agreements of the Powers with regard to the Far East be carried out without reckoning with the Russian Bear? What was the extent of Soviet influence in Mongolia? . . . Was the chaos in China more apparent than real? What was the real significance of the Pan-Asiatic movement?"

To answer these questions she took her rapid journey around the world. Her experiences vary all the way from taking tea with diplomats in Japan to a second period of imprisonment in Russia. At the end she admits that what she accomplished does not pretend to be a serious analysis of the Far Eastern problem.

Naturally! How could it be that? But as a book of the observations of a wide-awake traveler this is crowded with interest.

RUSSIA'S WOMEN. By *Nina Nikolaevna Selivanova*. E. P. Dutton, New York, 1923. Pp. 226. Price, \$3.00.

Feminists everywhere are interested in the status of woman in all ages and countries. This book follows the thread of women's development in Russia from the earliest history of that land to the present time. It will appeal especially, therefore, to feminists.

The early part of the book suffers a bit from a certain abruptness of style, due,

doubtless, to the catalog character of its structure. When, however, the history reaches the time of Peter the Great, his daughter Elizabeth, and Catherine the Great, the stream of narrative broadens out to a sort of lake of interesting story and incident.

All the way through, the Rise of Education in Russia might be a subtitle of the book.

For the later years we have brief biographies of prominent figures in Bolshevist Russia among the women. "But," says the author, "it is too early, and, moreover, too dangerous to speak of the women of non-Bolshevist creed." Nevertheless the last chapter gives a pathetic and inspiring picture of "the woman who has fought in the vanguard, who has sacrificed everything to see the freedom of every Russian and not the freedom of one class at the expense of another." None of these non-Bolshevist women are mentioned by name.

One finds in the book a faint distant picture of a renewed Russia, in whose regeneration her "amazing women" will take their full share and responsibility.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS IN HISTORY, LAW AND POLITICS. By *Pitman B. Potter*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1924. Pp. 299. Price, \$2.50.

The author of this work acknowledges indebtedness to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which granted him a fellowship in International Law. It was under this fellowship that he produced this work from the doctoral thesis which was the germ of the book.

The freedom of the seas is a highly controversial subject, but it nevertheless influences profoundly, international polity. Mr. Potter says that no other question except that of the balance of power touches international problems more vitally. Therefore, it follows that a book which fixes and clarifies the vagueness of the phrase "Freedom of the Seas" is a valuable contribution to international law.

The author has studied particularly Grotius and Selden on his subject and has done a well-nigh incredible amount of reading besides. The book resulting is an excellent summary of the conclusions reached from this voluminous reading, arranged in well-organized relation.

Of special excellence is the bibliography which forms Appendix B.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS. FOURTH YEAR BOOK.
By *Charles H. Levermore, Ph. D.* *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 1924. Pp. 440. Price, \$1.50.

This brochure, prepared by the winner of the Bok peace plan, provides a useful summary of the deeds of the League of Nations during the past year. He has included references to other international events closely touching the purposes of the League, such as conferences, reparations, and the official and unofficial co-operation of the United States with the League.

The book also includes Mr. Levermore's winning plan in the recent "American peace award."

A STRONG MAN'S HOUSE. By *Francis Neilson*.
B. W. Huebsch, Inc., New York, 1924. Pp. 360. Price, \$2.00.

A great novel always teaches some vital truth, but not all novels written to teach a vital truth are great. Though not among the greatest, this book, the scene of which is laid in war-time England, is so earnestly done, the characters are so well delineated, and the plot, for the most part, so convincing, that it ranks high in its class of novels with a purpose.

The ruling class in England is represented by Sir Alfred Horton-Birkett, M. P., a man whose personal appearance and mental make-up are almost too perfectly the typical "John Bull." The particular political faith of Sir Alfred he expressed, before the World War, as follows: "The old gospel of Bright and Cobden is gone forever. Britain must arm to keep the peace. It is the only way. An armed peace may be expensive, but money wisely spent on insurance is never wasted." With this convenient doctrine, in which, by the bye, Sir Alfred was perfectly sincere, he was able to expand his large holdings and ventures in munitions factories. He became very rich and powerful, not only from his British factories, but from others in Germany, France, Russia, Austria, Spain, Italy, and Japan. The ownership of the foreign plants was slightly camouflaged, to be sure. He disliked deception, but "with so many evil-minded people about one must be cautious."

Sir Alfred's family was composed of persons all of whom are interesting for one reason or another. The havoc wrought among

them by the war, their reaction to it, and the pathetic amazement of their father is uncommonly well told. Sir Alfred's dogged but faithful persistence in his ways, in the face of all evidence of their error is human and pitiful.

Up to the very close the story moves with the ease of inevitability. The catastrophe at the end, however, is not convincing. Perhaps because it is not sufficiently foreshadowed, perhaps because it is so pat as to be artificial, the conclusion comes like a joke. On almost the last page Sir Alfred wanders unexpectedly down to Wapping, where his business life began, and which we have not heard of since the first page. Here, standing by his factory, a bomb, perhaps one of his own patents, drops from a Zeppelin, blowing up both man and building. It comes with the sort of sudden surprise used in humor, but not in tragedy.

Aside from this, the art of the story is unusual. It is also a dramatic and truthful study of the delusion of armament war-insurance.

ENGLAND'S LABOR RULERS. By *Iconoclast*.
Thos. Seltzer, New York, 1924. Pp. 136. Price, \$1.50.

The author of this book, Mrs. Mary Hamilton, has already written a biography of Ramsay MacDonald. This series of portrait sketches completes the list of England's present government. It is a humanly written "Who's Who" of the Labor leaders of England.

It is evident that the writer is herself in sympathy with Socialism, as opposed to Bolshevism and to militarism. But it is quite respectable in Europe today to be a Socialist.

The biographical sketches are short and graphic, few more than two pages in length; but, supplemented as they are with pen-and-ink portraits, they serve clearly to delineate the outstanding men in Great Britain's affairs at the moment.

The book will be of value especially to Americans. It gives the sort of information which the Englishman has gathered from his newspapers and magazines, just as we unconsciously gather information about our own political leaders as they come into prominence. Our press, however, does not keep us so well informed about European leaders. Therefore, a book of this kind is much needed here.

The Will to End War

By Arthur Deerin Call

This pamphlet of 39 pages tells of the cost of war—reasons for the will to end war—beginnings of the modern peace movement—the organizations of peace societies, periodicals, congresses—international plans and organizations—the two Hague conferences—the League of Nations and World Court.

The original statute of the International Court and the statute as finally adopted are both included.

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Order from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Any Book on
International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Our "Federal Convention" Pamphlet

This pamphlet—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership IN The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional.....	\$25.00
Contributing.....	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual.....	\$2.00		

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$..... PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A.....
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name

Address

.....

.....

FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Volume 86, No. 12

December, 1924

Christmas

The Next Four Years

Enthusiastic Pacifists in Berlin

Peace Essay Awards

PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
COLORADO BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRICE 20 CENTS

THE PURPOSE

THE purpose of the American Peace Society shall be to promote permanent international peace through justice; and to advance in every proper way the general use of conciliation, arbitration, judicial methods, and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences among nations, to the end that right shall rule might in a law-governed world.

—*Constitution of the
American Peace Society
Article II.*

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

1815-1828

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington.")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate subscription price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, 20 cents each.

Entered as second-class matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

CONTENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR A GOVERNED WORLD.....	643
EDITORIALS	
Our Christmas Shopping—Our Next Four Years Abroad—British Conservatives at the Helm—End of the Peace Essay Awards—The Most Beautiful Thing in the World—"The Wrestlers"—Editorial Notes	645-654
WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW	
Economic Progress in the United States—The New British Government—The Communist International—The Last Five Years in the Devastated Regions—Pan Pacific Scientific Research—Results of the German Peace Award	654-666
IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL DATES.....	667
GENERAL ARTICLES	
Twenty-third International Peace Congress in Berlin..... By Arthur Deerin Call	669
Rights and Duties of States (Third Installment)..... By the Rt. Hon. Lord Phillimore	673
Foreign Societies in Peking..... By John Gilbert Reid	679
A Winning German Peace Plan.....	681
INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
The German Loan.....	690
French Recognition of the Soviet Government.....	694
The Zinoviev Letter and the British Protest.....	695
The United States Note to Persia.....	698
NEWS IN BRIEF.....	698
BOOK REVIEWS.....	703

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

It is the first of its kind in the United States. It will be one hundred years old in 1928. It has helped to make the fundamental principles of any desirable peace known the world around.

Its purpose is to prevent the injustices of war by extending the methods of law and order among the nations, and to educate the peoples everywhere in what an ancient Roman law-giver once called "the constant and unchanging will to give to every one his due."

It is built on justice, fair play, and law. If men and nations were just, this Society would never have been started.

It has spent its men and its money in arousing the thoughts and the consciences of statesmen to the ways which are better than war, and of men and women everywhere to the gifts which America can bring to the altar of a Governed World.

Its claim upon you is that of an organization which has been one of the greatest forces for right thinking in the United States for nearly a century; which is today the defender of the principles of law, of judicial settlement, of arbitration, of international conferences, of right-mindedness, and of understanding among the Powers. It publishes ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the first in point of time and the widest circulated peace magazine in the world.

It is supported entirely by the free and generous gifts, large and small, of those who are interested in its work. It has never received a dollar from State, city, or nation.

It is the American Peace Society, with its headquarters in Boston for three-quarters of a century, but since 1911 in Washington, D. C. It has been incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts since 1848.

FEES

The minimum fees for membership:
Annual Membership is two dollars;
Sustaining Membership, five dollars;
Contributing Membership, twenty-five dollars;

Institutional Membership, twenty-five dollars;
Life Membership is one hundred dollars.
All memberships include a free subscription to
ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, President American Peace Society, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Secretary American Peace Society and Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE, Washington, D. C.

Hon. P. P. CLAXTON, Ex-United States Commissioner of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN, Director Speakers' Bureau, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Senator from Illinois, Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, Member of Congress from Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. PHILIP NORTH MOORE, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN, 1841 Irving Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Esq., 1155 Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, California.

Prof. ARTHUR RAMSAY, Ex-President Fairmount Seminary, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

PAUL SLEMAN, Esq., Secretary American Colonization Society, Washington, D. C.

THEODORE STANFIELD, 126 W. 74th Street, New York, N. Y.

JAY T. STOCKING, D. D., Upper Montclair, N. J.

Hon. HENRY TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE, President National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON
ARTHUR DEERIN CALL
Dr. THOMAS E. GREEN
Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY
Hon. ANDREW J. MONTAGUE
Rev. WALTER A. MORGAN

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS
HENRY C. MORRIS
PAUL SLEMAN
THEODORE STANFIELD
JAY T. STOCKING, D. D.
Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE

Dr. GEORGE W. WHITE

OFFICERS

President:

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, Member of Congress from Ohio, Washington, D. C.

Secretary:

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Treasurer:

GEORGE W. WHITE, National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents:

Hon. DAVID JAYNE HILL, Washington, D. C.
Hon. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.
Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
A. T. BELL, Esq., Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J.
GILBERT BOWLES, Esq., Richmond, Indiana.
Dead CHARLES R. BROWN, New Haven, Conn.
Pres. E. E. BROWN, New York University, New York.
GEORGE BURNHAM, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. FRANCIS E. CLARK, Boston, Mass.
Rt. Rev. Bishop J. DARLINGTON, Harrisburg, Pa.
Dr. W. H. P. FAUNCE, Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
GEORGE A. FINCH, Washington, D. C.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM P. GEST, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hon. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Washington, D. C.
CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D. D., New York, N. Y.
Dr. DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, Calif.
Geo. H. JUDD, Washington, D. C.

Bishop WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Boston, Mass.
JOSEPH LEE, Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM H. LUDEN, Reading, Pa.
L. H. PILLSBURY, Derry, N. H.
Judge HENRY WADE ROGERS, New York, N. Y.
Hon. ELIHU ROOT, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. FREDERIC SCHOFF, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. RUTH H. SPRAY, Salda, Colo.
Senator THOMAS STERLING, Washington, D. C.
EDWARD STEVENS, Columbia, Mo.
*Pres. M. CAREY THOMAS, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
*Pres. C. F. THWING, Cleveland, Ohio.
Pres. MARY E. WOOLLEY, South Hadley, Mass.

*Emeritus.

Suggestions for a Governed World

(Adopted by the American Peace Society, May 27, 1921)

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, mindful of the precepts of its founders—precepts which have been confirmed by the experience of the past hundred years—recurs, in these days of storm and stress at home and of confusion and discord abroad, to these precepts and its own traditions, and, confessing anew its faith in their feasibility and necessity, restates and resubmits to a hesitant, a suffering, and a war-torn world:

That the voluntary Union of States and their helpful co-operation for the attainment of their common ideals can only be effective if, and only so far as, "The rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations";

That the rules of conduct governing individual relations, and which must needs be expressed in terms of international law, relate to "the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety"; and

That these concepts, which are the very life and breath of reason and justice, upon which the Law of Nations is founded, must be a chief concern of nations, inasmuch as "justice," and its administration, "is the great interest of man on earth."

Therefore, realizing the conditions which confront the world at the termination of its greatest of wars; conscious that permanent relief can only come through standards of morality and principles of justice expressed in rules of law, to the end that the conduct of nations shall be a regulated conduct, and that the government of the Union of States, as well as the government of each member thereof, shall be a government of laws and not of men; and desiring to contribute to the extent of its capacity, the American Peace Society ventures, at its ninety-third annual meeting, held in the city of Washington, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, to suggest, as calculated to incorporate these principles in the practice of nations, an international agreement:

I. To institute Conferences of Nations, to meet at stated intervals, in continuation of the first two conferences of The Hague; and

To facilitate the labors of such conferences; to invite accredited institutions devoted to the study of international law, to prepare projects for the consideration of governments, in advance of submission to the conferences; in order

To restate and amend, reconcile and clarify, extend and advance, the rules of international law, which are indispensable to the permanent establishment and the successful administration of justice between and among nations.

II. To convoke, as soon as practicable, a conference for the advancement of international law; to provide for its organization outside of the domination of any one nation or any limited group of nations; to which conference every nation recognizing, accepting, and applying international law in its relations with other nations shall be invited and in which all shall participate upon a footing of equality.

III. To establish an Administrative Council to be composed of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the government of the State in which the conference

for the advancement of international law convenes; which representatives shall, in addition to their ordinary functions as diplomatic agents, represent the common interests of the nations during the interval between successive conferences; and to provide that

The president of the Administrative Council shall, according to diplomatic usage, be the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the country in which the conference convenes;

An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrative Council from among its members, which shall meet at short, regular, and stated periods;

The chairman of the advisory committee shall be elected by its members;

The advisory committee shall report the result of its labors to the Administrative Council;

The members of the Administrative Council, having considered the report of the advisory committee, shall transmit their findings or recommendations to their respective governments, together with their collective or individual opinions, and that they shall act thereafter upon such findings and recommendations only in accordance with instructions from the governments which they represent.

IV. To authorize the Administrative Council to appoint, outside its own members, an executive committee or secretary's office to perform such duties as the conference for the advancement of international law, or the nations shall from time to time prescribe; and to provide that

The executive committee or secretary's office shall be under the supervision of the Administrative Council;

The executive committee or secretary's office shall report to the Administrative Council at stated periods.

V. To empower the Administrative Council to appoint other committees for the performance of such duties as the nations in their wisdom or discretion shall find it desirable to impose.

VI. To furnish technical advisers to assist the Administrative Council, the advisory committee, or other committees appointed by the council in the performance of their respective duties whenever the appointment of such technical advisers may be necessary or desirable, with the understanding that the request for the appointment of such experts may be made by the conference for the advancement of international law or by the Administrative Council.

VII. To employ good offices, mediation and friendly composition wherever feasible and practicable, in their own disputes, and to urge their employment whenever feasible and practicable, in disputes between other nations.

VIII. To organize a Commission of Inquiry of limited membership, which may be enlarged by the nations in dispute, to which commission they may refer, for investigation and report, their differences of an international character, unless they are otherwise bound to submit them to arbitration or to other form of peaceful settlement; and

To pledge their good faith to abstain from any act of force against one another pending the investigation of the commission and the receipt of its report; and

To reserve the right to act on the report as their respective interests may seem to them to demand; and

To provide that the Commission of Inquiry shall submit its report to the nations in controversy for their action, and to the Administrative Council for its information.

IX. To create a Council of Conciliation of limited membership, with power on behalf of the nations in dispute to add to its members, to consider and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character, the settlement whereof is not otherwise prescribed, which shall from time to time be submitted to the Council

of Conciliation, either by the powers in dispute or by the Administrative Council; and to provide that.

The Council of Conciliation shall transmit its proposals to the nations in dispute, for such action as they may deem advisable, and to the Council of Administration for its information.

X. To arbitrate differences of an international character not otherwise provided for and, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to submit them to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in order that they may be adjusted upon a basis of respect for law, with the understanding that disputes of a justiciable nature may likewise be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration when the parties in controversy prefer to have their differences settled by judges of their own choice, appointed for the occasion.

XI. To set up an international court of justice with obligatory jurisdiction, to which, upon the failure of diplomacy to adjust their disputes of a justiciable nature, all States shall have direct access—a court whose decisions shall bind the litigating States, and, eventually, all parties to its creation, and to which the States in controversy may submit, by special agreement, disputes beyond the scope of obligatory jurisdiction.

XII. To enlarge from time to time the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice by framing rules of law in the conferences for the advancement of international law, to be applied by the court for the decision of questions which fall either beyond its present obligatory jurisdiction or which nations have not hitherto submitted to judicial decision.

XIII. To apply inwardly international law as a rule of law for the decision of all questions involving its principles, and outwardly to apply international law to all questions arising between and among all nations, so far as they involve the Law of Nations.

XIV. To furnish their citizens or subjects adequate instructions in their international obligations and duties, as well as in their rights and prerogatives:

To take all necessary steps to render such instruction effective; and thus

To create that "international mind" and enlightened public opinion which shall persuade in the future, where force has failed to compel in the past, the observance of those standards of honor, morality, and justice which obtain between and among individuals, bringing in their train law and order, through which, and through which alone, peace between nations may become practicable, attainable, and desirable.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOLUME
86

DECEMBER, 1924

NUMBER
12

EDITORIALS

ONE WAY TO DO OUR CHRISTMAS SHOPPING

YOU and I will soon be doing our Christmas shopping. We will worry long about the appropriate gift for this and that friend of ours.

Have you thought of a subscription to *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*?

You have been receiving this magazine; you have been enjoying it. Some of your friends would enjoy it, too; and the magazine will be a welcome remembrance for a whole year.

Furthermore, the subscription price, \$2.00 a year, enables you to bestow, without spending a fortune, a really worthwhile gift.

The new volume, volume 87, begins with the next number, January, 1925.

Why not write out some such form as the following, send it to us at once, and solve a large part of your Christmas shopping problems?

THE EDITOR.

Date, — — —.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
613 Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.:

For the enclosed remittance of \$ — enter the following subscriptions to *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* (\$2.00 each, including membership in the American Peace Society) for the year 1925. You are to send to each a complimentary copy of the December number, and also notify each one of my gift.

Name,

Address,

Name,

Address,

(My renewal of subscription.)

Name,

Address,

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE AND OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

OUR elections, November 4, decided that, beginning the 4th of next March, we are to have four years of Calvin Coolidge as President of the United States. He will begin his term with a safe majority of Republican supporters in the Senate and with a majority of fifty-five in the House. This means that our executive and legislative departments are to be controlled for the next few years by the Republicans. We are, therefore, naturally concerned to forecast as best we can the meaning of this situation, particularly its bearing upon our foreign policies. Just what can we American friends of international peace work for and look forward to in the light of this new situation?

Our answer to this question takes us back to another, namely, what manner of man is this Calvin Coolidge?

We know that he was country born and country bred; that he graduated from Amherst college; that he studied law and took up the practice of that profession in the little town of Northampton, Massachusetts, where he became councilman, city solicitor, clerk of the courts, and then Mayor. We know that he became a member of the Massachusetts Assembly, a member of the State Senate, Lieutenant Governor, and Governor. He was elected Vice-President of the United States for the term 1921-25, and therefore took the office of President after the death of War-

ren G. Harding. In 1905 he married Miss Grace Goodhue, of Burlington, Vermont. He is the author of two little books, one entitled, "Have Faith in Massachusetts;" another, "The Price of Freedom."

It is out of this record that we must find the answer to our question about the character, ability, and outlook of Calvin Coolidge.

Had Mr. Harding lived, Mr. Coolidge would probably have continued to play a minor rôle in our national affairs. His record as Vice-President, his rather trite and pious addresses on various occasions, had failed to arouse any enthusiastic support for his further advancement in the political service of the nation. In the natural course of events he probably would not have been renominated for the position of Vice-President. But the fates have decided otherwise. When in his paternal home in the village of Plymouth, Vermont, a little before 3 o'clock on the morning of August 3, 1923, Calvin Coolidge took the oath of office, administered by his father, the world began to ask, "What will he do? How will he measure up to the task? Can this somewhat taciturn and comparatively unknown New England Yankee be expected to win any appreciable support from the people of the United States? The answer was a popular majority of three million votes at the November election.

Evidently, here is a man to be reckoned with. Why is this so? Mr. Coolidge's success does not seem to have been the result of any calculated policy of selfish ambition. He never gives one the impression of being a conceited man. Nothing in his presence or in his writings indicates that he is an egotistical person. He seems rather to have instinctively absorbed and adopted the old-fashioned principles upon which America has been reared. He has applied these principles as a practical politician. As is seen from

his career, he has been constantly absorbed with the art of government. One has come to think of him as a pragmatist in politics. He once charged the Massachusetts Senate, "Do the day's work." There is a quality of constructive assertiveness about him. And yet he is a plain man, never apparently looking for unusual effects. There is a clarity about him which catches the public approval. He can put things straight. When elected President of the Massachusetts Senate, he said to that body, "Do not hesitate to be as revolutionary as science. Do not hesitate to be as reactionary as the multiplication table."

Mr. Coolidge is not a stand-patter. In an address on "The Nature of Politics," he used these words, "Government is not an edifice that the founders turned over to posterity all completed. It is an institution, like a university, which fails unless the process of education continues." He does not look upon government as a mystery. He feels that it is the task of the statesman to simplify and to clarify the truths of government.

It may be charged that he is a conservative, but this is true only in the sense that he prefers the system under which America has become great to any system based merely upon speculation. Back in 1921, at the University of Pennsylvania, Mr. Coolidge said: "It is impossible for society to break with its past. It is the product of all which has gone before . . . the development of society is a gradual accomplishment."

American born, American bred, he has stood for American ideals, in his utterances and in his life. He believes in a government of laws rather than in a government of men. He has always expressed himself as a firm believer in the principles of democracy. He believes in courts and the processes of law. He has frequently pleaded for a more enlightened

public opinion as the hope for our advancing social order.

But, still more important for us peace workers, we may believe that Calvin Coolidge is a pacifist of the best kind. He has frequently spoken in behalf of international peace. He is opposed to a large standing army. He profoundly hopes for the outlawry of war in this world. He wishes that war may be made impossible. We know these things to be true, for he said so in a letter dated July 23, 1924. But he has also pointed out that he believes in an army and in a navy, not for aggression, but for defense. He said, "Security and order are our most valuable possessions. They are cheap at any price. But I am opposed to every kind of military aggrandizement and to all forms of competitive armament. The ideal would be for nations to become parties to mutual covenants limiting their military establishments, and making it obvious that they are not maintained to menace each other. This ideal should be made practical as fast as possible." Mr. Coolidge has frequently recognized the binding force of treaties. His lawyer's mind leads him to respect international law. He is favorable to international co-operation. He is sympathetic toward any covenant or league of nations which will not restrict the sovereignty of America or diminish her power of determining her own affairs. He is therefore opposed to the existing League of Nations. At least, he is opposed to the United States joining it as a member.

In his first message to Congress, Mr. Coolidge said: "Our country has definitely refused to adopt and ratify the Covenant of the League of Nations. We have not felt warranted in assuming the responsibilities which its members have assumed. I am not proposing any change in this policy; neither is the Senate. The incident, so far as we are concerned, is closed.

The League exists as a foreign agency. We hope it will be helpful. But the United States sees no reason to limit its own freedom and independence of action by joining it. We should do well to recognize this basic fact in all national affairs and govern ourselves accordingly. . . . For us peace reigns everywhere. We desire to perpetuate it always by granting full justice to others and requiring of others full justice to ourselves."

He believes in the Permanent Court of International Justice, and that we should make use of it as occasion may arise.

We may expect President Coolidge to work with the United States Senate. He admires that branch of our Government. As he has said: "Whatever its faults, whatever its human imperfections, there is no legislative body in all history that has used its powers with more wisdom and discretion, more uniformity for the execution of the public will, or more in harmony with the spirit of the authority of the people which has created it, than the United States Senate."

