



JX1932

.L19

1908-1912

REPORT
OF THE
FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE
ON
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

1908

REPORTED BY MISS LILIAN D. POWERS

PUBLISHED BY THE
LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION
1908

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

OF THE

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MAY 20-22, 1908

President: HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, Washington.

Secretary to the Conference: CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF, Philadelphia.

Permanent Corresponding Secretary: H. C. PHILLIPS, Mohonk Lake,
N. Y.

Treasurer: ALEXANDER C. WOOD, Camden, N. J.

Auditor: DEXTER HUNTER, Jacksonville, Fla.

Business Committee: HON. JOHN H. STINESS, Providence, Chairman;
HON. JOHN BARRETT, Washington; SAMUEL J. BARROWS, D. D.,
New York; HON. DAVID J. BREWER, Washington; HON. ELMER
ELLSWORTH BROWN, Washington; PROF. SAMUEL T. DUTTON,
New York; GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY, LL. D., New York; MAHLON
N. KLINE, Philadelphia; EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston; HON. JOSEPH
B. MOORE, Lansing, Mich.; ELIAS ROGERS, Toronto; HON. JAMES
BROWN SCOTT, Washington; DANIEL SMILEY, Mohonk Lake, N. Y.;
BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL. D., Boston; CLINTON ROGERS
WOODRUFF, Philadelphia.

Publication Committee: DANIEL SMILEY, Mohonk Lake, Chairman;
H. C. PHILLIPS, Mohonk Lake; BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL. D.,
Boston.

Press Committee: ALBERT E. HOYT, Albany, Chairman; FRANK FOX-
CROFT, Boston; HAMILTON HOLT, New York; MATTHEW H. HOOVER,
Lockport, N. Y.; ROLLO OGDEN, New York.

Finance Committee: J. EDWARD SIMMONS, New York; HENRY VAN
KLEECK, Denver.

PREFACE

The Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration was held in the parlor of the Lake Mohonk Mountain House, May 20th, 21st and 22d, 1908. About three hundred members were in attendance as the invited guests of Mr. Albert K. Smiley. Six sessions were held, the proceedings of which—consisting of discussions of the present status of International Arbitration, of the education of public opinion, of work in colleges and universities and among business men, and of other allied subjects—are given, nearly in full, in this Report.

Throughout the Conference a strong sentiment regarding limitation of armaments found expression in many speeches. The Conference as a body, while recognizing this sentiment, was divided in opinion whether discussion of the subject was within its scope and as to the advisability of such discussion. This division of opinion led to the exclusion from the Platform of any reference to limitation of armaments.

The management of the Conference, while providing opportunity for free discussion of matters not foreign to the purpose of the meeting, assumes no responsibility for individual opinions printed herein.

One copy of this Report is sent to each member of the Conference and several thousand copies are mailed to individuals in public and private life, to libraries and to other institutions. Applications for copies should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary of the Conference.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PLATFORM OF THE CONFERENCE	7

First Session.

OPENING REMARKS BY ALBERT K. SMILEY, LL.D.	9
OPENING ADDRESS BY THE CHAIRMAN, HON. JOHN W. FOSTER. . .	12
THE GAINS OF ARBITRATION DURING THE PAST YEAR, BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D.	15
THE SECOND HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCE, BY HON. JAMES BROWN SCOTT.	19
THE HAGUE CONFERENCE A POWER FOR INTERNATIONAL AMITY, BY DR. WILLIAM I. HULL.	26
SOME TRIUMPHS OF ARBITRATION AND OF STATESMANSHIP, BY EDWIN D. MEAD.	28
PUBLIC SENTIMENT A GROWING POWER FOR PEACE, BY PHILIP S. MOXOM, D.D.	31
PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S WORK FOR PEACE, BY CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF.	33
THE MEETING OF THE HAGUE CONFERENCE A GREAT FACT, BY REV. FREDERICK LYNCH.	34
NEUTRALIZATION AND NON-INTERCOURSE, BY MRS. EDWIN D. MEAD.	34
THE SENATE AND THE ARBITRATION TREATIES, BY HON. JAMES BROWN SCOTT.	35

Second Session.

I. Topic: " <i>Pan-American Interest in International Arbitration.</i> "	
THE CENTRAL AMERICAN PEACE CONFERENCE OF 1907, AND THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COURT OF JUSTICE, BY SENOR DON JOAQUIN B. CALVO.	38
WHAT PAN-AMERICA IS DOING FOR INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, BY HON. JOHN BARRETT.	47
THE FIRST PAN-AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS, BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.	51

II. Topic—General.

HAWAII'S INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, BY HON. W. F. FREAR.	57
THE PART OF ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE ARBITRATION MOVEMENT, BY PROFESSOR JOHN B. CLARK.	59
ARMIES AND NAVIES A NECESSITY, BY HON. CHARLES F. MANDERSON.	63

Third Session.

JAPAN'S DEVELOPMENT A WORK OF PEACE, BY BARON KOGORO TAKAHIRA.	66
THE INFLUENCE OF TREATIES OF ARBITRATION, BY HON. JAMES BRYCE.	70
INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE WORLD'S PEACE, BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY.	71

	PAGE
THE TRUE PRINCIPLES OF PEACE AND GREATNESS, BY REV. WALTER WALSH.....	75
A PEACE PROGRAM, BY REV. CHARLES F. DOLE.....	79
UPRIGHT DIPLOMACY A POWER FOR PEACE, BY HON. CHESTER HOLCOMBE.....	81
THE TREATY OF PORTSMOUTH, BY HON. JOHN McLANE.....	84
THE MORAL GROUNDS OF PEACE, BY MRS. HENRY VILLARD....	86
NATIONAL CALMNESS PRODUCTIVE OF PEACE, BY REV. S. E. EASTMAN.....	86
ARMIES AND NAVIES STILL NECESSARY, BY GENERAL HORATIO C. KING.....	87
CONTINUAL WORK FOR PEACE ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS, BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL T. DUTTON.....	87

Fourth Session.

Topic: "*Business Men and International Arbitration.*"

DECLARATION OF BUSINESS MEN.....	88
REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO APPEAL TO BUSINESS MEN AND BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS, BY MAHLON N. KLINE.	89
LIST OF DELEGATES PRESENT FROM BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS.	92
LIST OF BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS CO-OPERATING WITH THE LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE.....	93
BUSINESS MEN AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, BY CHARLES B. MURRAY.....	95
WHY BUSINESS MEN SHOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MOVEMENT, BY MARCUS M. MARKS	96
COMMERCE THE AGENT OF PEACE, BY FRANK D. LALANNE....	98
WAR AND DEMOCRACY, BY HON. THOMAS M. OSBORNE.....	103
OUTCOME OF THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE, BY A. B. FARQUHAR.....	108
COMMERCE, NAVIES AND PEACE, BY WALSTEIN R. CHESTER	111
THE ETHICS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE, BY JAMES ARBUCKLE	112
THE LESSON OF THE GREAT LAKES, BY CLARK OLDS.....	115
THE INFLUENCE OF THE BUSINESS MEN FOR PEACE, BY REV. JOHN McDOWELL.....	117
INTERESTING BUSINESS MEN THROUGH PUBLICITY, BY HON. FREDERICK H. JACKSON.....	119

Fifth Session.

I. Topic: "*The Place of Colleges and Universities in the Arbitration Movement.*"

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WORK AMONG COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, BY L. CLARKE SEELYE, D.D.....	120
THE POWER OF IDEALISM IN COLLEGES, BY DR. RUSH RHEES..	123
HOW THE COLLEGES MAY PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, BY DR. JOSEPH SWAIN.....	125
HOW UNIVERSITY STUDENTS MAY BE INTERESTED IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, BY DR. WILLIAM PERRY ROGERS.	129
HOW CAN THE AVERAGE AMERICAN COLLEGE BEST PROMOTE THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MOVEMENT? BY DR. HENRY C. WHITE.....	135
ENLISTING STUDENTS IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT, BY MR. GEORGE FULK.....	141
UNIVERSAL EDUCATION ESSENTIAL TO PEACE, BY HON. ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN.....	144
ACCEPTANCE OF PRIZE GIVEN BY CHESTER DEWITT PUGSLEY..	145

II. Topic.—General.		PAGE
THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ARBITRATION, BY HON. JOHN H. STINESS		145
AMERICA'S DUTY IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT, BY HON. DAVID J. BREWER.....		147
THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL AGREEMENT IN WORK FOR PEACE, BY HON. JOSEPH B. MOORE.....		149
DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION OF CONFERENCE PLATFORM.....		150

Sixth Session.

I. Topic: "*The Press.*"

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRESS TOWARD THE PEACE MOVEMENT, BY ROLLO OGDEN.....	151
HOW THE PRESS MAY BE MADE A GREATER INFLUENCE FOR PEACE, BY MR. HAMILTON HOLT.....	156

II. Topic: "*The Churches and the Y. M. C. A.*"

THE ABILITY AND DUTY OF THE CHURCHES TO AID MORE ACTIVELY THE ARBITRATION AND PEACE MOVEMENT, BY REV. FRANCIS H. ROWLEY, D.D.....	159
THE RELATION OF THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION TO THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MOVEMENT, BY MR. JOHN R. MOTT.....	164

III. Topic.—General.

INFLUENCES WORKING FOR PEACE, BY REV. FREDERICK LYNCH	170
ARMAMENTS AND POLICE FORCES NOT ANALOGOUS, BY MRS. EDWIN D. MEAD.....	172
NAVIES AS PEACE PRESERVERS, BY REAR ADMIRAL FRENCH E. CHADWICK.....	172
RESOLUTIONS OF THANKS.....	175
CLOSING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN.....	176

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE.....	177
INDEX.....	183

PLATF O R M

OF THE

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, 1908

(The Platform is the official utterance of the Conference and embodies only those principles on which the members agreed with practical unanimity. Ed.)

The Fourteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration recognizes with profound gratitude the continuous and conscious development of the forces which make for international peace through international justice. It especially approves and commends the work of the Second Hague Conference which,

revising and perfecting the various Conventions of the Conference of 1899,

restricting the use of force in the collection of contract debts,

proclaiming unanimously the principle of obligatory arbitration,

establishing an international Court of Prize, and

declaring in favor of the establishment of a permanent Court of Arbitral Justice,

measures a great and welcome advance towards the regulation of international relations upon the basis of justice, reason and respect for law.

The Fourteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration notes with pleasure the existence of fifty and more treaties of arbitration concluded within the past five years and more especially the arbitration treaties concluded between the United States and France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Switzerland, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal and Spain. The Conference, therefore, expresses the hope that the peaceful and judicial settlement of international difficulties by resort to courts of arbitration and of justice bids fair to become

the rule of the future as it has been in a measure the enlightened practice of the immediate past.

The Fourteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration further commends the activity of our schools, colleges, universities and the various professional, business and labor organizations of the country by which and through which popular sentiment is created, trained and directed, not merely to the maintenance of peace, but also, by the elimination of the ostensible causes of war by peaceful settlement, to the prevention of war itself.

Finally, the Fourteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration rejoices in the fact that the representation of all the civilized nations of the world in the second Hague Conference and the recommendation in its final act for a future conference guarantee for the future, conferences of international and permanent character capable of correcting the inequalities of international practice and of enacting a code of international law based upon justice and equity.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DELEGATES PRESENT FROM BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS.

(Forty-seven prominent commercial bodies were represented at the Conference. The delegates from these bodies, a list of whom will be found on page 92, united in the adoption of the following resolution. Ed.)

Resolved, That the men representing business organizations in various parts of the country recognize the fact that international arbitration as a substitute for war between nations, is a practical proposition; that popular education should be encouraged as the best means to hasten the day of a world's Court of Justice; that the business men, being vitally interested in this, the greatest cause of humanity, feel it their duty to assume a large share of the financial burden of this educational campaign. They appreciate, further, that they should give time and serious thought to the problems confronting those who are now engaged in the international arbitration movement.

THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

First Session

Wednesday Morning, May 20, 1908

The Fourteenth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration met in the parlor of the Lake Mohonk House on the 20th of May, 1908, at 10 o'clock in the morning. The meeting was called to order by Mr. ALBERT K. SMILEY, the host of the Conference, who, in welcoming his guests, said:

OPENING REMARKS OF MR. ALBERT K. SMILEY

It gives me the greatest pleasure to welcome this morning so large a company of distinguished men and women interested in this great movement for the betterment of mankind, and I trust that our deliberations, like those of former conferences, may prove a great impulse toward the settlement of international controversies by arbitration.

Highly important subjects will claim our attention this week. The results of the Second Hague Conference will, of course, furnish our most important topic, and I hope we will be emphatic in giving that Conference the great credit it deserves. It is most unfortunate that its results have been underestimated and misunderstood in so many quarters when in reality I consider it, without exception, the greatest international event of all history. We have with us two men who were members of the Conference besides many who were present during its sessions, and one of the members, whose wide knowledge of international law and unbounded energy and enthusiasm are recognized as powerful factors in the great achievements of our American delegation, will present a review of what was accomplished. I shall not, therefore, touch on the matter except to briefly contradict the pessimistic impression that little was accomplished.

Last year in this Conference we asked that the Hague Conference act on five measures which we considered within reasonable expectation. The first was a provision for stated meetings of the Hague Conference. Does not the provision for another Conference in about eight years and under international direction

practically insure this? Our second request was for a permanent judicial tribunal. Was this idle when the Hague Conference unanimously agreed on a plan of organization and procedure for such a Court and failed only to devise a plan of allotting the judges, leaving the nations free to do this by diplomacy and to put the Court into operation? When Secretary Root is quoted by Joseph H. Choate as believing that this can be done before the Third Hague Conference, have we any reason for charging complete failure on this point? Our third recommendation was a general treaty of arbitration. Was this ignored when the principle was unanimously endorsed and when, in deference to only nine of forty-four nations, its definite enactment was deferred? Do not the treaties recently negotiated by this country indicate a general intention to substitute individual treaties until the general treaty shall be adopted? Our fourth request of last year, inviolability of private property at sea, was not, it is true, granted, but, thanks to our delegation, it gained ground. And our fifth request, that for the prohibition of armed force for the collection of private claims when the debtor nation will submit to arbitration, was unanimously and completely granted. When to these achievements we add the improvements to the Convention of 1899, the creation of an international court of prize, the extension of the Red Cross to naval warfare and the modest but potent provision that hereafter either party to a controversy may publicly ask for its submission to the Hague Tribunal (whereas it has heretofore had to *agree* with its adversary to do so),—when we recall these things, remembering further that absolute unanimity was required for adoption of any proposition, is it not unpatriotic and unjust to accord to our delegation and to the Conference anything but the highest praise? (Applause.)

In this hemisphere we have recently witnessed another event of far-reaching importance. When the representatives of the Central American republics met in Washington last winter and agreed upon an international court to which all their future differences are to be submitted, besides providing many safeguards against civil strife, they took a long step forward. And when their governments promptly ratified their action, they gave us the highest ground for hope that the long-wished-for peace in Central America is at last to be realized. In this connection, the recent laying in Washington of the corner-stone of the new home of the International Bureau of American Republics—the gift of that friend of mankind, Mr. Carnegie—directs attention to an institution that is designed to play a powerful part in the better relations of all the nations of North and South America.

These events, and others I have not time to name, confirm me in the belief that our movement is in a more hopeful stage than

ever before. We should now bend our efforts to the creation of a public sentiment that will, at the Third Hague Conference, sweep away all opposition and bring about the adoption of the great measures which won in principle if not in form last year.

In our own country we see on every hand new evidences of interest. The American Society of International Law, initiated here only three years ago, is already, through its wonderfully valuable Journal, exercising a national and international influence. The American Branch of the Association for International Conciliation, still younger, is doing an immense work through its publications. The American Peace Society, stronger than ever before, is extending and increasing its departments, and, largely through its influence, state and local peace societies are springing up all over the country. The great Congress held in Pennsylvania only a day or two ago should be the forerunner of many similar meetings. The Intercollegiate Peace Association is rapidly advancing to a position of national importance. The press is lending more and more its powerful influence. All this interest should be kept alive and increased.

Turning now, briefly, to our own Conference, it is of interest that we have co-operating with us more than 160 of the strongest chambers of commerce, boards of trade and like organizations in 128 of our largest cities in 42 states and in Canada. About 50 of these bodies have delegates at this meeting. The fact that one delegate comes from Honolulu, one from Jacksonville (Fla.), and one from Portland (Maine), shows that this movement among business men is not local. I have often said that I consider the enlistment of business men and organizations of very great practical value.

The colleges too have responded to our appeals, and about 200 of them have, during the present college year, undertaken to present to their students in special ways the principal facts of the arbitration movement. The report of our Committee at a later session will bring out many interesting facts. I hope this movement will be continued until all college students shall leave college familiar with the progress of our movement and able to intelligently promote it.

It is also, to me, a hopeful sign that the correspondence of our permanent conference office steadily increases almost one-third each year and that we have been compelled to recognize the wish of many prominent persons who desire to assist, all of whom cannot for lack of space be invited to our meetings, by enrolling them as correspondents. Those thus enrolled are doing fine work in their respective communities, through the press, the pulpit, public meetings and in many other ways.

We have this year as presiding officer one who has served us several times and always most acceptably, who is thoroughly

abreast of the movement and one of its staunchest friends, who has held the honored position of Secretary of State and who during the past year has added to his brilliant diplomatic and literary achievements the distinction of being a member of the Second Hague Conference. It gives me great pleasure to present as the President of the Conference, Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER. (Applause.)

OPENING ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, CHAIRMAN

The events of the past year give encouragement and hope to the attendants upon the Mohonk Arbitration Conference that their high ideal of a substitution of arbitration for war may yet become a reality; but these events also show that there is much work to be done before this ideal is realized.

Three events of the past year have greatly advanced the cause of international peace and arbitration. The first and most important of these is the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, which must be regarded as in some respects the most important event in the history of the human race. It did not accomplish all that the ardent friends of peace desired, and notably so in the cause of arbitration; but a marked advance was made in that cause. The treaty on that subject made by the First Peace Conference of 1899 was amended and improved both in respect to commissions of inquiry and the court of arbitration; while a treaty for obligatory arbitration could not be agreed upon owing to the opposition of a few powers, the vote of the Conference was unanimous in favor of the principle; and the bases for a permanent tribunal of arbitration were approved, to be put in operation as soon as the composition of the tribunal can be determined.

The second event of importance was the Peace Conference of the Central American States held in Washington during the past winter. Various measures were agreed upon and put into the shape of treaties, tending to promote harmony and preserve the peace between the five Central American republics, which have in the past been the scene of so much strife, the most prominent and practicable of which was the establishment of an international court for these republics before which all questions between them are to be brought in the future for peaceful determination. It is the first time in the history of nations that such a permanent international tribunal has been established, and its operation will be watched with much interest. Judged from the past conduct of those states, it may encounter obstacles, but with their consent it has the moral support of the two great neighboring republics of Mexico and the United States, and under their influence we

may anticipate that this international court will have a salutary effect in preserving peace in this long distracted section of the hemisphere.

The third event calling for notice is the action of the Secretary of State, Mr. Root, in negotiating arbitration treaties with twelve nations, among them some of the most powerful, including our southern and northern neighbors; and in securing for them the unanimous approval of the Senate. When we recall the disappointment experienced by the friends of arbitration three years ago because of the disagreement between the President and the Senate on this subject, our estimate of the skill, good judgment and devotion to peace of our present Secretary of State is greatly heightened. It is fortunate for us and the world that the foreign relations of our government are under the control of so able and conservative a statesman, a lover of peace and justice, possessing the confidence of the President and the country.

The laying of the corner-stone in Washington of the edifice which is to be the home of the Bureau of the twenty-one American Republics is an event of no slight significance. The treaties negotiated by a number of the powers of Europe by which their territorial rights are to be respected is another omen of peace. These and other subjects will be discussed by the speakers who are to address the Conference. Before closing; I desire to make a brief reference to some of the obstacles to the attainment of universal arbitration, which it must be the task of the friends of peace to overcome.

Two objects which seemed on the point of realization at The Hague and which had the support of an overwhelming majority of the nations, failed of accomplishment for want of unanimity. Obligatory arbitration to a limited extent would have been adopted, but for the determined opposition of Germany, the great military power of the world. The permanent arbitration tribunal would have been established but for the jealousy of a few of the smaller states. It should be the task of the friends of peace throughout the world to create such a public sentiment that when the next Peace Conference assembles at The Hague these two measures shall be enacted into treaties.

To those of us in the United States who believe that arbitration is a wise and practicable substitute for war the recrudescence of the martial spirit in this country during the past year has been a source of solicitude and some discouragement. The dispatch of our great fleet of battleships and their auxiliaries on a voyage around the world, an event in military annals heretofore unprecedented, and the senseless rumors of a coming war with Japan, have been the occasion of this awakened spirit of militarism.

Hitherto in our history our people and our statesmen have been content to have our country grow and develop in the peace-

ful pursuits of the industries, commerce, and intelligence. We have congratulated ourselves that our continental isolation had removed us from the strife and political complications of the war-like nations of the earth, with no dangerous neighbors. We have been satisfied to have our nation stand before the world as the model republic, cultivating friendship with all peoples and cherishing no military ambitions. The record of a hundred and twenty years of peace, with less than five years of foreign war since our independence, is a record of which a nation may well be proud. But we seem to be entering upon a new career. The cry now is for a great navy equal to any other nation and an army able to repel a hostile invasion; and the representatives of the people are voting seventy per cent of the entire revenues of the government for a war budget.

I have had some opportunity to study the spirit and policy of the nations of Europe and the East, and I am pleased to say that I see no threatening danger to our peace and safety. In my opinion there never was a time when there was less likelihood of war between us and foreign nations than to-day. (Applause.) It behooves the friends of peace and arbitration to raise their voice in sturdy opposition to this clamor to place our republic on a war footing commensurate with the martial nations of Europe. Our destiny in the future, as in the past, should be along the paths of peaceful industries and the intellectual and moral well-being of our people. The victories of peace are infinitely greater than those of war. The Geneva Arbitration gave our country greater prestige and glory than any battle ever fought by our soldiers. In that direction lie our true greatness and glory. (Applause.)

At the conclusion of his address, the Chairman called upon Mr. CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF, Secretary of the Business Committee selected by Mr. Smiley, who announced the further officers and committees chosen by that Committee.

(For the list of officers and committees, see page 2.)

Mr. ALEXANDER C. WOOD, Treasurer of the Conference, presented his report, properly audited, which was accepted. Mr Wood called attention to the fact that the funds voluntarily contributed by the members were used for printing and postage only, all other expenses of the permanent conference office being borne by Mr. Smiley.

THE CHAIRMAN: By his untiring devotion to the cause of peace, the speaker who is now to address us has earned the title of an American apostle of peace. Dr. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, of Boston, Secretary of the American Peace Society, will present a review of the progress of international arbitration since we last met.

THE GAINS OF ARBITRATION DURING THE PAST YEAR

ADDRESS OF BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL. D.

It is not easy to separate the subject of arbitration from other lines of peace work and consider it by itself. Work for arbitration is only one section of a great movement, all of whose parts interact upon one another, either for better or for worse. Delay in one means more or less delay in all; the advancement of one, the advancement of the whole. The attempt has been made to show that arbitration by itself can be promoted to success, and that when the contest for it is won, all else will follow necessarily, even limitation and reduction of armaments, even though nothing direct in the meantime be done to bring about that result. The past year shows, as one would suppose from the very nature of the problem, that this position is untenable. The power that defeated the proposal for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration at The Hague last summer is the greatest military power of Europe, and the power which steadily refused to allow the subject of limitation of armaments to be even seriously considered. It is practically certain that no power, either Germany or any other, will ever approve of a thoroughly good and satisfactory general system of obligatory arbitration until it is willing to see an agreement go into effect for the arrest of competitive arming.

For the purpose of study, however, and the taking of our bearings on the special subject in whose interests we have gathered in this Fourteenth Mohonk Conference, arbitration may for the time properly be considered alone.

When our Conference closed here last year, it was generally expected by leaders of the arbitration and peace movement in all countries that whatever else the Second Hague Conference might or might not do, it would give us a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, to run for a fixed period and to cover a specified number of classes of controversies. Action to this end was strongly urged upon the Conference by the International Peace Congress, by this Conference, by the Interparliamentary Union and many other organizations. This subject was prominent on the program for the Conference put forward by the London meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. The largest single memorial presented to the President of The Hague Conference was a petition gotten up by Miss Anna B. Eckstein of Boston in behalf of a general arbitration treaty, and signed individually and representatively by more than two million persons. In spite, however, of this strong moral pressure and of the positive support of many of the governments themselves, the Conference, because of the opposition of a small group of states led by Germany, failed to prepare and recommend such a treaty.

But this failure to reach a positive result does not mean that the principle of obligatory arbitration was not materially advanced at the Conference. On the contrary, one of the greatest results was the advancement of this subject a long way toward final solution. More than four-fifths of the delegations voted for a treaty of this type, and even Germany, which refused to give her approval to such a treaty, declared that she was in favor of obligatory arbitration, as she had shown by entering into a treaty of this nature with one or two of the powers. But she declared herself unwilling to enter into a general agreement which would include among its signatories some of the less advanced nations.

Besides this approval of the principle of obligatory arbitration by so large a majority of the Conference, the cause of arbitration was advanced by its action in several other directions. The first of these was the revision and strengthening of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes adopted at the first Hague Conference. This Convention was enlarged from sixty-one to ninety-seven articles and improved in important respects. The Permanent Court of Arbitration has, therefore, the increased prestige given by the approval of the Second Hague Conference and by the admission as parties to it of all the nations which were not represented at The Hague in 1899. It has become, therefore, a real world arbitration court.

The procedure of the Court was also improved in certain respects, into whose details it is not necessary here to go.

One of the most important ways in which arbitration was advanced and strengthened was the insertion of Article 48, on the suggestion of the Peruvian delegation, with the approval of the United States representatives, of a provision that in case one of two disputing nations should desire to have the case arbitrated and the other party should hesitate or be unwilling to do so, the first party might go directly to the bureau of the Hague Court and declare its wish to have the controversy referred to the Court. The opinion of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, as of the United States delegates and other important members of the Conference, that this provision will make it practically impossible for any nation to refuse to arbitrate a controversy, when it is asked to do so before the public opinion of the world, is, it seems to me, entirely right. The provision, of course, does not make it possible for a nation to compel its opponent to appear before the bar of the Court, but the request for arbitration in this open, public way will probably in practice have the same results. The united moral power of the governments of the world is now in a position to accomplish almost any desired end.

In the matter of the collection of debts claimed to be due from one government to the citizens of another, the action of the Sec-

ond Hague Conference has also greatly strengthened the cause of arbitration. The Drago doctrine, pure and simple, was not approved, though ably presented by its author, Dr. Drago, himself. But the Conference adopted a convention, prepared by General Horace Porter of the United States delegation, providing that force should not be used in the collection of contractual debts from a debtor nation, until the justice of the claim should first be submitted to arbitration, or until arbitration should be refused by the debtor state. As it is not likely that any debtor nation would ever refuse to arbitrate a case of this kind, this convention means substantially that obligatory arbitration has been extended to all that class of international disputes involving money indemnities. These disputes are, of course, not among the most important that arise between nations, but they are often very troublesome and annoying, frequently creating prejudice and ill-will; and the bringing of them by conventional agreement into the field of obligatory arbitration is certainly a great triumph for the principle for which we contend.

The failure of the Conference to give us a general treaty of obligatory arbitration is being made up in part by the continuation of the conclusion of treaties of arbitration between the nations in pairs. Before the Hague Conference closed two treaties of this type were signed at The Hague, one between Italy and the Argentine Republic and the other between Italy and Mexico. Since the close of the Conference our own government, acting on the recommendation of the Conference, has taken up again the work begun by the late Secretary Hay and has already concluded treaties with Great Britain, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Mexico, Denmark, The Netherlands, Japan, Spain, Portugal and Switzerland. Adding these twelve treaties, all of which have been ratified by the Senate, to those previously concluded within the past four years and a half, we have at the present time no less than sixty-one of these treaties between the nations two and two, already in force.

The most of these treaties run for five years and stipulate reference to the Hague Court only of questions of a judicial order and those arising in the application and interpretation of existing treaties. Two of them—those between Denmark and The Netherlands and Denmark and Italy—are without limitation of any kind. They refer all questions of all kinds for all time to the Hague Court. The treaty between Norway and Sweden runs for ten years and has the special provision that in case a dispute is by either nation conceived to involve the question of vital interest or national honor, this preliminary question shall first be submitted to the Hague Court. In the rest of these treaties questions of vital interest, national honor and national independence are reserved.

On this line the new treaties which Secretary Root is negotiating are drawn. These new treaties provide that the Senate, as a part of the treaty-making power, shall pass upon the agreement for submission before it goes into force. They also stipulate that the other government, party to the treaty, shall not be bound until the special agreement for the reference of a dispute shall have been passed upon by our Senate. The President has yielded to the Senate in the matter which caused the failure of the Hay Treaties to go into effect. It is understood that our government is to continue the negotiating of these treaties, until, if possible, it has concluded agreements with all the governments of the world.

I must not neglect to mention in this resumé the results of the Central American Conference held in Washington a little time ago. In the treaties formulated at that Conference, since accepted by the five interested governments, especially in the Convention providing for the setting up of a regular Central American Court of Justice, the principle of the judicial settlement of controversies between states has been carried further toward ultimate completeness than in any other quarter. How much stability this remarkable compact will have it is too early yet to say. But we shall all certainly hope that it will not have to encounter the storms of passion and small politics which have so often swept over that region, and wrecked all schemes for settled order and peace.

One further matter, to complete the summary of what the year has done for the advancement of arbitration. As is well known to all, our government and that of Great Britain have reached an agreement, the details of which are being gradually worked out, for the submission of the whole Newfoundland-Labrador fisheries dispute to the Court at The Hague. This is a very important agreement and the result of it will be, without doubt, to remove from the field of controversy a question which, practically ever since the foundation of our government, has been frequently the occasion of misunderstanding and more or less bad feeling among those directly interested in the Newfoundland fishing industry.

Looking at the subject in general, therefore, from all points of view,—from the point of view of the successes and general influence of the Second Hague Conference, the strengthening of the Hague Court, the special application of obligatory arbitration provided for by the Convention on contractual claims, the provision that any government wishing to arbitrate a controversy with an unwilling opponent may go directly to the Bureau of the Hague Court and ask through the Bureau for the arbitration of the case; from the point of view also of the increase in the number of arbitration treaties between the nations two and two, and

from that of the Newfoundland Fisheries submission, it is clear that the cause of arbitration has gained greatly increased strength and made substantial progress during the year.

Perhaps more important still than any of these special attainments is the fact that the people of all classes, in the different countries, are more universally and more unitedly than ever before determined that arbitration and not war shall be the uniform method of disposing of such controversies as may hereafter arise between nations which cannot be adjusted through the regular channels of diplomacy. It is this wide-spread popular support of the movement, and not any particular attainments in the way of conferences and conventions, important as these are, that constitutes our surest ground for hope of an early realization of the high ideal for which this Mohonk gathering stands. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are all familiar with the work of our American delegation to the Second Hague Conference, and some of us at least know of the great work done for that delegation and for the Conference by the gentleman now to address us. We are very fortunate in having with us Hon. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Solicitor of the State Department, and American delegate to the Second Hague Conference, who, we may properly say, is the man who did the bulk of the heavy, technical work of the American delegation.

THE SECOND HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCE

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES BROWN SCOTT

Mr. Smiley, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the few remarks which I shall make upon the subject of the actual work accomplished at the Second Hague Conference, I presuppose familiarity with the various movements leading up to the calling of the first Conference, and which were necessarily present in influencing the calling of the second. I leave out of consideration the question of arbitration broadly and generally, with which I have little to do at present, and I also omit from consideration all matters concerning the work done by the Central American Peace Conference, as well as the new era we hope will follow,—an era of friendship and good fellowship, evidenced by the temple of friendship dedicated in Washington but a week ago. I shall confine my remarks solely to the positive results of the second conference and court questioning at the end of my paper by any who may care to examine important details of the various matters submitted to you.

The calling of the Second Hague Peace Conference was suggested by President Roosevelt in the fall of 1904 and a circular letter was sent to the states represented at the first conference

in order to see if they would not attend the second. The answers were favorable and this fact was communicated by the Department of State to the various members represented. The Russo-Japanese war prevented the assembling of the Conference but when peace was concluded between Russia and Japan through the medium of President Roosevelt, Russia desired the honor of calling the Conference as the Czar had initiated the movement, and President Roosevelt chivalrously yielded the initiative. The part taken by President Roosevelt is acknowledged and stated in the very first line of the Final Act of the Conference.

The Conference thus proposed by President Roosevelt met at The Hague on June 15, and sat until October 18, 1907. Resembling its predecessor, it was yet strikingly different. For example, in the conference of 1899 but twenty-six states of the civilized world were represented, of which only two, Mexico and the United States, were from the western hemisphere. Through the efforts of Mr. Root, Latin America was invited and was represented with the exception of Costa Rica and Honduras, the latter by reason of revolution and internal commotion, the former, it would seem, by reason of sympathy with its neighbor, not wishing to be represented when it could not be present. Forty-six states were thus invited to the Conference and forty-four attended. Honduras, although not present at the beginning, later sent delegates, but they were too late to take part in the work. The second Conference therefore was international in the highest sense of the word, in that it represented not merely part but practically all of the states recognizing and enforcing international law in their mutual relations. The nations of Europe looked forward to the presence of Latin America with foreboding, but Latin America justified itself and there can be no doubt that the attendance of Latin America was wise and statesmanlike, viewed from any standpoint. It showed Europe what manner of people inhabits Central and South America and enabled it to appreciate the young republics. In the same way it brought Latin America into touch with Europe and enabled the former to appreciate the latter at its true value. It made the Conference representative not merely of geography, but representative of the different ideals and systems of the world, so that the assembly was more representative than that of 1899, indeed more representative than any assembly known to history.

The result of the presence of all the civilized states showed clearly that they could work together for the advancement of the world's interests and that a loose form of confederation was not really the dream of the philosopher or the philanthropist, but that it was indeed practicable in the very present. If the conference thus composed had met and sat for four months without accomplishing anything of importance, it would have justified its calling

because its calling would have amounted to a demonstration that such an assembly is a possibility.

But the Conference of 1907 was a distinct success, considered by actual results of its deliberations. In the first place it revised, in the light of practical experience, the conventions of 1899 providing for the peaceful solution of international disputes, the laws and customs of war, and the Geneva Convention. It substituted arbitration for the use of force in the collection of contract debts. In the next place it continued the work of the conference of 1899 by regulating the rights and duties of neutrals and neutral states in land warfare. It forbade the opening of hostilities without a declaration both in the interests of belligerents and neutral powers. It regulated the transformation of merchant ships into men of war. It sought to define the status of enemy merchant ships at the outbreak of war. It regulated the laying of mines. It forbade the bombardment of undefended ports, it freed mail on the high seas from capture, and it exempted certain forms of enemy property—namely, coastal fishing vessels and other such craft—from capture. It organized an international prize court. It adopted an elaborate convention concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in naval warfare in which the three rules of Washington were incorporated. It forbade until the end of the next conference the discharge of projectiles from balloons.

In addition, the Conference recognized by a unanimous vote the principle of obligatory arbitration and the fact that certain subjects may be arbitrated without the reserves of independence, vital interests and honor. It renewed the declaration of 1899 concerning the necessity of a limitation of armaments. It laid the broad foundations for a court of arbitral justice and it finally declared that a third conference should meet at or about 1915.

Three of these various subjects may be mentioned somewhat more in detail. The convention renouncing the use of force in the collection of contract debts is of fundamental importance because the term "contract debts" is of very broad significance and disputes have constantly arisen concerning their recovery. Within the present century—namely, in 1902—the ports of Venezuela were blockaded. By the agreement of the powers, resort is not likely to be had to force because the powers specifically renounce the right to resort to force but make this renunciation conditional upon the good faith of the debtor state, which good faith is evidenced by a willingness to arbitrate and by actual arbitration and the execution of the award so reached. At the same time large powers are conferred upon the arbitrator. The amount and justice of the debt, the means and manner of payment, all are to be determined by the tribunal to which the controversy is submitted. It is seen at once that this convention not only makes for peace but guarantees peace, that it not only protects

Central and South America, it frees the United States from the necessity of intervention. The Monroe Doctrine is the public law of the world.

In the next place an international Court of Prize was created to consist of fifteen judges, in which court both neutral and belligerent are represented, although the overwhelming majority is composed of neutral members. The captor passes in first instance upon the validity of the seizure. An appeal lies according to local legislation, either to a court of appeal within the captor's country or directly to the international court at The Hague. In this way the captor is not divested of the right to pass upon the validity of his act but the neutral claims the right to decide in last instance whether the seizure and confiscation of neutral property is just and therefore justifiable. The convention is, in a word, the substitution of the neutral point of view for that of the belligerent, and in eliminating belligerent animus a great gain has been made for impartial judicial proceedings.

The Conference endeavored to create a Court of Arbitral Justice, free and easy of access, composed of jurists representing the different judicial systems of the world, and capable of insuring continuity in arbitral jurisprudence. Without examining in detail this project, it is sufficient to say that it was to be a court in the judicial sense of the word, composed of approximately fifteen judges, trained in the law, that it was to meet at least once a year at The Hague and to be represented by a small judicial committee of three chosen from among its members. In this way a small tribunal would always be in session and the larger tribunal convoked at least once a year for the consideration of the greater causes, or those which by the discretion of the judicial committee or the desire of the powers, might be referred to it. The last stone was not put upon the structure, because an acceptable method of appointing the judges was not found, but the project was adopted unanimously in the belief that diplomacy would devise an acceptable method of appointing the judges and thus constituting the court. As the number of judges is not specified, or the number of states, it is evident that any number of states may agree upon the method of appointing the judges and thus establish it. The court may therefore be considered as existing *in posse* if not in fact.

And finally, the Conference provided for the meeting of a third conference at or about 1915; that two years before the probable meeting of the conference a committee of the powers should arrange a program and provide for the organization of the conference. In other words, the experiment has been successful. Not only has the world declared in favor of the Conference, but the Conference itself was convinced by the result of four months' deliberation that it should be a permanent institution. The prep-

aratory committee will result in having a carefully devised program including all subjects ripe for early settlement, and the provision for the organization can only mean that it is henceforth to be in control of itself not under the exclusive domination of any one power.

Such in brief was the work of the second Conference. It was worthy of the conference, it was worthy of its predecessor. It will have a successor, and in course of time it will undoubtedly, although a diplomatic body, resemble a parliament which recommends to the represented powers, but does not legislate directly for them. When the Court of Arbitral Justice is established, and in operation, the world will have two great international institutions, the one making or recommending the law, the other interpreting it, and the first great step will have been taken toward the judicial organization of the world. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have heard a very lucid statement of the Hague Conference. If there are any questions to be propounded, Mr. Scott is willing to answer them.

Dr. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD: I wish Mr. Scott would tell us what is the thought in the State Department or any other about the probability of this court going into force before the third Hague Conference.

Mr. SCOTT: In reply to the question, I would say that the greatest hopes are entertained that the court may be established through the peaceful channels of diplomacy before the meeting of the third Conference. I am betraying no secret when I state to you that the view advanced is that of our great Secretary of State. He believes that as adopted by the conference it is indeed a more finished instrument than if the provisions for the appointment of judges had been included in it; because such provisions would have been the result of compromise; and we wish a court composed after reflection and careful consideration, rather than by a method devised in great heat and under great excitement, and as a result of a compromise. His view is that no number of powers being specified, it is competent for any number of powers to agree to appoint judges, adopting this framework as the basis of the court, and the court is then established for those powers. Indeed, it is no secret that there were several powers at the Conference last summer willing to establish the court as their court; and they were not the meanest nor the most insignificant powers in this world of ours. Therefore, Mr. Root believes that any half dozen powers may agree and the court is established for those powers. Powers wishing to submit a case to the tribunal may be permitted to make use of the court, and during the trial of such a case a judge of their own choice may be added to the tribunal, so that they will be upon an

equality with the powers permanently sitting at the court. If established and the experiment succeeds, for it is noticeable that the number of judges is not defined, although the judges to be appointed will be appointed for the period of twelve years,—if the tribunal is established and succeeds, all countries will wish to be a party to the court; if the court when established does not succeed then we will wish to withdraw from it. Therefore, it is in such a condition that it may be established when those wish to do so who have the cause of arbitration at heart; but it is fortunately in the condition of an experiment which may advance, but which can not retard the judicial settlement of international difficulties.

Mr. SMILEY: How may the Latin-American states come before the court and have their cases tried?

Mr. SCOTT: They may come before the court by expressing a willingness to do so, supposing that they have ratified the convention, and thus opened the court to them. The difficulty is, and I say it in all kindness, in getting the representatives of those states to come before any court, to get them in the frame of mind to arbitrate rather than to refuse to arbitrate. But the proposition proposed by the American delegation, that as certain states have very large material interests, and that as material interests give rise to law suits, it would seem that in those large states by reason of population, industry and commerce, not by reason of fleets or armies, but by reason of the natural principle of population which includes these various elements, the unit of thirty millions might be taken for the appointment of a judge during the full period, say, of twelve years; that states aggregating less than thirty millions might serve upon the court for a lesser time; but there being a permanent nucleus, no harm could come to the court by the change, and great good to the states associated upon the court for a shorter time. In any case, each state, if it cared to adhere, would appoint a judge for the period of twelve years; he would be called into service for a lesser period, but if during this period, when such state did not have a judge upon the court, his country had a case, then *ad hoc* he would be a member of the court, and the absolute equality of the nations would be preserved. And, finally, those nations participating in the court were to pay the expense of the court according to the amount of their participation. Therefore, those that did not always sit did not always pay; and the result was the careful balancing of the purse to the actual representation upon the court.

Mr. WILLIAM P. ROGERS: I should like to ask Mr Scott, first, whether there was unanimous agreement about the formation of the court, and second, whether the establishment of this court pre-supposes compulsory submission to it in any way?

Mr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT: The answer to these questions will be simple and precise. The vote taken in the Conference on the last business day of the session was with the result that no nation declared against the establishment of the court; six and only six states out of the forty-four abstained from voting, on the ground that they were satisfied with the present institution; but no negative vote was cast. Regarding the second question, there is no element of compulsion. If you do, however, frame a universal treaty, such as a treaty of obligatory arbitration, it would seem to be very necessary indeed that there be a court which can authoritatively interpret this treaty to which all are parties. Because it being a general treaty by which all are bound, it naturally follows that all are not only interested, but are precluded by the interpretation of the clauses of this treaty. Therefore, if there be a universal treaty of that kind, it follows of necessity that there should be a court for its interpretation. But it was thought best not to attempt to give to the new institution any obligatory force. The two institutions are to be created side by side. The court of arbitration, composed of arbitrators, judges of their own choice; and a court of arbitral justice on the other hand, composed of a permanent board of judges in session, either in bank or in chamber if you choose, and to allow time to determine which was the more fitted to survive; no compulsion of any kind; the nations to determine in their treaties which they preferred, or neither. The feeling was marked that the institution, if established, would justify itself, because the expenses of the court would be paid by the nations, not by the individual litigants. The judges were to be constantly in session, and the spirit of *stare decisis*, the value of a precedent, would grow up, and a body, close and compact, of international law would be the result of the decisions; therefore, it was felt without any obligatory jurisdiction, a court which could inspire confidence in its judgments, would draw cases to it; and indeed the more voluntary the jurisdiction, the larger the jurisdiction, the larger the business.

Mr. GEORGE BURNHAM: I would like to ask Mr. Scott whether the question of procedure of the court, in harmony with the Roman or English law, was considered?

Mr. JAMES BROWN SCOTT: The answer to that question is contained in the instrument itself, providing that the procedure before the court of arbitral justice shall be the procedure of the convention for the peaceful settlement of international difficulties so far as applicable. The court as proposed by the American delegation, was to consist of approximately fifteen judges selected from the various states of the world, with due regard to systems of jurisprudence and languages, and also with due regard to the

training which the lawyers would have received in their home countries and the necessary influence from their environment. Therefore, in such a court there would sit an English judge representing the common law; in all probability there would sit an American judge representing the common law in its Western development and manifestation; there would sit as of right the various states whose jurisprudence is based upon the Roman law, the civil law; and since in accordance with the plan submitted, there would at least be two or three judges of Latin-America present in every year, Spanish law would be represented in its Western modifications. And so I might go through the judicial systems showing that each system would be represented in the court—China, Japan and Turkey.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to hear from several speakers, who were observers at The Hague, concerning the outside features of that great gathering. I have pleasure in introducing Dr. WILLIAM I. HULL, of Swarthmore College, who, since his return, has written a history of the two Hague Conferences.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE A POWER FOR INTERNATIONAL AMITY

REMARKS OF DR. WILLIAM I. HULL

Mr. Smiley, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Conference: It was my pleasure and my duty to endeavor to see as much of the great Hague Conference as possible, both from the inside and from the outside. And although I am rather sorry that before this audience my topic debars me from the *inside* of the Conference, I believe that there were some outside aspects of it which may be called important.

The importance of hospitality, of festivals and ceremonies, was recognized at the great Hague Conference, and the streams of hospitality flowed in and around it even as the canals of Holland encircle The Hague. This hospitality was of a private, semi-official and official character. In addition to innumerable dinners and receptions given by individuals, the city of The Hague gave a great concert at Scheveningen in which the national costumes, songs and dances played an interesting part. The Netherlands government gave an excursion, which traversed the great New Waterway leading up to Rotterdam; and as the Conference went through the various towns along the route, it was greeted by short speeches from officials, by flags and flowers and triumphal arches, and by singing by hundreds of school children. It was truly inspiring. And I think that the impression made by the conference upon Holland itself was an inspiring one. As you know, it was received with the utmost cordiality; and the fact

that the next conference is to meet in The Hague was also cordially welcomed.

The most important of all the public ceremonies was the laying of the corner-stone of the Palace of Peace. The ceremony was performed by M. Nelidoff of Russia, president of the Conference; and Mr. Jonkheer van Karnebeek of the Netherlands, made a most significant and eloquent address, in which he gave due credit to our own distinguished fellow-citizen, Mr. Carnegie, the donor of the Palace. And I could not help thinking of that ceremony the other day, when I saw Mr. Carnegie's program for the promotion of peace rather unkindly criticized by some of our American newspapers. Surely Mr. Carnegie does not believe that merely by Peace Palaces will universal peace and arbitration be achieved. He believes, as we do, that these palaces are symbols; and it seems to me that there at The Hague this palace will be an impressive symbol of the great ideal of international amity. You may know that the Conference passed a resolution inviting all the nations of the world to contribute of their substance, their marble, their iron or their wood, or of their artistic objects, to the construction and decoration of this palace; another symbol of that beautiful ideal of international amity.

The public interest in the Conference was intense; and I am sure that the conference itself must have felt that interest beating upon it from beginning to end. This fact was illustrated at various times in the discussions of the Conference. I remember that M. Beernaert, of Belgium, spoke most impressively of that "redoubtable sovereign, public opinion," and said that "public opinion is listening to and watching us; and at this time there is no assembly which can meet in this world without having its windows open, listening to the voices from outside."

I think that one of the chief "outside aspects" of the Conference, too, was the fact that not only did it represent forty-four nationalities meeting at The Hague, but that these representatives, and the other citizens of those nationalities present, felt that after all there is a fundamental likeness between the high ideals of all nations. It seemed to me that national barriers were lowered greatly if not obliterated altogether in the atmosphere of that Conference; that in the atmosphere of the Conference it was possible to climb above national prejudices and limitations (which I am afraid most of us indulge in at most times), and realize that behind the mountains and behind the seas there are also people with high ideals; it was possible to forget our national prejudices and to have a genuine faith in the fundamental integrity and high ideals of our fellowmen, those ideals which will undoubtedly bring about the realization of that Court of Arbitral Justice of which Mr. Scott has told us so impressively. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker needs no introduction. His untiring efforts for peace are known throughout the country. Mr. EDWIN D. MEAD, of Boston.

SOME TRIUMPHS OF ARBITRATION AND OF STATES- MANSHIP

REMARKS OF MR. EDWIN D. MEAD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I think there is never a time when any cause is in so hopeful a condition as when it is between great triumphs and great tasks; when it is encouraged and fortified by the thought of victories behind it, and commanded by the thought of large duties before it. That is precisely where we stand. The advance of the cause in whose interests we are here has been, in the ten or dozen years since we first began to assemble here, something which the most optimistic of us in that first time could hardly have believed possible. We have been dreaming for so many decades about the Parliament of Man that it is hard to realize that at last it is here in plain prose, and that some of us outsiders were privileged to sit in the gallery there at The Hague for a little, last autumn, in the old Hall of Knights, and look down upon the Parliament of Man in actual operation. It is a wonderful international epoch in which we stand. If we had been told here at Mohonk ten years ago, in the days when Dr. Hale used to be making his resolute prophecies, that we should see to-day an international tribunal in the world, that we should see an international parliament practically assured, that we should see an international prize court, that we should see impartial commissions of inquiry guaranteed, and that we should see sixty-one treaties of arbitration already concluded between nations,—I say the most hopeful of us could hardly have believed it. Yet that is what has been realized.

What is this movement for which Mohonk has worked, and which the Hague Conferences are bringing to successful accomplishment? It is the supplanting of the system of war by the system of law. It is not to be done in a hurry. There will be many failures and delays. But if any people in the world are under obligation to patience as they watch the work of organizing the world, and participate in it, we in the United States are especially so bound; because no other nation is so familiar with the process of federation and its difficulties. We know how hard a thing it was to federate these thirteen states; we know that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was nearly wrecked more than once by the jealousies between the large and the small states. How much harder to bring into working order the world's fifty nations, with all their varieties of race, speech, re-

ligion, law, government and prejudice! It is a big job, my friends; but we are seeing it done.

We may properly rejoice that, whatever was done or was not done at The Hague, our American delegates stood there from first to last for the broadest and most advanced policies. We may rejoice too that, in the adoption of the Porter proposition, the modified Drago doctrine, relieving us at one stroke of half our fancied need for a great navy, the Hague Conference was worth to the United States a hundred times what it cost in money, time or effort.

The clear logic of the Hague conventions prescribes the steady decrease of the machinery for the arbitrament of international differences by battle corresponding to the increase and remarkable development of the machinery for their arbitrament by reason. We shall not see the one system entirely give way until the other is substantially perfected. But for any nation party to the Hague conventions, unless new dangers can be shown at the time, to be engaged in actual increase of the machinery of war, is to show infidelity to the clear logic, the clear command, of the Hague conventions; it shows at any rate a terrible blindness to the dominant and inspiring movement of our time in international affairs.

Now the men at The Hague clearly saw the importance of attending to the one great need, as to the other; and they urged the nations to see to it that they studied the one as they worked upon the other. And it is a most hopeful thing that the nations are taking this study up in earnest. The Hague resolution touching armaments will not be left academic, a mere pious inspiration; but, acting upon the mandate of the International Peace Congress at Munich last autumn the International Peace Bureau at Berne, through its representatives in the different nations, is creating able commissions to study the next steps in this movement for the lessening of the machinery of war. Among those who have accepted positions upon our American Committee of Ten are such eminent men in Congress as Theodore E. Burton and Samuel W. McCall, such eminent military experts as General Miles and General Wagner of Philadelphia, such eminent scholars and jurists as Judge Stiness, Charles S. Hamlin, President Warfield, and Dean Kirchwey of the Columbia University Law School. Similar commissions have been created in England, Germany and France; and from their united deliberations we have a right to expect much. These able voluntary bodies will blaze the way for the governments.

The admiral of our fleet out in San Francisco harbor, to which fleet our president referred in his opening address, is reported to have said the other day a rather startling thing. He said according to the newspapers, that we should be better off if we

had "fewer statesmen and more battleships." Now we thank the admiral, at any rate, for pointing, in his reported remark, a most important antithesis,—the antithesis between battleship and statesmanship. That is precisely the antithesis we have to deal with at this juncture. The fewer statesmen, the more battleships; the more statesmen, the fewer battleships! Which ship shall continue to sail the sea, which ship shall rule us, battleship or statesmanship,—that is the question now proposed to America and to the world.

Let me remind you of two accomplishments of statesmanship. Just a month ago, at Berlin—and a similar thing was done at St. Petersburg the next day affecting the Baltic—there was signed a treaty between the foreign secretary of Germany and the ambassadors or ministers of Great Britain, France, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, providing that the territory of all those states bordering on the North Sea should forever be mutually respected by the states. It should not be interfered with in case of war. If it was ever at any point menaced, then the nations party to the treaty must through their representatives come together and settle the matter in concert. When you consider the fear that there has been in the past that Holland might sometime be meddled with by Germany, and consider other things of that kind involved, how momentous this thing is! Yet it was hardly mentioned in our American newspapers. This treaty, the work of true statesmanship, will do more to keep peace between England and Germany than all the battleships in both their navies. Why are we so slow to learn the great lesson of our Canadian frontier, that it is when nations, in mutual trust act like gentlemen, that they are safe?

Let me remind you of something else. There was an arbitration convention in Washington in 1904, a convention of perhaps 200 leading American international thinkers, presided over by the president of this Mohonk Conference at this hour. That arbitration convention, one of the largest, I think the most important, which has met in America, unanimously passed a resolution that in all arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign powers our government should refer to arbitration every question whatever without exception. Now we want to live up to that brave and prophetic American action, and to help all the world to frame treaties on that principle. What is necessary to perfect the work in which we here are engaged, and in which the Hague Conferences are engaged, is that the territorial integrity of nations shall be guaranteed and that arbitration treaties shall extend their scope to the measure of that high demand of the Washington convention. That is statesmanship; and with the firm establishment of a few things in that line, the battleship will become a useless and impertinent thing. If the United States

will take the leadership in insisting upon a few great things of this character, it will be leading in that for which the world waits. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Turning now from the Hague Conference, we are to hear from a gentleman well-known to the Conference, Dr. PHILIP S. MOXOM, of Springfield, Mass.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT A GROWING POWER FOR PEACE

REMARKS OF REV. PHILIP S. MOXOM, D.D.

Mr. Smiley, Mr. Chairman: In view of the very marked and unexpected successes that have been achieved, the greatest need is that of patience in view of possible temporary reverses. I do not think we are in danger of any great reverse; but certain things may not move as fast as we should like. The direct influence of this Conference upon the question of limitation or reduction of armaments cannot be very great. It was with the wisdom of a seer, or the foresight of a prophet; that Mr. Smiley defined the function of this Conference when he named it a Conference on International Arbitration. It may come in as an incident to this to discuss the question of the limitation and the reduction of armaments; but I believe our main end will be reached more quickly not by devoting time to that, but to the real purpose for which the Conference was organized. The question of the limitation or reduction of armaments in the nature of the case must be reached through the governments of the world, and those governments must be reached through the people whom they represent. I am not at all discouraged by the demand for four big battleships,—the demand reduced to two; nor even by Admiral Evans' somewhat facetious remarks about battleships and statesmen; for the brightest feature in the outlook to-day is the growth, very rapid as I look back over a few years, in the sentiment and conviction among the people against war and in favor of the peaceable and rational adjustment of international difficulties. The natural and easy pessimism of a dozen years ago has largely passed. Men said as I went home from this Conference then, "O, well, men have always fought, and they always will fight." They are not saying that to-day. The greatest revolutionizing force in the world is thought; and the people are thinking on the farm and in the shop and in the factory and in the bank and in the home. And when the people decidedly do not want battleships there will be no more battleships. The great movement is the passing of the determining power in the expression of national life from the sovereign to the people. And that is going on faster than we have suspected. Nothing good will be accomplished by railing at politicians in Congress. Did you

ever think, with all respect to Congress, and I believe in paying honor to every office and department in our government,—did you ever think that the average Congress is always a little behind and never ahead of the people? When we wish advanced prophetic statesmen and put them there we shall have them. Congress is bound to do what the people distinctly want; and if Congress ever makes a mistake in this respect and begins to hear from the constituency, Congressmen tumble over one another to heed the call. Our great objective is this vast composite American people in the schools, in the social clubs, in the boards of trade, in the churches, in all those social and religious and civic organizations in which the people variously integrate themselves.

I have been in contact during the past year with a movement which has been going on for several years in the community where I live, that is full of promise and hope. To-day our high school boys and girls in both the central and the technical high schools are devoting weeks of every year to a deliberate and persistent and enthusiastic study of these questions. They are writing about them and talking about them in their homes; and all through the city in the homes of the people, mothers are talking about this question, spreading it, so that it is going abroad throughout the land. And what is the result of this work among the people? It appears in the character of the government and in the action of the government.

It is not only useless but it is ungracious to indulge in criticism or in judgment upon the men, men like us, who have devoted themselves to the service of the country in the army and navy. We have no disposition to do that. We always give them honor and credit. The feeling of the people about this great voyage is not at all a jingo feeling, as I read the sentiments of the people. They take pleasure and pride in a great naval achievement. But it is rarely that I find a kindling of the war spirit. That is the beautiful surprise of the situation. There are some people in Washington who want war; but they would be very decidedly dampened and chilled if they were to come down among the common people and find they are not thinking about war. They are even afraid sometimes that the men who are so ready to talk about it will get them into it. But if they do they will find their everlasting Judgment Day at the hands of the people. So I am very decidedly hopeful; hopeful on the basis of a growing mass of facts, a growing power of sentiment, a growing power of steady intelligence, and the rational view of life which points to the adjustment of international difficulties as men adjust their individual difficulties before the courts, is coming already into consciousness as a matter of course. How fast we have moved. Fourteen years ago we were a company of dreamers laughed at

by the newspapers and others. They do not laugh any more, and their ears are to the ground to listen to the voices that are speaking from Lake Mohonk Conferences and the other conferences which are springing up all over the world. And these are reaching the great centers of influence in the hearts of the masses of the people; and these people will speak in a voice which will be heard round the world,—“No more battleships, no more armies; but peace on earth good will to men!” (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: In the remaining minutes of the session voluntary speeches of three minutes will be welcomed.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S WORK FOR PEACE

REMARKS OF MR. CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF

I have been impressed, Mr. Smiley and Ladies and Gentlemen, with the fact that some are inclined to think of Theodore Roosevelt in terms of four battleships. That is an utterly unfair way of thinking of one of the most potential factors making for the growth of substantial sentiment in favor of the peaceful arbitrament of international difficulties. I believe, and I say it with all the deliberation possible, that President Roosevelt has done more during his term of service as President of the United States to advance the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations and to advance the public sentiment of this land along these lines than any of his predecessors. Think of what he did when those two great antagonists were fighting out what seemed to many a life and death struggle there in the far East; he brought Russia and Japan together. Think of what he did last week when he brought together the governors of the states of this country to consider how to conserve the natural resources of our land, one of the most statesmanlike policies of his administration. Think of what he did to promote this second Hague Conference, and to give force and effect to the recommendations of that body.

Those who are in close touch with affairs at Washington will tell you that he is constantly using his personal influence, “big stick” if you please, to bring contending parties together for a peaceful settlement of their differences. And while it is true he may be asking, for reasons which are good and sufficient to him, for four battleships, he is using all the mighty resources of his great office to promote that which we have in mind and thought here, the growth of international arbitration. It is true he does not talk much about peace, because he believes like Mr. Smiley and like most of us who are here, that peace will come naturally and inevitably as a result of the establishment of international arbitration. And we see peace coming as a result of the work which has been done and which has been described to us this

morning. So as we think and talk about this subject which is engaging our minds, let us remember that the man who sits at Washington is one of our mightiest helpers; that he has demonstrated his interest and his faith by his works. (Applause.)

THE MEETING OF THE HAGUE CONFERENCE A GREAT FACT

REMARKS OF REV. FREDERICK LYNCH

Mr. President: I think we ought to emphasize very strongly the fact which Dr. Scott and others have brought out, that really for the first time in the history of the world all the world has been in one room. I think that after all, this is almost the greatest thing the second Hague Conference accomplished—for the first time in history practically all the world was gathered together in one room, and we ought to bear that in mind that for four months it was together talking not things of war, but talking things of peace; talking of the unity of the world; talking of the ideas that were common to all.

Not long ago I heard Mr. Choate speak before the Union League Club, recounting the things that the Hague Court had accomplished; and he made this remark, "Did you notice during the four months of the Hague Conference, there was no war in any part of the world? Now," he said, "that is typical to my mind of what may continue until the next Hague Conference convenes. The men who make the wars of the world were at the Hague Conference, many of them, talking the things of peace; and those men have gone home from the Hague Conference thinking of the things of peace, and with many of their asperities and suspicions rubbed down." (Applause.)

NEUTRALIZATION AND NON-INTERCOURSE

REMARKS OF MRS. EDWIN D. MEAD

Mr. Chairman: There are at least two substitutes for armaments besides arbitration which must be used in connection with arbitration if the latter is ever to be made so complete as to displace rival armies and navies. One of these is neutralization. No mention has been made this morning of the recent neutralization of Honduras or the agreement signed in February by Russia, Germany, England and France to protect Norway from aggression. Little Norway needs her money for internal improvements and now she is saved the necessity for a navy. We need to recall that Belgium, Switzerland and Luxembourg have been neutralized and to realize that we have but to ask the nations to agree to neutralize the Philippines when we grant them the independence which Secretary Taft has promised, and we could,

as naval officers admit, reduce our navy one-half. The neutralization of our Pacific possessions would remove all danger from our Pacific coast.

Another substitute for huge armaments is agreement to use non-intercourse as a last resort. We all hate the idea of the boycott or ostracism in its sudden and often cruel use in labor disputes. But let us dissociate our mind from that form of non-intercourse and realize its power to keep peace when embodied in international law. Justice Brewer told us here in 1905, that we shall never need an army behind the Hague Court to enforce its decisions because no nation will be so recalcitrant as to dare face the combined ostracism of the world. As I have observed how a few Chinese merchants without backing by their government have compelled our nation to lessen the drastic enforcement of exclusion laws by refusing to buy our goods, I have seen a new power arise which some day shall compel nations by other means than brute force.

It is not necessary for us to wait for the complete organization of the world and arbitration of every question before we win security. For nearly a hundred years England, France and the United States have arbitrated every difficulty. Let these three nations make a beginning,—agree to arbitrate all questions in the future and then if a nation attacked any one of the three, let the other two withdraw diplomatic relations and commerce. Of course this would require careful preparation and agreement to reimburse merchants' losses if ever it were done. But the punishment of non-intercourse would never be actually executed; the threat of it would prevent aggression. I believe that all the South American nations could absolutely protect themselves from the rest of the world without any Monroe doctrine, would they simply agree to carry out a policy of non-intercourse with any nation that attacked one of them.

Neutralization and non-intercourse as well as arbitration are to play a mighty part in the future war against rival armies and navies. They need months of study. (Applause.)

THE SENATE AND THE ARBITRATION TREATIES

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES BROWN SCOTT

Mr. Chairman: A moment ago we were told that President Roosevelt is a friend of peace. I want to perform the same service and in the same spirit for the American Senate. It is customary to denounce the Senate as composed of people who do not have the true interest of our country at heart. They have been sorely taken to task for the fact that they did not consent to the ratification of the various treaties concluded by the late

Secretary Hay. They did not ratify them in the form in which they were presented, because the Senate is a part of the treaty-making power of the United States; and it is for the treaty-making power to determine whether or not the honor, the vital interests, and the independence of the United States are involved in the submission of an international difficulty to arbitration. It is a grave question whether, without violating the spirit of the Constitution, the Senate could have renounced that power; and they should not have done so, if they had felt they might not constitutionally do so. The proper thing to do was to explain frankly to them the situation and request their co-operation, by submitting to them a question which was to be arbitrated, in order to secure in advance the wisdom of many minds, and if the matter were of the kind to be arbitrated, there is every reason to believe that the Senate would consent to it, in order that the arbitration might take place immediately.

The trouble with the treaties of 1904 was that the Senate amended the words "special agreement" to mean "special treaty" and they did it because the olive branch was not held out to them. Our present Secretary of State held out the olive branch by recognizing their constitutional rights, and proposed that not only the treaties should be submitted, but also the various questions involved in the "compromis," that is, the agreement of submission to arbitration, should be submitted for their advice and consent. The Senate ratified the arbitration treaties, and by so doing, the United States is bound in honor to agree to arbitrate a controversy of the kind specified in the treaty, and not excluded by the reserves of independence, vital interest, and honor. It is true that the "compromis" must be submitted to the Senate for its consent, but we will not be obliged to go through the formalities of concluding, ratifying, and exchanging ratification of a treaty. The experience of our present Secretary of State shows that the advice and consent of the Senate may be had for the asking, and when given may be communicated by a mere exchange of notes, without delay, and without the formality of a treaty.

That the Senate is not opposed to arbitration, and that it is not the indifferent body it has been represented, are sufficiently evidenced by the fact that it has in the present session ratified twelve treaties of arbitration negotiated by the present Secretary of State, and that it has already ratified no less than eleven Hague conventions.

As the attitude of the Senate seems to have been so beclouded and misunderstood, I thought I would trespass upon your time for a few moments in order to present to you the exact situation,

and to show you how easily the government runs when conducted upon the principle of a just respect for law and order.