In the light of these facts, it appears reasonable to assume that America will now have a President working in harmony with the Legislature for the firmer establishment of the principles of international peace. We shall have an American President working with an American Senate for the realization of American ideals in international affairs. This does not mean that America will scrap her Constitution and pass the control of its foreign policies over to any group of outside persons. It does mean that we, the people of the United States, have every reason for believing that our Government will continue to improve its already excellent diplomatic and consular services, the methods of friendly adjustment of disputes, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement. We have every reason to believe that our Govern-

ment will go about the business of promoting international conferences, international law, and applied justice between nations.

It is proper and highly desirable that our Government should know that we, the people, are expecting these things. The call to the peace workers of America is plain.

BRITISH CONSERVATIVES IN POWER

THE last British elections have insured Great Britain from change of government for the next four or five years. Unless the huge majority now possessed by the Conservative Party in the House of Commons dissolves through internal friction, there will be no new elections until the expiration of the term for which the new Parliament has been elected.

This is the outstanding fact of the elections. It has come as a distinct surprise to seasoned political observers. On the very eve of the elections there was still a widespread feeling in British political circles that the country had definitely entered upon a period of minority governments, *i. e.*, a situation in which none of the three major political parties would have a clear majority in the House of Commons, and one of them would have to rule, either in coalition with, or by consent of, another party. Instead of that, the elections have given the Conservative Party twice as many seats as the combined number obtained by the other two parties.

Apparently the British electorate had decided that the country had had enough of the uncertainty and instability incident upon frequent dissolutions of the Parliament. The short electoral campaign, which lasted but three weeks, was fought in an atmosphere of mounting frenzy, and its outcome has been a veritable landslide for the Conservatives, a fair showing for the Laborites, and a spectacular crash of the Liberals. The Conservative gains were

overwhelmingly from the ranks of the Liberal Party. That was the British elector's way of showing that he was tired of middle-of-the-road policies. He wanted something definite, and he has got it in the form of the largest single party majority in the House since 1880, except for the Liberal landslide in 1906.

As the electoral campaign gathered its swift momentum, it was becoming more and more apparent that the fundamental issue upon which it was being fought was that of Socialism. It is true that Labor showed unmistakable moderation all through Mr. MacDonald's tenure of office. But that was because it was merely a minority government. The Conservative appeal centered around the dangers for the business interests of the country inherent in a growth of Socialistic ideas, and it was eminently successful with the electorate.

The Russian question, as it figured in the campaign, played entirely into the hands of Labor's opponents. During the first phase of the campaign the point of attack focussed on the treaties signed by MacDonald with the representatives of Moscow, particularly on the provisions regarding a new loan to Russia, guaranteed by the British government. During the concluding phase, the injection of the Zinoviev letter and of the Foreign Office's protest against it (the text of both of these documents appears elsewhere in this issue) raised excitement to a frenzied pitch and was, probably, the strongest factor in determining the outcome.

The British Conservatives, led by Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the new Prime Minister, are now strongly entrenched in power. They are confronted with problems of primary importance and marked difficulty, especially in the realm of foreign affairs. But in the handling of these problems they do not, at least, have the handicap of a Parliament split into three impotent minorities.

THE END OF THE PEACE ESSAY AWARDS

SINCE Mr. Bok's peace award, Mr. Edward A. Filene, of Boston, Massachusetts, has been conducting a similar series of contests in Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. In each case the question has been, How can peace and prosperity be restored within the given country and in Europe through international cooperation? We have dealt with the awards in Great Britain, France, and Germany. Indeed, in this number we are printing one of two German peace plans to which was awarded the first prize. We are now in receipt of the Italian prize-winning plans. These in all probability close the peace essay contests, at least for a time. The Italian competition officially closed on September 10.

Separate awards of \$10,000 in various graded prizes were offered for the best proposals submitted in each country. As announced by the donor, the purpose of these competitions was to stimulate public opinion in the four most important nations of Europe on the conditions necessary for restoring prosperity and peace in the world. Over 15,000 plans were submitted in the various competitions, and Mr. Filene believes that the result has been to reveal the interesting and important cross-section of European opinion on international problems. This in all probability may be accepted as the fact.

In the case of Italy, the first prize was awarded equally to Prof. P. Feddozi and Prof. Gino Arias, the joint authors of one plan, and to V. Cento, author of another. There was a second, a third, and twenty-two minor prizes.

Assuming that the winning Italian prizes represent a real portion of public opinion in Italy, a summary of these plans is of interest. Such a summary follows:

I.—*Crisis Prevailing in Democratic Countries of Europe*

1. Duality of their essential principle.
 - (a) Ideal of liberty and spirit of class struggle not easily reconciled.
 - (b) Roots of social conflicts and constant menaces of war found in this deadlock.
 - (c) New problem: to reconcile the prerequisites of liberty with the authority of the State.
2. Case of Italy.
 - (a) Short experience as a united State the cause of her political immaturity.
 - (b) Her demographic wealth the cause of:
 - (1) Domestic difficulties.
 - (2) International complications.
 - (c) Necessity for a national consciousness to co-ordinate:
 - (1) Government *by* the people.
 - (2) Government *for* the people.
3. A national State the legitimate heir of the ideal of liberty.
 - (a) Need of a leading class to sanction the rights of the people.
 - (b) The cultural class the natural custodian of:
 - (1) The ideal of State.
 - (2) The elements of liberty.
 - (c) Italy constitutionally hampered in development of a leading group.
4. Interdependence of Italian and European problems.
 - (a) Problems of peace must be solved simultaneously with that of government.
 - (b) Prosperity the result of a relative harmony of interests.

II.—*Meaning and Significance of a National State*

1. Nationalism does not mean denial of:
 - (a) Other States' rights.
 - (b) Humanity as a whole.
2. Nationalism implies existence of a national consciousness.
3. Development from national state to federation of the States of Europe with the supreme common weal the mainspring of such union.
4. Motives for international solidarity.
 - (a) To organize discordant economic interests.

- (b) To reconcile the tendencies of governments with the demands of their peoples.
5. Decline of European hegemony; no longer enjoys unchallenged world domination.
- (a) Financial supremacy of United States a challenge to Europe.
- (b) American assistance in Europe conciliatory and protective as yet.
- (c) An Asiatic hegemony near its realization.
- (d) Danger of deterioration from interstate discord.
- (e) Need of consolidating common interests imperative.
6. United States of Europe and United States of America cannot have identical meaning.
- (a) National and racial traditions an obstacle to a political unity like that in America.
7. United States of Europe and League of Nations will have different tendencies.
- (a) The former a stable organization to withstand similar organizations.
- (b) The latter with tendency toward abstract peace.
- (c) Universal co-operation the outcome of both.

III.—*Obstacles in Way of European Federation*

1. Nationalistic sensibilities and demands unfavorable to a plural organization of Europe.
2. Unification of the Balkan States prerequisite to a United States of Europe.
3. Struggle of France and Germany for supremacy must end.
4. Means of achieving European co-operation.
- (a) Idea of its necessity must become common knowledge.
- (b) General favorable feeling for it created.
- (c) No abstract theories allowed to exercise their fascination.
- (d) Common advantages made clear.

IV.—*Reforms in the League of Nations Advocated*

- A. Covenant should be separated from the peace treaties.
- B. Reforms in the constitution.
- (1) Made universal with participation of all States.

- (2) Method of nominating delegates modified.
- (3) Mutual relations of the Assembly and Council more clearly defined.
- (4) Principle of unanimity modified.
- C. Functions of the reformed League of Nations.
- (1) Codification of international laws.
- (2) Reduction of armaments.
- (3) Peaceful settlement of international controversies.
- (4) Determining procedure to be followed in use of coercion.
- (5) Establishment of guarantees against aggression.
- (6) Regional and continental agreements in accordance with Article 21 advocated.
- (7) Economic functions.
- (a) The Economic-Financial Committee should be granted new and larger powers.
- (b) Assigned independent work.

V.—*World's Economic Crisis Examined*

- A. Causes originating in the World War.
- B. Reparations and interallied debts.
- (1) Stabilization of currency and finance in certain countries on principle of "equivalent fiscal burdens."
- (2) Countries suffering from moderate depreciation aided to restoration.
- (3) Gradual revaluation of currency recommended.
- C. Economic and financial reconstruction.
- (1) Currency should be adapted to individual country.
- (2) New bank of emissions should be modified to avoid future controversies.
- D. International collaboration to promote economic solidarity.
- (1) Task of the Economic Committee of the League.
- (2) Promotion of the principle of co-ordination and division of labor.
- (3) Tendency toward an economic rapprochement the sure foundation of world's peace and prosperity.

A study of the various plans reveals a certain unanimity upon a number of matters. It appears that all of the plans criticize the League of Nations as organized at present, on the ground that its activity is insufficiently adapted to exist-

ing conditions; that it is weak; that it is handicapped by the absence of the United States, Germany, Russia, and others. The plans are in practical agreement that the use of armed force by the League should not be authorized. Yet practically all the writers seem to feel the necessity for some form of sanction, such as political coercion, minus, however, the character of armed intervention.

A number of the plans lay special emphasis on the arbitration of international controversies through the arbitration court at The Hague.

In general, all possible forms of international collaboration are favored, particularly separate agreements leading toward a gradual consolidation of the larger interests. There is a wide feeling that a free exchange of raw materials, of goods and services, is the ideal means to a natural adjustment of the world's economic situation.

A number of the plans offer proposals calculated to eliminate all competition. Others emphasize the importance of a uniform medium of exchange.

Plans of a political character confine themselves in the main to one of two proposals: either the creation of a United States of Europe, with a representative body—a strictly authoritative supreme organization; or, second, either mutual guarantees or an absolute prohibition of the manufacture of war materials.

The necessity is also affirmed of developing greater consciousness of unity in Europe, somewhat like that already developing in America, with the view of counterbalancing the ethnic, the political and economic antagonisms.

As far as the Italian situation in particular is concerned, all plans agree that there are two chief issues of an international character, of which the first is reparations of war damages, forming part of the general question of interallied debts.

All efforts of the Italian nation to re-establish a normal balance will remain without results as long as this question remains unsolved. Italy's solvency in relation to Europe, and especially to America, is paralyzed by the present state of affairs. The Dawes Plan is considered a good beginning in the work of bringing order into the situation; but it should be followed by a solution of the question of reparations and debts.

The other grave question is that of emigration. The population of Italy is increasing at a rate which makes it impossible for the nation to subsist on the resources of the country. If the internal and colonial policies of other States should make all immigration into their territories impossible, not excluding even those lands which are capable of absorbing additional population, the result will be an ever-present cause of conflicts. This question ought to form the subject of a special international investigation.

As one studies these prize-winning plans, one is impressed with a degree of chaos in the minds of the faithful. They frequently contradict each other and are frequently in themselves self-contradictory. But throughout, the will to end war is unmistakable.

Looking back across this worthy effort to stimulate interest in international problems, one can but sense the difficulties besetting any democratic approach to the establishment of world peace. Carlyle once entered in his journal: "The public is an old woman. Let her maunder and mumble"—an unusually savage thrust, even for that rather choleric genius of Cheney Row.

And yet, so far as the attention of men and women has been called to the nature of the problem, and this seems to have been considerable, both Mr. Bok and Mr. Filene are entitled to the thanks of their fellows.

THE MOST BEAUTIFUL THING IN THE WORLD

PARIS, *August 17, 1924.*

THE most beautiful thing in the world is the Venus de Melos, now in the Louvre. Its beauty is best felt from the seat in the corner to the figure's front and left, where the matchless lines from the shadows of face and neck, of trunk and drapery, picture as nowhere else in all the earth the purity and lofty reach of sculpture. One sitting there catches the health, dignity, simplicity, and repose along those inner and invisible curves which mark the grace of posture. If even in the presence of a Grecian urn one finds it difficult to sense with the young English poet that beauty is truth, one will certainly feel it before this master work of that unknown Grecian artist. Only those shallow sight-seers, scribbling their notes, listening to the official guide mouthing his lecture, mar the scene. But now and then comes a fine and silent one, alone, who looks and sees and apprehends, with unconscious moisture in the eyes. This perfect embodiment of woman's nobility transcends the expression of words quite as the gods have thus far defied man's poor efforts to explain.

"THE WRESTLERS"

AVIGNON, FRANCE, *October 31, 1924.*

THAT statue in this little park here in Avignon—"The Wrestlers"—is an active thing, intense; the victor about-to-be has one of his opponent's heels pinned to the earth, the other foot high in the air, and the victory of superior strength seems near.

Similarly, time has overcome and destroyed the once famous university of Avignon, and all that is left is the *Place des Études*, a few steps away. The little church of the Poor Clares there, where in 1327, Francesco Petrarca entered to pray and beheld the Laura of his lyrical plaints

and praises, has given way to a furniture-maker. Time has bitten into the Benedictine church and into the school where André la Fabre taught, right before Charpentier's clever bronze. Time has dropped those old men on the benches around, lonely, forgotten hulks, whose only apparent comfort in life is the tobacco from stubs and cigarettes snatched from street and gutter. Time has rubbed out that old monastery, save only a few stones of the cloisters to our left. Time is now eating her holes into the poor stone figures man has scattered long since around the little park in his lame attempts to express himself in beauty. Time has apparently taken a child from the young and kindly couple in black, sitting wistfully there hand in hand, on that little bench.

And yet, and yet the victorious wrestler is there, at his job; and playing children, and lovers, brisk-walking shoppers, all, with their unstudied assurance, unconsciously serve notice that, in the struggle of life with death, life goes on. Workmen are repairing the roof of the post office hard by.

THE charm of the Christmas season is breaking upon the world once more. It is the time of the year when men and women are at their best. Life is a mystic stream, rising in the upland of thorn and flower, flowing now turbulently, now placidly out into the bosom of an infinite sea. The hope, the delight, the honor of it are fairer and sweeter things because of what came to pass in those days in Bethlehem of Judea.

AMERICA does not need assurance that any government in England will pursue the policies of international peace. It is comforting, however, to read the remarks of Mr. Austen Chamberlain, new Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, of the new Prime Minister, and others at the

Guild Hall banquet November 10. Mr. Chamberlain said, "My Lord Mayor, the aim of every statesman in the British Empire is, and must ever be, to preserve peace." The Prime Minister said, "We stand by the peace treaties, and we will cultivate good relations with foreign countries on the basis of those treaties."

AMERICANS are planning to participate in the celebration of the first centenary of the publication of Hugo Grotius' "De Jure Belli ac Pacis." It was in June, 1625, that the Hollander, Hugo Grotius, gave to the world this historical work.

He was then living in exile in Paris after a life spent in closest touch with the momentous political changes of his time. He had already astonished Europe by his learning. He knew, as few men have known, the motives for the actions of princes and statesmen. The book which he produced revolutionized the world's attitude towards war. Grotius showed that the glory of princes was better served by a peaceful reign than by a successful war, and by humanity towards one's enemies rather than the barbarity customarily practised upon defeated troops and civilian population.

It is recounted that the famous Cardinal Richelieu, when he took La Rochelle in 1628, was so impressed by the reasoning of the great jurist that he forbore to subject the military prisoners to the usual cruelties and ordered that the citizens be spared the horrors of pillage. This instance is merely one effect of Grotius' book in his own time. Its subsequent influence has been greater still. Every disquisition on World Peace, on international justice and arbitration, and on humanity between combatants, must go back to the opinion of the great Dutch scholar and statesman. Grotius has been justly called the "Father of International Law."

In order to commemorate fittingly the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Grotius' masterpiece, the Netherlands-America Foundation has offered to raise a fund. Ten thousand dollars is needed for a memorial window to be presented to the Nieuwe Kerk at Delft—the Dutch Westminster Abbey built in the fourteenth century—where Grotius lies buried. The Minister from the Netherlands has transmitted the proposal to the Dutch Government, which welcomed the suggestion and expressed cordial appreciation of the spirit which prompted it.

It is the intention of the Netherlands-America Foundation to approach the legal profession through the various Associations of the Bar, so that the window in memory of Grotius may be the gift of the American Bench and Bar. Individual subscriptions may be small as the amount needed is modest, and the legal profession throughout the United States will be asked to contribute. The expense of the collection and preservation of the fund will be borne by the Foundation so that the full amount collected may go to the purpose for which it is given. The window is to be of American design, and careful steps will be taken to make it an adequate memorial in every artistic and practical sense.

Checks should be drawn to the order of Netherlands-America Foundation, Grotius Fund, 17 East 42d Street, New York City.

OUR appalling ignorance of the peoples of other nations is not so much wilful as it is inevitable under the circumstances. Most of us are busy people, concerned primarily with our own affairs. With the time at our disposal, we find it difficult to keep track of our own people. Then, too, when we have the opportunity to learn of another nation, we don't know just how to go about it. Indeed, we don't know what it is we want to know. Now

comes the Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace with the answers to just the questions we ought to ask, particularly about the other Republics of this hemisphere. "Inter-American Digests—Economic Series No. I," has just appeared from the Inter-American Press of New York. It deals with Argentina, in a brochure of some 48 pages. It is an authorized digest of *El Desarrollo Económico de la República Argentina en los Últimos*

Cincuenta Años, made and translated by Peter H. Goldsmith. The little work is divided into ten parts as follows: population; production; industries; communications; foreign trade; shipping; exchange, banking and credit institutions; public wealth; consumption; and public finance. Truly here are the things we all should be interested to know about a country. Without any information in these fields, we can never get far toward the understanding of a people.

WORLD PROBLEMS IN REVIEW

ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE UNITED STATES

IN a review of business conditions during the year ending June 30, 1924, Secretary of Commerce Hoover gives the following as the outstanding features of the fiscal year under consideration: First, the advance in agricultural prices, which had hitherto lagged behind industry since the slump of 1920; second, the beginnings of sound policies in German reparations, leading to a hopeful measure of economic recovery in Europe; and third, the complete recovery of our own industry and commerce (aside from agriculture), great stability of prices, high production, full employment, expanding foreign trade, and prosperity throughout the business world. There are some moderate decreases in activity of some lines during the latter part of the fiscal year, but since its close there has again been general recovery in those lines.

Industry

The general condition of manufactures, industry, and commerce, as distinguished from agriculture, may be judged from such major economic indexes as volume of business, value of sales, etc.

These indexes, based on the calendar year 1919 as 100, show that the general

level of business activity was decidedly higher than even in that very prosperous year. The table indicates the following changes in the volume of business (quantities, not value) in the fiscal year 1924 as compared with the fiscal year 1923: The index of manufacturing production dropped slightly, being 115 in 1924 as compared with 116 in 1923. Mineral productions rose from 118 in 1923 to 131 in 1924. Forest products production rose from 111 to 117. Railroad freight (ton-miles) rose from 109 to 110, electric power production from 136 to 148, building contracts let (square feet), from 107 to 109.

Notwithstanding far lower prices than in 1919 the value of sales of retail stores was greater in 1924 than in that year. Thus the value of department-store sales stood at 120 in 1923 and 128 in 1924, of five-and-ten-cent stores at 152 and 173, respectively. In the case of mail-order houses the indexes rose from 90 in 1923 to 100 in 1924, and of wholesale trade from 80 to 82, the lower indexes as compared with 1919 being wholly due to the decline in prices. Based upon the calendar year 1913 as 100, the general average of wholesale prices dropped from 156 in 1923 to 150 in 1924.

A slight slackening in production occurred at the end of the fiscal year. However,

the sales of department stores, chain stores, and mail-order houses, the seasonal fluctuations of which make comparison from one month to another misleading, were larger in June than in the corresponding month of 1923. The subsequent recovery is shown by the September indexes, which for manufacturing production stood 13 points higher than in June, for mineral production 9 points, and for forest production 1 point higher. All these facts indicate that there had been but a very minor temporary recession in the spring. Of the most importance, however, the agricultural recovery by September had proceeded to a point where the wholesale price index of farm products was 143 on the 1913 base, as compared to 149 for the price of all commodities, thus marking the re-establishment of the farmers' buying power at much more nearly the pre-war ratio.

Agriculture

The outstanding event of the year was the improvement in agricultural prices. Unlike manufacturing and mineral industries, a change in the volume of agricultural production often does not reflect a parallel change in the well-being of the producers. Farm products in general have little elasticity of demand in the home market. The farmer cannot adapt his output rapidly to changes in the foreign demand. The aggregate area planted to crops in this country has varied only slightly from year to year since the war, and most of the individual crops show little change in acreage, although the low prices of wheat have resulted in a very considerable reduction in the planting of that cereal. The farmer, from the very nature of things, cannot suddenly and greatly increase or reduce his aggregate plantings or the proportion of his land devoted to different crops. Industries and commerce more readily adapt themselves to change in demand. The variations in output of crops from year to year are usually due much more to weather conditions than to the will of the farmer. Therefore, farm prosperity cannot be judged upon the criterion of production alone, but requires consideration of prices as well.

The situation of agricultural prices may be well indicated by comparing September prices with the general level of commodity prices. Based upon 1913 as 100, the

wholesale price index of all commodities was 149. The corresponding price index of No. 1 northern wheat was 148; of cotton (New York), 191; corn, 186; and hogs, 118. From the low point since the beginning of 1921, these figures represent recoveries: for wheat, of 37 points; cotton, 99; corn, 111; and hogs, 37. Many readjustments are needed yet, but agriculture has turned an important corner, and this change marks a vital step in the whole after-war economic readjustment.

The increasing stability in agriculture is further marked by the fact that wholesale prices of food products show a continuing decrease in spread as compared to farm prices. This spread in the two indexes, which amounted in certain months of 1921 to as much as 27 points, has now (September, 1924) decreased to 5 points, indicating the steady elimination of speculation and closer trading margins through increasing economic stability and closer competition. The rise in agricultural prices, while in large part due to general world economic readjustment and to settlement of European economic conflicts, has been favored to some degree by local and special causes, such as the decrease in corn crop and the fact that the abnormal world wheat crop of 1923 swung over to a slightly subnormal crop in 1924.

Transportation

This fiscal year marks the first occasion since long before the war when our railway facilities have been completely equal to the demand of the country. There were no car shortages of any consequence. There was a speeding up of delivery of all goods. This complete reconstruction, expansion, and growing efficiency in transportation facilities marks a fine accomplishment on the part of our railway management. Its economic effect is most far-reaching. Every car shortage is a strangulation in the movement of commodities which reduces price levels to the producer and increases them to the consumer. It disarranges the synchronizing of our industrial fabric and widens the margin all along the line between producer and consumer. There is still requirement for extension of terminals and readjustment of rates. There are large consolidations needed for the ultimate best service and sound finance.

The making of our transportation facilities adequate to our needs is one of the greatest contributions toward our economic stability.

Banking and Finance

The figures of the Federal Reserve system operations indicate a high degree of stability and an abundance of loanable capital.

The total volume of money in circulation on July 1, 1924, was practically the same as one year before, but its component elements had changed markedly. Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes declined from \$2,254,000,000 to \$1,853,000,000, but the circulation of gold and gold certificates increased from \$791,000,000 to \$1,198,000,000. The increase in gold and gold certificates in circulation was almost equal to the net imports of gold from abroad, and was about \$6,000,000 greater than the volume of Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes retired from circulation. This process makes for stability and minimizes dangers from inflation due to superabundant gold holdings.

One of the encouraging features of the exchange situation was the greater stability during the first half of 1924 in the values of the currencies of countries that have undertaken currency reforms. This was true not only of the rentenmark, the currency unit adopted in Germany after the collapse of the reichsmark, in the closing months of 1923, and of the chervonetz of Russia, but also of the currencies of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The foreign capital issues (exclusive of refunding loans) brought out in the United States during the fiscal year aggregated about \$450,000,000, a moderate increase over the preceding year. The new issues included \$150,000,000 for the Government of Japan for purchase of supplies in the United States, \$25,000,000 for the Dutch East Indies, \$40,000,000 for the Netherlands, \$50,000,000 for Switzerland, and \$20,000,000 for Norway. In addition to these issues, large amounts of short-term dollar credits were placed at the disposal of several European countries for the purpose of exchange stabilization.

Dawes Plan

A most important event in the field of world finance was the formulation of the plan of the first committee of experts, commonly called the Dawes Plan, which was finally ratified by the London Conference on August 17, 1924. The plan provides that German financial and currency stabilization is to be brought about by an internationally controlled gold-reserve bank of issue. During the period necessary for economic rehabilitation, an international loan of about 800,000,000 gold marks is to be floated, proceeds of which are to be placed in this bank and to be used for rehabilitation purposes for the continuance of essential deliveries in kind, and certain pro-reparation costs. Reparations are to be paid during the interim period on an increasing scale, reaching a total annual figure of two and a half billions of gold marks in the fifth year, and may be increased thereafter by a prosperity index outlined by the committee.

These sums are to be raised from a budget surplus, from interest on railroad bonds (the German Government railroads being turned over to a private company under international control), from the railroad transportation tax now in effect, and from interest and sinking-fund payments on industrial debentures. The latter are to be placed on German industry in order to equalize approximately the bonded indebtedness on these industries before the war, which is assumed to have been wiped out by post-war currency depreciation. The funds thus obtained on reparation account are to be deposited in the new bank of issue, and the responsibility for transferring these sums into foreign exchange for the benefit of the Allies rests with an international transfer committee, the chairman of which, called the agent for reparation payments, must effect these transfers without undermining German financial stability. Controls are established to insure the payment of the sums specified into the bank of issue. The plan offers within itself machinery for correction or alteration of details as difficulties arise in its execution.