(Applause.)

President E. D. WARFIELD of Lafayette College expressed the hope that a request for the neutralization of trade routes and for the limitation of armaments, mentioned in a former platform of this Conference, might find a place in the platform of this year.

The Conference then adjourned until 8.00 p. m.

Second Session

Wednesday Evening, May 20, 1908

THE CHAIRMAN: We are to open this session by a discussion of Pan-American contributions to the arbitration movement. Our first address was to have been made by SEÑOR DON JOAQUIN B. CALVO, Minister of Costa Rica to the United States and Dean of the Central American diplomatic corps, who was to have presented the work of the recent Central American Peace Conference, of which he was so important a member. Unfortunately for us, he has been called home to be present at the inauguration at Cartago, Costa Rica, of the Central American Court of Justice, the very institution concerning which he was to have spoken to us. He has sent his address, from which the secretary will read.

THE CENTRAL AMERICAN PEACE CONFERENCE OF 1907, AND THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COURT OF JUSTICE

PAPER OF SENOR DON JOAQUIN B. CALVO

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As a Central American, imbued with the idea of the great future which lies before the nations of the Isthmus, and as a son of Costa Rica, where the tree of peace has been assiduously cultivated, I feel the throbbing of those industrious countries in which the same misfortunes which afflict them also stimulate their fervent aspirations for order and the reign of justice which must forward the tranquil development of their numerous natural resources and the enjoyment of all the benefits of modern progress.

All of the countries of the world have suffered, more or less, the calamity of an evolution period before beginning once and for all, a civilized and law-abiding life; and if in the nations of Central America, which have been unable to except themselves from the general rule, these calamities are more conspicuous, because they recur from time to time, it is due to the very reason that having attained so many of the benefits of civilization, the lamentable difficulties which still surround them stand out in greater contrast before the world.

The inclination shown in these countries towards the principles of arbitration, affords an eloquent demonstration of the plane

which they have already reached. Consequently, I come before you animated with the same spirit which animates you and even if I can do little to contribute to your deliberations, I will receive from them the great fervor with which you seek to throw light on such important matters.

The countries of Central America were born under a well-known colonial rule, and under this rule they lived for nearly three hundred years.

In this part of the continent, also, there reigned the colonial government, but the independence of the United States once gained by the victory of Yorktown in 1781, the admirable North American constitution, irradiated, like a lighthouse of liberty, the brilliant light which must guide all America to a like desideratum,—and generous France seconded, in Europe, the active propaganda of the principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which have been the foundation stones of the new era opened to humanity during the last years of the century before last. Regenerative doctrines were diffused all over the world, and even Spain, invaded and in a great measure conquered, declared herself against the lamentable right of conquest which she had before sanctioned, and by establishing councils and provisional governments, gave to the colonies their first example of insurrection.

In the face of such great events, Spanish America, where the idea of liberty and independence already germinated, prepared herself for the struggle, and finally won the right to rule herself. The independence of Central America was won without a war, having been obtained in consequence of the great triumphs won by the noble patriots of Mexico and South America, and was declared in 1821. A union with Mexico followed, but this was soon dissolved and a National Assembly, which met in Guatemala in 1823, declared the unconditional independence of Central America, and adopted a federal constitution for the five states composing it. Subsequently each state organized its respective government on the same basis, and a federal government was duly inaugurated. Unfortunately this union from the beginning lived a precarious life which scarcely lasted up to 1887. Repeated efforts have been made to form a new union, but all plans, up to the present, have failed for obvious reasons. Nevertheless, the states recognize among themselves several principles which govern in certain common matters; for instance, in regard to the defense of the Central American territory, the citizenship of an individual from one to any other of the states, and the exercise of learned professions. In regard to the principle of arbitration, as already said, the five states have adjusted by this means several controversies arising from claims of foreign citizens.

Costa Rica, having been fortunate enough to have attracted to it a larger foreign population than any of the other states and an amount of foreign capital, particularly from the United States, only exceeded by that in Mexico and Cuba, enjoys the blessings of not having to-day, nor of ever having had any claims presented to her for damages or injuries to the citizens of other nations.

Consequently, Costa Rica in matters of arbitration has had but the boundary questions inherited from the imperfect titles issued by the colonial authorities, which have been almost everywhere a source of serious controversies. The question of limits with the two neighboring countries were submitted to arbitration. That with Nicaragua was successfully settled by the award of President Cleveland in 1888. That with Columbia—now with Panama,—submitted to President Loubet, of France, has not been finally settled, owing to the nature of the award issued in 1900. It would not be surprising if a new arbitration would be necessary for its final settlement.

The Republics of Honduras and Nicaragua have also submitted a boundary question to arbitration, the arbiter having been the King of Spain. Both countries have expressed their satisfaction at the solution given to a long-pending controversy.

These boundary questions are the most important differences settled by means of arbitration in Central America.

Unfortunately, although the principle has been recognized long ago by the five states and stipulated in various treaties, the calamity of war has afflicted the states north of Costa Rica. This was the case in 1906, when, at the invitation of the President of the United States of America and of the United Mexican States, representatives from Guatemala, Honduras and Salvador met on board the "Marblehead," U. S. N., and, among other things, agreed to conclude a general treaty of peace, friendship, commerce, etc., designating Costa Rica as the place of meeting for that purpose.

Acting on this provision, the treaty of San José was signed on September 25, 1906, by the representatives of Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Salvador. Among the principal stipulations contained in this treaty is an agreement by the governments of Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras to appoint, for the settlement of all difficulties arising among them, the Presidents of the United States and Mexico as umpires. Other stipulations of this treaty aim to the reestablishment of the Central American Union, and to the maintenance of peace. Other conventions signed by the same plenipotentiaries provided for the creation of a bureau to be located in the City of Guatemala, for the purpose of fostering intercourse among the signatory countries, and for the creation of a Central American pedagogical institute.

Disturbances have, however, continued in Central America and to such an extent has the peace of that portion of the world been threatened that the friendly mediation of the United States and Mexico became appropriate in the common interest of peace and good will. This tender of good offices was readily accepted by all the Central American states and their common effort to maintain peace and arrive at a definite understanding resulted in the protocol signed at the Department of State in Washington, on September 17, 1907, by the plenipotentiaries of all five of the Central American republics in the presence of the representatives of the United States and Mexico, providing for the Peace Conference which was held at Washington in November and December under the roof of the International Bureau of American Republics.

Fourteen were the sessions of the Conference between November 14 and December 20. Resulting from these deliberations eight conventions were agreed to and signed on the latter date. These conventions are: General treaty of peace and amity, additional convention to the general treaty, establishing a Central American Court of Justice, on extradition, on future conferences, on communications, establishing an international Central American bureau, and establishing a pedagogical institute.

The Conference recognized that peace is the great need of the Central American republics, and this peace should be based not upon force but upon the administration of justice. Hence, the convention for the establishment of a Central American Court of Justice in which each state should be represented and whose decisions should be binding alike upon government and citizen. It was felt that a court of justice would preserve equality of state and equality of right, but it was recognized that peace was improbable if not impossible as long as the causes of dissension remain. Therefore the general treaty of peace and amity declared "that every disposition or measure which may tend to alter the constitutional organization in any of them is to be deemed a menace to the peace of said republics," and as the dispositions or measures tending to alter the constitutional organization of the republics arise largely from the personal ambition of political leaders who seek not merely to establish but to perpetuate themselves in power and to choose their successors, an additional convention was drawn up, in which the contracting parties pledged themselves not to recognize "any other government which may come into power in any of the five republics as a consequence of a *coup d'état*, or of a revolution against the recognized government, so long as the freely elected representatives of the people thereof, have not constitutionally reorganized the country," and that the governments of Central America are recommended to "endeavor to bring about, by the means at their command, a con-

stitutional reform in the sense of prohibiting the reelection of the president of a republic, where such prohibition does not exist," and "to adopt all measures necessary to effect a complete guaranty of the principle of alternation in power."

The geographical situation of Honduras has made it in times past the object of aggression, for its possession or control seems to be of fundamental advantage to the contending Central American republics. Therefore, the treaty provides that "Honduras declares from now on its absolute neutrality in event of any conflict between the other republics; and the latter, in their turn, provided such neutrality be observed, bind themselves to respect it and in no case to violate the Honduran territory." This article eliminates a perennial and specific source of trouble, as Honduras borders with Guatemala, Salvador and Nicaragua, and, furthermore, the additional convention seeks to remove a general evil, for it provides that in case of civil war no government of Central America shall intervene in favor of or against the government of the country where the struggle takes place.

In other words, the general treaty looks to peace based upon the administration of justice as a permanent status, and by the removal of causes of past controversy seeks to guarantee the peaceful development of the respective countries.

But it is not merely the removal of causes of controversy that engaged the attention of the Conference. By removing artificial barriers, the convention looked upon the inhabitants of the respective republics as essentially one people and provided for equality of treatment of citizens of one in the territory of the others, both in political rights and privileges and in the educational and professional training necessary for the understanding and application of such rights and privileges. Therefore a pedagogical institute was to be established in Costa Rica, for the professional education of teachers.

Another convention establishes an international Central American bureau, to be located in Guatemala, in order to "develop the interests common to Central America" and "to take charge of the supervision and care of such interests."

These are the salient points of the work of the Central American Peace Conference of Washington. For much of the descriptive account of the work of the Conference, I have quoted the Honorable James Brown Scott, the distinguished Solicitor of the Department of State, and as regards the Central American Court of Justice, the paper of Mr. Anderson, hereto appended, will give a complete idea of the plan on which such Tribunal will be built.

Costa Rica being at peace with itself and enjoying the most cordial relations with all its sister republics, had no questions whatever which constrained her to attend the Conference, but moved by lofty ideas of brotherhood, and in contemplation of a

common future for the five states, gladly co-operated with the United States and Mexico in bringing about the happy results of the patriotic work of which I have very respectfully presented to you this simple statement. (Applause.)

I now quote from a statement presented to the National Congress of Costa Rica, by SEÑOR DON LUIS ANDERSON, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of that Republic, and President of the Central American Peace Conference, regarding the establishment of the Central American Court of Justice:

“Another important convention concluded by the Peace Conference is that relating to the establishment of a Central American Court of Justice. It appears in 28 articles that constitute the agreement, a provisional article and another annexed article that are in the nature of a recommendation which, if they see fit, the respective legislatures may incorporate into the treaty.

“The Central American Court of Justice, the first of its kind that will be established among nations, gives material form to the thought of eminent statesmen and philanthropists, who for a long time have been struggling to establish means in consonance with the tendencies of civilization for the settlement of international conflicts.

“Said court will be a permanent tribunal, which will proceed in the matters that are submitted to it for decision in accordance with the judicial rules of investigation observed by all the judicial tribunals of the civilized world, and shall decide impartially in accordance with the teaching of international law and with a view to a strict and scrupulous termination of the matter.

“Arbitration as the means of settling international difficulties has been the ideal of modern diplomacy; but for its realization in a manner that all peoples may accept it without reserve it is indispensable to give it juridic character which by the nature of its functions belong to it. Arbitration exercised by an umpire whom the parties have chosen to decide cases of conflict or difference of opinion between them has been an effort but slightly satisfactory in its results. The arbiter, although it has been attempted to cloak him with the attributes of a judge, has not shown himself, in the greater number of cases, in any other character than that of a friendly adjuster, a diplomat who after a more or less complete investigation of the matter submitted to his judgment has occupied himself rather in satisfying both parties litigant than in deciding in strict justice in favor of the party entitled to it, and in the majority of cases leaving the parties resorting to him dissatisfied. And it is natural that it should happen thus. The arbiter desires peaceful adjustment for those who have by common accord chosen him as a judge in their quarrels, and he renders judgments that he believes just and conciliatory, and in very good faith it is true, but nearly always without thorough knowledge of the matter, and only with the benevolent desire that in some manner the controversy may terminate and peace reign, although without the absolute prevalence of strict right.

“This has been the stumbling block with which the humanitarian doctrine of arbitration has met, intrusted to persons or commissions chosen ad hoc for the case as it arises. Right among nations, as among individuals, is not satisfied by a halfway adjustment, which leaves each one in the belief that he has been deprived of something that is his, but it requires a decision founded upon strict justice, to which all submit because the latter represents the inflexible expression of truth; and this

is the only way that all questions can be finally decided without leaving feelings of wounded pride or of legitimate interests defrauded.

"The Central American Republics, upon commencing a new life, relegating to oblivion past errors, persuaded as they are that the cardinal point in their compass ought to be the accomplishment of a positive and great prosperity, have sought in this new conception of arbitration the most powerful support of their desired tranquillity, and in order to put it into practice agreed in Washington to establish the Central American Court of Justice.

"To the end of constituting that high tribunal in such a manner that it may be the recipient of the most absolute confidence of those who are to bring to it the solution of their disagreements, it is necessary that the justices who compose it be men of recognized ability and integrity, and in that sense the convention provides that said justices shall be chosen—

'From among the jurists who possess the qualifications which the laws of each country prescribe for the exercise of high judicial office and who enjoy the highest consideration, both because of their moral character and their professional ability.'

"Organized, therefore, with such a personnel of irreproachable honor, free by reason of the character of the institution which has created it, there is no doubt but that the Central American Court of Justice will be as Article XIII says, 'Representative of the national conscience of Central America,' and that the people will have nothing to fear upon bringing their reciprocal differences to the final judgment of that conscience.

"I believe that the high position which belongs to the Central American Court of Justice can not be presented more clearly. Its members being named by the legislative power of each country, they will owe their office to the national will, conveyed with implicit trust, and they will, therefore, enter upon the exercise of their lofty and humanitarian duties without political compromises that may influence their conduct and surrounded by the highest prerogatives which can be conferred on a citizen within our republican régime, since, as Article X says:

'Whilst they remain in the country of their appointment the regular and substitute justices shall enjoy the personal immunity which the respective laws grant to the magistrates of the supreme court of justice, and in other contracting republics they shall have the privileges and immunities of diplomatic agents.'

"Under such conditions the Central American Court of Justice, as a creation of the popular will, need follow no other counsels than those of wisdom, nor listen to any other voice than that of conscience. Thus constituted, this tribunal, in my opinion, will be the highest that all those who are possessed by the spirit of justice, and who busy themselves by placing the sacred ideal of right in an inviolable sanctuary, can dream of at the present time, so fruitful of grand concepts.

"The first four articles of the convention point out the object for which the court is created and the scope which its attributes cover.

"The contracting parties thereupon bind themselves: 'To submit (to the court) all controversies or questions which may arise among them, of whatsoever nature and no matter what their origin may be, in case the respective departments of foreign affairs should not have been able to reach an understanding.'

"Here is avoided the possibility that the Central American Governments will in the future air their differences that arise among them in any other field than: First, that of diplomacy; or, later, the judicial field of the court, as a decisive and final resort, if in the former an agreement has not been reached. Appeal to arms has been absolutely

rejected as a means of settling any controversy between these nations; and that provision alone would be of sufficient merit that the convention should be adopted by Central Americans with universal applause.

“But more than this—

‘This court shall also take cognizance of the questions which individuals of one Central American country may raise against any of the other contracting Governments, because of the violation of treaties or conventions and other cases of an international character, no matter whether their own Government supports said claim or not; and provided that the remedies which the laws of the respective country provide against such violation shall have been exhausted or that denial of justice shall have been shown.’

“This breadth of jurisdiction of the court tends, above all, to prevent the possibility that a controversy between a government and one or more citizens of another Central American nation might be converted into an international conflict, if said citizens should resort to soliciting the protection of their respective Governments, instead of taking their differences to the court, as the only authorized tribunal, when once the ordinary way has been exhausted, to hear and determine them, as the convention provides.

“Furthermore—

‘It shall also take cognizance of the cases which by common accord the contracting Governments may submit to it, no matter whether they arise between two or more of them or between one of said Governments and individuals.’

“In which case the court will always be a potent element of good understanding, and the most expeditious judicial resort to put an end to questions that may concern the governments and to which resort may be had simply by the will and mutual agreement of the parties interested.

“Finally—

‘The court can likewise take cognizance of the international questions which by special agreement any one of the Central American Governments and a foreign government may have determined to submit to it.’

“Thus will our Central American Court of Justice come to be an international institution of justice, to which the nations who at any time have anything to claim with respect to any of our countries, will not refuse to resort, seeking an equitable and prompt decision. Perchance at some time, although remote—once the existence of the court is assured and its correct administration established—powerful nations will not find a more efficacious way of clearly showing their confidence in the right that supports their claims than by intrusting it to the hands of this tribunal.

“Article XVIII provides—

‘From the moment in which any suit is instituted against any one or more governments up to that in which a final decision has been pronounced, the court may, at the solicitation of any one of the parties, fix the situation in which the contending parties must remain, to the end that the difficulty shall not be aggravated and that things shall be conserved in *statu quo* pending a final decision.’

“This power of fixing the *statu quo* is in accord with the doctrine concerning the powers of arbitral judges, which eminent jurists have supported, and is an element of great importance, in order that the action of the court may correspond to the lofty purposes of its institution; because it is logical that on attempting to decide a controversy this latter should continue in the state in which it is submitted to the judges, so that in every case the judgment may be directed toward a fixed, determined, and precise matter; and on the other hand warlike preparations, the mobilization of forces, or other acts that tend to alter the existing footing of the armed force a State maintains are likely to aggravate the

situation and to cause the decision of the tribunal to be delayed or illusory, which can be avoided by means of a proper order of the court faithfully observed by all interested parties.

“According to the opinion held by the wisest expounders of public international law, arbitral judges ought to have the power to determine their jurisdiction, interpreting the treaties and conventions relative to their constitution and to the matter in dispute, and applying to their proceedings and resolutions the universally accepted principles of law. Without this the action of an arbitral tribunal becomes little less than impossible, its proceedings are uncertain, and the scope of its jurisdiction is involved in a question of interpretation. The conference kept in mind these observations and by Article XXII of the convention sanctioned said doctrine, expressly conferring on the court said power.

“In the other articles of the convention it is provided: That the seat of the court shall be in the city of Cartago in this Republic, but may temporarily be removed to another point in Central America, if special reasons exist therefor; that the regular and substitute justices shall be appointed for the term of five years and may be reelected; that the exercise of office of justice is incompatible with the practice of his profession and the discharge of public duties; that at its first annual session the court shall elect from among the justices the President and Vice-President, and shall organize the personnel of its office, and the form of procedure that it must follow in the disposition of matters which are submitted to it, and other provisions of internal and economic régime; and it is finally declared that—

“‘The high contracting parties solemnly declare that on no ground nor in any case will they consider the present convention as void; and that, therefore, they will consider it as being always in force during the term of ten years counted from the last ratification. In the event of the change or alteration of the political status of one or more of the contracting Republics, the functions of the Central American Court of Justice created by this convention shall be suspended *ipso facto*; and a conference to adjust the constitution of said court to the new order of things shall be forthwith convoked by the respective Governments; in case they do not unanimously agree the present convention shall be considered as rescinded.’

“Such are the provisions that constitute the agreement.

“With respect to the final provisory article, which is a mere annex whereby the jurisdiction of the court is extended to matters of an internal order, I believe that at present it can not be accepted by Costa Rica because it does not accord with our constitutional organization.

“I know well that those who mistrust moral advancement in society will ask me: ‘And the Central American Court of Justice being established, whence will it derive the force necessary to give effective sanction to its judgments, compelling those who are unwilling to submit to them?’

“Force! That is just what we wish to be done with, substituting therefor philosophy and morality.

“I would answer those who ask me such a question that the force on which the Central American Court of Justice relies for the sure execution of its judgments is rooted in the honor of the nations who made the agreement, in the patriotism of Central Americans whose conscience said tribunal represents, in the judgment of other nations who are watching our conduct, and, above all, in the advance of civilization which is rapidly blotting out the asperities of barbarism, the only ones that still exact the protection of brute force for right and justice.

“The signatory Governments have formally bound themselves to obey and compel the findings of the court to be obeyed, lending all assistance

necessary for the best and quickest disposition of matters that it may investigate; and with regard to making the judgment final, Article XXV reiterates the agreement of the signatory nations of the Convention in these terms—

“The judgments of the court shall be communicated to the five Governments of the contracting Republics. The interested parties solemnly bind themselves to submit to said judgments, and all agree to lend all moral support that may be necessary in order that they may be properly fulfilled, thereby constituting a real and positive guarantee of respect for this convention and for the Central American Court of Justice.”

THE CHAIRMAN: We have with us the Director of the International Bureau of the American Republics, an institution which is more and more becoming a great influence for peace in this hemisphere. Its achievements under its present director, Hon. JOHN BARRETT, are so well known that he needs no introduction to this audience.

WHAT PAN-AMERICA IS DOING FOR INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN BARRETT

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Whenever it is my privilege to address an audience of this intelligence, I do not know exactly where to begin and where to end in the discussion of the sister republics of the United States and of our relations with them. But I do want a gathering of men and women, who come together from all over the United States and represent our most progressive thought, to feel in sympathy with the purposes and plans and organization of the International Bureau of American Republics, which we are going to make one of the great institutions of the world, for the advancement of international peace, friendship and commerce among nations. We are only going to do it, however, by the co-operation of the class of men and women who gather here at this Conference. That institution was organized some eighteen years ago at the first Pan-American Conference, but it has awaited a further Conference to be reorganized and now is starting out upon a career of great usefulness to all the American Republics. Its governing board consists of the diplomatic representatives in Washington of all Latin-American countries presided over by the Secretary of State of the United States, who, in other words, is the chairman ex-officio. Its director is chosen by the vote of all these ministers and nations, and therefore, is an international officer. And I feel honored to-night to stand before you not as officer of the United States alone, but just as much of Mexico, Argentine, Chili, Peru, Cuba, and of other nations of the great south-land.

The International Bureau of American Republics is starting work upon a new home which is to be the first temple of peace,

comity and commerce erected upon the western hemisphere; and we have to thank largely for the success of this movement the great Secretary of State, the man who is doing so much for the advancement of American diplomacy all over the world, that distinguished New Yorker, Elihu Root (applause); and, in connection with him, that benefactor who has done so much to advance the cause of peace by his great gift to the Hague, and who now has given \$750,000 for our new edifice, Mr. Andrew Carnegie. (Applause.)

My friends, I wish that you might all have been in Washington a week ago Monday and witnessed the ceremony to which kind reference has been made. The character of the men who were there, the speeches they made, the environment of the situation, the idea that came forward made the occasion a great success. It is a remarkable fact that Mr. Carnegie, Cardinal Gibbons, the President and the Secretary of State should have all remarked that, in their entire career, they had never attended a ceremony of its kind which was more impressive and suggestive of greater things.

Perhaps one of the things that appealed so much to everybody was the unfurling, in the presence of four thousand people who are doing things in this world, of the flags of each one of the twenty-one nations of the western hemisphere to the tune of a great Pan-American hymn, made up of bars of music from each one of the national hymns of these countries. It was indeed an impressive spectacle and it was difficult to keep tears from our eyes as we realized the fact that right there in the Capitol of the United States this homage was being done to the flags of all these countries. We had cable messages from all the Presidents of the American Republics felicitating the President of the United States and the American people upon the laying of the cornerstone of this building. And every one of those messages suggested and breathed the spirit of international comity, closer union among the nations of the western hemisphere and of cooperative spirit for the building up of a great influence upon the western hemisphere that will stand for the peace and the welfare of all the countries concerned.

There were great speeches from the President of the United States, from the Secretary of State of the United States, from the Brazilian Ambassador, from the head of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, from the Dean of the Protestant clergy in the City of Washington, and from Mr. Carnegie himself, in the presence of the principal members of the Cabinet, of the Supreme Court, of the entire diplomatic corps, of the army and navy officials, heads of bureaus and departments, and a majority of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Five years ago it would have been absolutely impossible to have

held a celebration of that kind. People would have laughed and said it never could be realized. But it was a success. It was the "arrival," in the opinion and in the judgment of the American people of the principle of Pan-American accord, Pan-American comity, Pan-American peace, friendship and good will among nations of the western hemisphere.

My friends, the address of Mr. Calvo to which you have just listened, I hope many will read when it is published. Mr. Calvo was one of the moving spirits of the Central American Peace Congress, and I want you to-night to realize that that Central American Peace Conference, although it was a gathering of the smaller nations of the western hemisphere having associated with them two of the larger ones, Mexico and the United States, marked the most forward step for absolute international arbitration that has ever been taken by a group of nations in the history of the world. That international Conference adjourned with the first action of a group of nations binding themselves to settle every kind of dispute by an international court and without recourse to arms. As Mr. Scott has well stated to us it is an illustration of the fact that a little child as it were shall lead them, when we see these five Central American nations showing the world that a group of nations, even a group in the habit of being called revolutionary, have agreed that they can adjust their disputes by an international court. It is interesting to bear in mind that within a few days there will assemble at Cartago in Costa Rica, this court for its first meeting. I think indeed, although it may be said that the court will be over-ruled, we must say that it is a step forward on the same principle that we encourage a man in endeavoring to reform even though he may occasionally take a backward step. But I am honest in my conviction when I say that I believe it is the sincere purpose of those republics to carry through that court to a success and set an example to the rest of the world, which may mean much for the settlement of all disputes in the future. If we study the utterances of the leading statesmen of other Latin-American nations we discover that they too stand for the principle of arbitration.

I want to add a word about South America as a whole, so that we may realize how important is the position of the United States to-day as the older brother or big sister among all these countries. Do you know, and it is no exaggeration, that all Latin-America to-day is entering upon a period of development and progress almost unparalleled in the history of the world? While we have been so tremendously occupied with our own development, there has been going on in South America a material, economic, social, educational, and a general development that to-day stares us in the face, and says "Why have you failed to recognize what we have been doing?" And when we do recognize what they have

been doing we find Europe and even the far East are ahead of us in giving that part of the world credit.

I wish to-night that I could take you for a little journey through South America, and point out to you what is happening there, so that you could see that I am not indulging in exaggeration. I wish I could make you understand that in such countries as Argentina there is being started a new life, a new people as it were, who shall figure among the great nations of the world, conscious of lusty strength, conscious of resources, conscious of possibilities. Think of a country with only six millions of people doing a trade last year amounting to \$582,000,000 or nearly \$100 per head. In other words, Argentina, down in the temperate part of South America, carried on a greater foreign trade, bought and sold more, than Japan with fifty million people, or China with three hundred millions. There is Buenos Ayres, the fairest city of all America. Proud as we are of New York and even of Washington and of our other great cities, there is to-day no metropolis in our whole country more beautiful, more attractive and growing more rapidly than the great capital of Argentina, which has just reached 1,200,000 in its population. There is Rio de Janeiro, the great capital of Brazil, experiencing a similar progress. Upon the other side of South America we find Santiago, Chile, going ahead with enormous strides; Lima in Peru, which had a university a hundred years before Harvard was established, entering upon a new life. I could tell of the railroads of these countries, the establishments of institutions, building of hospitals, starting new newspapers, erecting great public structures.

I want to impress upon you that all Latin-Americans to-day are watching you, are watching us in a critical spirit. They are not seeking to follow us, unless we show that we are worthy of leadership. And it is idle to assume that, just because we are a great and powerful country, we are the only land that is attracting them. There is Europe which they are studying closely, and they are not going to follow us unless we "make good." Therefore the responsibility rests upon every man, every woman, who is interested in the welfare of our country, to help solve the great problems before us, so that we may deserve the support, the following, and the interest of all Latin-America. The responsibility is upon the American people; and I am sure if the class of men and women whom I see here to-night will study South America, its history, development, its present and future possibilities and reciprocate the interest which there has been aroused by our great Secretary of State in his journey around South America and through Mexico, we will soon see the actual dawning of that time when war upon the western hemisphere shall be at an end; when there shall be peace from Canada to Patagonia; and when

arbitration shall be the settlement of every character of dispute. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to listen to a gentleman who last year made a tour of South America and returned with an abundance of information which he is using to educate the students of Columbia University and the people of New York, in regard to that part of the world. I have pleasure in presenting Professor WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD, of Columbia University.

THE FIRST PAN-AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD

Mr. Chairman: Within the region known as "Latin America" there are twenty republics possessing a combined area nearly three times that of the United States, and a population more than three-fourths of the number of inhabitants in this country. Yet to the mind of our average citizen the name "Latin America" often means little more than it did a century ago. He is prone to think of it as a geographical expression referring to a vague extent of territory tenanted by races aboriginal and mixed, divided by doubtful boundary lines, shaken by earthquakes, afflicted with tropical diseases, and rent by revolutionary disturbances.

How we may increase our knowledge of Latin America, and what advantages such an enlargement of knowledge will afford, are coming to be important questions of the day. Of certain kinds of information concerning the twenty republics there is no lack. Government reports, magazine and newspaper articles, and books of travel tell us of natural resources, race blends, political practices, and commercial and industrial activities. They give us glimpses of large cities and curious customs, and occasionally recall the picturesque times of the Aztecs, the Incas, and the Spanish conqueror. All of this may be interesting enough to a select class of readers, but what the ordinary citizen of the United States cares to know is, how far the countries of Latin America, viewed either as a mass or as individuals, are entitled to recognition as civilized communities; to what extent have they exercised the powers of the intellect, the conscience, and the imagination so as to produce a degree of culture at all comparable with that of Europe or of our own land. He asks whether they are educating their people, striving to lessen human misery, applying their minds to a wise development of their natural wealth, encouraging the higher forms of thought, and stimulating a love of the beautiful.

On their own part the Latin Americans resent very naturally the presumption that such queries imply. In tones of sarcasm or of indignation they ask whether we think that they habitually

walk around in warpaint and feathers, and they express ironical thanks to visitors from the United States who evince surprise at the degree of culture actually shown. They are disposed, also, to ascribe what they regard as an insulting attitude of mind to a spirit of contempt or of unfriendliness on our part; whereas in reality it is due to the fact that as a nation we are ignorant of just those things about Latin America which we ought to know. All of these circumstances, indeed, lend special significance to the first Pan-American Scientific Congress which opens its sessions at Santiago, Chile, on the 25th of next December.

The idea of convoking a scientific congress of the Latin American states originated with the Scientific Society of the Argentine Republic, and the first assemblage of the sort was held at Buenos Ayres in 1898. It was repeated with increasing success at Montevideo in 1901, and at Rio de Janeiro in 1905. One of the most gratifying achievements of this interchange of learning was the sense of solidarity which it produced among states that, in spite of their similarity of speech, custom, and history, had dwelt in a mental isolation almost as complete from one another as from the United States. Accordingly the session at Rio de Janeiro resolved that the next Congress to be held at Santiago should devote a larger amount of attention to problems of common import to Latin America as a whole. As time went on, however, the Chilean Committee of Organization began to realize that, if the membership in the future Congress were to be limited strictly to Latin Americans, the discussion of such problems might be lacking in practical results. For this reason the United States has been officially requested through the medium of the Chilean government to send delegates to the meeting at Santiago, while the Committee of Organization on its own behalf has extended the invitation to fifteen of our prominent universities, and has appointed an American Committee of Co-operation as well. In order, also, to signalize the entrance of the United States, the fourth of these assemblies is to bear the appropriate title of "First Pan-American."

The hundreds of topics to be discussed at the Congress are divided into nine general sections; namely, mathematics, physical sciences, natural sciences, engineering, medicine, jurisprudence, social science, pedagogy and philosophy, and agriculture and animal industry. Throughout the effort to impress a Pan-American character upon a large percentage of the individual themes has been carefully and consistently maintained. Especially is this true of the matters to be treated under the head of "social science." The term is intended to be a comprehensive one, and includes American history, international law, the history of diplomacy, international policy, constitutional and administrative law, political and social economy, criminology, police, literature

and the fine arts, and American universities. Among the topics of particular interest in this section may be mentioned the following:

An explanation of the reasons why the colonies of English America were able to unite into a single state after attaining independence, while those of Spanish America never succeeded in establishing a permanent union among any of them; the extent to which America has come to possess a civilization, interests and problems, different from those of Europe; the feasibility of creating an American international law; the responsibility of the American governments for injuries caused to foreigners as a result of civil wars, strikes, or other internal disturbances; diplomatic reclamations against Latin American states and their peculiarities compared with those which have characterized such reclamations in Europe; upon what bases Pan-American diplomatic and scientific congresses should be organized to strengthen the bonds of solidarity among the countries of the western continent; commercial intercourse among American countries and means of promoting it; the establishment of a Pan-American bank, and the bases of its organization; the feasibility of having the American states set up a uniform system of regulating immigration; the legal, material, and moral condition of the working classes in Latin America, as compared with that in the United States and Europe; the establishment of closer relations on the part of the press in the several American states as a means of strengthening the bonds of connection among them; and the creation of an international bureau of American universities so as to facilitate communication among them, bring their publications together, and serve in general as a means of promoting cooperation in the study of American problems.