European stabilization, which this plan may be expected to achieve, will bring about a revival in world trade and increased consumption of commodities, in

which the United States is bound to have its share. This trade revival and increased consumption power should outweigh any increased competitive power which might be expected from the execution of the plan. It is not too much to say that this settlement of the vexed reparation problem, coming at the time it did, prevented another European collapse, with its inevitable repercussion on world trade and on the business of the United States. The Dawes Plan is the first effort to solve the reparations question purely on a commercial and economic basis. The American members on the committee were assisted by a competent staff of technical experts, among them some of the officials of the Department of Commerce.

Foreign Trade

In the fiscal year under review exports increased 9 per cent in value as compared with the preceding fiscal year, while imports decreased 6 per cent. The net result of these changes in opposite directions was an increase in the excess of exports over imports from \$176,000,000 in 1922-23 to \$757,000,000 in 1923-24. While in absolute amount this is a larger export balance than in any year prior to the war, the percentage by which exports exceed imports is somewhat smaller than in most pre-war years.

The outstanding feature of our foreign trade in commodities is its strong, real growth since 1913. Our total imports and exports in that fiscal year amounted to \$4,279,000,000, against \$7,865,000,000 in 1923-24. If we correct this difference by the depreciated buying power of the dollar, we still find an increase of 18.2 per cent.

This compares with decreases of 12 per cent for the United Kingdom, 14 per cent for France, and 51.4 per cent for Germany (in each case based on the calendar year 1923 in comparison with 1913, and with corrections for currency depreciation).

The gain in our total trade over the fiscal year 1913 is largely accounted for by the marked increases in our trade with Asia, Oceania, and South America. The value of trade with Asia increased 244 per cent and that with Oceania and South America 192 and 95 per cent, respectively. Although the actual value of trade with

Europe is greater than prior to the war, the gain is less than the increase in prices and the actual quantity of goods is smaller. This decline in the relative importance of Europe as a factor in our trade as other areas gain is in part a continuation of a gradual shift in this direction evident before the war and in part the result of the war's serious impairment of European commercial strength.

THE NEW BRITISH GOVERNMENT

THE British elections, which took place on October 29, changed the status of the three major parties in the British Parliament. Whereas before the dissolution of the Parliament, early in October, none of the parties had a majority of seats, in the new Parliament the Conservative Party has a large majority over the other two parties combined.

Composition of the New Parliament

The state of the parties in the new Parliament is as follows:

Conservatives	413
Labor	152
Liberals	42
Independents	5
	612

The state of the parties at the dissolution was as follows:

Conservatives	257
Labor	193
Liberals	158
Independents	6
	614

London University vacant.

The total net party gains and losses for 612 of the 615 seats are:

Net Conservative gains	154
Net Liberal losses	116
Net Labor losses	41

This overwhelming majority obtained by the Conservatives is due in a very considerable measure to the peculiarities of the British electoral system. As a matter of

fact, the votes cast in the election were divided as follows:

Conservatives	7,855,242
Labor	5,482,133
Liberals	2,985,519
Independents	121,504
Constitutionalists	101,052
Communists	68,989

Thus, while the Liberal and the Labor parties obtained together more votes than the Conservative Party, the latter has two-thirds of the seats in the new Parliament.

The New Baldwin Ministry

On November 4 Premier Ramsay MacDonald had an audience with the King, at which he tendered the resignation of the Labor Cabinet. The King immediately sent for Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the leader of the victorious Conservatives, and asked him to form a new cabinet.

Two days later the following list of appointments was announced by the new premier:

Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury and Leader of the House of Commons, Rt. Hon. Stanley Baldwin, M. P.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Deputy Leader of the House of Commons, Rt. Hon. Austen Chamberlain, M. P.

Lord Privy Seal, Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, K. G., G. C. V. O., C. B.

Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Lords, Most Hon. the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston, K. G., G. C. S. I., G. C. I. E.

Lord Chancellor, Rt. Hon. Viscount Cave, G. C. M. G., K. C.

Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, C. H., M. P.

Secretary of State for Home Affairs, Rt. Hon. Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Bt., M. P.

Secretary of State for the Colonies, Rt. Hon. L. C. M. S. Amery, M. P.

Secretary of State for War, Rt. Hon. Sir L. Worthington-Evans, Bt., C. B. E., M. P.

Secretary of State for India, Rt. Hon. the Earl of Birkenhead, K. C.

Secretary of State for Air, Rt. Hon. Sir Samuel Hoare, Bt., C. M. G., M. P.

First Lord of the Admiralty, Rt. Hon. W. C. Bridgeman, M. P.

President of the Board of Trade, Rt. Hon. Sir Philip Lloyd-Greame, K. B. E., M. C., M. P.

Minister of Health, Rt. Hon. Neville Chamberlain, M. P.

Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Rt. Hon. E. F. L. Wood, M. P.

Secretary for Scotland, Rt. Hon. Sir John Gilmour, Bt., M. P.

President of the Board of Education, Lord Eustace Percy, M. P.

Minister of Labor, Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, Bt., M. P.

Attorney General, Rt. Hon. Sir Douglas McGarel Hogg, K. C., M. P.

Considerable surprise was caused by the importance of the appointments received by Mr. Winston Churchill and Lord Birkenhead. Mr. Churchill had deserted the Conservative Party twenty years ago in favor of the Liberal Party and had held important portfolios under that party's government. He was elected to the new Parliament as a Constitutionalist, a small faction organized by himself, and while it was generally expected that he would be given a ministerial post, his appointment to the Chancellor of the Exchequer came as a distinct surprise. Lord Birkenhead, while always a Conservative, has not been on good terms with his party since it broke up the post-war coalition.

Biographies of the New Ministers

Following are biographical data of the more prominent members of the new Baldwin Cabinet:

Mr. Stanley Baldwin, Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury, is 57, and was at Harrow and Trinity, Cambridge. He has represented the Bewdley Division of Worcestershire since 1908, and became Financial Secretary to the Treasury in the Coalition Government in 1917. In 1921 he was appointed President of the Board of Trade, and in 1922 he helped to secure the withdrawal of the Unionist Party from the Coalition. In Mr. Bonar Law's Ministry he became Chancellor of the Exchequer and visited the United States for the funding of the war debt. He succeeded Mr. Bonar Law as prime Minister in May, 1923. In the following November he appeared to the country, but failed to obtain a majority, and resigned last January.

Mr. Joseph Austen Chamberlain, who is 61, was at Rugby and Trinity, Cambridge. He has been successively Civil Lord of the Admiralty, Financial Secretary to Treasury, Postmaster General, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Finance and Currency, Secretary of State for India, member of the War Cabinet, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Privy Seal and Leader of the House in 1921-22.

Lord Salisbury, who is 63, was at Eton and University College, Oxford. He was Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, 1900-3, Lord Privy Seal in 1903-5, President of the Board of Trade, 1905, Lord President of the Council, 1922-23, and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 1922-23.

Lord Curzon of Kedleston, who is 65, was at Eton and Balliol and a fellow of All Souls. He was Under-Secretary for India, 1891-92, and for Foreign Affairs, 1895-98. He was Viceroy of India with an Irish peerage from 1899 to 1905. In 1916 he was a member of the Imperial War Cabinet and leader in the House of Lords, and Foreign Secretary from 1919 until the fall of the Conservative Government last January.

Lord Cave, who is 68, was at Merchant Taylors' and St. John's College, Oxford. A chancery barrister he took silk in 1904, was Solicitor General in 1915, Home Secretary in 1916, and a Lord of Appeal from 1919 to 1922. He was created Viscount in 1918, and was Lord Chancellor from 1922 until last January.

Mr. Churchill, who is 50, was at Harrow and Sandhurst, and entered the army in 1895. He served with the Spanish forces in Cuba, the Malakand field force, the Tirah Expedition, and the Nile Expedition; also in the South African War. He was successively Conservative M. P. for Oldham, Liberal M. P. for N. W. Manchester, and Liberal M. P. for Dundee. He was Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, President of the Board of Trade, Home Secretary, First Lord of the Admiralty, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Minister of Munitions, and Secretary of State for War and for Air. He was defeated at Dundee, West Leicester,

and Westminster (Abbey Division), but was returned last week as Constitutional M. P. for Epping.

Lord Birkenhead was educated at Birkenhead School and Wadham College, Oxford. As Mr. F. E. Smith, he obtained a large practice at the bar, and after being Solicitor General and Attorney General was Lord Chancellor from 1919 to 1922.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

EVENTS connected with the British election have drawn close and more general attention to the Communist International, and though its character is roughly understood, there must be many who would be glad to have more precise and authentic information about it. The chief points of interest are its connection with the Bolshevik Government of Russia and the conditions of admission, which lay down the duties that affiliated bodies, such as the Communist Party in this country, pledge themselves to carry out.

The following survey of the C. I., or Communist International, is given by the *London Times*:

The Origin

The C. I., which is also called the Third International, was created somewhat hurriedly in March, 1919, with the obvious intention of anticipating or counteracting the Right Wing, or non-revolutionary Socialists, who were attempting to reconstruct the old Second International, which had gone to pieces on the outbreak of war. The Inter-Allied Socialists had in 1918 taken steps to hold a general conference at Bern in February, 1919, and the Bolsheviks, seeing what was in the wind, rushed out in January an invitation to a congress to be held in Moscow at the beginning of March. The hurry is evident, because it was impossible in the disturbed state of affairs for many of those invited to travel to Moscow at such short notice, and some never received the invitation at all until after the congress was over. However, it was held on March 2-6 and the C. I. was set up. The invitation, which condemned the Bern Conference before it had been

held, was signed by Lenin and Trotsky for Russia, and the manifesto and program adopted by the congress were signed by Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Rakovsky, and Platten. These documents laid down the aims of the new organization, which were simply to make Bolshevism a world-wide movement and so realize the Communist manifesto of Marx. In brief, what had been done in Russia was to be done everywhere. This had always been the dream of Lenin, who regarded the Russian Revolution as merely the beginning of world revolution. Zinoviev, who had long been a devoted disciple of Lenin, was made president, and he has held that position ever since.

At the second congress, held in August, 1920, this country was represented for the first time by four delegates—Quelch, Gallacher, Pankhurst, and MacLaine—who signed the manifesto issued by the congress; it was signed for Russia by Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Bukharin. But the principal business was the adoption of the statutes and the conditions of affiliation. The most interesting point in the statutes is the extreme emphasis laid on the principle of centralization, which is emphasized over and over again. There must be an "iron proletarian centralism," "an iron military order," "the strictest discipline," &c.; and all affiliated parties, organs, and accessory agencies are to be brought under the same central authority, which is the executive committee, seated in Moscow, under the presidency of Zinoviev. Russia has five representatives on it, and ten other countries have one each; but power is taken to maintain the purest orthodoxy and suppress all independence by removing persons or groups who show any signs of doubtful allegiance.

Conditions of Affiliation

In order to make clear the working of the C. I. in other countries, it is necessary to quote the conditions of affiliation in full:

(1) The entire propaganda and agitation must bear a thoroughly Communistic character and accord with the program and decisions of the C. I. All press organs of the party must be conducted by trustworthy Communists who have proved their devotion to

the cause of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be spoken of merely as a current stereotyped formula, but must be so propagated that its necessity is made intelligible to every simple workman, workwoman, soldier, and peasant from the facts of daily life, which must be systematically observed by our press and exploited day by day.

The periodical and ordinary press and all publication offices of the party must be completely subordinated to the central authority, without regard to the question whether the party as a whole is at any given moment legal or illegal. It is not permissible for the publication offices to misuse their independence and pursue a policy which does not completely coincide with that of the party. In the columns of the press, in popular meetings, in the trade unions, in the co-operative societies—everywhere, where adherents of the Third International can gain admittance, it is necessary to stigmatize systematically and mercilessly not only the bourgeoisie but also their assistants, the reformists of all shades.

(2) Every organization which desires affiliation to the C. I. must regularly and systematically remove from all more or less responsible posts in the labor movement (party organizations, editorial offices, trade unions, parliamentary groups, co-operative societies, communal administrations) the reformist and center elements and replace them by approved Communists, no matter if the place of "experienced" opportunists be taken, particularly at the beginning, by simple workmen from the rank and file.

(3) In almost all European and American countries the class conflict has entered on the phase of civil war. In these circumstances Communists can place no reliance on civil legality. They are in duty bound to create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus, which will assist the party at the decisive moment to fulfill their duty toward the revolution. In all countries where it is impossible, on account of a state of siege and exclusion regulations, for Communists to carry on the whole of their work legally, it is absolutely necessary to combine legal with illegal activities.

(4) The duty of disseminating Communist ideas includes the special obligation of an intensive systematic propaganda in the army. Where this agitation is repressed by prohibitive regulations it is to be illicitly carried on.

To abandon this task would be equivalent to a betrayal of revolutionary duty and incompatible with membership of the Third International.

(5) A systematic and planned agitation in agricultural areas is necessary. The working class cannot be victorious unless it has behind it the land proletariat and at least part of the poorest peasantry, and has secured by its policy the neutrality of the rest of the village population. The Communist task in agricultural areas is of outstanding importance at the present time. It must be carried on chiefly with the help of the revolutionary Communist workers of the town and the land who have agricultural connections. To abandon this task or to hand it over to unreliable half-reformist hands is equivalent to abandoning the proletarian revolution.

(6) Every party which desires affiliation to the Third International is bound to expose not only open social patriotism, but also the insincerity and hypocrisy of social pacifism, and systematically to impress upon the workers that without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism no international court of arbitration, no agreement about the reduction of armaments, no "democratic" reconstruction of the League of Nations, will be in a position to prevent new imperialist wars.

(7) Parties which wish to belong to the C. I. are bound to acknowledge the complete breach with reformism and the politics of the Center, and to propagate this breach in the remotest circles of their members. Without that, a consistent Communist policy is impossible.

The C. I. demands the unqualified and definitive execution of this breach with the least possible delay. The C. I. cannot consent to allow that notorious opportunists, as now represented by Turati, Kautsky, Hilferding, Hillquit, Longuet, MacDonald, Modigliani, and others, should have the right to count as belonging to the Third International. That could only lead to the Third International becoming just like the Second, which has gone to pieces.

(8) In the question of colonies and subject peoples, there is needed a particularly clear and sharply defined attitude from parties in those countries whose bourgeoisie possess colonies and hold other nations in subjection. Every party which wishes to belong to the Third International is bound to expose the

intrigues of its own Imperialists; to support, not only in words, but with deeds, every movement for freedom in the colonies; to demand the expulsion of native imperialists from the colonies; to cultivate in the hearts of the workers of its own country a real brotherly relation to the working population of the colonies and the subject nations, and to carry on a systematic agitation among the troops of its country against any and every subjection of the colonial peoples.

(9) Every party which wishes to belong to the C. I. must develop a systematic and persistent Communist activity within the trade unions, works committees, co-operative societies, and other mass organizations of workmen. Within these organizations it is necessary to organize cells, which by continuous and persistent work must win the unions, &c., to the cause of Communism. The cells are bound to expose everywhere in their daily work the treason of the social patriots and the vacillation of the Center. The Communist cells must be completely subordinated to the party as a whole.

(10) Every party affiliated to the C. I. is bound to carry on a determined fight against the Amsterdam International of the yellow unions. It must propagate among the workers, in the most energetic manner, the necessity of breaking with the Amsterdam Yellow International. It must support with every means the growing international unity of the Red trade unions which adhere to the C. I.

(11) Parties which wish to belong to the C. I. are bound to submit the personnel of their parliamentary groups to revision, to remove all unreliable elements from them, to subordinate these groups to the party authority, not only in word, but in deed, by demanding from every single member of Parliament that his entire activity be subjected to the interests of a really revolutionary propaganda and agitation.

(12) The parties affiliated to the C. I. must be built on the basis of the principle of democratic centralization. In the present period of acute civil war the Communist Party will be in a position to fulfill its duty only if it is organized in the most centralized possible manner, if iron discipline rules in it, and if the party center, upheld by the confidence of the membership, is furnished with the fullest power, authority, and the most far-reaching rights.

(13) The Communist parties of those coun-

tries in which they carry on their work legally must from time to time undertake cleansings (new registrations) of the composition of their party organizations in order to purge the party systematically of petty bourgeois (lower middle class) elements that have crept in.

(14) Every party which wishes to belong to the C. I. is bound to lend unreserved support to every Soviet republic in its fight against counter-revolutionary forces. The Communist parties must carry on an unambiguous propaganda to prevent the transport of munitions to enemies of the Soviet republics; and, further, they must carry on propaganda with every means, legal and illegal, among troops dispatched to strangle workers' republics.

(15) Parties which have still retained their old social democratic programs are now bound to alter them as quickly as possible and to work out a new Communist program in the sense of the decisions of the C. I., in conformity with the particular conditions of their own country. As a rule, the program of every party affiliated to the C. I. must be approved by the regular Congress of the C. I. or by the executive. In case of non-approval of a party program by the executive, the party concerned has the right of appeal to the Congress of the C. I.

"Acute Civil War"

(16) All decisions of the Congress of the C. I., as also decisions of the executive, are binding on all affiliated bodies. The C. I. having to work under the conditions of acute civil war, must be far more centralized in its structure than was the case with the Second International. At the same time the C. I. and its executive committee must, as a matter of course, in all their proceedings take account of the different conditions under which individual parties have to fight and work, and adopt decisions of universal application only in such questions as admit of it.

(17) In this connection it is incumbent on all parties wishing to belong to the C. I. to alter their titles. Every such party must bear the name "Communist International" of such and such a country (section of the Third Communist International). The question of title is not merely formal, but in a high degree a political question of great importance. The C. I. has declared war on the whole bourgeois world and the yellow social democratic

parties. It is necessary that the difference between the Communist parties and the old official social democratic and socialist parties, which have betrayed the banner of the working class, should be made clear to every simple working man.

(18) All leading press organs of the parties of all countries are bound to print all important official documents of the executive of the C. I.

(19) All parties which belong to the C. I. or have presented a request for admission are bound as soon as possible, and not later than four months after the Second Congress, to call an extraordinary meeting to examine all these conditions. At the same time, the central authorities must see to it that the decisions of the Second Congress are made known to all local organizations.

(20) Those parties which now desire admission to the Third International, but have not radically altered their previous tactics, must before admission see to it that not less than two-thirds of the members of their central committee and of all important central institutions are composed of comrades who have expressed themselves already before the Second Congress unambiguously in favor of admission to the Third International. Exceptions are permissible with the approval of the Executive of the Third International. The executive of the C. I. has the right to make exceptions in the case of the representatives of the Center referred to in (7).

(21) Those party members who disagree thoroughly with the conditions and principles laid down by the C. I. are to be expelled from the party. That particularly applies to delegates to the extraordinary meeting. (Communist International, No. 13, pp. 92-96. Moscow: The official journal of the C. I.)

The conditions are carefully and cleverly designed to combine widespread multiple and systematic propagation of Bolshevism, with strict centralization of authority in the hands of the Moscow group. The pretended independence of the C. I. is belied not only by its whole history, origin, aims, methods, and statutes, but also by the admissions of Zinoviev in a speech made last February to the Russian Bolsheviks and reported in the *Pravda*. He said:

While Lenin was in a state to direct our work we, the members of the Communist In-

ternational, came to him for advice, and the whole central committee agreed that his views were to be put in practice without further debate. When this became impossible, Lenin's guidance had to be replaced by that of a collective body.

The C. I. is, in effect, a department of the Moscow Administration, under the charge of Zinoviev, and its importance makes him a very influential member of the party. The apparent separation enables the Moscow Government to speak with two voices; one makes promises to foreign governments, while the other issues orders in an opposite sense to revolutionary parties in other countries.

FIVE YEARS' WORK IN THE DEVASTATED REGIONS

THE latest figures concerning reconstruction in the devastated regions of France have just been published. They give a good idea of what has been accomplished there during the last five years.

Plants, Manufactures, and Workshops: To be reconstructed at the time of the armistice: 22,900.

Rebuilt: January, 1921, 18,091; January, 1922, 19,442; January, 1923, 20,150; January, 1924, 20,872.

Dwellings: To be reconstructed, 741,933.

Rebuilt: January, 1921, 278,834; January, 1922, 355,479; January, 1923, 575,533; January, 1924, 605,989.

Population: Before the war, 4,690,183; Armistice, 2,075,067.

January, 1921, 3,288,152; January, 1922, 3,985,913; January, 1923, 4,074,970; January, 1924, 4,253,677.

Mines: Number of mines destroyed or damaged, 200.

In operation January, 1922, 106; January, 1923, 123; January, 1924, 145.

Highways: Total to be rebuilt at the end of the war, 36,500 miles.

Rebuilt: January, 1921, 5,600 miles; January, 1922, 14,000 miles; January, 1923, 24,000 miles; January, 1924, 26,500 miles.

Bridges, Tunnels, etc.: Total to be rebuilt at the end of the war, 6,125.

Rebuilt: January, 1921, 2,653; January,

1922, 3,689; January, 1923, 4,707; January, 1924, 4,800.

Land under Cultivation: The work of filling old trenches, of clearing barbed wires and destroying unexploded shells is practically completed.

At the time the Armistice was signed, 1,923,479 hectares (about 4,800,000 acres) of land had been rendered unfit for cultivation. The progress made in reclaiming that land is shown by the following figures:

January, 1921, 1,007,240 hectares (2,600,000 acres); January, 1922, 1,474,796 hectares (3,700,000 acres); January, 1923, 1,763,769 hectares (4,400,000 acres); January, 1924, 1,788,755 hectares (4,500,000 acres).

Cattle: Pre-war number of oxen, 892,338; horses, 407,888; sheep, 949,774; pigs, 356,610.

	Oxen.	Horses.	Sheep	Pigs.
January, 1921:	129,975	95,695	118,738	3,561
January, 1924:	529,940	299,690	429,000	183,720

Financial Effort Made by France in Reconstruction: The total amount of damages to private properties was estimated by local commissions, after investigation on the spot, at 82 billion francs.

For reparation of those damages, France has already disbursed 54 billion francs.

Moreover, damages done to government properties (highways, railroads, canals, bridges, etc.) amounting to 20 billion francs are now almost entirely repaired.

PAN-PACIFIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH WORK

THE first Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Congress, which came to its official close with Governor Wallace R. Farrington's banquet, has placed the Pan-Pacific Union on a firm basis as an organization interested in scientific research in conservation of natural resources, and in co-operation among Pacific countries in all matters of interest to their peoples.

According to G. E. Allen, writing in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, one of the less tangible, but nevertheless important, achievements of the conference was the bringing together from all over the Pacific

of men with similar interests and similar hopes. These men, many of whom knew each other by reputation and correspondence, met one another, in many cases, for the first time.

Pan-Pacific Representation

In representation, the conference was truly Pan-Pacific. For the first time, Russia, China, Siam, Indo-China, and Latin America have been represented at a Pan-Pacific scientific conference. For the first time, delegates from foreign countries outnumbered the delegates from the mainland United States and Hawaii. For the first time, a delegate from the League of Nations attended a conference of "the Pan-Pacific League of Nations."

The parts of the world represented form a continuous line around the border of the Pacific Ocean. There were Canada, mainland United States, Mexico, Latin America, Australia, New Zealand, Java, the Philippines, Siam, Indo-China, Formosa, China, Japan, Korea, Siberia, and Hawaii.

More distinguished persons attended this conference than any other one held under the Pan-Pacific Union's auspices. In the delegation from the United States there were four members of the National Academy of Science—Dean E. D. Merrill, Dr. David Starr Jordan, Dr. W. A. Setchell, and Dr. L. O. Howard.

Australia's delegation consisted of a number of prominent men, headed by Sir Joseph Carruthers, leader of the upper house of Parliament and former premier of New South Wales. New Zealand's delegation was headed by two members of its legislature, the Hon. Mark Cohen and the Hon. George M. Thomson.

Indo-China sent heads of six departments and members of the governor's staff. Her delegation consisted of Hippolyte Damiens, assistant chief of staff of the governor general; Viscount de la Jarrie, director of the bureau of French Colonial Information; Max de St. Felix, chief of the cabinet of the governor general; Henri Guibier, inspector in chief of the forests of Indo-China; Yves Henry, chief of the department of agriculture, Armand Krempf, director of fisheries, and Georges Marie Le Louet, head of the veterinary service.

From Macao came the governor himself, Dr. Rodrigo Rodrigues, and numerous other government officials appointed personal representatives.

The Pan-Pacific Scientific Institute

The conference has been doing much, but its work is to be continued through permanent organization and through work at the Pan-Pacific Scientific Institute at Castle Home, announcement of which was made at the opening of the conference.

Castle Home, according to the announcement, will be given to the Pan-Pacific Union, beginning next Christmas Day, with the possibility of permanent occupancy if the research institute is a success. The plans for the home will be in the hands of a Pan-Pacific Scientific Council, which will consist of the section members of the Pan-Pacific Conservation Conference.