The significance of these and similar examples of the matters to be brought before the Congress appears all the more strongly when we consider the advantages that the deliberations and conclusions of such a body may afford in advancing the cause of Pan-Americanism. For the first time in the history of the New World men of science representing civilizations of diverse origin and differing stages of development will meet to discuss topics of common interest to their respective countries. The broadening of ideas resultant from a personal contact of this sort is too obvious to need comment. Granting the novelty of the movement and conditions peculiar to Latin America which may not permit discussion to approach the liberal bounds possible in Europe or in the United States, the fact remains that the opportunity for an interchange of opinions and experiences certainly will be much greater at such a Congress than at Conferences in which the diplomatic element plays a part. In this connection, also, the advancement of scientific knowledge as an end in itself

must be emphasized. Learning is not the property of an individual, of a group of individuals, or even of a single nation. Universal in its nature, it should be universal in its diffusion. As the Latin Americans have a message for us, so have we a message for them, and the delivery of both should be effected in the place and under the circumstances where they will be productive of the greatest good.

Furthermore the Congress offers an ideal occasion to establish a reciprocity of personal acquaintance between the United States and the republics of Latin America. On our own part we can ascertain the conditions prevailing among our southern neighbors which indicate their actual progress and attainments in culture. The knowledge thereby gained will serve, first, to dispel the impression, unfortunately so current among us, that the countries to the south of the United States are hardly more than half civilized; second, to convince us, not only that some of the republics are more advanced than others, but that each is entitled to separate consideration as a state apart from the mass called "Latin America" into which we are apt to throw them; and third, to provide us with the means of forming a righteous judgment of the Latin American countries through the acquisition of the proofs of culture so abundant among those countries themselves, and hitherto so difficult for us to obtain at home.

On the other hand this reciprocity of personal acquaintance will give an impulse toward removing the similar degree of ignorance which is largely responsible for distrust, dislike, and prejudice, so far as these sentiments exist among the Latin American republics, in reference to the United States. The idea held by many Latin Americans, indeed, on the subject of the interest that we are supposed to have in their concerns was crisply expressed some time ago by a gentleman of one of the South American states when he declared that such interest came from a mixture of "sentimentality, money-getting, Monroeism, and manifest destiny." Like many quips of the sort the epigram unwittingly conceals the truth under a misconception of the truth. *Understood in the proper sense* it does set forth, in my opinion, the four motives that determine the real attitude of the United States toward the Latin American republics, and the Congress at Santiago will be an efficient means of rendering the attitude unmistakable.

As a result of the meeting of that body an appreciation of the genuine purpose of the Monroe doctrine may be reached in a manner more successful than ever before. "Monroeism" will be shown to involve neither officious tutelage, designs at exploitation, unrighteous interference, nor schemes of conquest, but rather a sincere desire to assure to the Latin American nations the progress and the prosperity that their conditions and talents

deserve, while rendering them free from the dangers of possible projects of ambition on the part of powers beyond the confines of the New World.

The participation of delegates from this country in the Congress will promote the extension to Latin America of the influence of the United States, so far as that influence is exemplified by our spirit of enterprise, our democratic institutions, our educational impulses and achievements, and by our social, economic, intellectual, and political training in general. This will mean the eventual diversion of the close relationship, material and intellectual, now existing between most of the Latin American republics and Europe, from that continent to the United States. No slight feature of this process of approximation is the recognition that is sure to come of the peculiar fitness of our system of technical and industrial education to the needs of Latin America. As an appreciation of this fact the number of Latin American students in attendance at our institutions of learning will be greatly increased. The practical knowledge that they will gain cannot fail to serve the interests of their native lands. Some idea of the extent of this service may be formed when we remember the circumstance that both the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere are provided with vast natural resources, that are relatively undeveloped. Given these resources, and aided by foreign capital and immigration, we have adapted our educational methods to the demands of a wealth that had to be made productive. The success attending our efforts has rendered the United States a rich and powerful nation. What we have done can be imitated by the Latin American countries to very much the same degree if the men who carry on the work of development are prepared for the task, as we have been, by a course of practical and systematic training. In all of these aspects of influence lies "manifest destiny" as a motive of the United States in dealing with Latin America.

The meetings of the Congress will help to strengthen sentiments of friendship and sympathy among all of the nations concerned. They will tend to awaken an active consciousness of American solidarity in its broadest sense, and will emphasize the community of American problems that can be solved and regulated only by the republics of the three Americas and the West Indies co-operating in hearty accord. Perhaps the greatest achievement of the Congress in this connection will be its facilitation of the work of the fourth Pan-American Conference to be held at Buenos Ayres in 1910. The Congress at Santiago affords an extremely valuable opportunity for a group of scientific men, unhampered by official instructions and undisturbed by dubious questions of ratification, to give a preliminary consideration to many topics that will be dealt with in the future Conference.

The practical bearing of the conclusions at which they may arrive upon the labors of that official gathering needs no remark. So far as the delegates from the United States assume a share in this process of drawing closer the friendly ties that bind the Americas together, herein consists our "sentimentality."

Lastly, the discussions of the Congress at Santiago will contribute to a better understanding of a number of problems connected specifically with the economic relations between the United States and Latin America. In brief these problems may be said to concern the system of transportation and communication, the investment of capital, and the growth of commerce. Under the first of the three heads may be included such matters as the improvement in shipping facilities between the United States and the countries of South America in particular, the construction of the Panama Canal, and the probable influence of that waterway when completed, and also the extension of the Intercontinental Railroad as projected between New York and Buenos Ayres. Regarding the investment of capital and the growth of commerce it should be remembered Latin America buys more than four times as much from the other nations of the world, especially of Europe, as it does from the United States. Statements like this, coupled with an increasing knowledge of the enormous natural resources of Latin America, furnish some idea of the possibilities of developing our trade with the southern republics. Problems of such paramount importance, and so closely bound up with the future welfare of the American continent as a whole, assuredly deserve a joint examination by scientists from so many of the states concerned. And when it be recalled, also, that the deficiency in our Latin American commerce is due for the most part to the backwardness of our trade with the countries of South America itself, the sessions of the Congress at Santiago assume even a greater interest than before.

The day when commerce was but a form of warfare has passed. Now it is regarded as a powerful agency of good, not only in contributing to the material prosperity of the nations thus related, but in diffusing mutual knowledge, and in cementing friendship between their peoples. While we exchange our products we compare ideas, and we develop sympathies. The benefits conferred are reciprocal throughout. If this be the sort of "money-getting" at which the United States aspires in Latin America, let us make the most of it, and let all of our sister republics go and do likewise. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Having completed our Pan-American program, we are now to have general discussion. We will first hear from the gentleman who represents in a high capacity one of our distant territories, the late Chief Justice and the present Governor of Hawaii, Hon. W F. FREAR.

HAWAII'S INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL
ARBITRATION

REMARKS OF HON. W. F. FREAR

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Conference: With your permission, I will express a few thoughts, suggested by my residence in little, remote Hawaii, bearing upon the questions before this Conference. It not infrequently happens that even the most far-reaching questions may be illumined by observation or experiment upon a small scale. The history of Hawaii is a great history in miniature. It exhibits, since the beginnings of Christian civilization there less than a century ago and in small compass, many of the problems and their solution that have made up in large part the histories of great nations of centuries' growth.

For four centuries before the advent of Christian civilization, those islands were in a constant state of internal warfare. Since then there have migrated thither large numbers of other races—Americans, English, Germans, Spaniards, Portuguese, Porto Ricans, Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, and other races, making perhaps the most cosmopolitan people upon the face of the earth and offering opportunity for a continuation and an intensification of the strife that had so long existed before. Yet so clear was the mutuality of interests among these different races, though each lived largely its own life and had its own individual interests; and so permeating were the principles of the "Prince of Peace" taken there by the missionaries and propagated by their descendants, that the history of that little group has flowed on smoothly and with wonderful results. It has illustrated in a small way the words of our Secretary of State, made only a few days ago at the laying of the corner-stone of the Bureau of American Republics that no difficulties are so great that they must lead to war if neither party really desires war; while no difficulties are so trifling but that they may lead to war if either party really desires war. It is all in the spirit. To illustrate by a single instance. Ninety-one Japanese children in the public schools nearly upset the great metropolis of the West, and through that nearly involved two nations in war. The same problem was presented in Hawaii, with five thousand Japanese children, and was solved without a ripple of excitement, but in a different manner and a different spirit. If in these little islands of Hawaii, among these different races, peace could be maintained through a sense of mutuality of interests and the inculcation of the doctrine of the brotherhood of man, may we not hope for similar results on a larger scale and through the same process.

Little Hawaii, apparently an easy prey to designing nations, long maintained her independence. Why? Once she lost her

independence for a short time and on its restoration, in 1843, the King addressing the people told them that if they would continue numbered among the nations of the earth, respected by other nations and at peace with other nations, they must keep pace with advancing civilization and pursue righteousness. In his own words: "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono"—"The life of the land is perpetuated by righteousness." That has ever since been the motto of Hawaii. It was that pursuit of righteousness very largely that led the United States government in 1842 to make what might be called a declaration of neutrality respecting Hawaii. It was that, too, very largely, that led France and Great Britain to enter into a mutual agreement to respect the independence of Hawaii. If a nation desires peace within itself and peace with other nations, it must lay the foundation in righteousness on its own part; it must show that it has a real desire for justice and a real desire for peace.

One other thought, suggested by the situation or the location of Hawaii at the center of the greatest of oceans. She lies there, alone,—the naval key, the Gibraltar of the North Pacific; the commercial cross-roads, the half-way station. It was long ago predicted that that ocean would become the theater of the world's final contest for permanent commercial and political supremacy. Every nation upon its borders is advancing by leaps and bounds—some with the vigor of first youth, others with that of rejuvenation. It is about to be made easily accessible by the completion of the Panama Canal on this side; on the other side the largest of nations is already rubbing its eyes in its awakening, with tenfold the population of her neighbor, Japan. It is obvious that if any people ought to be interested in the advocacy of peace and the settlement of international questions by peaceful methods, it is the people of Hawaii, situated as they are at what might naturally be considered an international storm center. That is to their material interests and I believe the people of those islands generally and genuinely desire that.

But the United States is about to expend over four millions of dollars in the fortification of those islands and the establishment of a naval station there. That will be only a beginning. A great fleet has just gone to those waters. What does it all mean? Is it inconsistent with the desire for peace? It may seem foolishness to some—to others not; but it can hardly be doubted that the object is peace. The point of difference is as to the best method of accomplishing that object. I for one, and I think the peace-loving people of Hawaii in general also, believe that the United States cannot with the greatest wisdom continue to pursue the methods of former times. Conditions have changed. The United States has entered upon the arena of world politics, and especially in the Far East. It was one of the most illustrious

feats of her statesmanship and diplomacy that secured the territorial integrity of China and the Open Door. These seemingly warlike moves are not merely for the protection of Hawaii, not merely for the protection of the Pacific coast, not merely for the protection of American commerce on the Pacific, not merely that we may be prepared for war in time of peace, but also that the United States may be in a position to insure peace among all in that storm area. A recent writer on the Russian-Japanese war referred to what he called "the irony of fate in dubbing that ocean the Pacific." It seems to me that it is one of the offices—one of the grandest and most important offices—of the United States, through respect engendered by her own extraordinary internal material and moral growth and respect and if necessary by a showing of external power, by her own efforts and by bringing about co-operation among the powers to see to it that that ocean has been rightly named the Pacific; so that the coming contest upon it for commercial and political supremacy may be a peaceful one. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is a gentleman we are always glad to hear, Professor JOHN B. CLARK, who holds the chair of political economy in Columbia University.

THE PART OF ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE ARBITRATION MOVEMENT

REMARKS OF PROFESSOR JOHN B. CLARK

Mr. Smiley, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The particular phase of the topic on which I shall speak concerns certain recent movements in the labor world, which seem to offer us allies in the cause of peace. These movements certainly have not gone unnoticed by the members of this Conference; but they have gone without anything approaching due notice by the world at large. There has not been a time since the formation of this Conference when we could not count on a more or less cordial assistance from organized labor in efforts to prevent war and to establish on a firm basis a system of arbitration. While that has been true, the amount of zeal actually displayed in that cause by organized labor has not been as great heretofore as it has recently become. The reason for that is not what we wish it were, but the fact itself we have to make the most of. Organized labor has become of late far more zealous in the cause of peace than it was. You are familiar with the fact that while in England and America trade unions do not, as a rule, go openly and definitely into politics for the accomplishment of their chief purposes, in the countries of continental Europe they do so; and it is there among continental nations that the influence of labor has

largely affected not only the laws of the different countries, but the relations of the countries to each other. It is the international character of such unions which, though not new, is much more dominant than it ever was before. The workmen of different countries have come to feel themselves so much a band of brethren that some of them have almost considered the question whether their allegiance belongs primarily to their class or their country; and the question has even been debated whether in the case of war they would fight for their country at all. Personally I think that their allegiance to their own countries is more dominant than in their utterances they sometimes make it, and that, if war should actually arise, they could be relied upon to do such patriotic fighting as they have done heretofore. The question of brotherhood with men of other countries would, for the moment, be held in abeyance. Nevertheless, that sense of brotherhood is growing and would most assuredly lead the organized workers of the world to protest against and resist by every means short of rebellion any policy on the part of their governments which would force them to fight against those whom they regard as brethren.

Now recently there has come upon the field a power which is not new but has acquired a great deal of additional importance, namely, modern socialism. And I want, in the first place, to make a grand concession as to one of the claims of the socialist party. This I do the more willingly because I am far from agreeing with the ultimate purposes of that party. It claims to be the great peace society of the world and has done much to justify that claim. As in the case of the organized labor there is reason for it which is not wholly agreeable. It was once expressed to me by a labor leader of the United States. Just after the beginning of this series of conferences I asked him for certain facts concerning the protests made by bodies of laborers both in Europe and America against a recent war and, in giving me the facts, he thought it necessary to assume a somewhat apologetic attitude, lest I should think that laborers were unduly soft-hearted. He said, "It is not because we are particularly tender-hearted but because we have another war on hand." It is the fact that they feel they are fighting the capitalist class in every country—that they have an issue which they must push through to success, and that cannot be carried to success without very close relations between the brethren in different countries—that makes them so earnest in this direction. Now that consideration has become far more apparent and more dominant than it formerly was. What the great socialist bodies of the various countries want is something more radical than getting better wages by making better bargains with their employers. They want no compromise with the existing wage system. They want it com-

pletely abolished. They want that done which would be to the deadly injury of capitalists as a class. And the warfare they have on hand—that which drives them into a position of fraternity with each other—is a much more powerful incentive than the one in which the trade unionists are engaged. One could count on a protest from all the organized bands of socialists the world over so loud and so powerful that it would out-do any protest that has ever been officially made against the declaration of war. It would be heard and respected in our own country, where the socialistic movement has not gone so far as it has in many others.

Now what does that mean as to the policy of peace societies? Is there a way whereby this enormous and growing force may be effectively utilized? Does it mean that we can count on a very large membership of trade unionists and socialists in the peace societies of the world. I think the answer of those who have tried some experiments in this direction would probably be “no” rather than “yes.” Though possibly, as the world still lives in hope of getting the organized workingmen into the church, we may hope, sooner or later, to get them into the peace societies. But we have formed a close affiliation with commercial bodies, and to our great advantage. The cause we seek to promote has been enormously furthered by the affiliation which not only this Conference but the peace organizations have formed with the various boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and kindred bodies, whose interests are so disastrously affected by the outbreak of war. That however tends to put our organizations in affiliation with those with which the socialists and the organized laborers have an issue. And if they are to be each others’ brethren, because they are not altogether brotherly towards us, I am not sure it is possible to expect them to come into our ranks as individuals and simply enlarge our numbers. The laboring men of the different lands will work the harder for peace with each other if they hold aloof from us, but, in my judgment, it is entirely possible to secure concurrent action with the bodies as a whole. If we did nothing whatsoever, they would go on working in behalf of arbitration. What they would do would be in line with what we are trying to do; and they would powerfully second our efforts. Their influence now is so powerful that it almost carries with it the key to success in the further and more difficult things which the friends of peace have still to accomplish. We have done much, and in my opinion, what we have already accomplished has been aided in an essential way and without much observation by this same influence. What has been thus far gained could not have been gained without it. The influence is now much more dominant than it has been and is more likely to carry weight in the councils of governments. It can assist us at this critical point, where we find ourselves, as Mr. Mead has said,

“between great achievements and great difficulties.” It is a force that can overcome the difficulties, if anything in the world can do so.

And now just one more word as to the cost of securing peace by this means. It looks, on the face of it, as though, if peace depended on this influence—and in my judgment it does so—it would have to be secured at the cost of a very serious break in the fraternal relations between different classes within each country. Are we insuring ourselves against war at the cost of a great amount of suspicion and enmity among our own people? Exactly that is scarcely true. The growing suspicion, enmity and the struggle of classes we should have in any case. It would have existed even though war had long ago ceased to be a possibility, and the measures we are now taking to prevent war do not aggravate the trouble at home, but rather tend to lessen it. The existence of this line of demarcation within every country, with its basis of class contention, does now work powerfully in the direction of peace between nations and is likely to continue to do so. We must make the most of this; and the question arises how we can find the way to do it. We should exhaust our diplomacy in bringing about an alliance in international affairs with those who, in internal affairs are, in a certain way, against us.

We have not, then, bought a prospect of peace with other nations at the cost of any increase of enmity among ourselves. It is in order, however, to ask whether the enmity that exists is bound to be permanent. After wars are things of the past—after the court of arbitration shall be on so firm a basis that all nations must and will resort to it—shall we find ourselves in a state of internal dissension which, if it does not mean civil war, will mean a menace, here and there, to local order and security and an end of the hope of general brotherhood? If so, our last state will be worse than the first. There is ground for hope for a better outcome. Arbitration will have its field within nations as well as between them and cordial and brotherly relations are not a dream though, frankly, the realization of them seems farther off than the ending of international wars. In these matters the economist is not forbidden to invoke the aid of moral forces. He lapses here—if it be a lapse—into idealism and believes in a future of harmony and fraternity, even though, by his own accustomed methods, he cannot fully blaze the route by which humanity will reach it. Quarrels and enmities will ultimately end, as will literal battles. Men are destined to be brothers in spirit as they are in blood. The day of general peace is coming; but it will take more elevated forces than those of mere self-interest to bring it. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker has been known to the American public for many years, having served with distinction

in the Senate of the United States, from which he has voluntarily returned to his profession. I am glad to present General and ex-Senator CHARLES F. MANDERSON, of Omaha, Nebraska.

ARMIES AND NAVIES A NECESSITY

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES F. MANDERSON

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: This is the first time that it has been my privilege to attend these conferences. And I want to say as a preamble that I not only have been charmed with what I have heard and have seen, but I have an earnest and heartfelt desire that these conferences may continue the perfect work that they have thus far accomplished. No man can desire with greater strength and with more heartfelt force than myself the coming of the time of peace among nations; and anything that I can do, anything that I can say in co-operation with your efforts in the direction of that international arbitration that would prevent war, I will do and I will say. And yet I have not that hearty feeling that some of those who have addressed you seem to have that we are about to enter upon a time of peace and quiet. True at this time there is no war; all the nations of the earth seem to have settled down to a period of peace. But I doubt its continuance, and not that I desire war, for I have seen it through four years of devastating strife in all its terrors and its horrors; not that I believe that great results beneficial to mankind can only be produced by warfare; not that I agree that in the wisdom of Providence He brings great results by these war conflicts, but because I cannot close my eyes to existing facts. I fear that war may yet come to us. I have heard expressions in private conversation here and from some who have publicly spoken looking to that that we all desire—the disarmament of the nations of the world that perhaps would induce peace to reign. I have heard expressions of antagonism to the maintenance in this Republic of ours of an army, and criticism upon the exhibition of naval force that under the direction of the President of the United States is now going on. I do not feel like making such criticism. I do not believe that Theodore Roosevelt, the President of the United States, will do a better thing during his administration of public affairs than the sending of these white ships of ours across the seas to visit foreign powers. It means a vast expenditure, but it is money well expended; for we will show that we are in that wise condition of preparedness for peace and that we obeyed the injunction of the first president of the United States that “in time of peace we should prepare for war.” These white ships of peace of ours are shortly to cross the Pacific and exhibit their conquering strength, their virile force, to the Asiatic powers. I

think it desirable that they should do so. For no thinking man can close his eyes to that that I believe will be the next great war of conflict. The Empire of Japan, bumptious, self-opinionated, shaking hands with itself over its great victory over Russia, has warlike ambitions, only, as I believe, held in check at this time by lack of financial ability to meet a conflict. She is exercising a dominating and a powerful influence over the Empire of China. She may be or she may not, but it is strongly expected that she is exercising an influence that points to danger in India. India for many years has not been so bestirred and excited and so filled with opposition to British rule as she is to-day; and it looks somewhat as though there might be in the near future a coalition of these three Asiatic powers that may cause us infinite trouble. I hope it may not be so. I do not want to see more war. I would dread a conflict between this Republic and any nation. But we should not blind ourselves to that that exists. While we long and hope for peace among all the nations of the earth, let me say to this peace-loving assembly, with which I am in hearty accord, that we cannot afford to abandon our navies and dismiss even our small and insignificant army.

But is foreign conflict all for which we should be prepared? There has been a very remarkable change in this country in the matter of immigration. A short time ago I had occasion to look and see what had been the change wrought by the years in the immigration to the United States. In the twenty years from 1840 to 1860, there came to this country from foreign lands, forty-three per cent. of Irish (it is said that the Irishman has shown ability to govern every land but his own) and thirty-five per cent. of Germans, making of the entire population of those twenty years seventy-eight per cent. of Irish and German akin to us in blood and race. From 1901 to 1906 the percentage of immigration from Ireland is five per cent. instead of forty-three per cent. and from Germany five per cent. instead of thirty-five, and the balance of the population that has come to our shores from foreign lands is of Italian twenty-eight per cent., of Austrians and Hungarians twenty-seven per cent., of Russians and Poles twenty per cent., making from these different nations, largely of southern Europe, seventy-five per cent. of the entire immigration, and but ten per cent. from the British Isles and Germany. Now these are startling figures, for they give to us the reason for some disturbances throughout this land of ours that have greatly worried us. It is not so easy for these peoples who are coming to us in such great numbers to become of the American type. The future will take care of it of course, their children and their children's children will be good Americans, but that they have been in the years that have just passed and that they will be in the years that are to come, disturbing influences be-

cause of their extreme socialistic and their anarchistic disposition, there can be no doubt. I mention these facts, this threat, if you please to so call it, of foreign aggression, this disturbing influence among ourselves, simply because I do not think that this is a safe time for us to abandon either army or navy. I wish we could. I wish it were possible for peace to reign on earth. But it can only come with good-will toward men; the two must unite; the peace on earth must follow the good-will among men.

I do not want to detain you. I know perhaps it is a little jarring for one to depart from preaching the roseate doctrines of peace and to mention that which may disturb peace and be productive of war, but man seems to be a combative animal, and that which characterizes the individual man seems to characterize collective men as they gather in the nations; and until we eradicate this combative disposition we must be prepared for the conflicts that are bound to come. But I will not jar or disturb you further by prophecies of that description; I simply want to impress upon you the fact that this Republic of ours, if it should lead as a peace maker must be in condition to maintain peace by fighting for it if that is necessary to bring about peace. But I will not detain you further, the hour is late and the heat has been oppressive and I simply desire to thank you for your attention. (Applause.)

Mr. A. B. FARQUHAR: May I say just a word? I have had dealings with Japan for thirty odd years. I know the people and I do not believe we have better friends on the face of this earth than the Japanese. In my opinion, there is as little danger of a war with Japan as of a war with the moon.

Mr. ALBERT K. SMILEY: To prevent misunderstanding, I wish to say that we invite to this Conference people of widely differing views. I was very much interested in Senator Mander-son's remarks, and thank him for presenting his views. I do not entirely agree with him, but, as I have frequently said, I doubt if the time will ever come when it will not be necessary to have both armies and navies to maintain law and order and permanent government.

The Conference then adjourned until the following morning.

Third Session

Thursday Morning, May 21, 1908

THE CHAIRMAN: We are much gratified that the representative of one of the great nations of the world has come to this Conference to take part in our discussions. I have the honor to present a gentleman who has served his country with great distinction, the Ambassador of Japan, His Excellency, BARON KOGORO TAKAHIRA.

(The Conference, rising, received the Ambassador with great applause.)

JAPAN'S DEVELOPMENT A WORK OF PEACE

ADDRESS OF BARON KOGORO TAKAHIRA*

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I feel highly gratified to be able to meet you here to-day because all of you are devoted to the lofty cause of peace and welfare for all mankind and are working so indefatigably to attain that desirable end.

From the tenor of the invitation and the letters which I received from the promoters of your Conference and the friends of it, I presume you are expecting me to say something unusually interesting to you. Perhaps you may have entertained such expectation owing to the unique position Japan occupies in the Far East, but she is only a young member of the international community, eager to learn the best means and the ways of the elder sisters and to adopt them as much as possible in order to assimilate herself to the recognized method of modern life. I have, therefore, not much to add to what must be already in your minds and I am afraid I will have to greatly disappoint you in your expectation.

In regard to arbitration, each year shows a steady advance in this movement to perpetuate peace, and each year witnesses an increase in the number of its advocates. Arbitration is considered a practical means to bring about the amicable settlement of international disputes and in that way to preserve friendly relations between nations. You are certainly aware that since many years Japan has been sometimes a party to this method of adjusting international differences. When, therefore, the American government took the initiative to conclude arbitration

*Baron Takahira's address, printed in the third session, for which it had been prepared was actually delivered at the fifth session.—Ed.

conventions with the powers, Japan promptly accepted its proposal. I do not know whether conventions of this character exactly accord with your idea. At all events, you can see from the attitude of the powers thus shown, that, with the progress of civilization, the feeling of trust and confidence among the nations has been gradually promoted, the moral sense of duty advanced and the danger of international complications proportionately lessened. This is a step forward in the direction at which you are aiming, and I hope you may feel repaid for your undertaking. It is needless to say that the United States has distinguished itself in the foreign policy by a high sense of justice and fair play, and yet, with such a power, strong and civilized as the prime mover, nothing farther could be accomplished than what has been done. It seems desirable, therefore, that not only an amicable method of adjusting international disputes but also a means to prevent such disputes, should be considered and adopted if possible. Undoubtedly, it is much more difficult to devise such a measure through a mutual understanding between nations. It is, perhaps, impossible, but if the moral sense of duty among the nations advances with the progress of civilization it appears not entirely hopeless to attain such an end in some way. A careful study of international disputes establishes, it seems to me, that they arise almost as much, if not more, from the internal conditions of the country affected, as they do from the conflict of outside interests; and it is a peculiar feature of such questions that where they occur there are almost always signs of disorder, retrogression, or misgovernment. In this respect, political observation somewhat resembles meteorological observations. The rain comes from where there are clouds. International disputes develop where there are undesirable conditions of life such as I have just mentioned. I do not, of course, mean to say that the less modern or the less organized states are in the wrong in all international questions. On the contrary, there are cases in which such countries deserve sincere sympathy. But it is an undeniable fact that the less modern or the less organized states present more frequently a cause of public anxiety on account of international disputes, and it may be reasonably questioned whether the unsettled condition they present—politically, economically or otherwise—does not lead to such disputes. There was a time when it was thought that aggression was a synonym of power, and the smaller or the weaker nations were always considered the sufferers, but the history of the political life of European states shows that with their advancement in civilization, apprehension of unprovoked attack has been gradually disappearing. Otherwise the comparatively small states would be constantly exposed to the dangers of aggression. In these states, however, good government constitutes power in itself and high

civilization makes felt its influence. As a result they hold as independent a position as the greater powers, and do not allow themselves to become a source of serious international questions.

But, in other countries, where we see more frequently the occurrence of international complications, it appears that domestic troubles, administrative disorganization and national inaptitude have often been the cause of foreign concern and difficulty. This naturally suggests an inquiry to establish whether this view be correct and if so, to devise, if possible, some means to remove the cause of trouble.

As regards Japan, young as she is as a modern nation, I may say without fear of being misunderstood that she is holding her own despite all the vicissitudes of life through which she has been passing during the last half century. The incessant criticisms and complaints that have been brought against her regarding her attitude and policies in the Far East appear to be, in my opinion, due to the rather hasty conclusions of travelling observers. Some are advanced against our action in our new field of industrial activities in Manchuria; others against the attitude we have adopted in the less organized kingdom under our protection. These are the countries from which Japan acquired in former times her system of government, education and even religion, by means of which we regulated our political and social life. If these countries could live up to their ideas of government and society, however obsolete they may be, it is certain they could maintain their position more securely. But failing in this they have allowed themselves to fall into an unhappy condition—disorganized, misgoverned, impoverished,—and thus have permitted themselves to become the prey of sinister designs and selfish purposes. With such countries as neighbors, Japan could not feel repose but found her own position threatened and she was finally obliged to take the necessary measures for her self-preservation and to assume responsibilities for their peace and happiness.

It is from our experience in these countries that I think a preventive measure may be as much, if not more necessary as a subsequent course like arbitration in removing the danger of international complications. Our experience teaches us that inability to adjust international disorder, inaptitude to assimilate universal usage, and indifferent method of dealing with international questions often create serious complications. If, therefore, the causes of such complications are found really to be more of a domestic than of a foreign origin, the remedy must come from within and not from without.

In this age of steam and electricity, there is not much room for excuse and pretext to the out-of-date-way of action in everything. The twentieth century must be considered more modern than the nineteenth century and no one is certain what wonders

will be announced to-morrow to supersede the wireless telegraphy. Every corner of the world should be treated as if it were in the immediate neighborhood. The principle of "majority to rule" observed in the popular assembly is the result of the natural development of the social organism from the desire and efforts to maintain its orderly existence. Under such circumstances, it is only by adaptation to environment that we find successful means of struggle for life. In other words, it is in adaptation to majority that the nation finds security, comfort and repose as does the individual. With such an idea in view, Japan is working in the Far East and however remote the scene of action may be from the center of civilization, we have no idea to do anything against the law and the principle recognized in the civilized world. Disorder, retrogression and misgovernment which called for our action cannot be removed in one day and in removing them, some struggles must necessarily ensue. To-day we are at the stage of such a struggle. There may be unsatisfactory scenes to the eyes of travelling observers, but criticisms and complaints on that account without taking into consideration what is actually intended for or aimed at, can never be accepted. We have a saying—"Look at our work when done." I have to use this expression in answering the criticisms of travellers, but I do not mean to tell them to stop their criticisms, for we are not afraid of the truth. If there is any truth in these criticisms it will be a good lesson to us, and we shall be glad to welcome them however continually and systematically they may be sent from the Far East against Japan so long as they are not the result of unfriendly design intended to mislead the friendly public of this great peace-loving country. It is, however, a most encouraging sign of our work that even in its "half-done" stage there is no danger of disturbing international peace in that part of the world in so far as our influence extends. So much is certain, and I venture to claim for my country the present condition of peace which we are now trying to place on a more solid and perpetual basis. We have no other idea than to secure our own peace by having organized states as our neighbors and to prosper ourselves by having prosperous countries as our neighbors. Your work of arbitration is a subsequent measure to preserve friendly relations between nations, as I said before. Our work of reformation may be considered as a preventive measure against the occurrence of international disputes. One seems as indispensable as the other to the cause of peace. The other day, on the occasion of the laying of the corner-stone of the Bureau of American Republics at Washington your distinguished Secretary of State well said that the matters in dispute between nations are nothing; the spirit which deals with them is everything. If every country deals with the matters between nations and also its own internal affairs in

a right spirit, I am sure that even arbitration will no longer be found necessary and you will be able to fully enjoy a genuine tranquillity of the Spring days at this beautiful spot on Lake Mohonk. (Applause.)

At the conclusion of Baron Takahira's address, the following resolution, offered by Mr. James Wood, was referred to the Business Committee of the Conference, approved by that Committee, presented by its Chairman to the Conference and adopted by a unanimous vote:

Resolved, That the Fourteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration rejoices that so many treaties of arbitration have been negotiated between the United States and other countries, and it expresses its peculiar gratification with the arbitration treaty with the Empire of Japan. Having confidence in the enlightenment and peaceful intentions of Japan, we regret the unfounded talk of war with that country that has been indulged in by an element among our people.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the officers of the Conference, be presented to the Japanese Ambassador, His Excellency, Baron Kogoro Takahira."

THE CHAIRMAN: The distinguished Ambassador of Great Britain who had hoped to be with us, but who has been detained in Washington, has written Mr. Smiley a letter which the Secretary will read.

THE INFLUENCE OF TREATIES OF ARBITRATION

LETTER FROM THE RIGHT HONORABLE JAMES BRYCE

BRITISH EMBASSY

WASHINGTON, *May 16, 1908*

Dear Mr. Smiley: To my great regret it is impossible for me to leave Washington during the coming week to attend the Lake Mohonk Conference to which you have kindly invited me. Pray express to your friends assembled to promote the sacred cause of peace and arbitration how sorry I am I cannot be with you and them.

That cause has been making substantial progress. The conclusion of so many treaties of arbitration between the United States and other powers marks a real onward step. Next to the arbitration treaty concluded between my own country and yours, none of these instruments give me more profound satisfaction than those you have made with Mexico, whose advance under the administration of President Porfirio Diaz has been so striking, and that with the Island Empire of Japan. These three treaties have provided the means for an amicable settlement of any cause of difference that may hereafter arise between your country and the two great nations

that live north and south of the United States, and the two great nations of Australia and Japan, your neighbors beyond the sea. Taken together, they all make the ocean that bounds you on the west veritably and in a new sense the Pacific Ocean.

It now remains for the people and the press of the countries that have entered into those treaties to see that full effect is given to them, and that if any cause of dispute should arise there shall be no disposition to stir up angry feelings, no attempt to evade the obligation to resort to that means of a peaceful settlement which arbitration provides.

Believe me to be, with best wishes for an agreeable and useful gathering which shall carry still further the excellent work achieved already at these Conferences.

Very truly yours,

JAMES BRYCE.

(Applause.)

Messages of regret at inability to attend the Conference were also read from Hon. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, Member of Congress from Missouri, Sir WILFRED LAURIER, Premier of Canada, Sir CHARLES FITZPATRICK, Chief Justice of Canada, Hon. GEORGE W. ROSS, Member of the Canadian Senate and Sir WILLIAM MULOCK, President of Canadian Peace Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is one well known to this Conference, Professor GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY, Dean of the Law School of Columbia University.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE WORLD'S PEACE

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: In announcing as my topic, "International Law and the World's Peace," I shall not apologize for using the term "peace" in this audience. Arbitration is, as every one will concede, not an end in itself. We do not seek arbitration for the sake of arbitration; we seek arbitration in order that the world's peace may thereby be promoted. And if the world's peace may be promoted by other means than arbitration, I am sure that the manner of promoting it, even if advocated on this floor, will not be regarded as alien to the central purposes of this gathering.

Let me say at the outset, that when we speak, as we sometimes do, of the desirability of the reign of law in international affairs, we forget the extent to which international affairs as a matter of fact are regulated by law; the law that we call international law. We find this especially illustrated in the

relations of countries at war. That which we call a state of war is a process, carefully regulated by law, for settling a controversy which has arisen between nations. The parallel which international law supplies with other forms of primitive law which have existed among men is most interesting and significant. Primitive law is mostly concerned with procedure and comparatively little with the delimitation of the rights and obligations of individuals. International law is primarily concerned with the procedure and settlements of controversies and to a comparatively limited extent with the determination of rights and obligations; the laws of war are the laws of procedure in the case of international litigation. The parallel may be pushed a step further and therefore made a little closer. In the early stages of our own legal development, as you are all aware, the favorite method for centuries, I might almost say the only method, of determining controversies between individuals was by the method that we call private war, or trial by battle; a method which was as carefully regulated by the courts, supervised by the entire machinery of government as is to-day the method for settling international controversies. It is not true that in the midst of arms, the laws are silent. In the midst of arms, the law of international procedure emerges and determines the settlement of the controversy. Now the objects of a settled jurisprudence—described by us as the reign of law—are twofold: First, to remove causes of friction by the strict definition of rights; and, second, to adjust controversies by peaceable means.

It is to the latter of these ends that the attention of this conference and of the friends of peace everywhere has been principally directed. I will not say that this has been a mistake. It has probably been inevitable. But, if we are to be guided by our experiences in the evolution of our private legal relations, we shall do well to shift the emphasis from the negotiation of treaties of arbitration, desirable as these may be, to the development of an international tribunal which shall command the confidence of the nations. Trial by battle died hard, and was reluctantly abandoned in favor of trial by jury owing to the early imperfections of the jury system and the general lack of confidence in that popular tribunal. An early law book, called "The Mirror of Justice," denounces the institution of the jury system and impeaches the king with usurpation in decreeing that thereafter defendants accused of crime should be permitted to appeal to a jury. That treatise says, it is not only a violation of the law and custom of the realm, it is a grave abuse that a man should be forced to put himself upon the country as the *expressionnis*, when

he is ready and willing to defend himself upon his body. At about the same period Louis the Pious, in France, abolished the trial by battle and within thirty years it came back again because it was found impossible to secure justice through the institution of the jury.

In view of the manner in which international arbitration commissions are usually constituted and their lack of a settled body of law to govern their determinations and the grotesque results too often attained, is it any wonder that the nations hesitate to commit themselves without important reservations to this method of settling their disputes? It is hardly too much to say that a nation which resorts to arbitration to-day, shows that it cares very much more for peace than to secure justice.

That man is a fighting animal and must have blood finds frequent expression even on this floor, and it seems to be assumed that he will have blood whatever institutions may be developed to furnish him with a reasonable satisfaction for the injury sustained by him, a reasonable satisfaction which does not involve his glut for blood. The ape and tiger have not completely died out of our common humanity. We have not been obliged to wait for its complete elimination before reaching the point where we could settle our private controversies without resorting to arms. Must we indeed wait for its complete elimination before we reach that stage of legal development when we shall settle our international controversies without a resort to arms? Can there be any doubt that the time is ripe for a resort to arbitral justice instead of arbitrament of war in the settlement of international disputes? The growing strength and influence of this conference is a testimony to the contrary. The cry for peace and a shrinking from war which every civilized nation manifests to-day are conclusive, it seems to me, upon that point. The penalties which would be visited upon me individually, if I were to seek to right my private wrongs by the arbitrament of battle, would be trifling to me in comparison with the penalties that are visited to-day upon the nation which seeks to adjust its differences with other nations by that method. The development of terrible and destructive engines of war, the enormous, the almost prohibitive cost of war, the growing sentiment of internationalism, the extension of commerce, the developing sentiment of a common Christian humanity, all of those tend to render war abhorrent not only to the ladies and gentlemen here gathered, but to the people at large, and more particularly to the rulers of Christendom. No, there will be no resort to war by the nations of the earth if any proper system of arbitral justice is pre-

sented to them as an alternative. They seek war to-day because war is the only means by which justice can be secured; for the same reason as that which led our remote ancestors to resent the institution of indifferent tribunals to settle their controversies. You may say that war does not satisfy the sense of justice. I think you are wrong. It does not do justice, but it satisfies the sense of justice. And we must have a tribunal which may perhaps come no nearer to doing justice than our tribunals do in the settlement of our private affairs, but which will satisfy the sentiment of justice. And when you have that, the nations will no longer resort to arms for the settlement of their controversies.

The first requisite, then, of a system which shall substitute a judicial trial for trial by battle in international affairs is the creation of a tribunal to which the nations will resort—not under the compulsion of treaties, for whose evasion there will always be an excuse if injustice be feared, but from a conviction that its cause of difference with a sister nation will be fairly and impartially heard and decided in accordance with settled principles of law and justice.

This it is which lends such significance to the declaration of the recent Conference at The Hague in favor of the establishment of a High Court of Arbitral Justice—a declaration which, though it failed to secure embodiment in a resolution, seems to me to be far and away the most important result of the Conference. If that tribunal—soon I trust to stand forth an accomplished fact—shall be wisely constituted and administered, it will, I believe, do more in a single decade to avert the arbitrament of war in the controversies of nations than all the arbitration treaties that could be written in that time.

But that the reign of law shall become a reality, one thing more is needed—needed not only to remove causes of friction among nations but also to furnish the High Court with a body of jurisprudence to administer—and that is a substantive international law which shall define the rights and obligations of nations toward one another.

May I venture, in the presence of the many international lawyers here present, to say that this law is to-day of the most meager description? The national or domestic law of substantive rights has to do mainly with contracts, quasi-contracts, torts and crimes and with the definition of property rights, and all of these find their analogies in the developing relations of the nations among themselves. This is not the place nor, indeed, is there time here and now to trace these analogies and to show to what extent each of these departments of national law finds its counterpart in the law of

nations, and how poorly it is there represented. Suffice it to say that, in my opinion, here is the true and ample field of the international lawyer—by discussion, by legislation, by treaty and, most of all, by guiding the deliberations of the High Court that is to be—to aid in the development of this body of substantive law. That such an international law will, by its moral operation alone, be a powerful factor in maintaining peace and good will among nations is certain. Mr. Root, our accomplished Secretary of State, has recently called attention to the fact that laws are for the most part self-executing! that the sanction of which we speak as giving validity to positive law is too rarely called into play to permit us to regard it as the real force behind law. The truth is that the very definition of our rights and obligations by the law furnishes us, men and nations alike, with a standard of conduct to which we easily conform and which, as the habit of conformity grows upon us, we disregard with increasing reluctance and difficulty.

If this analysis of the situation and its needs seems to place the lawyer in the van of the movement for international peace, let it be remembered that without you and such as you—the moulders of public opinion, the prophets of the new dispensation—his labors will be in vain. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman now to address us is one distinguished in his own country and well known in the peace movement, the Rev. WALTER WALSH, of Dundee, Scotland.

THE TRUE PRINCIPLES OF PEACE AND GREATNESS

REMARKS OF REV. WALTER WALSH

Ladies and Gentlemen: It may not be out of place for a plain Scotsman to draw your attention to the first principles, or at least to one or two of the first principles, which I have always understood animated and gave rise to this movement.

One of those first principles undoubtedly is that the paxists or pacifists, however you phrase it, by their very nature are men of large charity, comprehension of mind, liberality of judgment and peacefulness of disposition. That first principle is eminently illustrated in this assembly; for what would be thought of a gathering of teetotal prohibitionists who should nevertheless be willing to listen calmly to eulogies of drinking? And as this is impossible, because the prohibitionists do not have the catholicity of the pacifist mind, it is given to us to have the unique privilege of hearing people speak presumably in praise of peace, and yet inculcate most of the principles which lead directly to war! We may admit, undoubtedly, the probability of wars in the future;

and yet while prohibitionists admit that drinking will persist a little while longer, yet they turn their attention not to the means of promoting it, but toward removing it with all the speed that they may. So I think that we pacifists are rightly employed not in extolling such abominable and historical heresies as, "If you wish for peace, prepare for war," but in preparing the implements, and the principles, and the means of peace all the world over. But the pacifist is the only man I know who, when smitten upon one cheek by the argument for a great army, turns the other cheek to the plea for a big navy! I sometimes wish, Mr. Chairman, that some Ram Das like Carlyle's Indian devotee of that name, would enter such gatherings with his great declaration that he had fire enough in his belly to burn up the sins of the whole world. We want a great fire to burn up these speciosities and fallacies which are sometimes promulgated in the name of peace!

I wish I had such an eminent Scotsman, sir, as Lord Aberdeen, here to quote you in his own words, which in his absence I must read to you; he said that he was disposed to dissent from the maxim which had of late years received very general assent,—that the best security for the continuance of peace was to be prepared for war. Men, when they adopted such a maxim, said Lord Aberdeen, in the House of Commons, and made large preparations in time of peace that would be sufficient in the time of war, were apt to be influenced by the desire to put their efficiency to the test, that all their great preparations, the result of their toil and expense, might not be thrown away.

But why quote you merely a plain Scotsman,—even a titled Scotsman? Was it not the Czar of Russia in words which are surely familiar and memorable in the minds of every one present, who said in that immortal rescript which convened the First Hague Conference, "Economic crises," said he, "due in great part to the system and the continual danger which lies in this massing of war material, are transforming the armed peace of our days into a crushing burden which the people have more and more difficulty in bearing." "It appears evident, then," continued the Czar, "that if this state of things were prolonged it would inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is desired to avert, and the horrors of which make every thinking man shudder in advance." And another European monarch, this time a crowned queen, our good Alexandra, is reported to have said a little while ago, "I have always mistrusted warlike preparations of which the nations never seem to tire. Some day this accumulated material of soldiers and guns will burst into flames in a frightful war that will throw humanity into mourning on the earth and grieve our Universal Father in Heaven."

These things are not wholly matters of speculation. It is burned into my memory and brain by the experiences during our own Boer War, that after our first great national peace crusade, led by that renowned and spectacular figure, William T. Stead, in which I took some little part as a crusader, and during which I was the means of calling together a large gathering of all the dignitaries of our little town—the same took place in every town of any importance in Great Britain, and also, of course, in Scotland—after that crusade when the Boer war broke out all the mayors and pacifists and magistrates and bailies, all the dukes and the earls and lords, all the journalists, all the jurists and pretty nearly all the preachers quit the peace crusade and were found going over in a mighty apostacy to the war party! Unless we can keep our feet firmly planted on first principles, rooted and grounded in faith and pacificism, some similar experience, some great and mournful apostacy that may blight the bloom of youthful minds and go far to shake the faith of ardent enthusiasts in humanity and in the righteousness of Heaven itself may not improbably await the American people. If we seek to build up an empire by the sword, have we not given us, in the immortal words of England's former poet laureate, in his magnificent and beautiful version of the "Legend of King Arthur," a great and imaginative presentment in the passing of King Arthur of what awaits empires or territory built up by the sword? Empires built up on brutality, blood and the beast inevitably reel back to the source and origin from which they came!

I can talk not out of any knowledge of history greater than I suppose all of you have; but I can talk out of a racial inheritance longer than many of you. We have in our own history a sad example of the results of conquests by the sword. I refer not to my own country, but to the sister country of Ireland, of which it has been said that Irishmen know how to govern every country but their own! I think it is important to remember that by reason of the fact that she was conquered by the sword and has been held by the sword, Ireland during eight hundred years has never had the chance to govern herself. The people of Ireland have been butchered, as in the massacre of "Drogheda" and many others which you will recall; her industries have been suppressed; her agriculture has been spoiled; education was forbidden to her people; even marriage was made unlawful unless by the legalized priests of an alien Established Church; the very wearing of her national emblem, the simple flower of the field, was made treasonable and subject to the gallows;—and is it any wonder that we have in our empire up to this very

hour, after these eight hundred years of supremacy, a spot so weak that it is to this very hour, and will be, a menace to our imperial greatness, and, menace or no menace, must forever be a stain upon the brightness of Great Britain's renown. The greatest country, Mr. Chairman, is not that which has the largest territory, as you have very generously indicated in your opening remarks.

The history of Judea, of Switzerland, of Greece, of Scotland, of Holland, of New England, is sufficient to show that it is not vastness of territory, nor imperial might, but it is the character and the virtue of the people who compose that nation that constitutes true greatness.

We have in our country a statesman, Lord Rosebery, who some little time ago, having failed to find a political fold with either the great parties, announced that he was plowing his lonely furrow and that his one watchword of national regeneration was found in the word "efficiency." He deplored that such was the degeneracy of our young men that it was increasingly difficult to get young men fitted and qualified to serve in the army and to maintain our power abroad. He spoke of efficiency in order that the fighting men of Great Britain might never go short. Then was it that another great British statesman, a great and memorable name always, Mr. John Morley, retorted, "But efficiency will never bring you the millennium." No, Mr. Chairman, efficiency alone will never bring you the millennium. If you seek efficiency only for the sake of war and empire, only to breed brave and strong manhood in order to offer it an offering to the blazing jaws of the military Moloch, efficiency will never bring you the millennium. But if you seek efficiency in the sense of well educated, highly motivated, emphasized brain quality, youth and manhood for the sake of civic goodness, civic virtue, for the sake of intellectual power, for the sake of moral greatness, then indeed that kind of efficiency will bring you the millennium. And if our aim is to dedicate the flower of our youth to the arts of peace, to agriculture, commerce, just jurisprudence, wise and beneficent healing agencies, the development of agriculture, shipping,—then indeed that kind of efficiency will right speedily bring the millennium of the Bible itself.

I remember how the America of my youthful dreams impressed my imagination. All my life I have been reading your great founders, more especially I have been reading that splendid group of New England statesmen, reformers, poets, liberators who have made that quarter of your continent and your whole country illustrious, not only by their genius of poetry, of philosophy, of literature, but by their moral great-

ness and elevation. Mr. James Bryce, in his great book "The American Commonwealth," known of course intimately to every one of my hearers, intimates his opinion that on the American continent has been evolved the highest type of humanity which has yet appeared as the result of the process of human development. It is to that America that I was taught to look—an America beautifully described in the lines of one of your own poets, William Cullen Bryant, who, speaking of the up-growth of your country, said:

"Till other commonwealths for aid
Shall cling about her ample robe,
And from her frown shall shrink afraid
The crowned oppressors of the globe."

I think it was of America that John Milton must have prophesied, in "Areopagitica,"—the most magnificent eulogy of freedom ever written—speaking, of course, prophetically, as prophets did, and speaking better than he knew, when he wrote:

"Methinks, I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation,
rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking
her invincible locks; methinks I see her as an eagle, muing
her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full
mid-day beam, purging and unscaling her long abused sight
at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance, while the whole
noise of timorous and flocking birds with those also that love
the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means."
(Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to hear from the Rev. CHARLES F. DOLE, of Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts.

A PEACE PROGRAM

REMARKS OF REV. CHARLES F. DOLE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I want to say a few words in behalf of that much misunderstood word *faith*. I have wondered sometimes what would really happen if all the people in Christendom really believed in the Trinity. Just think of the splendid conception, not of one power, but a trinity of infinite powers, all dealing in righteousness! If we really believed in that, no one would say that there was need of any more war. The fact is, we are all handicapped, because we believe in an old Persian system of dualism. This was convenient when they wanted to bind church and state together. It made a very fine compromise for the oppressors. Nearly all of us were brought up with this bad theology. We were brought up to believe that

the good was feeble and that the bad was strong; that the bad was of tough fiber and was going to stay forever, but it was doubtful whether the good would live in this world; the good were dull and unintellectual, and the wicked people were bright and interesting. We still go on talking in this way; we largely give the devil credit for about all the virile power there is. And we fill our minds with all manner of suspicions. We harbor suspicions of all people not just like us, as if they were different altogether!

We have been learning in the past twenty years something of the real theology; we have learned that good is the most mighty force in the universe; that only a little good, concentrated, will do any amount of effective work. Here are only a few people putting up their voices together in favor of arbitration, and they have secured, as we heard yesterday, how much! All this in a little time. The great mass of the world was not with them; the great multitudes of people were too poor and ignorant to know what was going on, but just because a few people stood up for the good and said frankly what they wanted, this marvelous achievement has come about.

Now let us say somewhat frankly what more we believe. Is it not time to repeat that we cannot serve God and mammon? We have to choose. We cannot really go on trying, effectively, for the things which we stand for, and at the same time voting money for the other kind of thing. We must part company sometime from the militarists, just as society parted company with the man who undertook his own case with the private sword. We may do it as amiably as you please—the more amiably the better—but we must say squarely to the militarists, “We use a different method from yours.”

Let me venture, very briefly, to speak of certain things that a great many of us here believe are desirable, making a program that we think is safer than the other kind of program. We do not any of us profess absolute safety from being hurt; we expect to be hurt sometime, and so we take risks. We believe, however, that ours is a safer program than that of the militarists.

First, let us say that we hold it highly desirable not to expend money in fortifying cities; for evidently, as Dr. Scott has told us, they are more in danger fortified than they would be unfortified. Let us use some of the money which we save, and send certain excellent Columbia professors to South and Central America so that there will be at least one of them in each of their universities. We will thus do something positive to balance the negative account. Then we will not build any more war ships. This is on the broad principle that we wish to do ourselves as a nation what we think is desirable for all others to do. We hold that our country is in a position to take the lead in this respect.

Then we want to embrace in our arbitration treaties, not certain subjects, reserving others as causes of friction,—but all subjects. We cannot conceive, after once we have had, as we now have, a respectable court, that there can be any subject which we should care so much for as to be willing to fight about it.

We want too, to extend the sphere of neutralization. We have already been reminded how beautifully it works whenever we have tried it. It has worked splendidly on our Canadian frontier. We will go further and help neutralize a commercial zone, where the great steamers sail between America and England. We will neutralize the Panama Canal. Some of us would like to neutralize the Hawaiian Islands, so that instead of having a great naval station there, it will be reserved from the fear of friction. Then we want to go further and make arrangements as soon as we can to neutralize the Philippine Islands. And then we will never stop short till we have reserved and neutralized the whole ocean. The ocean is a means of highway for friendly intercourse and commerce between the nations. It is a great natural moat to keep us from getting at and hurting each other. We will make it a safe moat on which there will be no need of war ships. There are no longer pirates on the ocean. Why then do we need war ships? They talk of an international police, but, now that the pirates have disappeared, there is the least possible need of it.

Is this a very wrong program to present here? We say we believe in the New Testament. We quote the great phrase, "Ask and ye shall receive," that is to say, we believe that this is a universe where if we will but ask for the best things, the most desirable things, the whole force of the universe tends to give what we desire. We ask then for real and permanent civilization, such as we have never before had; we ask for that which we pray for so glibly—the coming of the kingdom of God,—“Thy kingdom come, thy will be done.” We ask for nothing less than that. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is one who has spent a large portion of his life in China, and has contributed largely to our literature on that country, the Hon. CHESTER HOLCOMBE, of Rochester.

UPRIGHT DIPLOMACY A POWER FOR PEACE

REMARKS OF HON. CHESTER HOLCOMBE

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: During last summer some of us neither delegates to the second Hague Conference, nor attendants as listeners, watched with a great deal of interest and much anxiety the progress of events there, as they came very sparsely and scantily reported by the press. I think none of us

could have failed to discover certain serious points of friction, and manifest difficulties, which were expected by those who knew what they were thinking about; points which interfered with the full success of that Conference. That the Conference succeeded so well as it did is to me almost a miracle. And I think too much praise cannot be given to the wisdom, courage, patience, gentleness and forbearance of the American delegation.

It was perfectly evident from the beginning to the end of the sessions that there was a lack of confidence among the delegates from the different countries, an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, of doubt, of fear, lest some other nation should get more than "my nation"; an anxiety to secure more for "my nation" than I was willing to grant to another, showing, and this is the only point I care to make with regard to it, that the nations have not yet come up to that plane of international comity where they ought to and must stand, before any general international treaty or international law providing for obligatory arbitration, as a substitute for war, can be a success.

It may be said that there are two grounds on which arbitration may be urged and accepted. Call the first, if you please, the commercial ground. Give up war because it never pays, unless a nation is forced to fight for its life. War never pays. It is a barbarism. Commercial interests furnish a justifiable and sound and good argument, so far as it goes, for the substitution of arbitration in place of war. But while not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, I thoroughly believe that no agreement, no scheme of arbitration founded on that theory alone will ever provide a satisfactory and permanent system of arbitration which will take the place of all war, except that for national self-defense.

Choose rather that other foundation in the innate and ineradicable fact of the brotherhood of humanity. Choose the moral or the ethical ground if you please, as a basis for arbitration and there you find an argument which cannot be answered, a basis on which a system can be built that will last forever.

We have heard much here about battleships. I am not going to have my turn at the battleship question further than to say that, in the face of a gathering of this sort, met for the purpose to which we are pledged, talk of building battleships and enlarging our navy is most hopelessly out of place. Again, consider the much discussed question of the danger of war with Japan. There are reasons many, but there is one especial reason why if the Empire of Japan had the desire, which she has not, for a war with us, there is no possibility of fighting us at the present time. And when we treat her as well as she treats us, treat her as well as she deserves to be treated, the question of war will not arise between that nation and this in the present generation, nor the next, nor the next.

Again, along the line of the suggestion that I made with regard to a moral and ethical basis as the only true foundation for a system of arbitration, I want to say,—and I hold no brief for China or Japan or any of those countries in the Far East,—that the time is coming, coming soon, when those nations must be reckoned with. And one thing is certain; if we desire to do fairly, honestly, and justly, and to recognize a man, wherever he is, as our fellowman, equally entitled to his rights with ourselves, and to act toward him as one gentleman ought to act toward another; if the American nation desires to act as a gentlemanly nation towards other nations, we must recast and improve, not so much our conduct, though that needs improvement, as our general attitude towards those nations of the Far East. They have shown more courtesy to us than we have ever dreamed of showing to them. I wish I had time to tell you the history of the making of the treaty of 1880, that famous treaty of immigration, which has been discussed, abused, and talked about a great deal, with the details of the construction of which I had considerable to do. Could I give you that history, you would admit the justice of criticism upon ourselves. Call them heathen, call them names, and do wrong to them, and then think they are a bad people. That is humanity. That is human nature in all lands, whether in the nation or in the individual; and that to a large extent, I am sorry to say, represents our course and policy with the Chinese. There is the stupidity and folly of it all. The Chinese people are long suffering and patient, and you can do anything with them, to use a familiar phrase, if you treat them decently and as men, and if we had cared to restrict or limit Chinese immigration and had gone about it in the proper way, approached the government of China as it ought to have been approached, as any nation has the right to expect to be approached, ten years ago or twenty years ago, we could have made as hearty an ally of China as anybody had reason to expect in an effort to limit and correct the lines of our immigration arrangements with that Empire. We did not care to do it. And now as I said, we must, in the interests of peace, for our own selfish interests, in obedience to the demands of good sense, fair dealing, and equal treatment among men, revise and correct our attitude towards those nations on the Pacific coast of the Far East. They do not want to fight but can. They despise war. And we are the last nation on the face of the earth with whom they think of fighting. But they are men, and must be treated as men. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from a representative of New Hampshire, a gentleman who has been Governor of that state, Hon. JOHN McLANE.

THE TREATY OF PORTSMOUTH

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M'LANE

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have come to tell you of what occurred three years ago in our own little state of New Hampshire, when Russia and Japan were fighting, each of them with more than 500,000 men facing each other ready to take each other's life. It was given to an American citizen, a great American, actuated by lofty ideas and by the civilized conscience of that world,—that conscience which you, Mr. Smiley, have done so much to educate—to say to Japan and Russia, “Cease your fighting. Come to America and arbitrate.” And backed by that same conscience it was not only an invitation, but like Napoleon's invitation to the Pope, it was almost a command. They came. Russia sent a large delegation of her most eminent statesmen; Japan was represented by her greatest men. They accepted an invitation to come to New Hampshire and hold their meetings there; and it was my privilege to be present, not at the conference because that was limited to the commissioners but at the place of meeting; and it was, I assure you, a great and interesting occasion. We should remember that neither side wanted to stop fighting; for, let me tell you, when they came there neither side expected to stop fighting. Japan, being the victorious nation, had come with a demand for twelve hundred million dollars as an indemnity, and other great concessions; Russia, I think, expected to pay some indemnity when their commissioners left the Russian capitol; but you will remember that strange things happened within a week. Before that time the Czar had trembled for his very throne on account of the great uprising among the people of Russia. But when the battle stopped and there was a thought of peace, the people began to be patriotic and it gave the Russian commissioners courage to say that they would pay no indemnity.

The Conference proceeded; many days were spent in preliminaries, and in passing let me say it was wonderful to see how precise and methodical the Japanese were. They had not been in the state twenty-four hours before they had all their libraries arranged, all their documents pigeonholed, all their files in order, so that they could give you any item of information regarding Japan and almost any part of the world. It was wonderful what a tremendous grasp of the affairs of nations those little brown men had. The Russians were more like our people, very much more, and came with little preparation, although Dr. Martens, the great international lawyer upon whom they relied for advice, was a man of great knowledge.

But to come to that eventful Friday, when Baron Komura had reduced his demands to \$600,000,000 for indemnity and lessened his other demands, and when the proposition had been rejected, it was, I think, one of the most dramatic moments of the whole Conference. On one side of the long mahogany table sat the Russian commissioners, on the other the Japanese with the Yankee Denison, who came from New Hampshire, and has been the confidential adviser of the imperial Japanese court for more than twenty-five years. After the proposition had been rejected, there was a silence. Now a silence of a minute on an important occasion is pretty long; but those men sat there for seven minutes without a word being spoken on either side. And when we reflect that upon the failure of the deliberations at that table, probably within an hour, those two great armies would be moved again in hostile combat; when we reflect on what great possibilities must have been in their minds, we can imagine the length of time it must have seemed to those men waiting around that table. The silence was finally broken by Komura, who said, "I suggest a recess until next Monday." During that recess the President of the United States again came to the rescue of the Conference, and with a diplomacy that was grand, noble and far-reaching he induced the Japanese to recede from their demands and made the Peace Conference a success. So that you, Mr. Smiley, and you gentlemen, who have been working for all these years, can see what one Conference has done for humanity.

Now, I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that there will come a time in the future as there has in the past when man will fight for national honor and national independence. When we reflect that we are enjoying the fruits of their labors, can we regret the war of the Revolution? Can we regret the war for the freedom of the sea? Can we regret that great war for the freedom of a race and the union of the nation? No, ladies and gentlemen, they were martyrs of human liberty, and we will build them greater monuments, reared on the foundations of a broader liberty and towering to the stars of a higher destiny. We will not dim the glory of their achievements by vain regrets that what they did was not accomplished by other means. But in the future I believe through your efforts and those of hundreds of thousands of like-minded, noble citizens, wars will be fewer and fewer and finally will cease to be. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Having completed the prescribed program we will now be glad to have brief, volunteer speeches from the floor.

THE MORAL GROUNDS OF PEACE

REMARKS OF MRS. HENRY VILLARD

I have been waiting ever since I was at the Hague Conference for some token to remind me that people believe in what they profess. I want very much to say only one thing, and that is that it is time that we remember that behind international law and national law must stand the moral law, else it falls of itself to pieces. And what is the higher law in regard to the taking of human life? Have we a right to take human life under any circumstances? If it is right to take human life, why then let us have our battleships, then let us increase our army a thousandfold. But ask ourselves, does human brotherhood mean the destruction of the body, the taking away from this world of those people who ought to help in uplifting it? And then we can only answer that there is no time and no occasion when it is right to weakly defend ourselves by doing a wrong. I protest that we too long delay reaching the heights that we ought to reach in order to uplift and bring that aid to the people which shall finally make peace absolutely possible. I wish a declaration of principles might go from this Lake Mohonk Conference round the world, saying "We believe in the inviolability and sacredness of human life under all circumstances," showing that we believe in the principles of right which are invincible, and not of those of expediency, which are only a snare and a delusion. I have certainly in my blood the fighting spirit. I believe in the fighting spirit. I love that part of militarism, the enthusiasm which may lead people into battle; but I think it a thousandfold more valuable and powerful on the great spiritual field. And it is not a mean thing to be a soldier in the army of the Lord. (Applause.)

NATIONAL CALMNESS PRODUCTIVE OF PEACE

REMARKS OF REV. S. E. EASTMAN

You remember when our physicians believed profoundly in the counter irritant and practiced their belief. That is to say, if you had congestion of the lungs and your lungs were burning up, they would use a plaster to burn you on the outside to put out the fire on the inside. It seems to me that is precisely the attitude to-day of those who favor increasing the navy and the army. Now you know the physicians are practicing an entirely different method. When a person is diseased in the lung, they pack the whole chest in ice. Now I submit to this Conference, that that is precisely what we want to do. When any nation in the world gets up a little heat we want to use ice and not heat. (Applause.)

ARMIES AND NAVIES STILL NECESSARY

REMARKS OF GENERAL HORATIO C. KING

Mr. Chairman: I merely wish to say that I do not quite agree with Mr. Holcombe that it is improper to discuss here the enlargement of the navy, or the enlargement of the army, if others insist upon discussing reduction of the navy and reduction of the army. Because Mr. Smiley has laid down the rule here that this is the place for open and fair, free discussion. Now we are all more or less idealists. We are all more or less dreamers. The only difficulty is that some of us do not dream quite so fast or quite so hard as others do, and we are not, therefore prepared to receive all the dreams. Some of them seem to me almost like pipe dreams. They are in the remote future. I believe peace may come some of these days, but at present I believe, with many others, that the country is not in a condition to reduce either its army or its navy. (Applause.)

CONTINUAL WORK FOR PEACE ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS

REMARKS OF PROFESSOR SAMUEL T. DUTTON

Mr. Chairman: It is a great pity that some of us perhaps come up here from year to year and then go away and forget. When we go home, I suppose many of us sing the hymn "Count your blessings," whereas we ought to be singing, "Work, for the night is coming." And that is what I want to say in one minute, "work." Every person here ought to go home and become the centre of a group of people who are interested in this great object,—every man and woman here, I do not care whether he or she lives in New York or in the most humble village. If we could interpret to the people around us the things we believe in I think that when we come up here next year we could look Mr. Smiley in the face with a little more confidence.