Many suggestions have been made by delegates of work which may well be undertaken by the Pan-Pacific Scientific Institute. They feel that it can direct the work of scientists working in co-operation throughout the Pacific and can act as a clearing house for scientific information.

Australia will be willing to help finance the institute in recognition of the work which it will do for the agriculture and industry of the country, Sir Joseph Carruthers has said. Tentative arrangements have also been made with other governments and institutions, it is said, for the financing of the project.

Castle Home, or some other centrally located place, has been suggested as a place for collections of rice and breadfruit species, where those interested in their cultivation can study them conveniently.

Fisheries and Sugar Work

The Pan-Pacific Scientific Council or the directors of Castle Home will have charge of the work of the proposed Pan-Pacific Fish Survey. The Minnesota delegation to the conference will continue its work on a fish survey in Hawaii and will report in Minnesota, after which details for the fish survey of the entire Pacific waters will be worked out. Each group of scientists will take one section of the Pacific for its special field of work, and the directors of the Pan-Pacific Scientific Re-

search Institute will be in general supervision. Applications have already been received from organizations which wish to work in certain places, and indications are that many separate groups will be at work within the next two years. Each group of scientists will probably put in two years of continuous work on its project.

Formation of the Association of Investigators of the Cane Sugar Industry by the sugar delegates to the conference is another outcome of the gathering which will be of lasting importance. The conference of cane sugar men plans to meet once every three years in the various sugar-growing regions of the world, to inspect plantations and mills of different countries, to exchange ideas, and to learn of new and improved methods.

Announcements of recent developments in the scientific world have been made at the conference and have been of great interest to the delegates. One of the most important was that made by Dr. P. H. Browning in regard to the probable discovery of the foot-and-mouth-disease virus. Discovery of the cause of the so-called "Lahaina disease" of sugar cane was another announcement of importance.

Complete proceedings of the conference in a book comprising several hundred pages are to be published. The publication committee consists of local delegates, with Hamilton P. Agee as chairman.

RESULTS OF THE GERMAN PEACE AWARD

HOW can peace and prosperity be restored in Germany and in Europe through international co-operation?" was the question submitted to the people of Germany in a competition inaugurated during the past months by Mr. Edward A. Filene, of Boston, Massachusetts, together with similar competitions in Great Britain, France, and Italy. Awards of \$10,000 in various graded prizes were offered in each country. The purpose of the competitions was to stimulate widespread interest among people of all classes in the problem of international co-operation, and it was hoped that this might result in a measurable contribution towards its solution.

The awards were administered by distinguished committees in each country, including such men as Premier Edouard Herriot, Paul Painlevé and Léon Bourgeois in France; Tommaso Tittoni, Luigi Luzzatti, and Guiseppi Bianchini in Italy; Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, Sir William Beveridge, Dr. Ernest Barker, and Professor Gilbert Murray in England. The German competition was under the direction of Dr. Walter Simons, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at Leipzig, assisted by Count Bernstorff, Dr. Breitscheid, Dr. Hilferding, Count Lerchenfeld, Dr. Hugo Preuss, Professor Schüking, Count Harry Kessler, and others.

Over 15,000 plans were submitted in the various competitions, the competitors being drawn from every walk of life and school of thought, and the result has been to reveal a large and important cross-section of European opinion on international problems. The French and British plans were publicly announced on September 1 and September 8, respectively, and created widespread interest in this country. The present publication of the German prize-winning plans is perhaps of even greater interest to the American public, as indicating the trend of thought in Germany today.

The adjudication of the German plans was undertaken by a jury composed of Dr. Breitscheid, Professor Dr. Harms, Count M. Montgelas, Frau Antoine Pfülf, Professor Dr. Ludwig Quidde, Legationsrat Freiherr von Rheinbaben, Dr. Walter Simons, President of the Reichsgericht; Dr. Spahn, and Frau Ministerialrat Helene Weber. The final selection of the winning plans from the 4,400 plans submitted was completed on September 5.

In the opinion of the prize jury, no single plan was outstandingly qualified for the first prize, and it therefore unanimously decided to divide the first prize between the two comparatively best plans submitted. The following survey covers one of the two first prize-winning plans and the second prize-winning plan. The text of First Prize Plan, No. 1682, is given elsewhere in this issue.

The First Prize Plan—No. 1681

This plan states that the dictate of Versailles provides a breeding ground for new

war; that no genuine condition of peace has yet begun, least of all in Germany, where political and economic tension has reached a threatening point, and that behind a new World War a world revolution threatens. It holds that only when the problem of reparations, with the experts' report as a basis, has been brought to a peaceful solution can the question of serviceable proposals for the lasting security of European peace have any practical meaning.

For the permanent pacification of Europe it maintains that the economic sources of conflict must be eliminated or so restricted that a decision by arms is needless. These conflicts must be regulated through the development of a union of economic purpose in order to clear away national economic rivalry and promote the national existence of all members of the Western and Central European group of States.

The most essential steps for security depend on the peaceful solution of the reparations problem and the political perils bound up with it, the abandonment of force measures in the occupation of the Ruhr, and in the immediate solution of the armament problem.

The League of Nations is considered a valuable instrument for peace, but its capacity for action must be strengthened by admitting Germany as an equal member, and by supplementing its activities through the co-operation of the Interparliamentary Union. The latter would undertake the establishment of a special propaganda center for peace, would deal with the question of a special security treaty between Germany and France, would direct the immediate completion of the general disarmament obligation as laid down in Article 8 of the Versailles Treaty, would examine the Versailles Treaty with a view to its revision by the League, and would prepare a plan to clear the way for an economic union of Western and Central Europe.

The Second Prize Plan

This plan summons the nations to a common peaceful effort toward an economic and political world community. It holds that world solidarity is the immi-

nent idea of our time, which is ceaselessly, even if almost unconsciously, being forced to realization. The question is of deliberately embodying the ideal of a world community in the world system which will otherwise be brought about at the cost of appalling sacrifices. The plan considers the political organization as the cause of international conflicts, and remedies for this are, therefore, provided by regulating trade and commerce between the States through properly constituted commercial commissions, by providing that diplomatic steps be taken always through some agency of the League, by concluding treaties between nations only under authority of the League, and by publicly conducted negotiations. With regard to disarmament, the plan provides for the scrapping of all war materials by means of a consortium constituted by the League of Nations, the entire proceeds to be used for the purpose of paying off the war debts. Armament industries are to be reduced radically and placed on a peace basis. The Treaty of Versailles is to be revised, providing for the complete sovereignty of Germany. There is to be no Ottomanizing of Germany. The archives of all countries are to be opened, and all frontier districts are to be neutralized. The present rivalry among nations is to be abandoned by subjecting all colonies not ready for independence to the authority and administration of the League of Nations, by the abolishment of barriers of protective tariffs, by the regulation of travel between States, and by the creation of a unified system of weights and measures and currencies. The organization of world economy and world community will require free trade as an international principle, will necessitate the reorganization of the League of Nations and the dissolution of modern peace treaties which do not comply with the new principle.

NOTE.—Since receiving this German plan, we have received the winning plans of the Italian Peace Award—last of the series—to which we have referred in our editorial columns. Persons wishing to know more of these plans may write to Edward P. Pierce, Jr., 5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.—THE EDITOR.

IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL DATES

(October 16-November 15)

- October 16—Fighting in Canton ends and a destructive fire is stopped.
- October 17—Five thousand well-armed but leaderless men threaten Shanghai.
- October 18.—J. P. Morgan, Premier Herriot, and Finance Minister Clementel hold a conference in Paris in regard to the raising of a French loan in the United States.
- The new Socialist Cabinet of Sweden, of which M. Branting is Prime Minister, assumes office, and announces its proposal to reduce the military forces now maintained for the country's defence.
- The funeral of Anatole France occurs in Paris, the expenses being defrayed by the State.
- October 19—M. Herriot, the French Prime Minister, delivers a long speech at Boulogne, in which he reviews the government's achievements and discusses its future policy.
- October 20—President Ebert of Germany signs a declaration dissolving the Reichstag.
- Zaghlul Pasha returns to Egypt after a conference with Premier MacDonald in London.
- General von Freytag-Loringhoven, well-known German writer on history and science of war, dies.
- October 21—The 119th anniversary of the Battle of Trafalgar and of the death of Nelson is celebrated by a commemoration service in St. Paul's Cathedral, London.
- The Greek Government appeals to the League of Nations to intervene in respect to the arrest of Greeks at Constantinople by the Turks.
- October 23—The fifth session of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations opens in Geneva to consider British and French reports on Palestine and Syria.
- Railway and telegraphic communications between Peking and the rest of China are suddenly cut, as Feng Yu-hsiang, the "Christian General," takes possession of the city; Feng declares it is his purpose to end the war in China, and issues a presidential decree ordering hostilities to cease.
- October 24—A Franco-Belgian commercial agreement is signed in Paris.
- October 25—Lord Reading, Viceroy of India, grants extraordinary powers to the Government of Bengal to enable it to suppress revolutionary crime.
- Tsao Kun resigns the Presidency of the Chinese Republic, and General Feng orders the cabinet to continue its work.
- October 27—The Council of the League of Nations meets at Brussels to consider the question of the *status quo* on the northern Irak border.
- The Allied and American financial experts meet in Paris to allocate the reparation payments under the Dawes Plan.
- October 28—M. Herriot, on behalf of the French Government, sends a note to Moscow, granting recognition *de jure* to the Soviet Government.
- October 29—The Council of the League of Nations determines the provisional frontier between Turkey and Irak, which both sides have agreed to observe pending the final decision by the League.
- In the English general election the Unionists win a total of 406, a majority of 208 over all other parties.
- October 30—An award, to be known as the Wright Brothers Medal and to be given each year for the most meritorious contribution to aeronautical science, is announced by the Dayton Section of the American Society of Automotive Engineers.
- November 1—Gerardo Machado, Liberal candidate, is elected President of Cuba by a majority of 50,000

- over his opponent, Mario G. Menocal.
- The British Empire Exhibition at Wembley closes.
- November 4—Ramsay MacDonald tenders to the King his resignation as Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Baldwin accepts the King's invitation to form a new cabinet.
- Negotiations for a Franco-German commercial treaty are resumed in Paris.
- In the presidential election in the United States, President Coolidge wins 379 electoral votes, 227 more than the combined votes of his two opponents, Davis and La Follette.
- November 5—The Messrs. Vickers, at Sheffield, England, announce having signed a contract to build an airship of 5,000,000 cubic feet capacity, more than twice the size of the ZR3.
- Soldiers sent by the provisional government invade the imperial palace in Peking and compel the young Manchu emperor to sign a revised agreement between the Manchu family and the Republic of China.
- November 6—Stanley Baldwin, the new English Prime Minister, announces the names of his cabinet members, after approval had been given by the King.
- November 7—Ramsay MacDonald's labor cabinet relinquish their offices to the King, and Stanley Baldwin's new ministers receive them a few minutes later.
- Premier Herriot, following a stormy session concerning the budget in the Chamber of Deputies, wins a vote of confidence by 393 to 117.
- A mandate is issued by the Provisional Chinese Government restoring the honors of various personages, including Chang Tso-lin, the Manchurian commander who was stripped of his honors in 1922.
- The attack on the Cambattenti by Fascisti recently in Rome causes a split in the Fascist Party.
- November 8—Following a general strike on the Austrian Federal Railways November 7, involving 95,000 men, the Austrian Government resigns; Dr. Hainish, the President of the Republic, accepts the resignation of the chancellor, Dr. Seipel, but requests him to remain in office pending the replacement of the cabinet.
- November 9—Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, conspicuous figure in the United States Senate for a generation, dies.
- November 10—Abdel Krim, the Rif leader, makes a statement declaring that he is in rightful occupation of part of the region on the Rif border within the French zone in Morocco.
- November 11—The nations of the world pay solemn tribute on the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Armistice.
- On the occasion of the celebration of the birthday of the King of Italy, Premier Mussolini makes an important speech in defense of his Government and again sets forth the aims of the Fascist Party.
- November 12—Mussolini opens his parliament, with all the members of the party of the opposition absent.
- Chang Tso-lin and Feng Yuhsiang, masters of North China, urge Tuan Chi-jui, the Anfu leader, to come forth from his retirement in Tientsin and assume the Presidency of the Chinese Republic.
- November 13—Foreign Minister Hymans suggests the desirability of a triple entente comprising Belgium, England, and France.
- November 14—An agreement is reached between the United States Treasury Department and representatives of the Polish Government for the funding of the Polish debt of \$178,560,000.
- November 15—Mussolini wins a vote of confidence in the Chamber of Deputies by 315 to 6, with 26 abstentions.

THE TWENTY-THIRD INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS

BY ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

BERLIN, *October 9, 1924.*

THE Congress of peace workers which began here in Berlin, October 2, ended last night with a dinner. A drab statement such as this covers practically every peace conference, sometimes it must be confessed, with sufficing fullness. It would not, however, be an adequate or a just summary of what has been going on here in the "*Reichswirtschaftsrat*," a government building formerly devoted to the administration of the German colonies, but now, I judge from the word, the government's house-cleaning department.

Co-operation of German Government

One of the many interesting things to an ordinary American, wandering around the various conferences here, is to note how readily the present German Government turns over its buildings to the use of the peace workers. It is difficult to conjure up in one's imagination one of our peace societies at home holding a meeting, say, in our Supreme Court chamber at Washington, of the American Peace Society holding a peace demonstration in the House of Representatives, or of our Government at Washington turning over the Department of the Interior to a radical peace demonstration. And yet, here in Berlin, I have seen an international conference arranged by the Union of Radical School Reformers, held through a number of days in the New Schoeneberg Rathaus; a series of quite radical meetings in the Berlin Stadthalle; and the official opening of this the Twenty-third International Peace Congress in the Reichstag itself, Sunday morning, October 5, when the place was packed with German men and women listening to an address by Senator Henri La Fontaine of Belgium, to another by Senator Ferdinand Buisson of France, to another by Mrs. E. Pethick-Lawrence of England, one by Paul Loebe of the German Parliament, and one by Fridtjof Nansen of Norway. The ovation which this large audience, mostly German men and women, gave to each

of these speakers—standing on the platform made conspicuous by Von Bethmann-Hollweg and others in 1914—gripped the visiting delegates, at least one of them. There was a dramatic element in the occasion. I noted, sitting there myself on the platform, that the seating capacity of the place seems larger than that of our own House of Representatives. The decorations are heavier, more ornate and symbolic. The hall is lighted from above through a glass the centerpiece of which is a shield and an eagle with savage, red talons astride a Greek cross. Every seat is taken and many are standing on the floor. The same thing is true of the gallery. At 11:18 the presiding officer rings a little bell. There is silence. Music by stringed instruments and a flute creates an atmosphere of religious solemnity. The speakers begin. The listeners follow the speakers with intentness and enthusiasm and applaud with sincerity. Every appeal to justice and freedom and peace seems to strike a tender and a responsive cord in the heart of each. This in the German Reichstag.

Preparatory Work

The preparation of the work of the congress was delegated, as is usual in these conferences, to commissions: one on actualities, a second on questions of international law and the League of Nations, a third on disarmament, a fourth on economic and social questions, a fifth on education and propaganda.

These commissions began their work Thursday, October 2. Their sessions lasted through Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and some of them into the next week. It must be said that the members of these commissions worked diligently, some of them through three sessions daily. The discussions in committee sometimes reached fever heat. Certain representatives of extreme views, resenting the will of the majority, later carried their proposals before the general assembly, where they remained defeated but unconvinced still.

Some of the Proposals

But all of the committees were able to report resolutions acceptable to the Congress. This was true even of the very thorny problem of the minorities, agitating particularly the newly created governments of Central Europe and the Balkans. It was generally agreed, for example, that the various peace organizations within the States where there are these national minorities should urge these minorities to create peace organizations on their own behalf. The thought seemed to be that in this way the International Peace Bureau at Geneva could be kept informed of the nature of the conflicts arising between these majorities and minorities. It was agreed that the States, particularly those created after the war, should organize the protection of the minorities in a way that these minorities should be endowed with the same intellectual, moral, religious, and economic rights and duties as the majorities, and that the existing treaties for the protection of these minorities should be kept, amplified, and extended to States that have not yet similar treaties. There is no doubt that this problem of the minorities must of necessity thrust itself into the discussions of any group concerned with the "actualities" in Europe.

Other "actualities" were noted by the Congress. For example, it was felt that France and Germany are showing signs of coming more hopefully together. The Congress recognized "with satisfaction" that nations are supporting the policy of conciliation and peace in their elections. The acceptance and the institution of the Dawes Plan, pledges and guarantees by Germany, a comprehensive treatment of German indebtedness, the recent conference in London, the fifth Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva, the efforts by the League of Nations to direct and control military activities, the gradual evacuation of the Ruhr, the proposed conference on disarmament, were all looked upon as "actualities" leading toward a real international peace.

At the same time, the Congress affirmed that the adequate and honorable payment of reparations by Germany, the reconstruction of the devastated areas in northern France and in Belgium, "are in-

dispensable in law and in practice." It urged the entry of Germany into the League of Nations, and the firmer establishment of the International Court of Justice, "supported by necessary sanctions."

The International Peace Bureau was requested to follow with special attention the course of events in the Balkans, from whence sprang the World War, to publish widely information of the situation in that section of Europe, and, if necessary, to take steps on its own initiative to awaken public opinion to the claims of civilization, to bring governments to recognize their duty to preserve peace. The International Peace Bureau was further urged, in accordance with a custom of the past, to furnish to future congresses a detailed report as a suitable basis for the discussion and decision on "actualities."

It appeared that the Congress was interested in political prisoners, "who in many lands are suffering long periods of imprisonment without trial." It was felt that such things lead to misunderstandings and increase international ill-will. The military campaign now devastating China was thought apparently to be "instigated by certain foreign influences," and the Congress pointed out the danger to all countries, even to those remotely situated, inherent in all outbreaks of war. It called attention to the fact that the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations has passed formal condemnation upon war, and that there is no conflict incapable of solution according to the principles of right and equity.

The Weakness of Attempting Too Much

Looking back across these days, perhaps the outstanding impression is that in attempting so much, very little has been accomplished. Seemingly only the limitations of time curtailed the ambitions of the delegates. Besides matters already mentioned, some were concerned with the improvement of the League of Nations, some with the methods of peace propaganda, some with the codification of international law, some with the difficulties arising from passports and visas, some with the adoption of some international language, some with the setting up of a Pan Europe, some with the alternative

service laws adopted by the governments of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Russia, which laws recognize the right of the individual to refuse military service on conscientious grounds.

The Congress went on to advocate the complete disarmament of all States "with the exception of the police force necessary for the maintenance of internal order and the collaboration in international action." It favored the general abolition of compulsory military service and "the proclamation by the League of Nations of a prohibition of compulsory military service in all affiliated States." It was believed that all private manufacture of war materials must be prohibited and the arms industry must become a State monopoly, under the control of the League of Nations. One group of the Congress felt that the maximum eight-hour day should be adopted by all countries, and that there should be a universal index as the basis for the minimum wages in the different countries. The fourth commission felt that this should make impossible that workers of one country are lower paid than another, and that thus pressure on wages would be prevented. The control of aircraft came in for its share of discussion. It was pointed out that, in view of the fact that economic rivalry is one of the main causes of war, "it is of the greatest interest to establish free trade as soon as possible," and that there should be "an international conference for economic disarmament." It was urged that there should be an international institution of credit and finance for the stabilization of commerce, for the flotation of international loans and the control of these loans, and the re-establishment of production, trade, and commerce. One group pointed out that there must be a radical reform in the whole system of education in the interest of world peace, a system impregnated with the spirit of conscious social unity embracing all mankind.

The Congress resolved that the International Peace Bureau should arrange for one uniform badge for all international peace congresses, and to do everything in its power to effect a closer and more intimate union of all the peace societies of the world, and to issue a world peace movement yearbook, giving as completely

as possible a list of addresses of societies, of speakers, of publications, and the like, together with a short up-to-date outline of the world peace movement.

Having learned that members of the Danish Government are working for a total disarmament of Denmark, the Congress sent its congratulations and fervently hoped that this large-hearted initiative will be adopted by the Chamber. I have since learned that this proposal to the Danish Parliament is a long way from adoption.

It was suggested that one of the most efficient means to promote international conciliation is by personal contacts, and that peace societies, therefore, should facilitate as far as possible the foreign journeys of their members.

Another Dramatic Picture

Some twenty nationalities were represented in the Congress. About a dozen delegates registered from the United States. There was a delegate from Argentina and another from Bulgaria. There were two Belgians present, a score or more from England. Several hundred Germans, members of various peace organizations, registered and attended the conferences. There were sixteen French peace workers present, including Ferdinand Buisson, Prof. Victor Basch, Lucian Le Foyer, Gaston Moch, and General Verraux.

The name of General Verraux reminds me of another interesting memory of this conference. General Verraux is not only a French general, he saw active service in his country's war with Germany. There has also been at the conference another general, General Freiherr von Schönaich, a German general who saw service on the other side. I had an interview with General von Schönaich. He is a tall, upstanding, and vigorous type. He looked mildly into my eyes and announced, "I am now a pacifist general." He has written a book the title of which, translated into English, is "*From the Last to the Next War*." This book, which has been from the press only a short time, has reached its second edition. General Percin of France and General Hamilton of England have written prefaces to the book. The General tells me that the ambition

of his life is to win people to pacifism, and that the immediate purpose of his book is to convince nations that it is to their interest to adopt the doctrines of pacifism. But the interesting memory to which I have just alluded, a picture which comes back now to me clearly, is that of General Verraux of the French army and General von Schönaich of the German army vying with each other, one in the French and the other in the German tongue, from a common platform in a government-owned building in the city of Berlin, pleading with all the sincerity at their command for a new world order based without equivocation upon the unalloyed principles of pacifism.

As to Publicity

The papers have not done justice to this Congress. They have represented it inadequately. They have pictured it untruthfully. For example, when Prof. Victor Basch of France and Herr Loebe, former President of the German Reichstag, addressed a peace meeting in Potsdam on the evening of October 6, one paper—printed in English, it must be confessed—ran at the head of its leading article the next day "*Potsdam Scene of Facist Riot . . . incident first test of strength between monarchists and republicans.*" The facts connected with this meeting warranted no such heading whatsoever. When the head of the police of Potsdam heard that there was to be a meeting, he notified the chief of police in Berlin that he would not be responsible for whatever might happen at the meeting. This evidently was a monarchist's expression of resentment that there was to be a peace meeting in Potsdam, headquarters of the Nationalist movement. Berlin's chief of police notified the Potsdam official, however, that he would be held strictly responsible for any disorders which might arise because of the peace meeting. The simple result was that there were no disorders of any kind whatsoever.

The worst that can be said of this International Peace Congress is that it had its share of what Mr. Roosevelt called the "lunatic fringe." But it had no more than the average conference of a similar size where reformers foregather.

The Meaning of It All

These gatherings are not without meaning. I have been watching the men and women responsible for this Congress carefully. I have talked with many of them. I have listened to their views and tried to understand with an open and sympathetic mind. Undoubtedly, these people represent a transection of genuine public opinion—a public opinion which rulers may well bear in mind as they go about their jobs of running things.

Reformers, especially when they are more zealous than informed, often injure their cause and at best secure for their efforts only smiles of forbearance, if not contempt, from the men in positions of responsibility, the men who control and direct policies. Enthusiasm is a most necessary factor in the upward march of humanity; it may be a glorious thing; but it may also be a foolish, a futile, even a harmful thing.

Yet this Congress has been brought into being by the International Peace Bureau which received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1910. The President of this bureau is Senator Henri La Fontaine, of Belgium, who received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1913. Indeed, the second award of the Nobel Peace Prize, in 1902, went to Messrs. Ducommun and Gobat, officials of this bureau. Dr. Ludwig Quidde, long a professor in the University of Munich and a former member of the German Reichstag, an outstanding peace worker of Europe for a generation, a captivating personality, with sense, devotion, and sweetness, has been, throughout, the main directing influence of the Congress. Of course, Dr. Golay, Secretary of the Peace Bureau, has been constantly at his post. Wehberg, Schücking, Eickhoff, Gerlach, not to mention the staff of secretaries, are some of the other Germans who made the conferences go.

But the Congress has meant more than any person. It has been an expression of the universal will, deep in the hearts of the common people everywhere, to end war. President Harding was right: "With the possible exception of a few selfish politicians, no people in all the world want war."

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES

By the Rt. Hon. LORD PHILLIMORE

(NOTE.—Following is the translation of the third lecture delivered by Lord Phillimore at the Academy of International Law, at The Hague, July, 1923. The second lecture was published in the October and November numbers of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.)

I AM not sorry to have finished my long account of the right of independence. The rights which remain for discussion can be more easily explained and applied. The third branch of the trunk is the right of self-defense.

Calvo calls it the right of preservation, and according to him it includes performance of all those acts which are indispensable in order to repel an aggression or avoid an imminent danger.

On this point I propose to cite an important passage from Wheaton :

"The first and most important of all absolute international rights, that which serves as a fundamental base to most of the others, is the right of preservation. Every corporate body from the moment that it achieves a lawful existence has the right to provide for the functioning and preservation of this existence. Therefore political societies or sovereign States, lawfully established, also enjoy this right. The right of self-preservation necessarily implies all the other incidental rights which are essential for arriving at this object. Among these rights is to be found that of repelling with force against the aggressor any unjust attacks against the State or its citizens.

"This form of the right of preservation is called the right of lawful defense, and this right comprehends that of requiring military service from all the peoples of the State, of keeping on foot naval forces, or of erecting fortifications and imposing taxes and requiring contributions for these objects. It is evident that the only limit which can be put on the exercise of these absolute rights is placed by the corresponding and equal rights of other States or by special treaties with those States."¹

My father has said :

"The right of self-preservation is the first law of nations, as it is of individuals. A

¹ Wheaton's *Droit International*, vol. 1, part 2, ch. 1, par. 2.

society which is not in a condition to repel aggression from without is wanting in its principal duty to the members of which it is composed and to the chief end of its institution.

"All means which do not affect the independence of other nations are lawful for this end. No nation has a right to prescribe to another what these means shall be, or to require any account of her conduct in this respect."²

It is not difficult to form an idea of what this right of preservation carries with it. Every State has the right to maintain an army, and, if it is a maritime State, a fleet, and a sufficient coast guard for its security; to fortify its ports and its frontiers and all its territory against all sorts of incursions, military, naval, or aerial; to construct and collect munitions of war; to repel hostile bands; to refuse admission to evil-disposed persons and to goods which are unwholesome in themselves or hurtful to domestic animals or cultivated trees and plants; to impose quarantine and every kind of hygienic precaution.

As a consequence of this right, the State, if it perceives in any neighboring State military preparations without apparent motive, or a concentration of troops near its frontiers, or even a great increase of military forces, will be entitled, as a precautionary measure, to demand explanation, and, if the answers made to it are not satisfactory, to take its own measures of defense; or if there should be a gathering of conspirators against its security which finds shelter in a neighboring State, to make its own demands accordingly.

But one must always keep in mind the counterpoise—*i. e.*, the maxim *sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas*, and that each right carries along with it a reciprocal duty. A State which complains of the increase in the military forces of another State must in itself give no cause for such an increase by its own military or naval preparations. It must not give shelter to people who are endeavoring to subvert the constitution of some other country, etc.

² Phillimore's *International Law*, sec. 211.

All that I am saying to you on this point is obvious, and there is no place for delicate distinctions. I can imagine only one exceptional case. If the police of a neighboring State is so feeble that it lets bands of adventurers form near the frontier, must the other State remain on the defensive, or has it the right to cross the frontier to disperse these hostile gatherings? My father thought that it had the right, and in connection with this matter he relates the affair of the ship, the *Caroline*³—that is, the sinking by the Canadian militia of an American ship anchored in American waters, which was about to aid a revolt in Canada. It is a case which has also an interest on the question of the discharge by a Federal State of its international obligations, and we shall return to it in my next lecture. My father justifies this drastic action as being one of legitimate self-defense, and Hall supports it as intervention for self-protection.⁴ But Calvo expresses himself in a contrary sense:

"In strictness we think that this is to go too far, to encourage the abuse of force, and to make a grave attack on the right of sovereignty."

And then he explains that one ought to begin by making a complaint to the other State and putting upon it the duty of taking necessary measures, and that after this has been done its acts or omissions would become unfriendly proceedings and give the right to acts of retorsion.

In my view, always excepting cases of emergency like that of the *Caroline*, a State should act as Calvo says. Or now, in the case of States which belong to the League of Nations, it should make a representation to the Council of the League, according to articles 12 and 15 of the Covenant.

Westlake says that one may go too far in the exercise of this right.⁵ He objects to the application of this doctrine, either in jurisprudence or as a matter of morality, in the case of individuals, as if (to put cases which occur to me) on a shipwreck two persons were clinging to a plank which could not support both, or

two men were in a desert or in the Arctic regions with provisions for one only. I think these are theoretical objections. I do not see how they could arise between two nations. I had, indeed, supposed that it might be possible, in the development of mechanical science, that such a barrage of the Nile might be set up as could turn the river away to right or left, and thus ruin Egypt; in which case Egypt would have the right to save itself. But the general law with regard to the rights of riverain States might well cover such a case. However, I make no objection to Westlake's definition of this right as a right of defense.

Writers sometimes speak of the right of equality and the right of respect as separate things, but they can be treated together. The equality of States is a phrase which in one sense is a truism, but in another sense false. It is like the equality side by side with liberty and fraternity in the well-known saying established by the French Revolution. It is true to say that all men are, as regards the law, equal. No citizen, no State, has a right to have a special law or privilege for itself. Laws apply equally to the noble and to the peasant, to States which are great and powerful and to those which are small and weak.

The rights of sovereignty, independence, and self-defense, and the other rights of which we have still to speak, exist for small States as well as great ones. A conference of the Great Powers cannot make new international laws without the consent of the smaller States. Wherever unanimity is required, the dissent of the smallest State is fatal. This appears in the Covenant, in which, by article 5, except for certain questions of procedure, unanimity is required, whether in the Council or in the Assembly.

But now let us look at the reverse of the medal. For practical purposes, one must reckon for an inequality among States. At any rate, since 1815, if not before, the Great Powers have exercised an hegemony. Every one of the schemes for securing perpetual peace which have been published during or since the World War, which I have read, and I have perused many, have accepted this kind of hegemony; and it is to be noticed in the

³ Phillimore, vol. 1, sec. 216; vol. II, sec. 38.

⁴ Hall, sections 90 and 91.

⁵ Westlake: *International Law*, 1904, ch. 13.

construction of the League of Nations, if the formation of the Council be compared with that of the Assembly.

It is the same thing in the Permanent Court of International Justice. After the failure of all the attempts which were made at The Hague Conference in 1907, and after we in the preparatory commission had found ourselves in difficulty because the equality of States was insisted upon, the genius of Mr. Root discovered a method of election which, while granting the suffrage to each State, gave notwithstanding recognition to the national authority of the Great Powers. As said the poet Sophocles:

"The small stones, without the support of the great, make a feeble and tottering fortress wall."*

Nevertheless, in the peirage of nations, each State is entitled to respect—Achtung. The right belongs to all, great and small. The style which each gives itself is accepted. We give to it and to its chief the titles of honor that it claims. We recognize the dignity of its King, Emperor, or Prince; or, if it is a Republic, of its President or the members of its Directory. Its accredited diplomats will all enjoy the same privileges; its flag receives the same salutes. It is, perhaps, a question of courtesy. But these matters are not unimportant for a nation which is jealous and proud of its fatherland.

On the right of acquiring territory (acquisition), much learning is to be found; but, for my part, I am not going to detain you long by discussing this subject, because almost every future acquisition will be obtained by way of cession, and we are not discussing rights which arise from contract or the products of a treaty, but only those rights which are primary and fundamental. In those rare cases where acquisition will be made otherwise than by cession, the right of acquiring by occupation must be admitted as a principle. No doubt you will remember this quotation from La Fontaine:

"La dame au nez pointu répondit que la terre était au premier occupant."†

But, with the exception of some deserts and the polar regions, there is now no part of the world unoccupied. The difficult moral question on the right of occupying territories where savage tribes, though without fixed habitation in them, were accustomed to wander as nomads are now matters of ancient history.

In a somewhat modified sense, one may think of the right of acquisition as the right of acquiring the riches of a country, exploiting its territory, unearthing its minerals, making use of all the intellectual and scientific capacities of its citizens, augmenting its commerce—in fine, developing itself. And the right of development (to use a phrase of the late M. Zeballos) without any interference from any jealous neighbor is an indisputable right.

The right of possession of public treasure and public ships, etc., to bring actions to recover or maintain possession, is a corollary of the right of acquisition.

Some writers make the right of jurisdiction into a separate right. By this they mean the right to constitute tribunals and courts of justice; to confer on them the authority of judging causes and giving their decisions thereon and having them carried into execution, *manu militari*, as the Roman lawyers used to express it—that is, by the officers of justice—*sergens*, *nuissiers*, etc. (the sheriffs in Anglo-American jurisprudence).

It is as well that you should understand that this right exists, but for my part I would rather treat it as a branch from or a consequence of the right of sovereignty than a separate right.

At this point, gentlemen, I set myself to study the texts, so as to be certain that jurisprudence did not conceive of other rights besides those with which I have been occupying myself. I was reassured. Even the careful enumeration of Cruchaga and his recapitulation of the rights mentioned by his predecessors did not reveal any other rights except those which I have mentioned and those about which I still propose to speak. It is true that writers do not always use the same terms.

I pass, therefore, on to the three last rights, which can be grouped under one formula—relative rights. They are the right of embassy, the supplementary right

* Ajax, II, 158-159.

† Le Chat, La Belette et le petit Lapin.

of making treaties, and the right of commerce.

It is well that I should remind you here of that which I said in my first lecture, that it is impossible in practice for a State to escape from having relations with other States, and it is in order that these relations may be properly established that use is made of the first right, the right of embassy.

When I speak of embassy and an ambassador I use these words in a general sense, understanding thereby every sort of diplomatic representation from one State towards another. Comprised under this genus are the following species: the ambassador in the strict sense, the officer who is called "ministre" in French and in English envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, and also the chargé d'affaires and the diplomatic agent. In a word, I speak of all those whom Bynkershoek calls "legati."

From time to time it is necessary for every State to communicate with another State—that is to say, to make friendly communications; to offer excuses if any injury has been done by the State or its citizens to the subjects of another State; to demand the discontinuance of some injury being done or compensation for an injury already done; to give explanations; to effect reconciliations and to agree upon measures which are advantageous to the citizens of the two countries.

The bearer of such commissions must necessarily have the right to a safe conduct and a peaceful reception. This is the elementary condition of the right of embassy. Then progress is made on these lines. The messenger is directed to make explanations *viva voce*, to receive them personally, to enter into conversations. Then he becomes a real ambassador. And on the occasions when there is need of an ambassador, the State has a right to send one, and it is the duty of the other State to receive him, always provided he is a *persona grata*; for if by possibility he might be a spy or a breeder of quarrels or likely to start a conspiracy, the State to whom he is accredited has a right to say, "Find me some one else."

So far I have been speaking of an embassy sent for a particular occasion, temporary, *ad hoc*. No State has a right to

demand of another State that it should admit the residence of a foreigner, bound in duty to his own State, privileged by virtue of his position, always at hand to collect and report the proceedings of the government—perhaps the most secret ones—and the floating currents of public opinion.

A permanent embassy is not a matter of right. The Amir of Afghanistan was, in my opinion, "dans son droit" when in years past he refused to admit a resident English ambassador. And it was, as I thought at the time, a mistake when my country used its right as a conqueror to insist upon such a permanent embassy—a mistake which entailed sad results.

I should agree with a government which, while admitting the presence of a Russian negotiator for the purpose of solving a particular question, refused him permission to make a long stay, while the Soviet Government took up a position upsetting and disturbing the repose of other States.

But, though a permanent embassy is not a matter of right, its existence has been so much accepted for a long time by most of the States of the world, accepted with reciprocity, "sub mutæ vicissitudinis obtentu," to use a phrase taken from the canon law, that it would be a grave and unfriendly act if a State, without some serious reason, refused to receive a resident ambassador.

This being so, the position of an ambassador, a privileged foreigner enjoying the right of extraterritoriality, has led to almost a code of special laws, which will be discussed in the lectures of my colleague, M. Strisower.

Now I pass to the right of making treaties. "What!" some one will ask me, "cannot one enter into contracts with whom one wishes? Is there a different rule for individuals and for States?" I answer that I agree with you and that it would be in the strict sense of the word impertinent if State X were to complain that States A and B have come to an agreement between themselves. Nevertheless, it will be useful to insist somewhat on this right.

For history teaches us that a powerful State has sometimes considered that it had another State, so to speak, "in its pocket," and has gone so far as to treat

it as an act of treachery if that State contracted a treaty without its permission.

It is the touchstone of a protectorate. A protected State cannot make treaties except with the permission of the protector State. For this very reason, therefore, the right to make treaties is so plainly a mark of independence that it must be insisted upon.

Nevertheless, as always, this right has its limitations. If by treaties of alliance, such as would form a league for offensive purposes, the peace of some other State was threatened, this latter could in its turn avail itself of the right of self-defense. To avoid this danger, the Covenant of the League of Nations contains three articles:

"Article 18. Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

"Article 19. The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

"Article 20. The members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

"In case any member of the League shall, before becoming a member of the League, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations."

Let us now turn to the right of commerce (*Verkehr*). This right, one should remark, is not the right of a State in its corporate capacity. It is the right of its subjects, the citizens of its nation.

Here again, as in the case of treaties, a third State cannot offer opposition to the subjects of two other States engaging in mutual commerce.⁸ If the United States sends goods to Holland and the people of

Holland wish to receive them, France cannot forbid this commerce. Yes; but if Holland does not desire that its subjects should receive American merchandise?

I must ask pardon of our hosts for the supposition that Holland could be capable of so unreasonable an act; but still, if it pleased her to forbid commerce with some other country—that is to say, to order its citizens not to receive products of another country—it would be within its rights. There are examples to be found everywhere. In my country there is a prohibition on the importation of cattle, with a noteworthy and recent exception for Canada; also, we do not allow dogs to be imported. In many countries all kinds of vegetable objects which might carry phylloxera are forbidden.

In Article 22 of the Covenant, on the subject of mandates, it is stated:

"Other peoples * * * are at such a stage that the mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions" * * *

Among which are enumerated—

"the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic." * * *

Here we trace an admission for the right to forbid commerce in certain articles.

If you substitute for absolute prohibition an imposition of duty so discouragingly heavy as almost to amount to actual prohibition, you will find nearly everywhere custom duties proposed for the protection of native industries.

Myself I have always been a disciple of Cobden, Laveleye, and Gladstone—a determined supporter of free trade; but I must admit that this doctrine has not made much progress during the last 80 years. Even in my own country, which is the source of this tenet, they have lately fallen away with a law which professes to be for the safeguarding of certain industries (Act of 1921, 11 and 12 George V, c. 47).

Again, by a sort of analogy, there are certain countries which do not permit free immigration. I shall speak more fully about these in my next lecture.

⁸ See also Holtzendorff, sec. 20.

Now, as to exportation, a matter of greater delicacy, I do not think that up to this moment any State has pushed its rights so far as to refuse to supply foreigners with raw materials; but till quite lately, if not still, the law of Holland forbade the exportation of sugar unless by license or in minute quantities; and Italy does not allow objects of antiquity or its masterpieces of painting and sculpture to be taken out of the country.

It is all very well to speak of the right of commerce, but in reality Vattel is right when he imposes his limitations:

"Seeing, then, that a nation has not by nature the right to sell its merchandise to another which does not wish to buy it, and that she has only an imperfect right to buy from other nations what she needs; that it is for these latter to determine whether they are in the position to sell or are not, and that commerce consists in the reciprocal sale and purchase of all sorts of merchandise, it is evident that it is a matter which depends on the will of each nation whether she will or will not have commerce with another. And if she is willing to permit it to a nation, it is still for her to permit it under such conditions as she may deem suitable. For in permitting commerce with her, she grants to her a right; and every one is free to attach such conditions as one pleases to a right which one voluntarily grants."⁹

Calvo well says:

"That it is in virtue of this same principle of the mutual independence of nations that one cannot refuse to any people the right of refusing to admit foreign commerce, to prohibit the exportation of its products or its treasures and to prevent immigration."¹⁰

I am bold enough to refuse to follow the authority of Cruchaga when he says:

"Do the sovereignty and independence of a State extend so far as to authorize it to shut all its doors against foreign commerce, thus isolating itself completely? Certainly not, because, as we have seen, the right of every State has for its limit the right of others."¹¹

For my part, it seems to me that the best statement of principle on this question is to be found in Oppenheim, a jurist

of great distinction, from whom I extract a rather long quotation:

"Many adherents of the doctrine of fundamental rights include therein also a right of intercourse of every State with all others. This right of intercourse is said to contain a right of diplomatic, commercial, postal telegraphic intercourse, of intercourse by railway, a right of foreigners to travel and reside on the territory of every State, and the like. But, if the real facts of international life are taken into consideration, it becomes at once apparent that such a fundamental right of intercourse does not exist. All the consequences which are said to follow from the right of intercourse are not at all consequences of a right, but nothing else than consequences of the fact that intercourse between the States is a condition without which a law of nations would not and could not exist. The civilized States make a community of States because they are knit together through their common interests and the manifold intercourse which serves these interests. Through intercourse with one another and with the growth of their common interests, the law of nations has grown up among the civilized States. Where there is no intercourse, there cannot be a community and a law for such community. A State cannot be a member of the family of nations and an international person if it has no intercourse whatever with at least one or more other States. Varied intercourse with other States is a necessity for every civilized State. . . . But no special right or rights of intercourse between the States exist, according to the law of nations. It is because such special rights of intercourse do not exist that the States conclude special treaties regarding matters of post, telegraphs, telephones, railways and commerce. On the other hand, most States keep up protective duties to exclude or hamper foreign trade in the interest of their home commerce, industry and agriculture. And although as a rule they allow aliens to travel and to reside on their territory, they can expel every foreign subject, according to discretion."¹²

Hall certainly,¹³ and it seems to me

⁹ Calvo: *Droit International*, sec. 385.

¹⁰ Cruchaga: *Nociones de Derecho Internacional*, sec. 249.

¹¹ L. Oppenheim: *International Law*, vol. 1, pages 199-200.

¹² Ed. Pearce Higgins, sec. 13.

⁹ Vattel: *Droit de Gens*, sec. 92.

Holzendorff⁴⁴ also, is of the same opinion. It follows that the right of commerce exists only as the right of any two nations to engage in commerce between each other without interference from a third State, and that for all other cases it is rather a proposition of political wisdom than one of jurisprudence.

So, gentlemen, of the three relative rights, the right of embassy exists abso-

⁴⁴ Holzendorff, sec. 26.

lutely, but only within certain limits; the rights to make treaties and to engage in commerce exist only relatively—that is to say, that if two States desire to bind themselves by an ordinary treaty or to engage mutually in commerce, a third State has no right to interfere. But no State can insist that another State should make a treaty with it or engage in commerce with it.

So, gentlemen, I conclude the chapter on fundamental rights.

FOREIGN SOCIETIES IN PEKING

By JOHN GILBERT REID

President of the International Institute of China

AN eminent Chinese physician recently made a suggestion which was something like this: In Peking there are too many societies, all with different officers and membership lists; also membership fees. Why not form one large, all-embracing organization and have the various society activities included under department heads? For instance, a resident of Peking might be interested in literature and public questions; then he could attend the meetings of the departments under those headings, which now, offered by separate societies, he can only attend if a member of both societies. That means, if the all-embracing organization were adopted, the various independent clubs and societies in Peking would unite, amalgamate, and divide up into branches of one society. The present Chinese Social and Political Science Association would then be a department with the same purpose; the present Historical Association would be another department; the present Wen Yu Hui would be a third department; the present "Things Chinese" Society would be a fourth; the present Friday Study Club a fifth; the Mothers' Club a sixth, and so forth—all, however, being necessary and desirable parts of the one parent organization, which would be international in character, broad in purpose, and useful in extent and scope.

While it is not the intention here to advocate any such combination, it is nevertheless interesting to ponder what

such union might mean to the social, intellectual, and recreational life of Peking. The American Woman's Club of Shanghai is an example of what such a combination might be, except that the Shanghai organization is restricted to American women, more or less, while the contemplated combination in Peking would include men and women of all nationalities. The main advantage of such an organization would be in the bringing closer together persons of various nations, in their association for mutual benefit, and in a simplification of the present rather confused state of Peking interests. A newcomer to Peking finds so many clubs, societies, and associations to join or to choose from that he or she is at a loss what to do. Certainly one cannot get the full benefit of all the organizations, for they even meet on the same evening or at the same time. However, it is not the intention here to discuss the advantages or disadvantages of details.

Peking's organizations have increased by leaps and bounds in very recent times. A score years ago, particularly before the Boxer movement, there were very few organizations, such as clubs, in Peking. Thirty years ago such a thing as internationalism in Peking was practically unknown. The Mandarin official had little or nothing to do with the foreigner. Foreigners approached Chinese officials only through their legations. There was scarcely any intercourse, any exchange of ideas. The foreign population in Peking

was almost nil, so far as influence went. Only the diplomat and the missionary had anything to do with the Chinese in Peking, for the trader was in a decided minority out of the coast treaty port. The missionary confined his activities exclusively to the poorer classes, leaving the official and higher classes to look after their own interests, which they were able to do with equanimity. It was really not until after the fateful days of the summer of 1900 that any semblance of intercourse between foreigners and Chinese official classes could be noted in Peking life. Only in the most recent years has the rapid increase of Sino-foreign organizations taken place. Perhaps either a halt or reorganization is needed now.

Thirty years ago a new and even novel venture was undertaken by an American whose first ten years in China as a missionary had convinced him that the higher classes also deserved some attention from the foreigner, particularly if friendship were to develop between the Easterner and the Westerner. The form which this venture took was described originally as a Mission Among the Higher Classes, later being renamed the International Institute of China. The founder of this organization, if such it might be called at that early period of Sino-foreign relations, arrived back in China from furlough at home with a scant thousand dollars with which to begin work. He was not supported by any home board and depended entirely on friends at home and in China for the success of his venture into internationalism in China. He came direct to Peking, seat of the government, and promptly tackled the higher classes. What at that time was unheard of—visiting imperial princes and officials without legation help—became one of the chief methods of bringing the West to the Eastern higher classes. Thirty years have brought many changes!

In less than three years the venture received its first official approval, which was later again shown at different times. On account of the sudden anti-foreign movement which broke out in North China in 1900, the headquarters of the International Institute of China were transferred to Shanghai. Prior to the anti-foreign outbreak, cordial approval and promised

financial aid from Americans and Europeans at home had encouraged the promoters of the venture to enlarge their efforts. At that time the founder himself had secured the valuable assistance of a co-worker, the well-known sinologue, Dr. W. A. P. Martin, and of a self-supporting friend from America, Rev. William B. Stelle. With this foreign staff the work was pushed vigorously, until the Boxer uprising put an end to it in Peking. Dr. Martin and Mr. Stelle did not feel ready to move to Shanghai, and the founder went south alone, however, with many expressions of good will and sympathy. It is not exactly correct to say he went alone, for he had, during the enthusiastic period just prior to the Boxer movement, undertaken a second venture. As a result, he went to Shanghai with a family consisting of wife and son. In Shanghai he found immediate support and great encouragement. The names of men who backed the International Institute of China are most of them prominent in the Sino-foreign life of Shanghai at that time. With their active help, the venture entered upon an era of growth and influence which lasted until war broke down every last vestige of internationalism in the world.

More than five years have now elapsed since the war ended. Due to the shattering of most of the war illusions since the armistice, the spirit of internationalism has begun again to revive. Peking is a splendid place in which to encourage this spirit. China took no active part in the war and the community in Peking is international in character. The futile feelings of the war are over, the hatreds have subsided, and common sense is once more forging to the front. The founder of the first international friendship society in China still believes in the principles for which he stood when he launched his venture thirty years ago. Whether he is personally able to see the vindication of those principles, it really does not matter; the point is that they should be and surely will be vindicated sooner or later. The Chinese physician's idea of a combined organization might suggest a way toward this vindication of the desirability for a real spirit of harmony, peace, friendship, of international proportions, especially in Peking, where East meets West every day in the year.

THE GERMAN PEACE PLAN

How Can Peace and Prosperity Be Restored in Germany and in Europe through International Co-operation?

Prize-winning Plan No. 1632—One of Two Plans Awarded First Prize in the German Peace Award

The Impending Peril of a New War

THE question stated above is of the utmost practical importance. Its peaceful solution therefore cannot be sought or found in considerations theoretically devised, but rather in a comprehension of contemporary realities and possibilities.

The dictate of Versailles has created more hostilities and antagonisms within the European family of nations than it has settled. No genuine condition of peace has yet begun—least of all in Germany, where political and economic tensions have reached a threatening height. The Poincaré policy on the Rhine and in the Ruhr has been a veritable hothouse for their growth.

The solution favored by the overwhelming majority of the German people immediately after the war, "Nie wieder Krieg!" (No more war!), has manifestly lost in its attractiveness and its following. The hope of regaining along the path of international conciliation the complete means of economic life and equality has been blasted. The thought that eventually there will be no other means left save to shatter by violence the chains of slavery imposed on us, in order to win once more all the rights of national life, has found lodging in the hearts and minds of millions.

Among the tens of thousands of ex-officers left without employment through compulsory disarmament, the movement for a new war has found its natural leaders and propagandists. The coming generations of youth, especially those in the higher educational institutions and academies, are being filled with ideal representations of our former power and might. The justifiable exasperation over the gagging and humiliation imposed upon our nation from without offers fruitful soil from which the seed of bitter hatred

against the foreign oppressor shoots up, depriving leaders and led of any sound judgment as to the limits of political and military possibilities. Thus it is that in modern Germany dangerously strong forces are working toward the catastrophe of a new war.