Another thing we ought to do is to watch for the things that are happening day by day which make up the interesting and valuable subject matter of this cause, and help others to see them also.

I want also to speak of what is coming this summer,—the great International Peace Conference to be held in July at London. There ought to be there one or two hundred delegates from this country, including a large number from this Conference. In these ways everyone of us can do something to help on this work. And when we come up here next year we can say, "We have done what we could." (Applause.)

The Conference then adjourned until 8.00 o'clock p. m.

Fourth Session

Thursday Evening, May 21, 1908

The fourth session was given exclusively to business men. Following the practice of former years, invitations had been extended to prominent business organizations co-operating with the Conference, and delegates of forty-seven bodies were present. A list of these delegates and of the organizations they represented will be found on page 92. In addition to the regular sessions of the Conference, the delegates held two meetings for business men only, the results of which are briefly summed up as follows, by Mr. WILLIAM R. TUCKER, Secretary of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, who acted as Secretary:

“The meeting organized by the selection of Mr. Frank D. Lanne, President of the National Board of Trade as Chairman, and the writer as Secretary. Fifty-nine associations were credited with having appointed delegates to the meeting and the representatives of forty-seven answered the roll-call.

“The speakers testified to the growing interest among the business men in the subject of International Arbitration as a means of preventing a recourse to arms among nations for the settlement of their misunderstandings and differences. Much satisfaction was expressed at the outcome of the second Hague Conference, as thoroughly explained in the address of Hon. James Brown Scott, at the opening session of the Conference.

“As a result of the meeting of the delegates of business organizations, the following was adopted as the expression of the business men:

“‘The men representing business organizations in various parts of the country recognize the fact that international arbitration, as a substitute for war between nations, is a practical proposition; that popular education should be encouraged as the best means to hasten the day of a world’s Court of Justice; that the business men, being vitally interested in this, the greatest cause of humanity, feel it their duty to assume a large share of the financial burden of this educational campaign. They appreciate, further, that they should give time and serious thought to the problems confronting those who are now engaged in the international arbitration movement.’”

At the same meeting the business men completed the program for the fourth public session of the Conference, which session was called to order at 8.00 o’clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Most of us are familiar with the work among business men, which a Committee of this Conference has been carrying on for several years through the permanent Conference office. We are now to hear the report of that Committee presented by Mr. MAHLON N. KLINE, one of its members, and President of the Trades League of Philadelphia.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO APPEAL TO BUSINESS MEN AND BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

TO THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MAY 21, 1908

In submitting this report to the Lake Mohonk Conference the Committee Appointed to Appeal to Business Men and Business Organizations desire to express their profound gratitude for the wonderful progress that has been made by the great cause of international arbitration during the last twelve months. It is doubtful if there has ever been another year in which the advocates of that cause have had so many reasons for congratulation and encouragement, as they have found in the far-sighted wisdom and tact of our government in connection with the Hague Conference, in the epoch-making conclusions and recommendations of that Conference, in the energy and skill of our State Department in carrying out those recommendations, and in the evident growth of public and official sentiment in favor of such efforts. The temptation to enlarge upon these and other evidences of progress would be difficult to resist were it not for the fact that they will be more appropriately presented and discussed in the other papers and proceedings of this Conference.

So far as this Committee was concerned it seemed clear that it would be unwise to undertake any new work while the Hague Conference was in session and our government was doing all that could be done to secure satisfactory results. After the adjournment of that Conference it was a long time before it was possible to obtain much official or reliable information as to just what had been or was being done at The Hague or in Washington. It was not until March that the Committee could obtain sufficient trustworthy data to enable them to decide as to what line of action would be advisable.

On March 20th circular letters (of which a copy is hereto annexed) were inclosed with personal letters from the Secretary, and mailed to the officers of business organizations in sympathy and correspondence with the Mohonk Conference. In these letters the achievements of the Hague Conference were briefly referred to, and it was urged that the admirable conduct and efforts of our government in connection with that Conference and its recommendations, should be strongly commended and supported. It is too soon for a report as to the effect of these circulars, although it may be stated that copies of favorable resolutions have been received from a number of organizations and promises of similar action by others.

With one exception all the organizations which were reported last year as having endorsed our circular, entitled "Why Business Men should Promote International Arbitration," have consented to become Cooperating and Corresponding Organizations, and to these have been added 37 others, making a total of 166, representing 128 cities in 42 states and Canada. All of these organizations are leading or fairly prominent bodies, and few are in cities of less than twenty-five or thirty thousand inhabitants. A list of these cooperating organizations with a statement of the action taken by each is appended to this report.

The number of organizations that have appointed delegates to this year's meeting is 59, delegates of 47 of which are present.

On the 16th of this month the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Conference, an entirely new organization, held its first meeting in Philadelphia. Its objects, as stated in its preliminary program, were:

First. To promote the universal acceptance of the principles of international arbitration, and the establishment of permanent courts of justice for the nations, as the only practical means to ensure the blessings of Peace by making wars improbable and ultimately impossible, in the civilized world.

Second. To give the people of Pennsylvania an opportunity to commend the splendid record of the United States with regard to arbitration, and to pledge their active and earnest support to every effort of our government to continue the work and to carry out the recommendations of the great Hague Conference of 1907.

Third. To form and provide for an effective representation of public sentiment upon the great issues making for international friendship and world organization that should signalize the third Hague Conference.

It has been proposed that similar conferences shall be held in every state of the Union, and that in order to provide for an effective development, organization and representation of public sentiment, every such conference shall appoint an executive committee with power to carry on the work, and to confer and cooperate with any other committees, officials or individuals at home or abroad.

The promotion and organization of such conferences is one of the most important duties that can now be undertaken, and it is one for which the business men are particularly well fitted.

In concluding this report it may be stated that if the business men and business organizations of the leading nations can be led to act together in the advocacy and support of the recommendations of the Hague Conference, their influence will certainly be decisive. There is no other way in which they can do so much for the protection of their own business and financial interests, or for the moral elevation, prosperity and happiness of the whole human race.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES RICHARDSON, Chairman,
JOHN CROSBY BROWN,
JOEL COOK,
MAHLON N. KLINE,
W. A. MAHONY,
GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY,
ELWYN G. PRESTON,
CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF,
Committee.

CIRCULAR LETTER SENT TO BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS.

LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, MOHONK LAKE, N. Y.

March 20, 1908.

Dear Sir.—The Second Hague Conference has been a source of great encouragement to the advocates of International Arbitration. The agreement for an international court of prize, and the decision that an offer of arbitration must always precede the employment of force for the collection of debts, are only two of the many exceedingly valuable results definitely accomplished by the fourteen elaborate conventions actually

adopted. But the most important service rendered by the Conference was, that by its specific recommendations, and by its substantial unanimity in endorsing the principle of International Arbitration and the project for an International High Court of Justice, it opened the way for immediate efforts to secure:

1st. A prompt confirmation of the conventions prepared by the Conference for the final approval of all the nations.

2nd. The negotiation and ratification of arbitration treaties between the respective nations, and the subsequent improvement of such treaties by making them more comprehensive from time to time as may be found feasible.

3rd. The suggestion and adoption of some satisfactory means for selecting the judges and completing the organization of an International High Court of Justice as designed by the Hague Conference.

4th. A practical acceptance of the recommendation of the Conference that the various governments should undertake a serious study, by commissions or otherwise, of a possible limitation of national armaments, or of annual expenditures for such armaments, upon some equitable or mutually acceptable basis.

5th. A still greater and more assertive public intelligence and public opinion in favor of arbitration as a substitute for war.

In conducting the preliminary negotiations, in preparing instructions for the delegates, and in endeavoring to perfect the work and carry out the ideas of the Conference, the United States Government has shown the most admirable wisdom and tact, and a sincere devotion to the essential principles involved.

While the official report of the Conference has not yet been published, its achievements have been made clear in papers of an official or semi-official character, such as the President's message to Congress, the Philadelphia address of Mr. Choate on February 22nd, and the pamphlet written by Prof. James Brown Scott, Solicitor of the State Department and Technical Delegate of the United States to the Hague Conference. Prof. Scott's paper is No. 5 of the pamphlets published by the American Branch of the Association for International Conciliation, Sub-station 84, New York, and it is stated that copies will be sent post-paid on request.

It seems to us that if the representatives of our leading business organizations should see fit to give to our government and to the Hague delegates cordial expressions of commendation for what has been achieved and of strong encouragement for further efforts on the lines suggested, it will be exceedingly appropriate and useful at this time.

The publication of such resolutions in the newspapers will also have an especially important influence in enlightening and stimulating public opinion and official action.

We submit for your consideration the desirability of having suitable resolutions or letters sent to the President, Secretary of State and Senators, and copies given to the press.

Information of action taken in this connection sent to H. C. Phillips, the Secretary of the Mohonk Conference at Mohonk Lake, N. Y., will be sincerely appreciated.

CHARLES RICHARDSON, Chairman,
JOHN CROSBY BROWN,
JOEL COOK,
MAHLON N. KLINE,
W. A. MAHONY,
GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY,
ELWYN G. PRESTON,
CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF,
Committee on Business Organizations.

DELEGATES OF BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1908

NATIONAL.

The National Association of Manufacturers.....	A. B. Farquhar.
The National Board of Trade.....	Frank D. LaLanne, President.
The National League of Commission Merchants.....	A. Warren Patch, Secretary.
The National Association of Clothiers.....	Marcus M. Marks, President.

COLORADO.

The Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce.....	James A. Hart.
The Colorado Springs Real Estate Exchange.....	James A. Hart.
The Denver Chamber of Commerce.....	Henry Van Kleeck.
The Denver Real Estate Exchange.....	Henry Van Kleeck.

CONNECTICUT.

The New Haven Business Men's Association.....	S. P. Butler, President.
The New Haven Chamber of Commerce.....	Irving Fisher.

FLORIDA.

The Jacksonville Board of Trade.....	Dexter Hunter.
--------------------------------------	----------------

HAWAII.

The Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.....	W. F. Frear.
---------------------------------------	--------------

MAINE.

The Portland Merchants' Exchange and Board of Trade..	S. W. Thaxter.
---	----------------

MARYLAND.

The Baltimore Board of Trade.....	D. C. Ammidon.
The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce.....	Douglas M. Wylie, President.

MASSACHUSETTS.

The Boston Chamber of Commerce.....	F. P. Shumway.
The Boston Merchants' Association.....	A. C. Farley.
The Massachusetts State Board of Trade (Boston).....	Walstein R. Chester.
The Lynn Board of Trade.....	William H. Treen, President.
The Springfield Board of Trade.....	George H. Sutton.
The Waltham Business Men's Association.....	James S. Kennedy.

MICHIGAN.

The Battle Creek Business Men's Association.....	I. L. Stone.
--	--------------

MISSOURI.

The Latin-American and Foreign Trade Association, St. Louis.....	James Arbuckle, Manager.
---	--------------------------

NEBRASKA.

The Omaha Commercial Club.....	Charles F. Manderson.
--------------------------------	-----------------------

NEW JERSEY.

The Camden Board of Trade.....	Alexander C. Wood.
The Newark Board of Trade.....	John McDowell.

NEW YORK.

The Albany Chamber of Commerce.....	William B. Jones, Secretary.
The Auburn Business Men's Association.....	Thomas M. Osborne.
The Manufacturers' Association of New York.....	James T. Hoile, Secretary.
The Amsterdam Board of Trade.....	William McCleary.
The Binghamton Chamber of Commerce.....	B. H. Gitchell, Secretary.
The Buffalo Chamber of Commerce.....	R. R. Hefford.
The Elmira Chamber of Commerce.....	S. E. Eastman.
The Lockport Board of Trade.....	M. H. Hoover.
The New York Merchants' Association.....	William A. Marble.
The Rochester Chamber of Commerce.....	Daniel B. Murphy.
The Syracuse Chamber of Commerce.....	Delmer E. Hawkins.

OHIO.

The Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.....	Chas. B. Murray, Superintendent
The Columbus Board of Trade.....	W. A. Mahony.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The Erie Chamber of Commerce.....	Clark Olds, President.
The Harrisburg Board of Trade.....	J. Horace McFarland.
The Philadelphia Board of Trade.....	William R. Tucker, Secretary.
The Philadelphia Trades League.....	Mahlon Kline, President.
The Scranton Board of Trade.....	A. W. Dickson.

RHODE ISLAND.

The Providence Board of Trade.....	Frederick H. Jackson
------------------------------------	----------------------

WYOMING.

The Industrial Club of Cheyenne.....	James A. Hart.
--------------------------------------	----------------

CANADA.

The Toronto Board of Trade.....	Elias Rogers.
---------------------------------	---------------

COOPERATING AND CORRESPONDING BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

The following bodies have enrolled as Cooperating and Corresponding Business Organizations to assist in furthering the work of the Mohonk Conference. Organizations marked with a * have adopted resolutions favoring international arbitration; those marked with a † have standing committees on international arbitration; and those marked with a ° have appointed delegates to one or more meetings of the Mohonk Conference.

NATIONAL.

The National Association of Clothiers°	New York.
The National Association of Manufacturers*°	St. Louis.
The National Board of Trade*°	Washington.
The National Business League of America*°	Chicago..
The National League of Commission Merchants*°	Boston.

ALABAMA.

The Commercial Club.....	Birmingham.
The Chamber of Commerce.....	Mobile.
The Commercial Club.....	Montgomery.

ARKANSAS.

The Arkansas State Board of Trade*†°	Little Rock.
The Board of Trade*°†.....	Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA.

The Fresno Co. Chamber of Commerce	Fresno.
The Chamber of Commerce*°..	Los Angeles.
The Chamber of Commerce.....	Oakland.
The Merchants' Exchange*.....	Oakland.
The Chamber of Commerce*°.	Sacramento.
The California State Board of Trade°	San Francisco.
The Chamber of Commerce	San Francisco.
The Merchants Exchange*.	San Francisco.

COLORADO.

The Chamber of Commerce*°	Colorado Springs
The Merchants' Association*°	Colorado Springs.
The Real Estate Exchange°	Colorado Springs.
The Chamber of Commerce*°...	Denver.
The Colorado State Commercial Association*°	Denver.
The Real Estate Exchange*°.....	Denver.
The Citizens Mining & Improvement Association	Leadville.
The Business Men's Association°..	Pueblo.

CONNECTICUT.

The Board of Trade.....	Bridgeport.
The Board of Trade.....	Meriden.
The Business Men's Association*°	New Haven.
The Chamber of Commerce*†°.	New Haven.
The Business Men's Association	New London.

DELAWARE.

The Board of Trade°.....	Wilmington.
--------------------------	-------------

FLORIDA.

The Board of Trade*°.....	Jacksonville.
The Board of Trade.....	Tampa.

GEORGIA.

The Chamber of Commerce....	Augusta.
The Board of Trade.....	Brunswick.
The Cotton Exchange*.....	Savannah.

HAWAII.

The Chamber of Commerce*°..	Honolulu.
-----------------------------	-----------

ILLINOIS.

The Board of Trade*.....	Chicago.
The Business Men's Association	Freeport.
The Business Men's Association...	Moline.
The Chamber of Commerce°.....	Quincy.
The Business Men's Association*†	Springfield.

INDIANA.

The Business Association.....	Evansville.
The Manufacturers' Association	Evansville.
The Commercial Club.....	Fort Wayne.
The Board of Trade.....	Indianapolis.
The Commercial Club°.....	Indianapolis.

IOWA.

The Merchants' Association..	Cedar Rapids.
The Commercial Club.....	Council Bluffs.
The Commercial Club*†.....	Des Moines.

KANSAS.

The Commercial Club.....Leavenworth.
The Commercial Club of Topeka*.Topeka.
The Chamber of Commerce....Wichita.

KENTUCKY.

The Board of Trade*.....Louisville.
The Merchants & Manufacturers Association
.....Louisville.
The Commercial Club.....Newport.

LOUISIANA.

The Board of Trade, Ltd.*°..New Orleans.
The Progressive Union*....New Orleans.
The Progressive League.....Shreveport.

MAINE.

The Maine State Board of Trade°.Bangor.
The Merchants' Exchange and Board of
Trade*°.....Portland.

MARYLAND.

The Board of Trade*°.....Baltimore.
The Chamber of Commerce*°..Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS.

The Chamber of Commerce*†°...Boston.
The Massachusetts State Board of Trade*†°
Boston.
The Merchants' Association*°...Boston.
The Brockton Board of Trade.Brockton.
The Board of Trade.....Lawrence.
The Board of Trade*°.....Lynn.
The Board of Trade*†°.....Springfield.
The Business Men's Association*†°
Waltham.
The Board of Trade.....Worcester.

MICHIGAN.

The Business Men's Association*°
Battle Creek.

MINNESOTA.

The Commercial Club.....Minneapolis.
The Northwestern Manufacturers' Asso-
ciation*.....St. Paul.

MISSOURI.

The Board of Trade*°.....Kansas City.
The Commercial Club.....Kansas City.
The Commercial Club.....St. Joseph.
The Business Men's League...St. Louis.
The Latin-American and Foreign Trade
Association*°.....St. Louis.
The Merchants' Exchange*°....St. Louis.

NEBRASKA.

The Commercial Club*.....Lincoln.
The Commercial Club*†°.....Omaha.
The Real Estate Exchange*.....Omaha.

NEVADA.

The Nevada Commercial League....Reno.

NEW JERSEY.

The Board of Trade*†°.....Camden.
The Board of Trade*†.....Elizabeth.
The Hoboken Board of Trade....Hoboken.
The Board of Trade*†°.....Newark.
The Taxpayers Association.....Paterson.

NEW MEXICO.

The Commercial Club°.....Albuquerque.

NEW YORK.

The Chamber of Commerce*†°....Albany.
The Board of Trade°.....Amsterdam.
The Business Men's Association*†°..Auburn.
The Chamber of Commerce°..Binghamton.
The Manufacturers' Association of New
York*†°.....Brooklyn
The Chamber of Commerce*°....Buffalo.
The Chamber of Commerce*°.....Elmira.
The Chamber of Commerce°.....Geneva.
The Manufacturers' Association.Jamestown.
The Board of Trade*°.....Lockport.
The Board of Trade & Transportation*†°
New York.
The Merchants' Association*†°..New York.
The North Side Board of Trade.New York.
The Produce Exchange.....New York.
The Chamber of Commerce*°..Rochester.
The Chamber of Commerce*°...Syracuse.
The Chamber of Commerce.....Troy.
The Chamber of Commerce.....Utica.
The Chamber of Commerce...Watertown.

NORTH CAROLINA.

The Board of Trade.....Asheville.
The Commercial Club.....Charlotte.
The Chamber of Commerce...Greensboro.
The Chamber of Commerce & Industry
Raleigh.
The Retail Grocers' Association..Raleigh.

OHIO.

The Business Men's Club*°....Cincinnati.
The Chamber of Commerce*†°..Cincinnati.
The Chamber of Commerce*†°..Cleveland.
The Board of Trade*†°.....Columbus.
The Dayton Chamber of Commerce°
Dayton.
The Chamber of Commerce*.....Elyria.

OKLAHOMA.

The Chamber of Commerce.Oklahoma City.

OREGON.

The Board of Trade°.....Portland.
The Chamber of Commerce*°..Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA.

The Board of Trade.....Chester.
The Board of Trade*.....Erie.
The Business Men's Exchange*.....Erie.
The Chamber of Commerce*†°.....Erie.
The Board of Trade°.....Harrisburg.
The Board of Trade.....Lancaster.
The Chamber of Commerce..McKeesport.
The Board of Trade*†°.....Philadelphia.
The Trades League*†°.....Philadelphia.
The Chamber of Commerce*°..Pittsburg.
The Board of Trade.....Reading.
The Board of Trade*†°.....Scranton.
The Board of Trade.....Wilkesbarre.
The Board of Trade°.....Williamsport.

RHODE ISLAND.

The Pawtucket Merchants' Association
Pawtucket.
The Board of Trade°.....Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Chamber of Commerce°..Charleston.

TENNESSEE.

The Cotton Exchange*.....Memphis.
The Merchants' Exchange*.....Memphis.
The Board of Trade*°.....Nashville.

TEXAS.

The Chamber of Commerce°. Beaumont.
 The Commercial Club.....Dallas.
 The Chamber of Commerce...Galveston.

UTAH.

The Commercial Club°...Salt Lake City.

VERMONT.

The Burlington Commercial Club
 Burlington.

VIRGINIA.

The Board of Trade & Business Men's
 Association Norfolk.
 The Stock Exchange.....Richmond.

WASHINGTON.

The Chamber of Commerce°.....Seattle.
 The Chamber of Commerce°.....Spokane.
 The Chamber of Commerce*.....Tacoma.

WEST VIRGINIA.

The Board of Trade°.....Wheeling.
 The West Virginia Board of Trade°
 Wheeling.

WISCONSIN.

The Commercial Club.....Menomonie.
 The Chamber of Commerce*°.Milwaukee.

WYOMING.

The Industrial Club of Cheyenne*°
 Cheyenne.

CANADA.

The Board of Trade.....Hamilton.
 The Board of Trade*.....Montreal.
 The Board of Trade°.....Toronto.
 The Canadian Manufacturers' Association*
 Toronto.
 The Retail Merchants' Association of
 Canada*Toronto.
 The Board of Trade*°.....Winnipeg.

THE CHAIRMAN: In addition to the report to which we have listened, a resolution was prepared at a meeting held this morning of the delegates present from business organizations, which will be presented by Mr. CHARLES B. MURRAY, Superintendent of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.

BUSINESS MEN AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

REMARKS OF MR. CHARLES B. MURRAY.

Mr. Chairman: In submitting an expression adopted at a meeting of the delegates of business organizations, who have come here to learn, not only of what is being done by the Mohonk Conference, but also as to what should be done by the bodies from which they come, in promoting the international arbitration sentiment, there is occasion for some remarks. Closely allied with humanitarian and economic questions and objects in the movement for international arbitration, is the business interest of the people of civilization. Commerce serves more than any other influence to induce a common interest in the cause of peace. International commerce has done and is doing much, probably more than any other distinctive cause, in promoting understanding between nations and in awakening recognition of the value and importance of relief from the wastages of warfare, under conflict and under preparation for conflict.

The Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, now holding its fourteenth annual meeting, has enlisted in recent years the cooperation of bodies directly concerned in industry and commerce in encouraging development of sentiments belonging to such a movement. The representatives of these bodies present on this occasion realize the significance of the service which the Mohonk Conference is performing and realize the

existence of opportunity for the interests concerned in industry and commerce to more fully join in movements for promoting the world's peace. It is therefore to be hoped that the organizations which have responded to the invitations to be represented at this meeting should more fully than heretofore awaken to the high merit of the peace movement through the means of arbitration, and should more actively give aid to it by appointment of committees, whose special province will be to encourage and widen knowledge of and interest in the great cause for advancing the welfare of mankind. Officials of organizations here represented, as well as all others of kindred nature in our country, should take steps for a more general appeal to their memberships to lend their influence in these efforts for the common good.

Mr. Chairman I now present the resolutions adopted or the expression adopted by the business men at their meeting. (For a copy of the resolutions see page 8 or 88.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to hear from the President of the National Association of Clothiers, Mr. MARCUS M. MARKS.

WHY BUSINESS MEN SHOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MOVEMENT

ADDRESS OF MR. MARCUS M. MARKS

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Why are business men so indifferent to the movement for international arbitration and peace? How can we shake their apathy and bring their practical help to what we consider the greatest cause of humanity?

These are the two questions that have been for some time agitating my mind. It has puzzled me to explain the absence of the business community as a class from the great councils of peace. There is no doubt that the merchants have most to lose by war and therefore it might fairly be expected that they would be in the foreground in every effort to prevent war. How can we account for their indifference when both selfish reasons and the general human dread of the terrors of war would naturally prompt them to give at least a part of their time to the business of promoting peace? Over-absorption in their affairs naturally suggests itself as the first explanation, but may we not find a deeper reason in the thought that the minds of business men are trained to undertake only such enterprises as offer the prospect of practical results in a *reasonable time*. If you present to the merchant a proposition that promises early reward, say in a season or a year or perhaps even in two or five years, he may be interested; but state a case to him in which actual results seem unlikely for fifty or one hundred years, and he will smile and

say, "This is my busy day," or "life's too short," or in some other short phrase dismiss the matter.

The idealist regards not the measurement of time, but looks joyfully ahead toward the ultimate end, far off though it may appear. He is inspired with faith and hope, and the seemingly impossible in time becomes possible through his persistent propaganda. While to his prophetic soul results are glorious and most to be desired, the very striving toward the goal is in itself a great satisfaction, and very little encouragement is needed to inspire him to further effort. The state of mind of the business men is entirely different. How can we induce them to join the clergy, the college presidents, the teachers, the lawyers and the other professional men in their efforts to further the cause of international arbitration? Only by persuading these so-called practical men that the grand result ahead is really in *sight* and coming *nearer* and nearer. Does any one know what part the merchant played in the movement that initiated our local courts of justice and our system of police, since the establishment of which the castle fortification has crumbled, Did not the influence of the merchant class contribute perhaps largely in bringing about the social relations that made the carrying of swords by the citizen unnecessary because of the perfection of a machinery of justice by which the rights of men were established on the basis of equity instead of physical strength? We should remember that it was not so long ago that conditions existed requiring the civilian to provide weapons for the protection of his person and property. Why should not this comparatively rapid change from barbarism to civilization give the practical business man good grounds for the hope that the nations will soon find it possible, by establishing international courts of justice and an international system of police, to gradually reduce their fortifications and eventually abandon them? The ocean steamer, the express train, the automobile, the wireless telegraph, the long distance telephone and other time and distance annihilators have drawn the people all over the world closer together and brought international arbitration within the range of reasonable expectation. Should not the merchant be inspired with the early fruition of the hopes of those who are working for peace, when he realizes that all the nations of the earth, assembled at The Hague under one roof last year, unanimously recognized the principle of international arbitration, and that there now remains only the problem of working out a plan of satisfactory representation in order to establish such a supreme court of the nations as, with the backing of a sufficient international police force, will do away with the necessity of our present great armies and navies, just as the courts within the States automatically did away with the fortified castle and the sword! Adding to the forces already mentioned as working

strongly toward a universal brotherhood the record of the many important arbitration treaties recently signed, there is certainly before the world enough evidence to encourage the merchants and the manufacturers to join their means and their brains in our movement to substitute international arbitration for the horrors of war. Business men believe in insurance—life insurance, fire insurance and insurance against many other kinds of losses. Why should they not be willing to pay, let us say, one-tenth of one per cent. of their capital every year for insurance against war? This would be cheap insurance—cheaper even than paying the tax for more and more warships. Education is our best weapon in this crusade against war. The machinery of education requires money, and the merchant's slight insurance premium would bring him not only financial relief in helping to prevent the havoc, the disarrangement of credits, the loss of business and the direct tax caused by war between nations, but the further and more precious satisfaction of having contributed his share toward bringing nearer the realization of the brotherhood of man, which, since the days of Cain and Abel has been outraged whenever, for any cause whatsoever, a man murdered his brother.

The dreamer whose mind is filled with noble thoughts, the idealist who is striving for lofty ideals, the seer who sees beyond the immediate present have by their enthusiasm and their faith sustained the great cause of peace while the merchant has only unconsciously been a promoter of the same cause by his enterprise and energy in bringing cities and nations closer through commercial intercourse. Would that I could now speak to each merchant in our land, heart to heart, and inspire him with the glorious opportunity, yes, the serious and direct duty that is his. The establishment of the machinery of an international court of justice is now intensely practical, and the great result can be hastened if the men of affairs back up strongly the advance guard marching forward bravely, holding aloft the white banner inscribed with the watchword: "Justice, not brute force"—"Brotherly love between all the People." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Mr. FRANK D. LALANNE, of Philadelphia, President of the National Board of Trade.

COMMERCE THE AGENT OF PEACE

ADDRESS OF MR. FRANK D. LALANNE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I cannot entirely agree with the preceding speaker, that the average business man is indifferent to public matters and particularly to international arbitration. The stand I take is that the average prosperous

merchant, is not only very often a college graduate, but he is the growth of the widest educational institution that the world has ever seen,—I mean the great world of business, of finance and of experience. You will find discourses in the counting-houses of our country, on all the great topics of the day, as well put, as well thought out, and more practical, than those found in many colleges.

I stand on this platform as the representative of the greatest business organization of our times, the National Board of Trade, numbering as it does eighty of the greatest Boards of Trade of our country, and I am glad to say that three other national organizations are here, and in conversation with representatives of them, I find that we could number in this convention, nearly 300 organizations, a power so potent that I would not wonder if it was the largest share of representation.

I am asked to speak from the business man's standpoint. In our study of history we find most of the records tell of the exploits of the warrior, the conquests of arms. In looking back at my school days I was taught principally of such events as the Siege of Troy and the Wooden Horse filled with heroes, and our boyish minds were trained to admire the deeds of the champions who fought there, and to look upon the history of the world as a record of bloodshed.

The conquests of peace are not as seriously written about, yet the thoughtful reader, recognizing that they contributed more to the greatness and progress of the world, is wont to pick from his books their results, and to note how the greatest commercial nations planted colonies, carried civilization and peace wherever commerce went, and how great cities and countries were created, whose stability stood for wealth, progress, enlightenment and peace.

The Phoenicians, those greatest of early traders, banded together in boards of trade the merchants of their great cities, who contended in friendly rivalry for the trade of the world. Solomon seeing the peaceful progress of Phoenician civilization, and believing that a reign of peace would better build up the nation of Jews than the warlike policy of his father, lent his powerful aid to the arts of peace. Soon by his encouragement of the natural inclination of his people for trade, he aided the healthful growth of his country during his peaceful rule, so that Israel ranked first among the powers, while his beneficent sway helped to keep the neighboring nations for friends and customers.

Later we find the greatest league of all times for peace dominating the commerce of northern Europe and the Baltic,—the union of the Hansa cities beginning in a small way in the city of Lübeck and soon having a membership of eighty

of the leading cities of the world, sweeping out of existence the bandit baron who obstructed the trading on land, and the pirates of the sea, so that all the nations should peacefully carry on their international trade. Not for warlike purposes did the Hanseatic League maintain an army and a navy, but only as guardians of the peace of the world. For nearly 600 years did this powerful league control the commerce of the nations of the north, keeping all its members generally happy, busy and at peace. The international laws or usages of this league grew into a well-known and respected code. Peace was maintained, wise regulations made vigorous commerce, prosperity was so general that the busy world had few temptations to break the laws, there were few criminals to prosecute, but those few were dealt with justly.

The well-organized commerce to-day of Germany, England, Holland, France, Spain, Italy and the Netherlands had its very foundation stones laid down by this combination of business men, and cemented by centuries of honest dealing and peace.

I have dug out of my books this brief synopsis of the merchant's influence upon civilization, happiness and peace of the world, but let us not think the business man desires peace at any cost, for the stability of commerce; he is no less a patriot than any other citizen, and the records show he willingly sacrifices his fortune and his life if need be, in defense of his country. We Americans can name thousands of such merchant patriots, beginning with Robert Morris, Benjamin Franklin, Gouverneur Morris and going through all the pages of our history we find their name is legion. Who more willingly furnishes the sinews of war than the patriotic business man, if a call is made or taxes are increased?

And now how best shall we continue at peace? The growing power and importance of the United States insures a treatment from the other powers of more deference and consideration than ever before. This is a safe guarantee of peace. I agree with our earnest, energetic President, that the maintenance of that deference and respect is best secured by a navy worthy of a first-class power. We are pledged to the broadest and most unselfish policy for the peace of our hemisphere, and the integrity of our sister republics south of us. The Monroe Doctrine while not recognized by the powers of Europe by formal assent, is quietly admired and studied and they know we will adhere to our ultimatum of "hands off." I am with the President for four battleships and peace. We want an adequate annual increase in our navy to keep us abreast of other first-class powers, so like the Hanseatic League which kept a well-equipped navy, whose full-armed ships were called "Peace Ships," and whose forts around the northern seas

were called "Peace Burgs," our fleet may be called the "Squadron of Peace" and when the Panama Canal is finished our fleet of battleships—"Peace Ships"—will be strong enough to insure peace on the east and west coasts of North and South America.

I am also with the President in his wise policy of sending our fleet around the world, not for warlike purposes, but to make friendship for peace, and let the Eastern nations understand that we are always prepared to strengthen our desire for peace with a navy second to none in the world. But I am sorry to say that we may hang our heads in sadness to think that with this splendid display of American mechanical genius and perfection in ship building, our great country is without a merchant marine, so that supplies are carried in hired boats, when a great navy like ours should have an auxiliary of American built ships, constructed in American yards, and manned by American officers and sailors, as aids for transportation in time of peace and assistance in time of war. We, as merchants, favor such protection given to an American merchant marine, as given by any other nations, so that American built ships, carrying the American flag, and American merchandise, may trade with every other part of the world, for we cannot understand why a shop ashore should be more protected than a shop afloat.