Outside Germany, however, prospects for eternal peace are not much brighter. No signs of the general limitation of armament proposed in the Versailles Treaty are to be seen. In almost all European countries—most of all in France and its satellite States to the east—military equipment on land, on water, and in the air has been strengthened and perfected. Tools of annihilation—newer, more effective, and more terrible than the old ones—have been introduced. Science and technology labor tirelessly to the end that the next war may work a still more terrible destruction of human life in masses, a more complete shattering of European civilization and its economic requisites than the last war produced.

He who labors for the development of a human and humane civilization, the man who believes in such a development as his life's ideal, must behold the approach of this new international catastrophe with the heaviest heart. And its Gorgon countenance would show features quite other than those of a war of nation against nation, for simultaneously with nationalistic passions the social antagonisms existing within the various nations themselves have been embittered. The economic misery of millions—terribly increased by the war and the dictate of Versailles—provides a breeding ground. A new war would probably be quick to loose a destructive internal struggle in Germany. Indeed, even in the States which were victorious in 1919, the prospects of civil war have increased. Behind a new world war a world revolution stands threateningly. Bolshevist Russia maintains everywhere a well or-

ganized and financed propaganda service for that very purpose and its Red army awaits the hoped-for hour.

II

An Unpleasant Preliminary Question

As we confront this threatening state of things, the preliminary question arises: Is it, after all, possible to prevent the disaster of a new war?

The question whether the development of a new war can be checked at all turns on the solutions of the reparations problem with the Experts' Report as a basis. If this attempt at conciliation is wrecked on the opposition of the nationalistic element in Germany and on the influence of imperialistic-nationalistic groups outside Germany, then, so far as we can see into the future, I discern no possible way in which "peace and prosperity can be secured for Germany and Europe through international co-operation."

Only when the problem of reparations, which controls the situation both at home and abroad, has been brought successfully to a peaceful conclusion does the question of serviceable proposals for the lasting security of European peace have any special practical meaning. Only upon this supposition, too, can and will the subsequent discussions come to grips with the problem of rectifying existing political realities and possibilities.

Our preliminary question, however, has a still more general significance. There is no lack of serious political leaders, historians, and sociologists who maintain that the ideal of a permanently established peace is nothing more than a Utopia, and that the question we have asked above is beyond solution under any circumstances. This widespread idea, buttressed with strong arguments, forms a heavy handicap for any effort toward European pacification. Its destruction is a necessary part of the work of pacification.

The limited scope prescribed for our theme prevents any very close approach to this question. Let it suffice to say: The exponents of the theory of "eternal war" are doubtless right in so far as it is an error to believe that strained relationships between States and the outbursts of hostility incident to them could be overcome by moralistic warnings to the re-

sponsible statesmen, by appeals to the consciences of the nations, or by similar purely ethical means. However powerful the ethical groundwork of the peace propaganda may be, it does not suffice in case of war. All manner of protests, pledges, and resolutions do not restrain the storm of excited national passions, which in days of intensified conflict in foreign affairs grow to a hurricane and sweep the nations involved into war. The belief that the national honor or right of existence of a nation are threatened—a belief which may either have grown up honestly or have been artificially cultivated—carries an incredible force within itself. With suggestive strength, the wrought-up national antagonism sweeps away the ethico-pacific shackles that were forged in times of peace and quiet.

If one seeks to become the permanent master of the war danger, he must ferret out the origin of every case of national antagonism, down to its very root, and consider the question whether it can be done away with, and, if so, by what means.

III

The Line to Take for the Permanent Pacification of Europe

If it is true that the fundamental causes of international struggles and the antagonisms that develop into the catastrophe of war are to be sought in the economic sphere—in the effort of the nations to secure a higher standard of living—then there can be no enduring pacification unless we succeed in eliminating these sources of conflict or—in so far as this is impossible—in so restricting them that a decision by arms is needless.

Besides its relation to foreign affairs, this problem has a relation to domestic policy. The exponents of the economic struggle between nations of modern development are capitalistic *entrepreneurs*.

They are interested as directly as it is possible to be in securing advantageous outlets for export, sources for raw materials, and opportunities for investment. It is they, therefore—controlling, as they do, the State's instruments of power through their influence over the press—who draw Parliament and the government into the service of their enterprises. They are often held primarily responsible for the eco-

conomic conflicts and antagonisms between nations, and the idea is held that one need but deprive them of the capacity to make the machinery of the state serve their ends in order to remove the impulse to economic-political struggles and antagonisms between States. That this is an error is shown by the economic-political conflicts, the diplomatic struggles and exertions of Soviet Russia. But one thing is quite true: through the fact that capitalists and groups of capitalists, spurred on solely by their own private prospects of gain and viewing things from that standpoint alone, are in a position to exert an authoritative influence in economic politics, and in certain circumstances to bring the machinery of force to their aid, uncontrollable and irresponsible forces, which are capable of working the utmost disaster, are brought into the economic relations and rivalries of nations.

Every nation is, therefore, under compelling necessity to bring the observation of their vital economic interests abroad into complete control and under such direction as the public interest of the State demands. The freeing of foreign affairs from interests whose orientation is solely egoistic is a domestic task of the greatest importance for the forces in every country that are devoted to securing peace.

But even when influences in economic policy which are prejudicial to the general interest have been done away with, conflicts of interest, which harbor in themselves the threat of war, still remain between nations which are competitors for the same sources of raw materials or export markets. Is it possible today so to regulate these conflicts of economic interest among the European nations that they cease to be the causes of international antagonism and of war?

The general economic and cultural reasons for thinking thus are now sufficiently understood. If we except Russia, which with her Asiatic territory represents a world of special political, economic, and social structure, it can be said of the rest of Europe that the differences of political, economic, and social opinions in the various countries have been so nearly leveled that the formation of a Western European economic community can be placed before us as a political goal.

How little economic autonomy the States of Western Europe still retain—that is, how little they continue to be self-sufficient national economic units—has been impressed upon their inhabitants during the war, and still more thoroughly during the period since the war. They have become so entirely dependent one upon another in an economic way, each suffers so bitterly from the others' economic difficulties, that the feeling of fundamental economic solidarity forces its way over more vigorously into their consciousness. The economic paralysis and crises that have made themselves felt in all countries which are economically linked with Germany, as a result of her crash, have had an illuminating effect; and the handling of these difficulties by an international committee of experts is a striking example of the extent to which the idea of a great supernational economic regulation has made its way into the conscious aims and achievements of men.

The development of a union of economic purpose is also to be sought in order to clear away national-economic rivalries and to promote the national existence of all members of the Western and Central European group of States.

That is a very distant goal. Yet it is intentionally made not nearly so distant as the aim of the "League of European States," or "United States of Europe," for which of late there has been so much zealous propaganda. It is possible constantly to recognize, a political federation of the States of Western and Central Europe, such as Coudenhove advocates in his book *Panuropa*, as the ultimate goal of this development. The immediate task, however, is in any case, that of bringing about economic solidarity. That forms the preposition without which a close political union is not to be thought of.

Even thus limited, the appointed task is hard enough, when we consider the overpowering egoistic resistance of individuals and of groups within the several States. But the question whether such a European economic union in its entirety is possible or premature does not matter so much as the question whether this aim is right in itself, and, hence, whether the effort toward its gradual attainment is the policy leading to a lasting victory over war.

An affirmative answer to this question may be given if we recognize the fact that the modern—the most modern—development in the technique of trade and economics is necessarily a tendency to do away with petty State divisions in the economic life of Western and Central Europe. A glance at the map of the world shows how parochial is the system of tariff frontiers—from a geopolitical standpoint wholly senseless—by means of which the States of Western and Central Europe, fettered in the chains of history, make their own lives difficult. Europeans can no longer afford the luxury of an economic system that is so irrational, that is burdened with so high a cost in unproductivity, and that takes refuge under the shield of antiquity, unless they are to be thrown wholly out of line in the economic competition of the world and given over to cultural stagnation. The condition of national economic tension in the struggle for existence among the countries of Western and Central Europe would, under such circumstances, become still more unbearable in the future, so that lasting peace would be out of the question.

IV

The Most Essential Step to Banishing an Immediate Danger to Peace

Though the systematic removal of national economic rivalries between the European States is the aim of a policy designed to secure permanent peace, it is, nevertheless, obviously impossible to await the completion of this fundamental task of pacification if we are to escape the impending danger now rising before our eyes, of a new war. For that purpose immediate political steps for security must be taken as speedily as possible. For this, however, an essential preliminary is a peaceful solution of the reparations problem and the political perils so closely bound up with it. Only when the measures of force taken in the west in connection with the occupation of the Ruhr have been undone and conditions in accordance with the treaty restored is the way clear for further steps toward peace.

In France the conclusion of a security pact is desired as a condition of the withdrawal of the forces—at present power-

ful—and the military régime on the Rhine. England is at length ready to come half way, and on the German side also, providing reciprocity is guaranteed, public opinion here and there is not unwilling to take this road toward pacification.

More important, however, than any such new assurance of peace by treaties is the immediate solution of the armament problem. If armaments for war proceed as they have hitherto done, all the treaties of the world will be of no avail on the outbreak of hostilities. Mistrust is continually receiving new nourishment, and constant familiarity with the militaristic spirit overcomes the disposition to peaceful conciliation. The problem of disarmament is today no theme for purely theoretical discussion. Even the nations victorious in the World War have pledged themselves to it by treaty. The document of Versailles envisions the general limitation and control of armaments in relation to and in consequence of German disarmament. It is self-evident that Germany cannot be held indefinitely in a condition of one-sided defenselessness in the midst of a Europe armed to the teeth for war. It is, as a matter of national psychology, simply impossible, and the longer this unnatural state of affairs continues, the worse must be the consequence, so far as the humiliated nation is concerned. German disarmament can be maintained only if the disarmament of the other States follows hard upon it. That is the plain meaning of the Versailles Treaty.*

*The preamble to the disarmament provisions imposed on Germany in the Versailles Treaty runs as follows: "In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations, Germany undertakes strictly to observe the military, naval, and air clauses which follow." And Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations says: "The members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations."

"The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several governments.

"Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

V

The League of Nations as an Instrument of Peace and Its Necessary Extension

In addition to its responsibility for the question of disarmament, the League possesses still other far-reaching powers intended to aid in assuring peace. Article 11 says specifically that every war and every threat of war, whether or not a member of the League is immediately affected, is a matter of concern to the whole League, and that it shall take action to safeguard the peace of nations. The steps proposed in the following articles for avoiding war strike deep into the sovereign rights of the State in restricting war, and no doubt imply, so far as they are observed, an effective blocking of the war peril.

The provisions of Article 16—in which all members of the League pledge themselves to sever all financial, commercial, or personal relations with a State that goes to war in disregard of the covenants for the assurance of peace, and likewise to subject it to a complete economic blockade—offer an extremely effective means of reprisal against a deliberate breach of the peace, against what nationalistic politicians style “sacred egoism.”

When one ponders further the significance of Article 14 of the Covenant, with its provisions for a “Permanent Court of International Justice,” as well as the very far-reaching controls over special international agreements provided for in Articles 18-21, and finally, when one considers

“After these plans shall have been adopted by the several governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

“The members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

“The members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval, and air programs, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.”

that the most perilous source of international conflicts—the field of economic relationships—is placed within the power of the League (Article 23 and the International Labor Office), one is forced to admit that a valuable instrument for the peaceful conciliation of the nations has here been created.

It is natural that there should be no lack of people, even outside the circles of war ideologists and those having a direct interest in war, who regard the League of Nations with thoroughgoing skepticism. They feel no faith in the honesty of its desire to administer impartial justice among the nations, neither do they feel confident that it has sufficient force at its disposal, especially where the prevention of war is in question, to do anything really effective. There is, of course, much to be said in criticism of the League in both respects; but he who believes in the possibility of impartial justice between nations and its effectiveness in preventing war would be very foolish if he passed by the League in order to undertake the hopeless experiment of creating from the very beginning a new and perfect instrument for carrying out his peace plan. The organization at Geneva, as it is today constituted, represents a union of considerable international power, competence, and organization.

It would, therefore, be a blunder, in spite of the shortcomings that still persist in it, to ignore the League in the practical solution of the problem with which we are confronted. Its claim to consideration in any practicable peace policy is obvious.

If the League is to be equitable in the great task that has been entrusted to it, there is, indeed, much to do that will strengthen its capacity for action in the great European questions, as well as faith in its objectivity and its executive power against any violator of the peace. For this purpose there are two prime necessities:

In the first place, Germany must immediately become a member of the League. However desirable it may be for the solution of further problems of world politics that the North American Republic and the Federation of Russian Soviet Republics should join the League organization, the entry of Germany has a far more prac-

tical meaning for the consolidation and pacification of the community of nations in Central and Western Europe. With Germany co-operating as an equal among equals, the League can become for the first time a living and objective organ of the European peace policy.

Then, too, Germany will thus secure for the first time a field for central operation and legal standing in her efforts to make her right to national existence felt within the community of European States. Such questions, moreover, as the Saar territory, the shameful occupations of the Rhine and Ruhr, German national rights in the separated territories, colonial mandates, and the union of Germany with Austria, as well as many others, can be discussed at Geneva and brought to a decision. With the League lies the general power to revise the terms of the Versailles Treaty (Cf. Article 19 of the Covenant of the League and the Entente's ultimatum of June 16, 1919).

But still another development is necessary to bring the League into close and living relation with the democratic forces and tendencies in all countries. Today the Assembly of the League is a mere conference of government officials. Even though these are sent by governments that are, in the last analysis, chosen by popular vote, such an indirect relation between the representatives of the people and the organization at Geneva does not suffice. The assembly of the League ought to be in constant and intimate touch with the stream of political life of the various peoples. If the sessions of the League are not to remain diplomatic conferences pure and simple, they must be supplemented by the participation of representatives of the people of the various countries.

The proposals for a League of Nations that the German Government laid before the Versailles Conference in the year 1919, suggested as an organ of the League a "World Parliament," which was to take over the task of representing the peoples, side by side with the "Congress of States," which was to be an assemblage of the representatives of governments. Such an organic supplementing by means of a parliamentary body, which had already been suggested in other and earlier outlines of

a possible League, must be an object in the further development of the League's constitution. As for the next imperative task, it is desirable to create a provisional something as soon as possible, which can link itself up with what is already in existence and pave the way for an eventual permanent solution.

VI

The Interparliamentary Union as a Preliminary Parliament of the League

Among all the other international organizations existing today for purposes of political conciliation, one is especially adapted to assume the task of a provisional Parliament for the League. This is the "Interparliamentary Union."

This organization, to which only active members or ex-members of national parliaments belong, was founded in the year 1889 with the special purpose of furthering the cause of international arbitration. As an instigator and initiator in this field, it has achieved as much merit as it has gained experience. In its ranks are found the most active and prominent workers for international law and conciliation of every country. The total number of its members runs at present to more than 3,000 parliamentarians, who are organized in 24 national groups. In the last year the Interparliamentary Union has realized that its true aim lies in aiding and encouraging the work of the League and, before everything else, in extending, strengthening, and completing the assurance of peace. Its principal task is thus formulated in its constitution: "To unite the members of all parliaments, assembled in national groups, in order to gain the co-operation of their States for the strengthening and democratic development of the international movement for peace and conciliation among the nations, by means of an all-embracing international organization." In accord with this pronouncement, it enjoins its members "to co-operate with all possible energy in the maintenance of peace."

At the last two sessions in Vienna (1922) and Copenhagen (1923) it dealt, among other grave questions of international conciliation, with the gravest and

most pressing problem in the prevention of war—general disarmament.*

In addition to this, the Interparliamentary Union grappled with the problem of the economic conciliation of the European peoples, which is gravest of all, so far as permanent elimination of the war danger is concerned.†

* The resolution laid before the Vienna Conference and carried through by Deputy Moutet (France), after a sharp criticism of the "system of armed peace," expresses the wish that the Assembly of the League should take action in favor of general disarmament.

"That the work of the commission on the limitation of armaments should be carried to its conclusion in a complete plan for disarmament, prescribing a limitation and progressive reduction of armaments applicable to all States, the reduction of military establishments, and of the supply of munitions through the prohibition of private trade in military supplies."

In Copenhagen, Dr. Munch (former Danish Minister of the Defense) and J. R. M. Butler (a former British M. P.) carried the treatment of the question still further, as correspondents. In one of the resolutions passed there this passage occurs:

"In view of the fact that an immediate reduction of armaments affecting all States is an imperative necessity in the interests of peace and economics, the 21st Conference of the Interparliamentary Union pledges the support of the Union to every plan that ensures a speedy and effective means of disarmament, whether by means of a treaty of guarantee—necessarily supplemented by special fulfillment treaties added to the general treaty; or through the establishment of demilitarized zones in specially dangerous frontier districts on a basis of mutual reciprocity; or through a combination of both methods. And it requests the executive committee of the Union to name a special committee to be entrusted with the duty of organizing a propaganda campaign among the parliaments of the entire world in favor of a general and considerable reduction of armaments, whether by means of such treaties or in other ways."

† In the resolution laid before the Copenhagen Conference by the former Finance Minister, Dr. Treub (Holland):

"The 21st Conference proclaims the imperative necessity of instituting an oversight of methods of every kind that in artificial and useless ways limit the import and export of finished goods and raw materials; and it requests the groups of the Union to give their support to the conclusion of commercial treaties which, as required by Article 23 of the League Covenant, guarantee freedom of communication and transit, as well as equitable treatment of commerce, and place the States concerned on a footing of equality."

The Interparliamentary Union is, therefore, in its entire organization and political adjustment, an instrument adapted in the highest degree for furthering the work of international pacification. Current business is managed by an executive committee consisting of five members, at whose disposal there is a permanent secretariat (Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union) as an auxiliary. Between the yearly congresses the Interparliamentary Council functions as a limited advisory body, to which every national parliamentary group nominates two members. As most of the States represented in the Interparliamentary Union grant yearly subventions out of the State funds, this voluntary international parliament for the promotion of peace has practical official recognition.

My proposal is, then, to bring this organization into a still closer and permanent relationship with the League. The goal to be attained is the integration of their organs (the full Assembly, Council, Executive Committee, and Secretariat) in the working organization of the League of Nations.

So long, however, as this aim has not been attained, the personal and practical connections existing on both sides are to be made still more intimate, since the Interparliamentary Union is concentrating its entire work at Geneva. Since the autumn of 1920 its permanent bureau has been settled there. The sessions of the Council and the full Assembly, however, migrate from land to land. In these business sessions here and there, the delegates and their wives become acquainted with the beauties and the sights of the various metropolises and enjoy special hospitalities. But, however valuable the personal contacts with the parliaments and political leaders who act as hosts, for which these events give opportunity, this way of doing things makes serious inroads on the time remaining for interparliamentary work. These interruptions and also the needless and costly external preparations, as well as the task of finding lodgings, would be obviated by a fixed meeting place. The Union would also enjoy a parliamentary apparatus of its own, instead of an improvised one.

The most effective external conditions for an intimate collaboration of parliaments and governments in the work of conciliation would thereby be created. The quick and easy development of impulses and initiatives from various parliaments and the Interparliamentary Union at the Geneva center and their permanent prosecution would be made possible; and, on the other hand, the immediate reaction of the League's resolutions would have a far more powerful effect upon the individual parliaments and governments than is now the case. The delay of ratifications and the complete oozing away of impulses proceeding from the League would be practically done away with.

If the regular sessions of the Interparliamentary Union took place shortly before the Assembly of the League and if the sessions of the councils on both sides were placed near together in point of time, we should see the growth of a feeling of close personal relation between the representatives of both bodies, and a fruitful co-operation in dealing with the great task that both share would then be a matter of a very short time.

In case, too, that peace were actually in peril, the possibility would be created of taking up at once the work of conciliation through the immediate convening of the Interparliamentary Union in Geneva, in contact with the League, and of throwing into the scales the whole weight of the peace-policy men in the parliaments of every country in favor of a peaceful and impartial solution.

VII

International Peace Establishment Enlarged by a Propaganda Center

By the method outlined in the preceding paragraphs we shall secure the most important factor in the prevention of a new war: the organized assemblage of all the forces working for peace in a systematic effort at preventing war.

Such an international establishment, in constant and immediate relationship with the parliaments and governments of individual States on the one hand and with the League as a center on the other, is quite indispensable for the measures necessary to preserve peace. Without such

a well organized and sturdy supporter of the peace policy, it is unthinkable that the political and economic forces working against it could be conquered, and all the various proposals for peace would remain tangled in a confusion of hindrances due to domestic or foreign politics.

This active gathering together of all the forces devoted to promoting peace through international conciliation would heighten the national and international impulses in an extraordinary degree. Whether, however, they would today be sufficiently strong, even when thus gathered together to check a new war psychosis, appears necessarily questionable. The war ideology, not yet discredited in certain circles, which is impressed on youth in school and home, the great influence of groups having a professional or economic interest in war, the operations of a widely circulated press devoted to the cult of "sacred egoism," which labors day in, day out, to embitter the mistrust and antagonism between nations—these are forces that will long remain unconquered. Luckily the peace propaganda that opposes them is growing. The associations promoting a peace policy and the parties supporting international conciliation are doing yeoman service. Yet all this does not suffice to overcome the poisoning of the international atmosphere.

For the great and imperative task of intellectual disarmament among the European nations, therefore, a central organization ought to be set up, a bureau for peace propaganda, which would have to stand in close relationship with the Interparliamentary Union and the peace blocs in the several parliaments; for success would not be attained through the hasty work of daily journalism, but through clarification and leadership in the great questions of international politics based on experience in co-operation between parliaments. For the supporters of peace in the various nations, it is constantly a question of finding the line along which the justifiable interests of their own nations coincide with international interests. Such political leaders, for whom the increasing development of their own nation and that of mankind are developing ideals, will find the line of conciliation, even in the difficult cases where national interests clash.

That is one side of the work. To it

must be added a systematic and well-organized distribution of the insight that has been gained and the requests submitted. That demands great means. But, however great these may be, the cost of such a propaganda center for an entire year certainly could not reach the cost of a single day of the World War.

In all countries the men who at the bottoms of their hearts desire peace form the great majority; but while the war ideologists and the war interests push their interests deliberately and with a widespread propaganda, the great body of the friends of peace remain persistently lethargic. It is a matter of stirring them out of their indifference, to bring to their eyes the danger of the warlike entanglements that threaten us, to enlighten them as to the ways and means of defense against it, and to lead them into active co-operation in eliminating the evil. A strenuous campaign of education and enlightenment in the peace policy is still to be carried out. It implies the creation in all countries of an invincible army, running into millions, for the cause of peace. To them, and not to the representatives of the means of warlike violence will the future belong.

VIII

Summary of the Measures Proposed

The execution of the policy of pacification developed above would lead the supporters of peace in the German Reichstag to make the following motions respectively, both there and in the Interparliamentary Union. Motions providing for:

I. Entrance of Germany as a member, with full rights, in the League of Nations. Members of the I. U. and the group representing this point of view in the German Reichstag face the necessity of bringing the German Government to the point of authorizing the appropriate application to the League. Members of the I. U. in groups in foreign parliaments, especially the French and Belgian Parliaments, face the necessity of combatting the opposition still existing there. All along the whole interparliamentary line there is work to do in preparing the governments to ensure Germany an honorable reception, with no hampering conditions, and to prepare a place for her in the Council.

II. Transfer of the established meeting place of the Interparliamentary Union to the seat of the League of Nations. A motion to that effect should be sent on immediately by the German group to the Executive Committee.

III. Increase of the subventions granted by the individual States for the Interparliamentary Union for the purpose of setting up an adequate parliamentary equipment at Geneva. So far as this is concerned, we may anticipate a common use of the arrangements and quarters of the League, to the extent that this is technically feasible. At the same time the broadening of the national groups to secure satisfactory representation of their parliaments should be pushed forward.

IV. The establishment of a special propaganda center on the part of the I. U. This is to ramify into the individual parliaments in such a way that henceforward constant co-operation can be carried on and a wider distribution of materials in parliament and press of the individual countries can be taken care of.

V. The question of a special security treaty dealing with the strained relations between Germany and France is to be dealt with by the interparliamentary representatives of the countries most closely affected and arranged in a spirit of equitable co-operation.

VI. Immediate completion of a general disarmament obligation, as laid down in Article 8 of the Versailles Treaty, is to be carried forward under the direction of the Interparliamentary Union with the united support of the elements friendly to a peace policy in all countries. The standing commission of the I. U. to be strengthened in order to work out an adequate plan. In this work contact to be maintained with the organizations of the League charged with similar work for the purpose of overcoming the still powerful forces supporting a war policy.

VII. Examination of the Versailles Treaty with a view to doing away with all national humiliation and causes of bitterness is to be taken up by the German group within the I. U., with the object of bringing about a proposal by the Union to the League that will restore equality and recognition of national honor to the States conquered in the World War. The

League is to be reminded of the powers of treaty revision granted it in Article 19 and induced to carry out the increasing responsibilities arising from it.

VIII. The permanent economic commission of the I. U. is to be entrusted with the task of preparing a plan to clear the way for an economic union of Western and Central Europe for the purpose of national economic pacification of European States as a basis for the permanent political pacification. A European Section is to be created in the I. U. and in the League for the examination of this question.

IX. In the event that the hoped-for solution of the reparations question and

the political cleansing of the Rhine and Ruhr, immediately related thereto, should come to nothing, an immediate convening of the Interparliamentary Union at Geneva should be authorized, to make the attempt to overcome the highly critical condition of European affairs that would then ensue, through measures that would protect Germany and Europe from the catastrophe of a new war. All forces working for international conciliation and true democracy are then to be brought into play as an international defense against the threatening disaster. A passive policy of "Let well enough alone" would be a crime. Where there is a single strong will, there is a way!

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

THE GERMAN LOAN

I. OFFICIAL COMMUNIQUE OF THE REPARATION COMMISSION

The Reparation Commission held a meeting on October 13, 1924, under the chairmanship of M. Louis Barthou.

In the presence of Mr. Owen D. Young, Agent General for Reparation Payments, the Commission took the following decisions concerning the loan of 800 million gold marks provided for in the report of the First Committee of Experts:

Decision No. 1

The Reparation Commission, considering that by Article 2 of the agreement, dated the 9th August, 1924, between the said Commission and the German Government, the said Commission undertook to take all appropriate measures for carrying into effect the plan for the discharge of the reparation obligations and other pecuniary liabilities of Germany under the Treaty of Versailles, proposed to the Reparation Commission on the 9th April, 1924, by the First Committee of Experts appointed by the said Commission (which plan is hereinafter referred to as "the Experts' Plan"), and, in particular, all measures appropriate for facilitating the

issue of the German loan of the effective equivalent of 800,000,000 gold marks provided for in the Experts' Plan as an essential part thereof;

And considering that under the Experts' Plan the amount required for the service of the said German loan was to be deducted from the sums placed at the disposal of Germany's creditors under that plan;

And considering that at the International Conference held in London and concluded on the 16th August, 1924, all the governments concerned and the said Commission confirmed their acceptance of the Experts' Plan and agreed to its being brought into operation;

And considering that in the course of the proceedings of the said conference certain mutually interdependent agreements (of which the said agreement of the 9th August, 1924, was one) necessary to bring the Experts' Plan into operation were drawn up and annexed to the final protocol of the said conference;

And considering that all the said agreements were subsequently duly signed by the parties thereto and are in course of being carried into effect;

And considering that under the Experts' Plan the payments to be made out of the

German budget, including any payments made by the German Government under its guarantee of the railway and industrial bonds, are secured on the gross receipts of the German customs and the taxes on tobacco, beer, and sugar, and the net receipts from the spirits monopoly, and any other indirect taxes that may hereafter be temporarily assigned (hereinafter referred to as "the controlled revenues");

And considering that under the Experts' Plan the whole of the payments to be made for the discharge of the obligations of Germany under the Treaty of Versailles, including such amounts as may be necessary for the service of the said German loan, are to be paid into the account of the Agent General for Reparation Payments provided for by and now instituted under the Experts' Plan;

And considering that it is contemplated that the annual amounts required for the service of the said German loan will be approximately the equivalent of 91,500,000 gold marks;

And considering that it is proposed as one of the terms of the issue of the said German loan that the annual amounts required for the service thereof shall be paid out of the account of the said Agent General for Reparation Payments in priority to all payments in discharge of the obligations of Germany for reparation and otherwise under the Treaty of Versailles and the Experts' Plan, and shall also be secured by way of collateral security as a first charge upon the controlled revenues, so that resort may be had to those revenues in the event of the said annual amounts not being provided out of the account of the said Agent General, such resort being had in priority to all other payments, of whatsoever nature or kind, whether by way of reparation payments or payments for the service of the interest or the amortization of the railway and industrial bonds, and in respect of which the guarantee of the German Government is collaterally secured,—

Hereby, in exercise of the power conferred by Article 248 of the Treaty of Versailles to make exceptions to the first charge created by that Treaty upon all the assets and revenues of the German Empire and its constituent States for the cost of reparation and other costs, and of every or any other power the said Commission thereunto enabling, and in execution of the Experts'

Plan, so accepted, as aforesaid, by all the governments concerned,

Postpones to the payments necessary for the service of the said German loan, (a) the charges on the assets and revenues of Germany and the German States, and on the controlled revenues respectively created by the said Article 248 and by the Experts' Plan, and (b) any and every other charge to which the powers of the said Commission extend, and *excepts* the said assets and revenues, whether controlled or otherwise, accordingly to the intent that the said Agent General for Reparation Payments (assenting hereto) shall in priority to and before providing for or allowing the costs of reparation, restitution, or any other obligation of Germany under the Experts' Plan, or under the Treaty of Versailles, or under any treaty, agreement, or arrangement under Article 248 thereof or otherwise, by cash payments, or by deliveries in kind (whether direct or by the operation of any recovery act, decree), or otherwise, howsoever, make provision for the service of the said German loan by means of payments to the trustees or other proper officer or officers appointed under the contracts relating to that loan out of the sums going to the credit of the Agent General under the Experts' Plan, and that in the event of such provision not being duly and fully made, resort may be had on behalf of the holders of the bonds of the said German loan to the controlled revenues in priority to the claims of the Reparation Commission.

For the purposes of conveniently and definitely insuring that the respective services of the various tranches constituting the before-mentioned loan shall be duly met in accordance with the relative provisions of the general bond to secure such loan (a copy of which general bond is attached hereto), it is understood that the Agent General shall pay to the trustees for the time being for the bondholders, or as they may direct, one-twelfth of the gross annual sum necessary to meet the yearly service of each such tranche in accordance with the provisions of clause 8 of the said general bond.

Considering that it is of importance that the trustees for the bondholders of the loan shall continue to act in harmony with the Agent General for reparation payments, the Reparation Commission consider it desirable that the Agent General for Reparation Payments should *ex officio* be one of the trustees

for the bondholders. In order to insure, if possible, the continuation of this arrangement, the Reparation Commission will, in the event of the post of the Agent General for Reparation Payments becoming vacant, consult with the remaining trustees with a view to appointing to the vacant post a person satisfactory to them, as representing the bondholders:

Provided always, and it is hereby declared, That, save as expressly herein provided, nothing herein contained shall prejudice or affect the rights of the said Commission under the Treaty of Versailles and the Experts' Plan for securing and recovering the amounts payable by Germany thereunder.

Decision No. 2

Considering the Resolution No. 2950 (I), passed by this Commission on the 13th October, 1924;

And considering that it is appreciated by this Commission that, in order to facilitate the issue of the German loan in the said resolution referred to, all assurances should be given to the lenders that all possible steps will be taken and all necessary measures enforced for the purposes of insuring that the annual services of the bonds of each tranche of the loan shall be duly and punctually paid to or at the direction of the trustees of the general bond securing the loan in accordance with the provisions of such general bond whilst such bonds or any of them are not redeemed or are not due for redemption,

It is further resolved as follows:

In the event of this Commission alienating or authorizing or concurring in the alienation or redemption of the bonds, debentures, scrip, or other like securities created under or in pursuance of the Experts' Plan (*i. e.* (a) the railway bonds; (b) the industrial bonds; (c) any bonds, debentures, or other securities issued secured wholly or in part on the transportation tax or on the contributions from the German budget; and (d) any bonds, debentures, or other securities issued, secured wholly or in part upon the bonds and other securities referred to in (a), (b), and (c), or any one or more of them, respectively, or upon any portion thereof, respectively), the moneys from time to time necessary for the payment of the interest and redemption of such bonds or other securities so alienated or redeemed shall be

paid into and through the account of the Agent General for Reparation Payments, and the payment out of such account shall be subject in all things to the approval of the Agent General for Reparation Payments and of the Transfer Committee, to the intent that nothing shall be done or authorized to be done in connection with any such alienation or redemption whereby the said services of the said loan shall be in anywise delayed or otherwise affected.

And it is further resolved, That any such alienations or redemptions, as aforesaid, shall be effected only under the advice of the Agent General for Reparation Payments and of the Transfer Committee.

Decision No. 3

The Commission approved the signature by the General Secretary of the following letter addressed to Dr. Luther, the German Minister of Finance:

REPARATION COMMISSION PARIS,
10th October, 1924.

DR. LÜTHER, *Minister of Finance of the German Reich.*

SIR: I am directed to inform you that the Reparation Commission has taken note of the statement signed by you, which is appended to the prospectuses about to be issued in connection with the German External Loan, 1924, and that they have taken the necessary action to enable the service of the loan to be fully secured under the charges referred to in that statement.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) S. A. ARMITAGE-SMITH,
Secretary General.

Decision No. 4

The Commission approved the prospectus for the English and for the American issues of the loan.

The Commission then proceeded to make the second announcement contemplated in Articles 1 and 3 of Annex III to the Final Protocol of the London Conference.

The Commission took note—

1. That Germany has taken the following measures:

(a) The voting by the Reichstag, in the form approved by the Reparation Commission, of the laws necessary to the working of the plan, and their promulgation.

(b) The installation, with a view to their normal working, of all the executive and controlling bodies provided for in the plan.

(c) The definitive constitution, in conformity with the provisions of the respective laws, of the bank and the German Railway Company.

(d) The deposit with the trustees of certificates representing the railway bonds and such similar certificates for the industrial debentures as may result from the report of the Organization Committee.

2. That contracts have been concluded assuring the subscription of the loan of 800 million gold marks as soon as the plan has been brought into operation and all the conditions contained in the Experts' Report have been fulfilled.

II. STATEMENT OF THE GERMAN MINISTER OF FINANCE

Arrangements have been made for portions of the loan to be issued in Great Britain, the United States of America, Belgium, France, Holland, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, and Germany. The loan will be issued in the form of bonds to bearer, carrying interest at 7 per cent per annum and repayable within 25 years by means of a sinking fund to be applied to the purchase and/or drawing of bonds of the issue in the manner set forth in the prospectuses relating to the several issues.

Bonds issued in the United States of America and the interest thereon will be expressed and be payable in United States dollars; bonds issued elsewhere and the interest thereon will be expressed and be payable in sterling or in the currency of the country of issue, as may be provided in the relative prospectuses.

The loan is issued for the purpose of carrying into effect the plan proposed to the Reparation Commission by the First Committee of Experts (the "Dawes Committee") for the discharge of the reparation obligations and other pecuniary liabilities of Germany under the Treaty of Versailles, which plan was confirmed by the various governments concerned and by the Reparation Commission at the London Conference of August, 1924. The German Government has undertaken to adopt all appropriate measures for carrying into effect the said plan and for insuring its permanent operation.

The loan is intended to serve the double purpose of insuring currency stability in Germany and financing, especially, deliveries in kind during the preliminary period of economic rehabilitation.

The service of interest and amortization of the loan is:

(1) A direct and unconditional obligation of the German Government chargeable on all the assets and revenues of that government.

(2) A specific first charge on all payments provided for under the plan of the Dawes Committee to or for the account of the Agent General for Reparation Payments, such charge being prior to reparation and other treaty payments, which, in turn, have a specific precedence over the existing German debt.

(3) A first charge, by way of collateral security, on the "controlled revenues"—i. e., the gross revenues of the German Government derived from the customs and from the taxes on tobacco, beer, and sugar, the net revenue of the German Government from the spirits monopoly, and such tax (if any) as may hereafter be similarly assigned by the German Government in accordance with the terms of the final protocol of the London Conference.

The Reparation Commission have postponed, in favor of the charges created in respect of the loan, all reparation and other charges upon the payments to the Agent General for Reparation Payments, including charges in respect of deliveries in kind or payments therefor, whether direct or through the operation of any reparation recovery act or decree.

The annual sum required for the service of interest and amortization of the loan on the basis of present exchange rates will not exceed about 91½ million gold marks. The payments to the Agent General for Reparation Payments have been fixed at 1,000 million gold marks for the first year and are expected to increase thereafter until they reach 2,500 million gold marks for the fifth and subsequent years. The annual gross receipts of the controlled revenues are estimated at not less than 1,000 million gold marks.

The German Government may not create any further charge upon the controlled revenues ranking in priority to or *pari passu* with the charge created in favor of the bondholders of this issue.

The German Government has executed a general bond, whereby S. Parker Gilbert (the Agent General for Reparation Payments), N. D. Jay, and C. E. ter Meulen have been ap-

pointed trustees for the bondholders of the loan. In the event of the termination of the appointment of a trustee other than the Agent General for Reparation Payments, the power of appointing a new trustee is vested in the remaining trustees.

The German Government have agreed that fifteen days prior to the due date of any installment of interest and fifteen days prior to the due date of any redemption moneys there shall be paid to the trustees the whole of the funds required to meet the service of such interest and redemption. With a view to carrying into effect this provision, arrangement is made for the payment to the trustees by the Agent General for Reparation Payments on the fifteenth day of each calendar month of a sum equivalent to at least one-twelfth of the amount necessary to meet the service of the loan for one year.

The Reparation Commission considers it desirable that the Agent General for Reparation Payments should, *ex officio*, be one of the trustees for the bondholders. In order to insure, if possible, the continuation of this arrangement, the Reparation Commission will, in the event of the post of Agent General becoming vacant, consult with the remaining trustees with a view to appointing to the vacant post a person satisfactory to them as representing the bondholders.

For the purpose of providing the necessary foreign currencies for the service of the loan, the German Government, the Reparation Commission, the Transfer Committee, and the Agent General for Reparation Payments have agreed that funds required to be sent abroad for that purpose shall have an absolute right of remittance, which right shall have priority over the remittance of funds required to be remitted in discharge of reparation payments or other liabilities.

Article 3 of Annex IV of the Final Protocol of the London Conference, Dated 16th August, 1924.

In order to secure the service of the loan of 800 million gold marks contemplated by the Experts' Plan, and in order to facilitate the issue of that loan to the public, the signatory governments hereby declare that, in case sanctions have to be imposed in consequence of a default by Germany, they will safeguard any specific securities which may be pledged to the service of the loan.

The signatory governments further declare that they consider the service of the loan as entitled to absolute priority as re-

gards any resources of Germany, so far as such resources may have been subjected to a general charge in favor of the said loan and also as regards any resources that may arise as a result of the imposition of sanctions.

DR. LÜTHER,
Minister of Finance
of the German Reich.

10TH OCTOBER, 1924.

FRENCH RECOGNITION OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

(NOTE.—Following is the text (I) of the communication dispatched on October 23 by the French Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, and (II) the Soviet reply to the French communication.)

I. The French Communication

Pursuant to the ministerial declaration of June 17, 1924, and to your communication of July 17 last, the Government of the Republic, true to the friendship which binds the Russian people to the French people, recognizes *de jure* as from today, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as the Government of the territories of the old Russian Empire, where its authority is accepted by the inhabitants and in those territories as the successor of the former Russian government.

It is, therefore, ready to open at once regular diplomatic relations with the Government of the Union by the reciprocal appointment of ambassadors.

In informing you of this recognition, which will in nowise infringe any undertaking entered into by France or treaty signed by her, the Government of the Republic desires to express its belief in the possibility of a general agreement between the two countries, of which the resumption of diplomatic relations is but the preface.

In this respect it intends expressly to reserve the rights which French citizens hold in respect of obligations entered into by Russia or her nationals under the former régimes, obligations respect for which is guaranteed by the general principles of law which remain for us the rule in international life.

The same reservations apply to the responsibilities assumed since 1914 by Russia towards the French State and its nationals.

In this spirit the Government of the Republic, in order to serve once again the

interests of peace and the future of Europe, has for its aim to seek with the Union a settlement equitable and practical, which will permit of the re-establishment between the two nations of useful relations and normal exchanges when confidence will have been justified.

As soon as you have made known your assent to the opening of negotiations of a general character, and more particularly of an economic character, we shall welcome to Paris your delegates, furnished with full powers to meet our negotiators. Until the happy issue of these negotiations, the treaties, conventions, and arrangements existing between France or French citizens and Russia shall have no effect on the rights of individuals, existing before the establishment of the Soviet Power; as between French subjects and Russians, such rights shall remain governed as hitherto.

Finally, it must be understood from the outset that non-interference in internal affairs will be the rule of the relations between our two countries.

(Signed)

HERRIOT.

II. The Soviet Reply

Moscow, 29, 10, 24.

M. HERRIOT, *President of the Council, Paris.*

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics welcomes with the greatest satisfaction the proposal of the French Government to restore fully and entirely regular diplomatic relations between the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and France by the reciprocal appointment of ambassadors, and to open immediate negotiations with a view to establishing friendly relations between the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and France. It expresses the hope that all the questions mentioned in the telegram of the President of the Council of the French Republic under today's date will be settled by a full accord between the two governments for the greatest advantage of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and France.

Good will being present on both sides, as well as absolute respect for mutual interests, the Central Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regards it as most important that all misunderstandings between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and France be dissipated, and that a general agreement be concluded which might serve as a firm basis for their friendly relations.

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics emphasizes the immense advantages accruing to both countries from the inauguration between them of close and lasting economic relations favoring the development of their productive powers and of their mutual commerce.

The Central Executive Committee, like the French Government, considers that non-interference in internal affairs is an essential condition of the relations with all States in general and with France in particular, and it greets with satisfaction the declaration of the French Government in this respect. It accepts Paris as the venue for the negotiations between the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and France.

It brings to the notice of the French Government that it has charged the Council of the Commissars of the people and the Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Union to take all measures necessary to open these negotiations without delay, and to bring about a friendly solution of the problems affecting both countries. It expresses the hope that these questions will be entirely liquidated in the interest of both countries and of peace in general.

(Signed)

KALININ,
RYKOFF,
CHICHERIN.

THE ZINOVIEV LETTER

(NOTE.—Following is the text of (I) the letter from G. Zinoviev, President of the Third International to the British Communist Party, and (II) of the British protest against this letter, handed to the Soviet chargé d'affaires in London.)

I. Moscow's Instructions to the British Communists

Very Secret

Executive Committee, Third (Communist) International Presidium, September 15, 1924, Moscow, to the Central Committee, British Communist Party.

DEAR COMRADES: The time is approaching for the Parliament of England to consider the treaty concluded between the Governments of Great Britain and the S. S. R. for the purpose of ratification. The fierce campaign raised by the British bourgeoisie around the question shows that the majority of the same, together with reactionary circles, are against the treaty for the purpose of breaking off an

agreement consolidating the ties between the proletariats of the two countries leading to the restoration of normal relations between England and the S. S. S. R.

The proletariat of Great Britain, which pronounced its weighty word when danger threatened a breaking off of the past negotiations and compelled the Government of MacDonald to conclude the treaty, must show the greatest possible energy in the further struggle for ratification and against the endeavors of British capitalists to compel Parliament to annul it.

It is indispensable to stir up the masses of the British proletariat to bring into movement the army of unemployed proletarians, whose position can be improved only after a loan has been granted to the S. S. S. R. for the restoration of her economics and when business collaboration between the British and Russian proletariats has been put in order.

It is imperative that the group in the Labor Party sympathizing with the treaty should bring increased pressure to bear upon the Government and Parliamentary circles in favor of the ratification of the treaty. Keep close observation over the leaders of the Labor Party, because these may easily be found in the leading-strings of the bourgeoisie.

The foreign policy of the Labor Party, as it is already, represents an inferior copy of the policy of the Curzon Government; organize a campaign of disclosure of the foreign policy of MacDonald. The Ikki [Executive Committee, Third (Communist) International] will willingly place at your disposal the wide material in its possession regarding the activities of British Imperialism in the Middle and Far East.

In the meanwhile, however, strain every nerve in the struggle for the ratification of the treaty in favor of a continuation of negotiations regarding the regulation of relations between the S. S. S. R. and England. A settlement of relations between the two countries will assist in the revolutionizing of the International and British proletariat, not less than a successful rising in any of the working districts of England, as the establishment of close contact between the British and Russian proletariat, the exchange of delegations and workers, &c., will make it possible for us to extend and develop the propaganda of ideas of Leninism in England and the colonies.

Armed warfare must be preceded by a struggle against the inclinations to compromise which are embedded among the majority of British workmen, against the ideas of evolution and peaceful extermination of capitalism. Only then will it be possible to count upon complete success of an armed insurrection.

In Ireland and the colonies the case is different. There there is a national question, and this represents too great a factor for success for us to waste time on a prolonged preparation of the working classes. But even in England, as in other countries where the workers are politically developed, events themselves move more rapidly to revolutionize the working masses than propaganda. For instance, a strike movement, repressions by the government, &c.

From your last report it is evident that agitation propaganda work in the army is weak; in the navy a very little better. Your explanation that the quality of the members attracted justifies the quantity is right in principle; nevertheless, it would be desirable to have "cells" in all the units of the troops, particularly among those quartered in the large centers of the country, and also among factories working on munitions and at military stores depots.

We request that the most particular attention be paid to these latter. In the event of danger of war, with the aid of the latter and in contact with the transport workers, it is possible to paralyze all the military preparations of the bourgeoisie and make a start in turning an imperialist war into a class war.

More than ever, we should be on our guard. Attempts at intervention in China show that world imperialism is still full of vigor, and is once more making endeavors to restore its shaken position and cause a new war, which as its final objective is to bring about the break-up of the Russian proletariat and the suppression of the budding world revolution, and further would lead to the enslavement of the colonial peoples.

"Danger of War," "The Bourgeoisie Seeks War and Capital Fresh Markets"—these are the slogans which you must familiarize the masses with, with which you must go to work into the mass of the proletariat. These slogans will open to you the doors of comprehension of the masses, will help you to capture them and march under the banner of Communism.

The military section of the British Communist Party, so far as we are aware, further suffers from a lack of specialists, the future directors of the British Red army. It is time you thought of forming such a group, which, together with the leaders, might be, in the event of an outbreak of active strife, the brain of the military organization of the party. Go attentively through the lists of the military "cells," detailing from them the more energetic and capable men. Turn attention to the more talented military specialists who have for one reason or another left the service and hold Socialist views. Attract them into the ranks of the Communist Party if they desire honestly to serve the proletariat and desire in the future to direct not the blind mechanical forces in the service of the bourgeoisie but a national army. Form a directing operative head of the military section. Do not put this off to a future moment which may be pregnant with events and catch you unprepared.

Desiring you all success both in organization and in your struggle, with Communist greetings,

ZINOVIEV,

President of the Presidium of the Ikki.

McMANUS,

Member of the Presidium.

KUUSINEN,

Secretary.

II. The British Protest

FOREIGN OFFICE, *October 24, 1924.*

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to the enclosed copy of a letter which has been received by the Central Committee of the British Communist Party from the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, over the signature of M. Zinoviev, its president, dated September 15.

1. The letter contains instructions to British subjects to work for the violent overthrow of existing institutions in this country and for the subversion of His Majesty's armed forces as a means to that end.

2. It is my duty to inform you that His Majesty's Government cannot allow this propaganda and must regard it as a direct interference from outside in British domestic affairs.

3. No one who understands the constitution and the relationships of the Communist International will doubt its intimate connec-

tion and contact with the Soviet Government. No government will ever tolerate an arrangement with a foreign government by which the latter is in formal diplomatic relations of a correct kind with it, whilst at the same time a propagandist body organically connected with that foreign government encourages and even orders subjects of the former to plot and plan revolution for its overthrow. Such conduct is not only a grave departure from the rules of international comity, but a violation of specific and solemn undertakings repeatedly given to His Majesty's Government.

4. So recently as June 4 of last year the Soviet Government made the following solemn agreement with His Majesty's Government:

"The Soviet Government undertakes not to support, with funds or in any other form, persons or bodies or agencies or institutions whose aim is to spread discontent or to foment rebellion in any part of the British Empire . . . and to impress upon its officers and officials the full and continuous observance of these conditions."

5. Moreover, in the treaty which His Majesty's Government recently concluded with your government, still further provision was made for the faithful execution of an analogous undertaking which is essential to the existence of good and friendly relations between the two countries.

His Majesty's Government means that these undertakings shall be carried out, both in the letter and in the spirit, and it cannot accept the contention that whilst the Soviet Government undertakes obligations a political body, as powerful as itself, is to be allowed to conduct a propaganda, and support it with money, which is in direct violation of the official agreement.

The Soviet Government either has or has not the power to make such agreements. If it has the power, it is its duty to carry them out and see that the other parties are not deceived. If it has not this power, and if responsibilities which belong to the State in other countries are in Russia in the keeping of private and irresponsible bodies, the Soviet Government ought not to make agreements which it knows it cannot carry out.

6. I should be obliged if you would be good enough to let me have the observations of your government on this subject without delay.

I have the honor to be, with high considerations, sir, your obedient servant
(In the absence of the Secretary of State),
(Signed) J. D. GREGORY.

U. S. NOTE TO PERSIA

(NOTE.—Following is the text of a note which the American Chargé d'Affaires at Teheran, Mr. Wallace S. Murray, delivered, under instructions from the United States Government, on the morning of November 9, to the Persian Government.)