Stability resulting from universal peace is the hope of every merchant, and in the light of the progress thus far made he sees not far off, the realization of his hope.

Our country's dignified representative at the second Hague Conference, Mr. Choate, in a short speech in January, before the New York State Bar Association, shows that substantial progress was made, and he very intelligently refutes the croakings of those birds of ill omen, who persist in bemoaning what was not done, and giving no recognition to much good accomplished.

It appears to me that such expressions as a great English journal made use of, to evince its hostility to what the leading diplomats of all the civilized nations, were earnestly working for "Universal International Arbitration," were unpatriotic, inhuman and untrue. I quote:

"In plain English the Conference is a sham and brought forth a progeny of shams, because it was founded on a sham. We do not believe that any progress whatever in the cause of peace, or in mitigation of the evils of war, can be accomplished by a repetition of the strange and humiliating performance which has just ended."

We cannot consider a Conference made up of dignified and learned men, representing all the civilized nations of the earth, a sham. We recognize that such a grand body of men,

with various customs, and perhaps different methods of thought, coming from states far separated, could not all be prepared to agree upon an identical method, at the moment of their arrival, though their general purpose be the same. Views had to be exchanged, compromises made, and the sentiment for which they convened, boiled down into an harmonious expression, and this naturally took time. The agreement by all the nations without reserve, for the creation of an international court of appeal in prize cases, alone, is worth all the work done and time expended.

I cannot understand what the learned journalist means, when he speaks of the Second Hague Conference as "a strange and humiliating performance." For earnest men, the representatives of hundreds of millions of people, to give their best efforts and most honest labors to find a way to prevent wars and their horrors cannot justly be called an humiliating performance.

The unanimous agreement that force of arms should not be resorted to, to collect contract debts due by citizens of one country to citizens of another, till arbitration had been offered or carried through and disobeyed, is of much value to the world. Then again, how could our friend call the Conference a failure because all the questions before it were not all carried at this Conference? To have two-thirds of the nations of the world agree to the old favorite American doctrine, that private property of enemies, even if carried in enemies' bottoms, shall be exempt from capture, is a victory but deferred. Is it not an important step taken by the Second Hague Conference, towards the speedy accomplishment of our most cherished hope, the permanent establishment of an "International Court of Arbitration" that all the nations voted that such a court ought to be created, and that the Conference agreed to a scheme, functions, organization and procedure of such a court? A stumbling block as to the method of selecting or appointing the judges prevented for the time, the full accomplishment, but I am glad to say our able Secretary of State, Mr. Root, is hopeful that objections may be smoothed out by diplomacy, and a method for selecting the judges be adopted, so that the court may be established without waiting for another Conference. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The next gentleman to address us represents the Auburn Business Men's Association, but he is better known to us as an eminent citizen, a former mayor of Auburn and now a member of the Public Utilities Commission of New York. I have pleasure in presenting Hon. THOMAS M. OSBORNE.

WAR AND DEMOCRACY

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS M. OSBORNE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is as a representative of the business men of the city of Auburn that I am here; and the business men of my city—an important manufacturing community now for the greater part of a hundred years—while indulging in healthy differences of opinion on every other conceivable subject are yet united in one. Upon the upper section of our city seal, above the lifted arm with a hammer typifying labor and industry, are the crossed calumets of the Iroquois—signifying not only the former Indian domination of the land of the Cayugas, but Auburn's appreciation of and love for that peace which is our country's peculiar mission to the world.

In the midst of arms the laws are silent, says the old Latin adage; but there are many things silent besides the laws when the spirit of war is abroad; and we, the citizens of Auburn whose prosperity has come through peaceful industry, believe that while one corner-stone of our democracy is liberty, and another is equality and the third is brotherhood, insist that the fourth corner-stone, no less necessary than the other three, is peace.

It is rather astonishing how many people there are who fail to see how utterly contradictory and inconsistent is the idea of war and that of a true democracy; this failure arises from the fact that men so often misunderstand what is closest and most important to them; and what can be closer and more important to us than our own system of government. It is not altogether valueless, therefore, for members of even the most intelligent audiences, to ask themselves some rather searching questions—and think out again some very old problems. We may not discover any new truths, but it is not a waste of time to reaffirm the old ones.

I am going, therefore, to ask why it is that war and democracy are contradictory terms; but to answer that, we must first ask ourselves what is democracy.

The speaker then traced in detail four great experiments in human government and society, *imperialism, feudalism, paternalism, and aristocracy*, showing how each had fallen under the test of truth, because each failed to recognize the right of the people to rule. Mr. Osborne then continued:

Then at last, far away over the sea, where England, the island country which had been enabled to pursue most naturally its own development, had planted colonies where freedom was breathed in with the very air, there, in the new world, far away from the follies and failures of the past, arose the fifth great experiment in human government.

Democracy was no experiment; it was simply the only course left, after every other system of government had failed to satisfy mankind: imperialism—the rule of master over slave; feudalism—the rule of lord over vassal; paternalism—the rule of a claimant of divine right over obedient subjects; aristocracy—the rule of the privileged few over the unprivileged many; what was there left save democracy, the rule of the people itself, of brother-citizens over themselves?

Here at last was a new system indeed; yet like all new things it was in its essence as old as the hills; forever, since the dawning of intelligence in the mind of man, the passion for freedom had stirred him to ever new protest against every new form of tyranny. But here at last was a new system of human government founded boldly upon the very rock against which all other systems had come to wreck. Here at last was what the world had been waiting for, the political expression of the Golden Rule. Here was a proclamation that every man should be free, bound only by his obligation to his brother-man. Little by little the truth had forced its way in; little by little the democratic idea had burgeoned into a political system.

The pronouncement of democracy as a political ideal did not bring about democracy; nor even its formulation as a political system in the Constitution of the United States. Ideals are but dreams, constitutions but ink and paper;—both must be infused by the quickening spirit which turns dreams to realities and translates dead legal forms into living acts.

Anthony Trollope, with unwonted philosophic insight, once said of the disappointment over the results of freeing the slaves in Jamaica, that it was not generally understood that “the cessation of a sin is only the beginning of a struggle.” So when America turned from the old systems of government and our great Republic was launched, the work of democracy was only begun. Even now we have made but a fair start. How foolish it is then to lose faith in our system of government, as some good souls do, because we do not attain quickly the certain benefits gained by other systems after centuries of struggle! How stupid to expect finalities while we are yet in the time of sunrise—the glorious sunrise of that light which will shine more and more unto the perfect day, but which is still only the sunrise.

There is, however, a certain tendency of our present time which is dangerous because it evidences a serious lack of faith.

Besides the experiments in human government I have tried to define, there is yet another form to which allusion should be made, although it cannot be classed as an organized system; we may rather call it an episode which occurs occasionally in history when for any reason society becomes discouraged with existing conditions, and fails to see how pressing problems can be solved

without the aid of a *deus ex machina*. The thing I have in mind is called *Caesarism*. It expresses itself by undue faith and reliance placed upon some single man who is allowed by society to assume the character of a dictator—endeavoring to focus in himself all the functions of government, and dispense the blessings of providence through his individual person. Frequently the unfortunate mortal becomes convinced that he is more than human—believing that by some God-given faculty he is far better able to judge of the needs of the people than they themselves, and much better qualified to exercise the functions of government than any regular system developed under the natural pressure of the necessities and desires of society.

Such a dictator was Julius Caesar, from whom the name arises; such were many of the petty tyrants of earlier or later times; such in later history was Bonaparte before he developed his imperial system; such in cheap imitation of his great namesakes was the third Napoleon. In our own history, developed with much difficulty under the restrictions of a democratic form of government, such in a mild form was Andrew Jackson,—a thoroughly well-meaning man, frequently deceived by the ardor of his enthusiastic partisans into mistaking excellent intentions for good administration, and profound belief in himself for a genuine faith in the people. Whether any one of Jackson's successors in the presidency should be classed in the same category as a sort of democratic Caesar it is not necessary upon this occasion to enquire; but certain it is that in our petty political bosses we sometimes have a sordid variety of this disease of the body politic which is difficult to explain, and hateful to contemplate.

What it is desired to point out is the undoubted danger we are running—first of losing faith in our political ideals because we find them slow of attainment and often expressed in crude and unlovely forms—and then of turning to Caesarism for relief. We must remember—constantly remember—that government of the people, by the people and for the people has only been approximated—has never yet been attained. All the more is it the duty of everyone of us who loves the true democratic ideal to contribute as best he may toward that attainment. And one of the best contributions we can make toward that end is the establishment and perpetuation of international peace.

“The Empire,” said Louis Napoleon, endeavoring to commend his government of glittering shams to Europe—“the Empire means peace.” The statement was false, but it was the tribute of a political freebooter to the conscience which underlies the civilized world.

In the fullest and truest sense we may say democracy means peace;—for it is the one system of human government with which peace goes hand in hand. In every other system war is the

natural if not the inevitable accompaniment. *Imperialism* means war; for slaves will revolt against their masters, subject nations will rebel against their oppressors; the strong is not necessarily the right, and when the right lies with the weaker party—in the enslaved rather than in the enslaver, there is a condition of unstable equilibrium in which war is sure to arise, whenever the oppressor grows too harsh, or the oppressed feels strong enough to hazard a chance for freedom.

Feudalism means war; for not only do Emperor and Pope continually contend, each claiming that his share of dominion over man has been curtailed; but each petty vassal Baron quarrels with his neighbor, and both war against the merchant and artisan—the producers of wealth.

Paternalism means war; for one claimant of divine right is sure to be contradicted by another claimant of divine right; and when two of God's alleged vice-regents differ as to His wishes (or their own) there is no way out but to resort to the old barbaric code—scandalous as the spectacle may be.

Aristocracy means war; for what way is there by which your common herd shall be duly led by the wise and powerful, if it refuse to accept their guidance peaceably; and likewise the business of war affords a very fine opening for younger sons; and for ambitious scions of aristocracy to gain experience in the art of forcing others to do their bidding.

Moreover, in these older systems of government the very formation of political parties even, tends to breed Revolution. To question the will of the Emperor is not mere opposition,—it is treason; to oppose the demand of an overload is to upset the very basis of feudal society; to resist the authority of a divinely appointed monarch is damnable heresy; to thwart the plans of an aristocracy is to sin against superior judgment. It follows therefore that under such governments, if the play of parties is vital, it becomes dangerous to the state; while in a democracy the healthy differences of parties form the very firmest basis upon which the state can rest; party differences, instead of unsettling the state, by forming a proper balance of conflicting opinions only make it more stable.

Thus we find that in every one of the four older systems of government war is a natural concomitant; but in a democracy, founded as it is upon the relation of brother-man to brother-man, of citizens with equal rights in a common state, we have the only system in which peace is an inevitable part of the structure. How could it be otherwise in a system which is the political expression of the Golden Rule? How can we, with the words of Jesus on our lips, go forth to murder our brethren? It is only because our conception of democracy is often so indistinct that we can ever see it otherwise. Lowell's

Hosea Biglow, in his shrewd Yankee way, sees through the haze very clearly, and expresses it in the keenest satire:

“We were gettin’ on nicely up here to our village,
 With good idees o’ wut’s right and wut ain’t,
 We kind o’ thought Christ went agin war and pillage,
 An’ thet eppyletts worn’t the best mark of a saint;
 But John P.
 Robinson he
 Sez this kind o’ thing’s an exploded idee.”

“War,” wisely says the Regent Murray in Scott’s fine novel, “war is the only game from which both parties rise losers.”

Democracy is the one system of government in which every-one is the gainer. It means peaceful commerce; it means natural development; it means education of the whole mass; it means spreading civilization by means of trade; it means the example of a prosperous and God-fearing state, growing ever greater and more powerful because it is free and enlightened and peaceful.

We are mighty in the world’s affairs to-day not because of the brag and bluster which has been somewhat too much the fashion these last few years, but because of our wonderful growth since we became the first great organized democracy; because of our being the new home of the oppressed and liberal elements of all nations, fleeing from the oppression of old and failing systems of government; because of the help and sympathy we have extended to all efforts for freedom—France, Spanish-America, Greece, Italy, Hungary, Japan. It was this strength rather than that of our armies or navies, which caused Louis Napoleon to withdraw his troops from Mexico, and induced England to submit to arbitration the Alabama claims. In all these things we have been strong in the armor of righteousness, and thrice armed because of the justice of our cause.

I would not say that war can always be avoided;—as it takes two parties to make a quarrel, it also takes two to keep the peace. Yet if we have the intention to keep the peace, there are very few occasions when we cannot do so. And the poorest way to prepare for keeping the peace is to arm ourselves for war.

When we think of the cost of armaments—when we think of the millions voted into new battle-ships which go out of fashion as soon as built—when we reflect upon the schools that vast sum could build; of the medical research it could endow; of the Junior Republics it could support; of the lives it could save; of the children it could train to righteousness; of the hunger it could feed; of the vice and crime it could prevent; does it not seem the height of folly—of *criminal* folly

in every sense of the word, to keep on at the rate we are now going? What quarrel have we with any nation? Whose hand is against us? Are we not as safe now as we were in all the years before we were pouring out our millions upon these worse than useless engines of destruction?

How can we go into our churches Sunday after Sunday, proclaiming ourselves the followers of Jesus, and forget that he not only laid down the Golden Rule—that most *practical* method of solving all the problems of life—but spoke also those wonderful words—which were we wise enough would guide our national counsels as well as our personal conduct: “Resist not evil; but overcome evil with good.” (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I now present Mr. A. B. FARQUHAR, of York, Pa., who represents the National Association of Manufacturers.

OUTCOME OF THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE

REMARKS OF MR. A. B. FARQUHAR

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I spent some days at The Hague, about midway in the proceedings of the international Conference, and there was opportunity to make acquaintance with a number of members, and form some opinion of who they were and of the work they were doing. My impression was unqualified, of the high ability of the men and of the serious view they took of their duties. They were day and night at work, discussing and adjusting. I had felt, when they first assembled in June, that a significant victory had been gained for us in bringing those able and influential men together; and this was my prevailing feeling when I visited The Hague. That all the great powers should have at last been driven, by the mastering force of the world's growing moral sentiment, to give heed to the call for a peaceful settlement of their differences; that they should have incurred the expense of fitting out a delegation and have spared some of their best men to represent them; and that those representatives should have been confident enough of their support to feel justified in proposing and concluding fourteen agreements,—though for the most part on minor questions,—this is our greatest victory, and nothing in the Conference proceedings detracts from its significance. Half a century ago, no such meeting could have been held, nor would any potentate have ventured to convoke it. That the Conference of 1899 should have assembled and have acted, and that its acts should have lasted; that this second Conference should so promptly, so easily, and so naturally have succeeded it, further advancing its good work; and that

the 1907 Conference should be followed by unanimous unquestioning expectation of the assembling of a third;—this is surely the most significant advance toward peace among the nations that has been made since those earth-awakening voices were heard from the Mount in Galilee, and from the Areopagus.

Although the permanent International Court of Arbitration, to which we hopefully looked, is still unprovided, yet the United States delegation, represented by its most conspicuous members, expressed themselves satisfied that the Conference was, on the whole, decidedly successful.

Mr. Choate was one of the most prominent, and perhaps the leading figure at The Hague last summer, and when he says “a great deal was done,” and that they made “a very great advance,” we have at least the words of one in a position to know whereof he speaks. His final summing-up is in this sentence: “We cannot expect to succeed all at once, or to avoid war altogether, but real advances were made towards the desired end.” Mr. Scott, technical delegate of the United States to the Conference, adopts precisely the same tone. After reviewing the conventions, on which the represented powers agreed with practical unanimity, he concludes “that this Conference, which lasted four months, and which was subjected to criticism in all parts of the world and to misrepresentation in the journals, has not only justified its calling but that it is a landmark in international development.”

Now it is by no means merely because it accords with our desires, that we accept this testimony in preference to that of the newspapers and others, who had predetermined a failure for the Conference and who promptly began to assure us that their anticipations had been prophetic. In the first place, Mr. Choate and Mr. Scott have a character for hard common-sense, which they would not permit any enthusiasm to put in jeopardy. In the second place, the difference between a temperate, gradual progress, placing the foot only on firm ground,—ground that can be permanently held, that will prove a sure base for another step forward,—between this and no progress at all, may be not striking to the superficial glance; but to one who remembers how mankind has been moved and states have been built is wide indeed. In the third place, the claims made by Mr. Choate and Mr. Scott are fully supported by a consideration of the debates from which these agreements grew.

It would be a mistake to limit the good work of the Hague Conference, in any fair computation, to what has been hitherto set forth, even though to the practical effects of the resolutions adopted we add the vast moral effect of setting and keeping

such an assemblage at work at all. The advance made toward the formation of a permanent arbitration tribunal is by no means to be estimated by the inadequate resolution on the subject actually passed, but rather by the fact which the discussion brought clearly to light—that civilized mankind is overwhelmingly of opinion that such a tribunal ought to be formed. Had it not been in accordance with the careful policy of the Conference, to take no decided action without a practical unanimity to support it, the strong majority for the tribunal would have expressed itself in no uncertain terms. But even without the sanction of a formal vote of the Hague delegates, it would obviously be possible to constitute our permanent tribunal by a simple treaty arrangement, such as has already been made to cover several different points—such as international weights and measures, recognition of the Red Cross societies, the world-wide Postal Union, and many others. And two or more great powers could establish it for cases arising among themselves, by simply providing for the payment of its expenses. It would be quite proper, therefore, to put this item of our program into immediate effect, without waiting for another Conference. It is now proved past all question that a move in this direction, made by any great nation that prefers to base its claims from others on justice rather than brute force, would at least be courteously received, and would probably be met in the same spirit, thus making the Tribunal an accomplished fact. Honor to the nation that starts first!

Yet it cannot be denied that, with all the progress that has come, there are a few discordant notes that still too surely tell our waiting ear that progress is not yet fulfillment. Even in ratifying an international arbitration treaty, our United States Senate was moved, by the prompting of some voice echoing down from the dark ages, to make reservation of cases affecting “the honor of the two contracting states.” This is readily recognizable as a mere subterfuge, meaning nothing whatever except that the nation concluding the treaty may, at its will or whim, withdraw any case from its operation under a sounding pretext; but the interesting point about it is its origin. The word “Honor,” in such a connection, comes to us straight from the famed “Code” of the duelist, in which honor was recognized as something which the shedding of human blood was required to satisfy. Among gentlemen the duelists’ “honor” is well-nigh forgotten; and that the same word should be used in the same sense in international dealings is an interesting proof how far the nation lags behind its component units in the march of civilization.

This chatter about a "national honor" need not, however, seriously discourage us. Wherever the proposition to arbitrate is favorably entertained in any shape, there we see the faces of men turned the right way; let us hope, and act, as in our ability lies, and we shall soon find them moving on the path to lasting peace. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I now present Mr. WALSTEIN R. CHESTER, delegate and vice-president of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade.

COMMERCE, NAVIES AND PEACE

REMARKS OF MR. WALSTEIN R. CHESTER

Mr. President, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: The Massachusetts State Board of Trade tenders you its hearty good wishes, and congratulations, on the success that has thus far marked your efforts.

Our association voicing the business interests of our state, asks that an international Court of Arbitration shall be established, before which all nations shall appear, and present their differences, and more, agree to *abide* by the decision of the court.

We shall always need an army and navy of sufficient size and strength to give the country proper police service. We must never forget that our navy carries a mighty influence for peace in our relations to foreign countries, not only on official but on business matters as well, coming in contact as it does with different branches of industry, and using its influence to bring before foreigners the business interests of our own country. Naval officers are among the best equipped men in the world. They are not only sailors, but engineers, electricians, constructors, navigators, business men, they have few equals in gunnery or in international law, and they are diplomats of the first order. Naval officers have never been guilty of making diplomatic errors and have proved to be able ambassadors abroad. Vastly more heroic services have been done, more lives saved from wrecks and vessels on lee shores by our navy than they ever lost through war.

War does not emanate from army or navy men, and heroes are not necessarily fighting men. The true hero is the man who devotes his time, his influence, his wealth to the saving, protection, happiness and improvements of life and the general welfare of his fellowmen.

A fleet of merchant ships flying the Stars and Stripes sailing to foreign ports, loaded with the products of this country, is a good peacemaker. Commerce, whether carried on by our ships or our railroads, is a great pacificator. We must give it hearty support, and permit nothing to destroy confidence in it.

The United States is rich in her soil, her forests, her mines, her manufactures and more in her wonderful energy, and in her glorious manhood and womanhood. She has a splendid prestige and is strong enough to set an example by keeping her army and navy and fortifications on a peace footing. If she would do so, other nations would gladly follow, for they are tired of seeing the results of war. All they need is the great moral support of a nation like ours.

This Convention is made up of representative men of different nations gathered for the purpose of promoting peace. Our influence and power should enable us to suggest a line of international policy broad enough to cover the ground fully, to the end that every flag of every nation shall be an emblem of peace and good will to all men. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from the manager of the Latin American and Foreign Trade Association, of St. Louis, Mr. JAMES ARBUCKLE.

THE ETHICS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE

REMARKS OF MR. JAMES ARBUCKLE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It has been said that trade consists "in buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest." It means a great deal more than this. It has been a great civilizing element in the world's progress. Merchants have carried their wares to the most barbarous peoples, and have helped to open up vast continents, established trading posts, and have been leaders in the colonization of extensive territories. In reviewing the history of the trading nations of the world, one is struck with the moral results accomplished through their international ventures, and which may be termed the conquests of civilization.

The conquests made by the barbaric nations in early times to satisfy their rapacious greed and love of war and conquest, resulted in no good to the conquered, who usually were killed, robbed of their property, or enslaved. The invasion of the Medes and Persians into Europe; the Assyrians into Egypt and Syria, and the invasion of the Goths and Huns in Europe, and the Tartars under Genghish Kahn (the curse of God) are illustrations of the barbaric spirit of pure conquest and its unhappy and miserable results.

The commercial spirit which prompted the ancient Phoenicians to trade along the Mediterranean coasts and to plant colonies, which subsequently became centers of refinement and education, illustrates the true ethical spirit of international trading. This spirit they carried along the west coasts of Europe, and schools

and colleges established through their influence, were the first beginnings of the civilization of Europe. The British Isles were often visited by them. They worked the tin mines of Cornwall, and extended their trading as far north as St. Andrews, where they established a school, which for centuries was known as the school of the Culdees.

We come later down the centuries and find the Greeks becoming active traders, and planting colonies everywhere. The spirit of enlightenment spread with them and the Greek civilization had its strong influence in waking up the barbaric mind to higher thoughts of life.

The Aryan invasion of Europe with its refining influences, had its commercial spirit which served to introduce it amongst the warlike Gauls, Goths, Slavs, Gaels and Teutons. When later on Vasca de Gama rounded the Cape of Good Hope in his quest of the riches of Asia, whilst the Portuguese methods were not of the most elevating character, still they served to inspire a thirst for knowledge and adventure, and the spirit of trading, which leads to enlightenment. The commercial spirit has been largely the civilizing element which has raised the world to its present status.

When Columbus in his journey west in search for the wealth of the Indies, planted a new civilization amongst the aborigines of America, little he thought of the wondrous development which was to take place on this hemisphere in the course of a few centuries through the spirit and enterprise of commerce. The colonists who came from Great Britain to this Northern Continent, were imbued with the same spirit of commercial adventure, but had also the desire to live in better and more improving conditions and their extraordinary growth and development in three centuries has been simply marvelous, having no parallel in the history of the world.

The same commercial spirit which the Anglo-Keltic race displayed in the settlement of this country, led them to Asia, and to the East Indies, whose riches were the dream of all the great explorers, and later to settle the continents of Australasia and South Africa, developing communities, distinguished for their enlightenment and progress.

The colonizing of the Central and South Americas, in search of gold, was not animated by the same spirit of love and independence manifested by the Puritan and Cavalier of the North, although later they followed the example of the united English colonies of the North and declared their independence of Spain. Their great aim was the establishment of the Catholic religion, which no doubt fulfilled an important mission in civilizing the indigenes of the Southern Hemisphere. These countries have not displayed the same active, restless commercial spirit as those

of the North, and have been much afflicted with the constant revolutionary spirit in their politics. This however seems to be coming to a solution in the enacting of arbitration treaties and other agencies, which have been aided also by influences in the United States.

America, once a "terra incognita," was invaded by European adventurous traders, and the northern part especially has become developed into one of the most progressive nations of the world.

The commercial spirit which has settled and developed this great continent, has settled in a like way the extensive continents of Australasia and Africa. The Anglo-Keltic spirit of venture and of bartering and trading has had its beneficent results sometimes in the establishment of law and order, and in the betterment of conditions, as illustrated in the conquest of India and its gradual elevation from a condition of chaos, where rivers of blood had been shed between the Mahomedan and the Hindu for centuries. In other respects where the indigenous races could not cope with the exacting terms of modern civilization, they are gradually disappearing and will cease to be, and give place to "the survival of the fittest."

It is not inopportune in this assembly, where so many of you are proud of the Anglo-Keltic blood flowing in your veins, to say that it looks as if Providence in His wisdom assigned a high duty to this race, and for the past five hundred years has spread its blood and its spirit of enterprise and commercialism throughout the world, and has improved on the conditions existing in Europe. The strong characteristics of the race in courage, enterprise and ambition for higher ethics for humanity, has developed, by this experience, nations whose possibilities for the future can only be dreamed of.

The great awakening of the Portuguese and Spanish nations to foreign commerce, over five hundred years ago; Vasco de Gama rounding the Cape of Good Hope to Asia, and a hundred years later Columbus coming west to this continent in search of the riches of the Indies, was the same commercial spirit, and is illustrated in the development of Latin America.

I will now compare the results of the respective races, their settlements and subsequent development.

The settlement of Mexico and South America by the Spanish Conquistadores, was not one in which ethics played much of a part. It is true religion played a role which reflected credit on their priesthood, in protecting, in some degree, the indigenes from being robbed unscrupulously of their lands and country. Ferdinand and Isabella, whilst generally beneficent in their plans for the natives of their new possessions, were devoted to the spread of the faith of Rome, and it no doubt has served a good

purpose in the economy of government, for those people, but their plans were perverted to the selfish greed of the leaders and commanders, and Hernandez Cortez and Pizarro will always live in history, as examples of it. Commerce was not such a feature in those southern countries as it was with the northern. The genius of the Latin races does not find its expression in commerce, as does that of the Anglo-Keltic.

The ethics of the Anglo-Keltic commercial spirit, its love of personal liberty, its altruistic aspirations, its steadfastness to its purposes, all lends in its influence for higher conditions.

Commerce between nations and the purposes of Divine Providence seem to go hand in hand, and a wonderful development which has taken place here, until now, as a world power this country is ready to take its share in carrying "the white man's burden."

War between nations is most destructive of international commerce, and throws the world backward.

Commerce is, therefore, most interested in this international arbitration question, as nothing more effectually stops foreign commerce than war; hence the importance of arbitration is an all absorbing subject to the commercial man.

The reprisals and destruction of floating property in past wars have been most serious and often attended with great injustice and wrong, to say nothing of the great loss of business in the respective countries engaged, or the sad loss of life.

The higher ideals of the honorable merchant as business is now carried on, evokes the spirit of brotherhood between nations, and brings about such a relationship of amity between them as must in time cement national friendships, bring all nations closer together and bring nearer the day when all peoples shall live happily together on this earth in universal, friendly accord. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. CLARK OLDS, President of the Erie Chamber of Commerce, is the next speaker.

THE LESSON OF THE GREAT LAKES

REMARKS OF MR. CLARK OLDS

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have the honor of representing the Erie Chamber of Commerce a second time at the Lake Mohonk Conference. The city of Erie has a very large Chamber of Commerce. It comprises more than a thousand members of Erie's manufacturers and its merchants. The city of Erie is the only port the state of Pennsylvania has upon the Great Lakes. It is the gateway through which the iron of the great manufacturing state enters. Without Pennsylvania being

adjacent to the Great Lakes it never could have been a great manufacturing state because it never would have had the benefit of cheap water transportation. Therefore, we believe in the conserving of our national mines and forests and in the improvement of all the deserving waterways of the nation. And I wish to illustrate the growth of the merchant marine of the lakes by saying that during the last year more than 52,000,000 tons of iron ore were unloaded on the shores of Lake Erie, and the merchant marine has grown so that at our port last year we had over a thousand vessels enter and clear, many of them of more than ten thousand tons burden. And by way of comparison I wish to say that that little fleet which Commodore Perry had at Erie, which made the battle of Lake Erie memorable, was built at that port, and that you could place upon the decks of one of the vessels of our present merchant marine, six of his vessels.

After the treaty of peace was completed between the United States and Great Britain, it was provided that each nation might build a man-of-war and maintain it upon the Great Lakes. The United States availed itself of that right in 1844, and built the first iron ship that was ever built in our navy,—the “Michigan,” now called the “Wolverine,” which is still in commission and still a man-of-war upon the lakes. At the time she was built she was considered as large a vessel as could navigate the rivers and waters of the Great Lakes. I want to say to-day that, taking into consideration her length and tonnage, one of our modern freighters would carry four such ships upon her decks and only be in good ballast. How I wish we could say that the merchant marine of the nation had grown on the ocean the same as it has grown upon the Great Lakes! Infinitely better would it be to my mind if Congress would appropriate the twenty-five or thirty or thirty-five million dollars necessary to build new battleships, toward the constructing and subsidizing of merchant ships to carry our manufactured products to every part of the globe.

But it seems to me, gentlemen, that representatives of our great commercial organizations are out of place upon the floor of this Conference. We should listen to the principles here promulgated and go home and preach them to our chambers of commerce, to our workmen in the shops, to our children in the schools, and by inculcating those principles, which we have learned here at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, we will become powerful factors in preserving the peace of nations. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to listen to Rev. JOHN McDOWELL, delegate of the Newark Board of Trade.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE BUSINESS MEN FOR PEACE

REMARKS OF REV. JOHN M'DOWELL

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have the honor of being a member of the Newark Board of Trade, and Chairman of its Committee on International Arbitration. I bring to Mr. Smiley and to this Conference the cordial greetings and congratulations of that body.

These business men, whom I have the pleasure of representing, are usually regarded as intensely practical and that is one reason why I joined their organization as a preacher to get an over-dose of that sense of the practical. I think it is a difficult thing to combine theory and practice and I do not know of any place where that is done so splendidly as it is done here.

I want to speak of three things to-night, and first of all of the right this Conference has to appeal to the business men. You have a right to appeal to the business men because the business men of this country and the world over have made the world a neighborhood by their inventions and by their investments. We are closely bound together to-day. We are a neighborhood and we cannot escape the responsibility of that fact. What that will mean for the world will depend very largely upon the business men. And if they who have made the world a neighborhood are alive and alert as to their opportunity, they will see to it that what has been done in the nineteenth century, namely, making the world a neighborhood, shall be duplicated in the twentieth century. The business men will lead the way not only to making the world a neighborhood, but in this twentieth century they can and will lead the way to making it a brotherhood. So that out of neighborhood shall come universal brotherhood.

The second point of which I want to speak is,—what are business men doing? I cannot resist calling your attention to the fact that in many of these boards of trade there are committees on international arbitration, working in the schools, the churches and the homes. Just the other day I spoke in the city of Newark to over fifteen hundred pupils. By my side sat the president of our board of trade, on my left the ex-president of the state board of education, and two or three other representative men. It was one of the biggest events that has happened in that city of Newark. Last year when I started for the Mohonk Conference the president of the board of trade said to me, "Mr. McDowell you are going up into the mountains to hear some hot air and bring some back." After I returned and made my report he came to me and after apologizing said, "Here is \$50 to be used in any way you please to encourage study of this great subject of international arbitration in our public schools."

I hold in my hand a resolution passed the other day by a great commercial organization. It reads thus, "It pays so much better to sell the foreigner our industrial product than to wage war with him that our investments ought to take the former rather than the latter direction. In the long run commerce is a better national defence than armaments, giving a country immeasurably more strength."

One other thought. What are the difficulties in the way of promotion of this movement by boards of trade? I may reduce them to two to-night. In the first place there is the difficulty of ignorance. Many business men do not know what this means. They are ignorant of the great facts regarding the progress of arbitration. I say that guardedly. I know the men who are here are not ignorant, but the men you represent, many of them, do not know what you are aiming at. Furthermore, they are not familiar with the facts. When I stood before the board of trade last year, I said, "Arbitration is not a sentiment; it is a fact; it is a power. Two hundred and forty cases have been decided within the last hundred years by arbitration, more cases than have been decided by war," and that fact opened their eyes. They were not aware of it. There are many other facts which they ought to know.