I am instructed by my government to inform you of its gratification at the reports which have been received as to the action which has been and is being taken by the Persian Government to carry out the sentences passed by the military tribunal in the cases of those found guilty of participating in the attack on Vice-Consul Imbric. My government has also instructed me to make acknowledgment of the action of your government in paying the indemnity of \$60,000 for the widow of Vice-Consul Imbric and in rendering appropriate honors in connection with the return of the remains of Mr. Imbric.

One question which is now outstanding between the two governments with respect to the late incident is that of reimbursement for the expenses incurred in dispatching an American man-of-war to Persia for the return of the Vice-Consul's remains, expenses which the Persian Government in its note of July 29 has already expressed its willingness to meet. It is anticipated that this sum will approximate \$110,000.

My government desires to effect a settlement of this question in a manner that will tend to promote the friendly relations between the two countries. It has therefore authorized me to propose that the Persian Government's undertakings in this matter be carried out by the establishment of a trust fund, to be utilized for the education of Persian students at institutions of higher learning in the United States.

Upon receipt of information that the Persian Government is prepared to carry out this suggestion, the precise arrangements which could best be made to give effect thereto can be easily determined. My government believes that the Persian Government will be in full agreement with its view that the plan suggested will result in promoting a closer relationship and a better understanding between the peoples of the two countries.

News in Brief

THE NINTH PRAGUE SAMPLES FAIR, which closed September 28, had during the eight days more than 400,000 visitors, among whom were numerous foreigners. The majority of these came from Austria, Poland, Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, Rumania, Germany, Denmark, France, and Russia, etc.—*i. e.*, from places which, owing to their nearness to Czechoslovakia, will play the most important part as markets for Czechoslovak goods. Thus Prague is gradually becoming the center for commerce of the Succession States and the Slavonic countries.

THE ROYAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION of Rome has drawn up a provisional plan of organization for an international office of vocational education. A draft plan of action has been established, including the following questions:

- (1) Vocational education in relation to social questions and the general organization of vocational schools.
- (2) A preparatory school of instruction preliminary to apprenticeship.
- (3) Vocational guidance and the skilled trades.
- (4) Schools of apprenticeship or probation for skilled workers.
- (5) Supervision of the work of minors and corresponding questions.
- (6) Schools for chief technicians and foremen.
- (7) Higher institutions and courses of technical specialization.
- (8) Courses for teachers, etc.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN BULGARIA is progressing as a result of the coming into force of the new law, which amends that of 1921 on public education. At the present time there are in Bulgaria one high school of commerce, 21 intermediate schools of commerce, and 73 technical schools. The new law provides for two kinds of schools—practical schools and intermediate special schools.

IT WILL BE RECALLED that an agreement was concluded between the Russian Soviet Gov-

ernment and certain steamship companies in 1923 concerning the establishment of emigration offices in Russia. In view of the small number of Russian emigrants (2,248) who will be allowed to enter the United States in the future as a result of the new immigration act, these shipping companies have decided to close their branch offices in Russia, only the main office in Moscow remaining open.

THE BUDGET OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR OFFICE, Geneva, for the financial year 1925 has just been approved. The total amount of this budget is 7,087,595 gold francs, a little more than one and one-third millions of dollars. This amount is contributed in varying proportions by the various fifty-seven member governments, the United States of America, the United States of Mexico, and Soviet Russia being the only large countries not represented. This sum provides for all of the expenses of the annual International Labor Conference and the maintenance of the office, with its 350 employees and its branches in London, Paris, Washington, Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo. While in general make-up and the manner in which its duties are performed it resembles very closely the Department of Labor of the United States, its budget for carrying on this work throughout the entire world is less than one-fourth of the budget of the American Department of Labor.

ACCORDING TO THE MONTHLY STATISTICS of unemployment throughout the world, published by the International Labor Office in its monthly *International Labor Review*, the summer months have seen a decided change in the employment situation in some countries. In Germany unemployment increased after a steady decline during the previous six months. The greatest increase was among workers on part time. The percentage of workers partially employed increased from 8.2 in May to 28.2 at the end of July. All industries seem to have shared in this increase with the exception of agriculture and certain sections of the building industry. In Austria and Great Britain a slight increase in unemployment is shown for the summer months. In Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Sweden the situation continued to improve. In Belgium, Denmark, and France there was practically no change in the situation.

COST OF LIVING HAS REMAINED MUCH THE SAME in most countries during the past few months. In a few cases there was a slight upward trend, which was most marked in the Irish Free State, Hungary, and Germany. Italy and the Netherlands are the only countries where there has been a perceptible fall in the cost of living, due mainly to a fall in food prices.

A CORRESPONDENT OFFERS the following brow-lifting suggestion as a panacea for war: To satisfy man's propensity to fight (which is in-born and which he will gratify until the end of time; "it's in 'em") and to do away with the awfulness of war, let the nations that cannot settle their differences without fighting appoint a dozen or more men from each nation, put them in a ring, and let them fight by turns—the winners making the terms. These terms, backed by the World Court, would have to be accepted by the defeated parties. If men knew that national disputes were to be settled in this way, they would go any distance and pay any price to see the game. Thus we could turn the horrors of war into a pleasure, and enough money would be realized to pacify all the countries."—Q. E. D.

A COLLECTION OF 50 BOOKS dealing with the first accounts of the discovery of America were brought to New York recently by Dr. Otto Vollbehr, of Germany, who will submit them as possible additions to the New York Public Library or the Congressional Library in Washington. In the collection is a two-leaf brochure, printed in Rome in 1493, being a printed reproduction of the first report of Columbus on his discovery of the New World. The rarest object in the collection of Dr. Vollbehr, he said, is a manuscript report to King Ferdinand of Spain by the lawyer of Columbus, setting forth his discoveries in the New World. Annotations and amendments are made upon the vellum border in Columbus's own handwriting. This manuscript, Dr. Vollbehr said, will be sent to the United States shortly.

DURING THE FIRST FOUR MONTHS of this year the Russian State Department of Agriculture has sold 200,000 agricultural machines in Russia from its warehouses. The number of orders for agricultural machinery has increased since the prices fell and the price of grain went up. Thus, twice as many plows, 11 times as many tractors, and three

times as many automobiles as last year have been ordered this year. The largest orders have come mainly from the Ukraine and South Russia.

IT IS ANNOUNCED that the first Franco-German commercial accord has been concluded. It concerns the potash industry, which is held as a practical monopoly by Germany in Alsace. Before the war Germany, holding Alsace, could make the whole world depend upon it. Now, if it is to avoid competition, it is inevitable that it should come to an arrangement with the Alsace potash mine holders, for Alsace is attached to France. The 1923 deliveries of potash in America reached 200,000 tons, representing a sum of \$15,500,000. The United States was too good a market either for the French or German potash kings to lose by rivalry. Therefore representatives of the industry on both sides have signed an accord by which France takes 37½ per cent of the trade and Germany 62½. The accord is for three years. There now remain the problems of coal, coke, iron, and textiles.

FORMER EMPEROR WILLIAM has been enjoying a monthly drawing account of 50,000 gold marks since January 1, 1924, with which he was expected to support himself, his wife, and his five sons and their families, and also his brother, Prince Henry, and his cousin, Prince Friedrich Leopold. As now constituted, the Hohenzollern family comprises about 40 heads, all of whom will share in the final settlement to be effected between the former ruling house and Prussia. Up to May, 1920, Prussia had turned over to the former Emperor, out of the proceeds of his private exchequer, the sum of 32,000,000 marks. To enable him to set up his domicile in Holland, Prussia purchased from him a valuable plot of realty in the heart of Berlin, on which the present "White House" is situated. During 1923 the one-time Emperor was given a further instalment of about \$10,000 from the proceeds of the royal exchequer, out of which all moneys thus far paid to the former Kaiser have been drawn. Most of the famous royal palaces in Berlin and Potsdam, and in the vicinity of Koenigsberg, Marienburg, Coblenz, Hamburg, Hanover, and Wilhelmshoehe, and the numerous hunting lodges will remain the permanent property of Prussia, which has agreed to permit the former Emperor to retain only

a few of the minor castles and palaces in Potsdam and its vicinity.

A SUM OF \$30,000,000 is to be loaned to Belgium, according to a convention signed by George Theunis with American bankers. The interest is 6½ per cent for a term of 25 years and the loan is destined to absorb the old loan made in America in 1920 and falling due on January 1, 1925.

FIFTY-SIX THOUSAND MEN, including 25,000 traitors from the army, took part in the recent revolt in Mexico under Adodo de la Huerto. The cost to the Mexican Government of suppressing the movement was approximately 60,000,000 pesos.

LAST WINTER WAS THE MOST SUCCESSFUL that Egypt's tourist industry has ever known. Ten thousand visitors came from America alone and between 3,000 and 4,000 from other parts of the world. The coming season promises to be even more prosperous. It is estimated that during the coming winter between 15,000 and 18,000 tourists from the United States will visit Egypt. The great increase in Egypt's popularity as a winter resort is largely traceable to the publicity afforded during the last two years by the discovery of Tut-ankh-Amen's tomb. But this is a temporary attraction. Hitherto Egypt has neglected the fêtes, carnivals, and battles of flowers which are so conspicuous a feature of the Riviera season. But this winter a strong effort is to be made to outshine the carnivals of Nice and Cannes. The Nile is to be utilized for a series of river fêtes by night, in which an attempt will be made to reproduce the craft and the costumes depicted in the tombs and temples of ancient Egypt. Of greater artistic interest will be the production of two operas, Massenet's "Thais" and Verdi's "Aida," which are to be presented on a moonlight night in March alongside the Sphinx and practically under the Great Pyramid at Giza. "Aida" was given in similar circumstances 18 years ago and proved a great success.

ONE OF THE FIRST CONCRETE RESULTS of difficulties encountered by American fliers in Greenland is announcement by the Danish Government of proposed erection of four radio stations on the island. The plan had been devised before the war, but recent developments have emphasized its importance. Permission for their erection has been

granted by the Danish Rigsdag, and are to be constructed immediately at Julianehaab, 60 degrees latitude; Godthaab, 65 degrees, and Godhaven, 70 degrees, on the west coast, and at Angmagsalik, 65 degrees, on the east coast. The contract for the erection of the stations has been placed in the hands of the Danish Radio Company, Ltd., who have already begun to send the necessary equipment and workers. It is anticipated the stations will be in operation before the end of the year.

DETAILS OF THE UNCOVERING on the site of Antioch of Pisidia, Asia Minor, of the foundations of a large Christian church, which, it is said, may represent a successor of the church founded there by Paul, have been disclosed by Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, of the University of Michigan Expedition, excavating under the direction of Prof. David M. Roberts. The existence of such an edifice had been known, but its date and character could be determined only by excavation. The church was of the basilica type and was more than 200 feet long. The nave was 160 feet long, measured from the middle of the apse to the doors, and about 35 feet wide. The aisles on either side of the nave were 150 feet wide, and were separated from the nave by columns. Eighteen inches below the floor level of the nave was found a mosaic floor, which clearly belonged to a much earlier church. The floor contained several mosaic inscriptions in Greek, two of them referring to the Bishop Optimus, who lived about 375 A. D. The floor was carefully laid in small cubes of stone about half an inch square, arranged in geometrical pattern in five colors—red, yellow, blue, rose, and white. The significance of the discovery may be far-reaching, in the opinion of the excavators.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY (CALIFORNIA) could within the next century accommodate 60,000 students and house them on its own grounds, according to a recent statement of its president, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur. "This is also probably the one institution with 1,500 acres of campus and property amounting to 8,000 acres, enough room for any resident university," he added, "and our greatest asset is the fact that we have practically all the students and a majority of the faculty actually living on the campus. We are at present desirous of quality in our accommodations, not quantity. That is why we have devel-

oped the housing system as we have, to follow the wish of the founders. The fact that the university is privately endowed makes it possible for the board of trustees to try experiments and move faster than State institutions."

THE ARMENIAN PROPOSAL to make Mount Ararat an international reservation was explained by Dr. Russell T. Uhls, health director of the Near East Relief in Russian Armenia, who arrived recently in New York, as a proposal in the interests of international peace of very great importance in the Near East. "Both Russia and Turkey claim Mount Ararat," said Dr. Uhls, "which is, incidentally, the sacred mountain of the Armenian people. It is now in Turkish territory, having been taken in the Bolshevik aftermath of the war; but since a resumption of the struggle over Mount Ararat is deemed inevitable in the Caucasus, Leon Pashalian, secretary of the Armenian National Committee at Geneva, has suggested as a measure of arbitration that it be made a small international buffer State by itself, with a local police force to protect its accessibility as a place of visit for Christian travelers from all over the world." The control of the mountain, said Dr. Uhls, would be best put in the hands of a nation with no immediate responsibilities in the region, preferably the United States.

THE RUINS OF THE TEMPLE OF ECHMOUN, to the north of Sidon, and the temple of Byblos, are said to be the only authentic Phœnician buildings which have as yet been recovered. The former was discovered 25 years ago and partially explored. Researches have been begun anew on this important site by Maurice Dunand and the Archeological Commission of Syria, assisted by Léon Albanese. The commission are at present engaged in disencumbering the northwest angle of the temple, which hitherto has not been explored. Even should these investigations bring to light no movable objects or inscriptions, they will expose to view a specimen of Phœnician architecture which will furnish useful elements for comparison between that of the ancient Phœnicians and the Romans. The commission has already uncovered the remains of three adjoining halls paved with mosaic.

AN UNPRECEDENTED NUMBER OF PERSONS, 200,690, passed from Canada and Newfound-

land into the United States during the year ending June, 1924. In the same period Canada received 160,773 immigrants from all sources; the natural increase of Canada's population for the year was under 120,000. Canada's net increase in population during the past year was, therefore, less than 80,000—a very unsatisfactory showing.

THAT FOOD AND CLOTHING will be provided for the world through the science of chemistry was the belief expressed by Sir Max Muspratt, of the United Alkali Company, Liverpool, speaking at the opening session of the Sixty-eighth Convention of the American Chemical Society, September 9, at Ithaca, New York. Sir Max especially decried the materialism of today. He declared that "the greatest danger that is threatening civilization today is materialism. The growth of materialism has far outdistanced the mental and spiritual development of man. The human factor must not be swallowed by the machine or civilization is doomed. Man is more important than industry. It is for the chemist to teach this doctrine more than anyone else—to add humanitarianism to his specialization and save the world from materialism."

A COLLECTION OF SAMPLES of every known variety of wheat grown on the American continent has recently been completed by William E. Schultz, of Moscow, Idaho. According to Mr. Schultz, there are 246 accepted varieties of wheat raised in the United States and Canada. The display consists of the characteristic head of wheat and a small quantity of the threshed kernels, each separated and under glass cover. Mr. Schultz has made a close study of each variety and is in touch with the good and the bad characteristics of each, as well as the climatic and soil conditions necessary to the successful propagation of each variety.

TOSHIKAZU KAKINOKI, foremost efficiency expert of Japan, is now in America studying modern industrial methods. He will spend five months in America and in Europe, and then report to the Japanese Government on plans for improving the commerce of his country. According to Mr. Kakinoki, "Japan has just awakened to the value of efficiency in all branches of national life." Mr. Kakinoki is a director of the newly organized Efficiency League of Japan—an organization

created to introduce greater efficiency into Japanese trade and commerce.

A BILL IMPOSING SUNDAY CLOSING on Jewish shops in Salonika was passed by the Assembly at Athens July 12. The Jews of Saloniki, numbering about 80,000, had hitherto enjoyed the privilege of keeping their offices and shops open on Sundays, whereas those of the Christians remained closed. As a result of repeated petitions by Greek trade unions and the Chamber of Commerce of Salonika against this privilege, the question was brought before the Assembly. M. Papanastasiou, the Prime Minister, replying to the deputies who were opposing bill, said that by permitting Jewish offices and shops to open on Sunday they would place Greek business firms and shopkeepers at a disadvantage, the more so as Greek offices, in addition to Sunday, also closed for Saturday afternoon.

THE DEPOSED MOSLEM CALIPH, Abdul Mejid, has accepted a recent offer of a pension of £300 per month. The indigence of the deposed Caliph Abdul Mejid has been a matter of serious concern to many Indian Moslems, and recently steps were taken by distinguished members of the community to issue a general appeal for subscriptions to a fund to provide His Majesty with a fixed income. This appeal was rendered unnecessary by the action of the Nizam of Hyderabad in offering the deposed Caliph a life pension of £3,600 per annum, with effect from July 1. When the Caliph Abdul Mejid was deposed by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in March, he was hurriedly expelled from the country and arrived in Switzerland with inadequate means. His action in issuing a proclamation from his place of exile to all Moslems was made the excuse by the Turkish Government for refusing to pay any allowance. The Caliph's property in Turkey was also sequestered, but there is now a possibility that His Majesty will be allowed to dispose of this.

THE PERSIAN GOVERNMENT HAS PAID \$60,000 to the widow of Robert W. Imbrie. This is the sum fixed by the United States Government for payment to Mrs. Imbrie as reparation for the death of the American vice-consul at Teheran, which followed an attack in the streets of the Persian capital during a religious demonstration. The

check complied with the last of several demands made by the United States.

THE CZECHOSLOVAK MILITARY AIR SQUADRON has completed a journey round the countries forming the Little Entente. This circular tour lasted from August 26 to September 18, and the distance covered was 3,500 kilometers. On its journey the air squadron stopped at the following places: Prague, Bratislava, Zagreb, Novi Bad, Turn Severin, Bucarest, Teckot, Jassy, Kluz Kosice, Nitra, Prague. The flight was carried out without a single hitch, to the general admiration of the Yugoslav and Rumanian airmen.

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF RUSSIAN SAVANTS was opened in Prague on September 25, under the chairmanship of Professor Lomshakov. Important speeches were delivered by M. Pastnek, the rector of the Caroline University of Prague, who pointed out the significance of Prague as a center for Slavonic studies, and M. Lomshakov. A greatly attended address was that by Professor A. V. Florovsky on the dawn of Russian and Czech history. Professor N. Vergun spoke on the need for a revision of the school textbooks dealing with Russian history and the relations of the other Slavonic peoples to Russia.

AN EPOCH-MARKING EVENT is the First Pan-American Standardization Conference, to be held at Lima, Peru, in December, 1924. This conference, called with the co-operation of all the American republics, will determine upon uniform specifications and quantity nomenclature for raw materials, merchandise, and commercial equipment. The sessions also will take up the general subject of standardization, its principles, and its importance in the economic development of the world, with particular reference to inter-American trade. Accomplishments of European countries in establishing uniform standards will be reviewed.

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS TO Palestine was 7,991 in 1923, as compared with 8,128 in 1922. About two-thirds of the immigrants come from Poland, the Ukraine, and Russia. A considerable number also come from Asia and Africa, amounting to about 2,000 persons for the period September, 1922, to September, 1923. The majority of all the immigrants consists of handicraftsmen and skilled workers, and most of them have found employment at their own trades.

AN OFFICIAL STATION for the testing and analysing of goods connected with the textile, leather, and soap industries exists at St. Gall, Switzerland. It is under government supervision and is at the disposal of the public at low charges. Certificates are given showing the result of the tests.

BOOK REVIEWS

POEMS OF CHILD LABOR. National Child Labor Committee, New York. Pp. 53. Price, 35 cents.

This brochure is an admirable little anthology on the subject of child labor. The editor has successfully avoided including poems which are over-serious at the expense of art. Yet the note of protest is strong, the background of tragedy inescapable.

Mr. Lovejoy, in the introduction, makes this wise admission: "We have never joined in with the tendency to blame the employer as the sole offender in the iniquity of child labor. Society is the offender, but obviously poetry, like drama, often produces its concrete picture by the art of personification."

He ranks child labor with slavery, and war in its power to arouse in creative writers the emotional response of the poem of protest.

Among the authors grouped here we find the names of Mrs. Browning, Arthur Guiterman, Robert Frost, Theodosia Garrison, Burton, Untermeyer, Van Dyke, and others well known in current magazine verse.

One of the most suggestive of the shorter poems is "The Immigrant Madonna," by Helen Dwight Fisher. It contains the following lines addressed appealingly to all of us:

"This Christmastide, America, I bring to you,
my son,
My baby son.
He comes with little heritage,
But his eyes are clear, his body strong.
He is ready for you to do with him what
you will.
What will you?

"Will you use him hurriedly for your quick
ends?
And will you then discard him because he
is worn out—and still a foreigner?"

Or will you teach him, watch him grow, and
 help him to be one of you,
 To work for those great things you seek?

"He is my son, America,
 And all my treasure.
 I bring him here to you—
 And you, what will you do with him?"

THE HISTORY OF IRELAND. By *Stephen Gwynn*.
 Macmillan Co., New York, 1923. Pp. 549.
 Price, \$5.00.

Mr. Gwynn was an Irish member of the British parliament from 1906 to 1918. He has written numerous novels, plays, and criticisms. Now he turns his attention to the monumental task of producing a complete political history of Ireland.

Since, through tradition, this history can be traced further back than that of any other European people, except the Greeks and Romans, the story is necessarily long. The book is a voluminous one, therefore, 549 pages in length.

Let no one interested in Irish history, however, be deterred from dipping into the book, because of its forbidding bulk. Mr. Gwynn has a charmingly simple style. He finds intuitively the salient points in each matter under discussion. His sentences come with much the same impact and magnetism as those of a good public speaker.

Moreover, whatever the political or religious sympathy of the reader, it is most important to get the story of Ireland from one who is in sympathy with her, as well as with Irish Catholicism. On the whole, this story seems to be presented justly, as well as interestingly.

With great strides we progress from the days when Ireland was still under ice, through the later stone age, to the earliest myths, the romances, and to the dawn of the historical period, in the fourth and fifth centuries. Thence by easier steps, through all the important stages, when Ireland's life impinged upon that of Denmark, Iceland, Britain, and West Europe, down to the birth of the Irish Free State, in 1922.

"But whether Ireland, after a period of unrest, accepts willingly her place among the British Dominions or no," says this loyal son of Erin, "her position can never be the same as theirs. They are offshoots; she is a parent state, one of the mother nations. Ireland is the only Catholic nation in the English-speaking world, and this in itself gives her a special importance."

From any point of view, there was never an event of more importance to any nation than the withdrawing of the British army from Ireland, after an occupancy of 750 years.

THE SOUL OF SAMUEL PEPYS. By *Gamaliel Bradford*. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, 1924. Pp. 261. Price, \$3.50.

Mr. Bradford's method of biography has become, in its way, classic. It has found imitators. It is not so much a connected narrative of events in a life as the grouping of events, so they illuminate some phases of the personality. Then a summary at the close gives the final touches to a portrait more living than any likeness done with brush or crayon. He calls his method psychographic. He has pursued it successfully before in several collections of short studies.

Samuel Pepys, whose voluminous diary, written in the seventeenth century, has recently been reissued, has been one of the chief sources of the historic social gossip of his day. The diary, originally written in cipher, is so very bulky that for the ordinary reader the chance of approaching the whole personality of its author is very slight. Here and there a bit will stand out as tragic or comic or scandalous, or, perchance, all three, but the whole value of the diary as a human document, it is difficult to get because of its very abundance.

Mr. Bradford, therefore, has done his generation a real service in whittling away the irrelevant and giving us a well-rounded portrait of a man strangely like the ordinary well-meaning man of today. The "complicated, ardent, and, in many respects corrupting world in which he lived," is shown by the biographer as the moulding environment of a very human, but essentially upright, soul.

In summarizing the books Mr. Bradford cannot refrain from a comparison of the diary of Pepys, full of busy, active, external, material life, with that of Amiel and its longing consciousness of God. He gives us this picture of Samuel Pepys and this comparison with Amiel "because the vast brooding consciousness of God alone gives such a life all its significance and all its emptiness, and because," he says, "I believe the busy, active, external, material life of America today, so much the life personified by the great Diarist, needs God more than anything else to save it."

The Will to End War

By Arthur Deerin Call

This pamphlet of 39 pages tells of the cost of war—reasons for the will to end war—beginnings of the modern peace movement—the organizations of peace societies, periodicals, congresses—international plans and organizations—the two Hague conferences—the League of Nations and World Court.

The original statute of the International Court and the statute as finally adopted are both included.

PRICE, FIFTEEN CENTS

Order from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Any Book on International Peace

FOR SALE AT OFFICE OF

The American PEACE Society

612-614 Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

The Federal Convention of 1787

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ADEQUATE TO ITS PURPOSE

This is the title of our little book setting forth the history, significance, documents relating to one international conference which has stood the test of time.

This eighty-page work—25c. each, 22½c. each for twelve or more, 20c. each for twenty-five or more—should be ordered from

The American Peace Society

Colorado Building

Washington, D. C.

Application for Membership

IN

The American Peace Society

THE MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION
TO THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE

TYPES OF MEMBERSHIP:

Life	\$100.00	Institutional.....	\$25.00
Contributing.....	25.00	Sustaining	5.00
Annual.....			\$2.00

FOR THE ENCLOSED \$..... PLEASE ENROLL ME AS A.....
MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Name

Address

.....

.....