A second difficulty with boards of trade and commercial bodies is due to their prejudice,—prejudice born of certain dense statements, such as "In time of peace prepare for war." Oh, how that flies back at you when you talk about arbitration! We have to meet that. I hope that this Conference will give us an argument to meet it. May I suggest an argument that I am using, "In time of peace prepare to make war impossible." Another prejudice is based on that statement, "survival of the fittest." The fittest will survive, in my judgment, of barbarism, of animalism. We need to meet that. We need to meet it, it seems to me, with the argument that the fittest shall help all others to survive. Rise to that high point where we shall feel our responsibility for the weaker nations. I am very sure that I am voicing to-night the spirit of the business men of America when I say that they do not want to be appealed to on the commercial basis of this movement. Our business men in the last analysis are men who are dominated by high sentiments, and if we are going to enlist them in this cause, we are going to do it appealing to the noblest sentiment that is in them, that sentiment that always responds to the spirit of brotherhood. And I believe that no power will have larger part in ushering in that time,

"When the war drums throb no longer,
When the battle-flags are furled
In the Parliament of Man,
The Federation of the World." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. FREDERICK H. JACKSON, representing the Providence Board of Trade, is the last speaker of the session.

INTERESTING BUSINESS MEN THROUGH PUBLICITY

REMARKS OF HON. FREDERICK H. JACKSON

Mr. Chairman: This is a business meeting. I want to make a suggestion regarding the proceedings of this Conference. Those of us who are fortunate enough to represent organizations are blessed indeed, but the reflected influence of these meetings would be the important part of them, if they could be conveyed to the organizations which we represent. I want to ask if there is any method by which concrete statements, resolutions that have been passed or some such matter, can be prepared by and occasionally sent from the Conference office to the various boards of trade, to their presidents or secretaries, or to their representatives who have been here. The Providence Board of Trade publishes a monthly organ, "The Board of Trade Journal," which goes to every board of trade in this country and in Europe, and if some such statement could be printed in that paper, it would be an avenue of immediate promulgation of the spirit of this place, and of the work that has been done. That I believe would be very valuable. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I am informed that the Conference office will take into consideration Mr. Jackson's suggestion, and that it will doubtless be acted on.

The meeting then adjourned until the following morning.

Fifth Session

Friday Morning, May 22, 1908

THE CHAIRMAN: Our topic for this morning is, "Work among the Colleges and Universities." We will first listen to a report of the past year's work of our Committee on that subject, which will be presented by Dr. L. CLARK SEELYE, President of Smith College.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WORK AMONG COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

REMARKS OF L. CLARK SEELYE, D. D.

The special committee appointed by the Lake Mohonk Conference to bring the subject of international arbitration to the attention of the colleges and universities, selected last year Dr. Benjamin Ide Wheeler as Chairman, and he consented to act in that capacity and should properly have made this report, but unfortunately he has been prevented from attending this meeting.

By direction of Dr. Wheeler, a circular letter was sent in December, 1907, to all the colleges and universities, suggesting that each institution set apart some special occasion before the close of the academic year for presentation to the student body of some phase or phases of the international arbitration and peace movement. This circular was accompanied by a personal letter from Mr. H. C. Phillips, the Secretary of the Conference, calling attention to its importance. Mr. Phillips, to whose efficient and valuable service are due our statistics, states that replies have been received by him from about two hundred colleges favoring annual occasions for recognition of the subject. From eighty-five institutions special public meetings to consider the subject were reported, which were addressed by speakers from abroad, by members of the Faculty or of the student body. Debates and oratorical contests have been introduced by thirty institutions, for the same purpose, and in six of these institutions permanent prizes have been established, and temporary prizes have been offered in two for the best presentation of the subject. About seventy have recorded themselves as favorable to the movement and have pledged themselves to give the matter special attention during the next academic year. Only seven institutions have declined to cooperate; these not from lack of sympathy, but on the ground

that such specific action is unnecessary and would be more or less of an interference with the regular academic work.

Mr. Phillips also states that numerous suggestions have been received by him, which he has grouped within these four following classes:

First. A large number of institutions believe it advisable to place a speaker or speakers permanently in the field at the disposal of colleges for special meetings.

Second. A smaller number, believing in debates and oratorical contests, suggest that prizes should be established sufficient in value to encourage wide-spread interests.

Third. A few hold that it is not proper for the college authorities to give direct aid to the movement, but suggest that if peace societies were organized among the students and under student control, they would receive the hearty cooperation of those in authority.

Fourth. A larger number of institutions are of the opinion that merely student organizations cannot maintain permanent interest in the subject, and that the greatest measure of student cooperation would be brought out by the largest possible direction of the faculty.

The gift of \$250 made by Mr. Eugene Levering of Baltimore to the Mohonk Conference for the use of the committee on colleges and which was accepted by the Conference last year, with the understanding that it was to be spent under the direction of Professor W. W. Willoughby of Johns Hopkins University, or any one whom the Conference might appoint as his successor, was expended for a course of lectures at Johns Hopkins University by the Hon. James Brown Scott.

As an indication of the interest in this subject among students, this year a prize of \$50 is offered to the Conference by Mr. Chester D. Pugsley, a Harvard undergraduate, for the best essay upon international arbitration by any undergraduate student in any American college or university. Mr. Pugsley suggests, if the Conference accept his offer, that the judges be the last three presiding officers of the Mohonk Conference or such persons as they may select. Your committee would recommend that this offer be accepted.

The annual commemoration of the opening of the Hague Conference in accordance with the recommendation of Dr. Brown, the United States Commissioner of Education, is being more and more extensively observed by our institutions of learning and is of much service in increasing the collegiate interest in this peace movement.

The Intercollegiate Peace Association, which is one of the offspring of this Conference embraces now forty-five colleges and universities in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan and Pennsylvania.

Your committee are indebted to Mr. George Fulk, the Secretary of the Association, for the following statement:

"The active work of the Association this year consisted in the promotion of nineteen oratorical contests, local, state and interstate. In these \$325 was expended for prizes to students. No less than one hundred students were led to read and write on the subject of International Arbitration and Peace. About \$350 was spent by the institutions for peace literature. Lectures on the subject were promoted by a number of institutions. Two local students' peace societies were organized. Steps have been taken for the organization of several more.

"The policy has been adopted of promoting local students' peace societies wherever feasible and where this is not feasible, to have local history and political science clubs foster the local interests of the Intercollegiate Peace Association. This policy was pursued this year in several of the larger universities. The Association is affiliated with the American Peace Society and with 'Corda Fratres' International Federation of Students. The affiliation of the Association with 'Corda Fratres' International Federation of Students places the students' organized Peace Movement on a truly international basis. In Europe the federation now has local branches in sixty-three of the principal universities and has a total membership of fifteen thousand students.

"It is the purpose of the Intercollegiate Peace Association to extend its organization and work to the other colleges and universities of the United States as rapidly as possible with a view to ultimately becoming national, and in its larger relation with 'Corda Fratres,' international."

In view of these facts, your Committee are assured that the movement for international arbitration will encounter no opposition in the colleges and universities, but will meet with their sympathetic and active cooperation. It will find in them forces already powerfully operating to secure international peace. There are no places where the rich and the poor meet daily in more friendly and familiar intercourse. The representatives of different creeds, which have so often convulsed with devastation and wars, worship and live amicably together, and learn religious tolerance. In every department of instruction students are taught their indebtedness to all nations for the knowledge which they acquire. From them come our most eminent jurists and our ablest exponents of international law. Their intercollegiate games, however fiercely they may be conducted, are essentially good natured and promote fellowship. An appeal to reason is the ultimate tribunal in their disputes. Scholarship is no longer provincial, but international and has become one of the most powerful agencies in bringing the nations of the earth into peaceful

relations. The students who are traveling to all lands in pursuit of knowledge are among the most efficient peace-makers. Those young men who have come from China and Japan to the colleges and universities of America and Europe, will do more to prevent war between the Orient and the Occident than all our navies. These international congresses of scholars and scientists which are becoming more frequent and more important will prove among our most impregnable strongholds.

While, therefore, we would not presume to dictate to our institutions of learning the methods which they should individually pursue to accomplish the end desired, realizing that these methods must vary according to academic peculiarities, your committee are confident that colleges and universities everywhere can be relied upon as most potent factors in promoting peace and good-will among the nations. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. RUSH RHEES, President of the University of Rochester, has been asked to speak on this subject.

THE POWER OF IDEALISM IN COLLEGES

REMARKS OF DR. RUSH RHEES

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I heartily concur in all the optimistic element that entered into the report which has just been made. It is not strange that you should look to companies of young men and women under the instruction of men devoted to the intellectual life for influences making for the realization of ideals. In all the history of our country there has been no place so clearly the seminary of the idealistic life as the college wherever located in all our broad land. I sometimes think, and that thought was confirmed last night as I listened to Professor Clark's address, that our colleges are coming under an influence not wholly favorable to the culture of ideals. We have come to realize the force and imperative importance of what is known as the scientific method—that method which devotes itself to the inquiry concerning things that are and things that have been. And I think I may venture to say that sometimes the pursuit of the scientific method tends to blind the eye to the visions of life. Professor Clark's words last night indicated to us that the economist if he is to become the dreamer must leave for the time his attention to the things that the scientific method presents to him and frankly adopt the method of the prophet and the dreamer. I believe myself that in any study, the investigation that stops with the inquiry of things that are, and things that have been, and does not consider the under-

lying tendencies which, without the purpose of men or in spite of the purpose of men, made for a larger righteousness,—I believe that such inquiry is essentially lacking, even if it claim to be scientific. The thing that impresses me more than anything else as I come here is the peculiarly firm and beautiful marriage of high vision with the consciousness of practical possibility. But because here at Mohonk under the leadership of Mr. Smiley particularly we are taught to keep our feet upon the ground, we are not, therefore, led to be content with what we can find upon the ground, but our eyes are turned still toward the cloud. The vision there entrances us and we are led to reach upwards, if we may find some ground which will bear our feet, still higher and higher.

Now the colleges are the perfectly fertile ground for the culture of that kind of idealism to-day. I think that this present generation does not know the warmth and ardor of idealism that pervaded the colleges two generations ago; but it is still true that the youth is nature's priest and he needs but to have the vision put before his eyes to adopt it with ardor and joy; and if we can have set before our youth such a vision of ideal necessity as was given by Professor Kirchwey's paper yesterday morning, if we can have set before our youth a conviction concerning the idiocy of war,—the idiocy not to be found in the fact simply that it is costly of treasure and vantage, but of that which is a more priceless thing, human character and fine and noble sentiment,—then our youth will find themselves still climbing toward the higher regions of life, although they may be taught with utmost earnestness that the ultimate test of life's accomplishment is efficiency, and that the man who does not keep his feet upon the ground is in danger of having no part in the practical movements of the present day. I think that the efforts of this Conference to bring before our colleges the interests of the movement for arbitration and international peace contribute very largely to the crystalization of the ideal purpose of the work of the colleges and tend to fix the minds of our youth, and those who teach our youth, upon something worth living for with all our hearts because the path to its realization is not entirely hidden by the mists. There are steps that can now be taken which will accomplish in our generation something of the realization of that noble vision. The colleges I am confident welcome the opportunity to cooperate with us in our effort to realize a vision so worthy; and the youth who are given unto us to train will not be the slowest among our citizens to respond to the call of such a heavenly vision. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker is Dr. JOSEPH SWAIN, President of Swarthmore College.

HOW THE COLLEGES MAY PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

ADDRESS OF DR. JOSEPH SWAIN

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is with hesitation that I present this morning the topic assigned me, from the standpoint of the college I happen to represent. To make the discussion more pointed, more practical, and therefore more helpful, must be my apology for making this paper apply directly to Swarthmore College.

The thought has come to me that should every college president in the world ask the question, "*what has the institution of which I am president done, what is it doing, and what may it legitimately do, to promote the peace of the world,*" he would find it possible for his institution to do much more in the future in this direction than it has done hitherto, without in any way stepping out of its proper sphere. With this thought in mind, I have endeavored to answer in a brief and general way, the question for Swarthmore College.

Swarthmore is one of the group of small colleges known as Friends' Colleges. It has naturally a large number of students who come from the homes of Friends. In addition there are many others who come from Quaker stock. All of these have grown up with a belief in the principles of peace held by the Society of Friends. Thus we may truly say that **the** peace ideals have been held in and advocated by the college authorities.

The late Edward H. Magill, for twenty years president of Swarthmore and in some way connected with its work from the beginning until the time of his death last winter, was an ardent advocate of peace principles, to which he gave expression both within the college and elsewhere. His last address to the student body at the beginning of this college year was a review of the progress of the peace movement. The Professor of Philosophy and the History of Religion, has as great a concern for the promotion of peace as had Dr. Magill. He is Chairman of the Peace Section of the Philanthropic Committee of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and writes and speaks much upon this subject. Our Professor of History has spent the past year in study abroad. The greater part of his time was used in the study of the peace movement from the standpoint of the two Hague Conferences. He was present at the Hague during all of the last Conference and the results of his observations and study will soon be published in book form. The Lecturer in Law, and a prominent leader in reform movements in Philadelphia, was chairman and leader of the great Peace Conference just held in Phila-

delphia. These cases will serve to illustrate the interest and activity in the peace movement of some of the members of the faculty at the present time.

President Thwing, last year, very tersely and attractively set forth two fundamental characteristics which should be possessed by the college graduate, namely, self-restraint and comprehensiveness of ideals. There is perhaps nothing in the whole range of ideals for which education stands that can be placed above the importance of self-control. The person who has become master of his passions, his prejudices and all his faculties, is an educated man, no matter whether he has ever spent a day in school or not. "Better is he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." Such a person is a walking delegate in the interests of peace, even if he never attended a peace conference nor spoke in behalf of international arbitration. Institutions of higher learning, in training men and women in self-control are making one very important step in the direction desired. The graduate of any institution who has comprehensive ideals respects the views of others. He realizes more fully the meaning of universal brotherhood. He is better able to put himself in the place of other men or other nations and thus has an attitude of mind favorable to arbitration.

Perhaps the dominant feature in higher education to-day is what is known as the scientific spirit. This spirit which permeates all learning to-day, assumes that there is such a thing as truth; that it is the duty of every human being to do his best to search out the truth; that he approach every problem with an open mind; that he be not satisfied short of the whole truth and nothing but the truth; and that knowing the truth he adjust his life to it. "The scientific habit of mind," says Peabody, "is not alone the power to see straight and reason right. It has quite as much power to wait, to sacrifice, to free one's self from passion, prejudice, and fear. A greater gain to the world perhaps than all the growth of scientific knowledge is the growth of the scientific spirit with its courage and serenity, its discipline of conscience, its intellectual morality and its habitual response to any disclosure of the truth." The student who goes out of college imbued with this scientific spirit does not draw his lines between places and nations, but between truth and error. This tells for the cause of international peace.

There are numerous subjects taught in the college which prepare the way to an interest in the promotion of the purposes of this Peace Conference by the students and the general public. In a large way every subject taught in college contributes to this end by creating the scientific spirit and

by developing a more profound respect for the exact truth and a knowledge of the absolute futility in the end of everything not based upon the truth. There are several subjects however, which especially lead to a better knowledge of that form of truth which demands that every man and every nation shall cultivate sentiments and habits of justice. President Rhees pointed out last year the importance of the study of law for this purpose. We have had in the past few years, courses in law presented by Franklin Spencer Edmonds, of Philadelphia. These courses have been very helpful. In general the students taking these courses do not expect to be lawyers. They take this work for business or for culture reasons. Concrete examples of the method of justice are found in the history of the law and the realization that the common law has grown up as a series of rules through a thousand years of experience of the people expressing their ideals of justice, are more convincing to a student than any formal teachings of ethics, however excellent.

Lectures on international law were given at Swarthmore last year by Justice William P. Potter, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. He presented the subject both from the standpoint of war and from the standpoint of peace, in such a manner that the students drew their own conclusions that peace is much more rational and much more to be desired than war. And so, in an indirect way, a new argument for international arbitration was given them.

Courses in history and political science may be made effective aids in placing in the possession of students, material for the promotion of peace. For example, this year at Swarthmore one of the faculty gave a course in American History from the year of discovery to the end of the Revolution. Although the period included two great wars, military history was but briefly studied. To the soldier, the movements of troops, the details of battle, the causes of defeat or success in particular battles, are all military questions of great significance, but the civilian should know rather what were the character, the spirit, and the resources of the two combatants and why one succeeded and one failed. Courses in college history should train the student's judgment to lead him to see both sides of a question and to think. Causes and effects are much more important than events. Students have learned from such courses the steps in the rise of American nationality and the growth of the nation out of scattered and inharmonious colonies as well as the extension of popular government over the area of the then United States of America. This end is vastly more to be desired and much better for the student, not only in the interest of peace but in every way.

It suggests to his mind that the study of battle, and of military heroes is not the chief purpose of history. The colleges and universities are doing much in the interest of peace by the new and better methods of teaching history.

Constitutional history is a good example of a college study which furnishes excellent material for incidentally teaching the practicability of the ideals held by peace advocates. The three departments of our government furnish examples of evolution from a non-centralized to a centralized power. The large powers of the President of the United States to-day are in marked contrast to the powers of the committee system in colonial days. The duties of the Continental Congress were only advisory, while Congress to-day has definite control of certain national affairs. In like manner the present power of the Supreme Court is the result of gradual development. It is but a logical step therefore, in the evolution in education, that will bring the world to a centralized power in certain definite things, as our civilization progresses and gives us an international Supreme Court with power to settle all international differences.

“The most pressing need of the Peace Movement to-day,” says Dr. Hull, “is an *inductive argument* which shall convince those of our people who are not seers and prophets, and a *positive program* which shall replace in the popular mind Bismarck’s barrack philosophy and Roosevelt’s war-ship philosophy of peace. This inductive argument and positive program can be most readily and surely derived from the history of the two Conferences at The Hague. I therefore believe it to be the privilege and the duty of our colleges and universities to dig out of the thousands of pages of the official French records of those Conferences these two essential factors in the promotion of peace, and to start them on their mission of molding public opinion to the acceptance of arbitration and the sanction of arbitral awards.”

Through the study of political science aggressive warfare is seen to be an unnecessary evil and numerous ways are discovered by which the evils of war are lessened.

There are innumerable methods by which war may be averted. The concrete illustrations of what has been done by arbitration in this direction at once appeal to the intelligence of the average student. There is no other subject in college that should have more influence as an aid in attaining the ends mentioned than the study of biblical literature. We have a course in the study of the Bible which is required of all students at Swarthmore. Both the truths of Christianity and the knowledge of the evolution of moral ideals from the earlier to modern civilization set forth in the scriptures, interpreted in the free air of the college, under the guidance of

an inspiring teacher and biblical scholar, should also prepare the way for permanent peace. The study of ethics may also be made of great value in this direction.

Student activities of the college and university under proper direction, are the means for promoting ideals of justice. There is no better way for the young person to secure a knowledge of human nature than in the practice of athletics. Every game should be a lesson in fair play. I wish also to especially commend the plan of student government, which we have at Swarthmore, as excellent preparation for citizenship and in the interest of the ideals of this Conference.

This line of thought has suggested to me the desirability of meetings of students where some such general statement might be made as I have made here, followed by ten minute speeches from about a half-dozen departments of the college. For example a talk from the professor of history, illustrated by some historical events, pointing out the bearing of the study of history on the promotion of international peace. In a similar manner talks from the professor of biblical literature, the professor of political economy and the lecturer on law. Such a meeting would give the students a general notion of how the studies of the college have a bearing on the subject of our discussion here and would furnish material for them to use for the same purposes.

In all this it needs to be said that while the college may aid in a thousand ways in the movement for international peace, these results should be attained as an incidental thing in the great work of the teachings of truth and in the development of the character of the students. There is nothing to be gained and much to be lost by making the college an agent for the propaganda of any one good thing at the expense of all good things. We must train young men and women for a life of service. Given a faculty that possesses high ideals and supplied with such material as has been suggested, the average student will go out into the world ready to aid in public life, in public meetings, through the press, and in a thousand ways, the great cause of international peace. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will next be addressed by Dr. WILLIAM PERRY ROGERS, Dean of the Law School of the University of Cincinnati.

HOW UNIVERSITY STUDENTS MAY BE INTERESTED IN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

ADDRESS OF DR. WILLIAM PERRY ROGERS

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The thoughtful man of the present age who studies and analyses the customs and insti-

tutions of nations is not so much astonished with the new theories and radical ideas so frequently advanced by dreamers and fanatics as with those customs which have been established and practiced for centuries.

So accustomed has the individual become to these that even though the evils be gigantic they are passed without a thought, till some one points to their outrages on society, and thus temporarily attracts to them the public's attention. If this can be held till an impression is made and until some educational seed can take root the days of the evil institution's legal existence are numbered. By a filtering process of education the limits of which are as indefinable as those of the wind, the great public mind is made up and the verdict of death to the institution most surely follows. Powerful influences, vast wealth, great names all interested in the institution's existence may for awhile stay the overwhelming tide, but sooner or later these will all be brushed aside and *right* will come into the possession of her own.

It is only one of the many evidences of the fact that right is greater and more powerful than wrong; that what is true must finally prevail; that evil must be supported with artificial props and extrinsic aid, and that when these are withdrawn the crash is not far distant.

What student of history has read the story of human slavery, with its cruel whipping posts and its savage masters and overseers without amazement that Christian civilization should so long, not only have endured but cultivated this institution? Equally remarkable is the story of the degradation of womanhood in the institution of polygamy. That we should even in the twentieth century occasionally see its lingering specter, has its recompense in the knowledge that it is rapidly vanishing, and only dares to be known or seen within the shadows and secret places.

And so it has been with great numbers of evils which have been connected with and buttressed in religious institutions, such as witch-craft, the inquisition, persecutions and the like. The light of clearer vision, and the rule of reason, together with the advancement of the doctrine of the brotherhood of man, have made impossible the continued existence of these inhuman practices.

Personal liberty, personal rights and especially property rights stand for those principles for which men feel justified in making their fiercest contests; and hence not infrequently are the strongholds to which most vicious customs retreat for protection.

Because of the respect which public opinion had for the man who claimed the right personally to protect the good name of himself or his family the duel was for centuries unmolested. From the duel it is only a step to that other degrading contest

known as wager of battle. This method of settling disputes was recognized in Germany and established there with certain legal regulations about the year 500. From Germany it spread to every country of Europe and came to be the common method of determining the true ownership of lands. It was later utilized in testing the guilt or innocence of those charged with murder or other heinous crimes. It was first known in England after the Norman Conquest.

Wager of battle, as sanctioned by the laws of the various countries where it was practiced, to us seems abhorrent. That the law of any civilized nation should recognize the theory that one's guilt or innocence of a grave crime should be determined by a physical combat with some relative of the person wronged, seems to us impossible. But in history we cannot omit these pages. They stand before us, true records of the past, pointing out some of the greatest lessons in the evolution of man, and the development of human government. Other and better customs and laws had gradually developed, and without repealing, practically obliterated this ancient curiosity in legal procedure. Should two or more persons now agree to thus test the title to land or the guilt or innocence of one of them charged with crime, on the first attempt to execute this agreement the law would appear, personified in a peace officer, who would forcibly terminate hostilities and point to the methods of reason and common sense for the determination of such affairs.

Yet there is no objection presented to the forcible and bloody settlement between citizens in their private disputes, which does not apply equally to the adoption of such methods by nations in determining their differences with each other. If we condemn Smith for striking Jones on the head with a club, because he did not promptly pay him a doubtful debt, what shall we say of the display of armed cruisers of the big nation, threatening destruction at the port of the little nation for the same reason? If we impose upon A the death penalty because in his anger he suddenly took the life of B, why shall the nation which deliberately planned and coolly accomplished her neighbor's destruction, go unpunished? Or if one nation may, by reason of her superior force, take from another a choice stretch of territory, without the disapproval of the world, why shall we comment unfavorably upon the land frauds of the West, where unoccupied territory passes into the hands of those who are not entitled to it?

It is indeed difficult to see why the individual and the nation, in matters of principle, in matters of right and wrong, should not rest their conduct on the same general basis.

From the beginning of time the history of mankind has been told in the story of battles and wars. As the race grew strong in numbers the conflicts were proportionately more fierce. As the

nations became enriched more wealth was lavished upon armies and squandered upon navies. As they came to be more and more civilized and christianized their weapons of warfare were made to be more savage and more destructive of life and property. Their men of genius were called upon to devote their powers to the invention of instruments and weapons of death. The modern battleship and the modern war equipment make battles brief because so many men can so quickly be made to bite the dust. How grim the truthful boast!

Shall civilization which dared to grapple to the death these other evils shrink from her duty here and now? Shall war at last prove conqueror and the god of battle ever rule the hearts of men? However fierce and overwhelming war may be, can we not find a greater power wherewith to conquer? Every established evil which has been suppressed has been compelled to yield to a more powerful influence. That war is unnecessary is becoming a universal sentiment. That it may be obviated by arbitration has been repeatedly illustrated.

How then can the universities and colleges best contribute to this great movement of international arbitration? The subject is not found in the college curriculum. The members of the faculty are interested in it only in a general way, as other citizens are interested. Their time is occupied in teaching those subjects for which they have been engaged. It may be as in many history courses, that wars and battles and generals will be discussed and commented upon, but the subject of arbitration will rarely receive even a passing notice. And the student on his own initiative will probably not find occasion to be absorbed in the subject. If for any reason he incidentally begins its investigation he may find it worth while to give some time to it, but this is not probable. What then can be done in this important, fertile field?

First of all, those who are already enthusiastically in favor of international arbitration must contribute a spark of their enthusiasm to the field. They must adopt some plan to challenge the attention of college men and direct it to the monstrous evils of war, and to the other fact, that for it arbitration may be and is being successfully substituted.

Fortunately there are men of wealth like Mr. Carnegie who are willing to lend their aid financially and otherwise in forwarding this movement. Give such men to know and see that our colleges and universities present the greatest possible opportunities for crystalizing sentiment on this subject and also for spreading it broadcast with wisdom and intelligence. Let us persuade them to give to various colleges and universities a fund large enough if possible to produce an income which may be offered as a prize for the best essays, orations or debates presented by students on the subject. In this manner young men who are the leaders in

their institutions and among their fellows will be induced to look into the question, to study it and to talk and write upon it. Both experience and observation prove that when one is interested to this extent, he finds himself unconsciously an advocate of peace and of international arbitration. He will later become an enthusiast, and will aid in the advancement of the cause. That in this way students may be induced to earnestly investigate and advocate the great peace movement has been clearly established by what has already been accomplished by the Intercollegiate Peace Association which recently held its third annual convention at DePauw University. This Association is at present composed of some of the leading colleges and universities of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Pennsylvania. It recently issued the following statement: "The International Arbitration and Peace Movement is unparalleled in the history of civilization. Its object is the practical elimination of international war, as rapidly and as far as possible, by the promotion of arbitration and the science of law as a substitute for war in the international realm. The Intercollegiate Peace Association has been organized, and is being developed, for the promotion of organized activity throughout the colleges and universities of the United States in behalf of this movement. The students of Europe are organized for this purpose in sixty-three leading universities and invite the American students to cooperate, in measures for the affiliation, on an international basis of the American and European students' peace societies."

At its annual meeting the most important event is the oratorical contest between students representing various states. These orations all have for their subject some phase of the peace and arbitration movement. All who hear them are deeply impressed with the earnest research these young men have made. They are also impressed with the inestimable value to the cause represented by this brilliant array of young men who are thus bound to it and who will perhaps for life continue to advocate it. But not only have these young men who represent their institutions at this annual oratorical contest studied and written and spoken upon the question. They have secured the privilege of here representing their states by winning in other preliminary contests. First perhaps in their own university, then in a state contest between the representatives of the various colleges of the state, and finally in the interstate contest. Hundreds of young men are thus working seriously for the best and latest thought upon the subject. They are to the best of their ability adding to and remolding this thought in their orations, and then in their best possible way presenting it to college audiences, many of whom for the first time learn of the great world movement and the marvelous advance it has made.

It is not difficult to see that in this way there are innumerable torches of intelligence lighted, which quickly form themselves into an endless chain, destined soon to encircle the globe.

Let us hope and work for such an enlargement of the Inter-collegiate Peace Association that it may in the near future include in its membership every college and university of our land. Already it has taken firm foothold in Europe and the day seems not far distant when the educational institutions of the world will be thus linked together against international wars, and in favor of international peace.

Is it possible to make elsewhere a better investment for the cause of peace?

The intelligent statesmen who advocate increased armaments, and who are willing to expend hundreds of millions of dollars in armies and navies, insist that it is only for the purpose of maintaining peace. He is a rash man who will now contend for a battleship or an appropriation for the purpose of making war on another nation. Such a proposition would find no support in times of peace. And yet for the purpose of maintaining peace the civilized world is spending more money now in war equipment than ever before in the world's history in time of peace. Why will our statesmen not learn that our strength lies more in educated conscience, in the world's great moral and intellectual forces than in physical forces represented in battleships, and in armies and navies. If our Congress would within the next year expend the cost of one battleship in teaching our people the value of peace and arbitration, it would thereby more nearly establish permanent peace than by the erection of four or even twenty battleships. If the civilized governments of the world would expend a portion of their military and naval funds thus till the minds of the youth are filled with a love of peace instead of being inflamed with a passion for war, the world's security against this monstrous evil would soon be established. Can our statesmen not see the hand upon the wall beginning to write "The End of Carnage and War?" Do they not know that a Conference of forty-four nations for the purpose, in some way of finally establishing peace, and an adjournment to again meet to further advance this end, must result in such friendly relations and acquaintanceship that war equipments have already become of less importance and the cultivation of international friendships of much more value?

Let us hope that the educational influences, humbly begun in our colleges and universities, may spread over our land until it shall influence our rulers for peace and arbitration.

Let each citizen who believes in this movement freely express his sentiments on all proper occasions.

Let the governments take five per cent—yes, one per cent—of what is now spent in naval and military affairs and with this aid in the promulgation of the doctrine of arbitration and peace, till this sentiment everywhere predominates, and the necessity for forts, arsenals and battleships will fade away.

Education along this line will establish a system of international ethics not unlike that which prevails between individuals. It will finally produce a conscience among nations which will make unpopular, if not impossible, a great international war.

Let us each, again, here and now, resolve to cast our influence for peace and arbitration of disputes, and to frown upon and, if possible, prevent the recurrence of war.

When all the men and the women of the civilized nations who believe in these principles thus resolve, there will, indeed, be no more wars. Then there shall be "peace on earth; good will among men." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: From the fact that he comes from the South, a section which we wish might be more largely represented in these conferences, we give a hearty welcome to the next speaker, Dr. HENRY C. WHITE, President of the State College of Georgia, and a member of the faculty of the University of Georgia.

HOW CAN THE AVERAGE AMERICAN COLLEGE BEST PROMOTE THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MOVEMENT?

ADDRESS OF DR. HENRY C. WHITE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The assignment of this topic as one worthy to engage the attention of this Conference merely emphasizes what, of course, must have been recognized from the outset, that the purposes of the Conference can only be accomplished through the growth of a favoring public sentiment. Certainly true in America, it is also largely true for all civilized countries, that public opinion, manifested in varying ways, controls the domestic policies of the nations. It needs only enlightenment and a clear understanding of the intimate connection of domestic welfare with foreign relations to cause public opinion to dominate foreign policies as well. Public opinion is moulded, at last, by the intelligence of the community. And the nursery of intelligence is the college.

The American college has many useful functions other than those exercised within the college walls, and in many ways it may influence sentiment in the body politic, but its best contributions to human progress come through the young Americans whom it trains. It is this aspect of the question to which I shall confine myself.

The question before us, therefore, is—in what manner may the agencies for intellectual and moral training employed by the college be legitimately and most effectively utilized to increase intelligence in the matter of international relationships.

The conduct-relations of individuals and groups of individuals involve, of course, both moral and intellectual considerations. It is undoubtedly true that, in the evolution of human society, moral considerations have frequently quickened intellectual endeavor. But, surely no American college of to-day performs its fundamental duty or discharges its fundamental business that does not insist upon recognition by its students of such elementary principles of morality as that an individual may not murder, may not steal, may not lie, may not wantonly inflict injury or distress upon another, and that what an individual may not do an aggregation of individuals may not do whether it be denominated a Black Hand Society or a Nation. The recognition of the obligations of morality in international relations follows, as of course, the recognition of the obligations of individual morality. So far, therefore, as the creation of a sentiment for moral conduct in international relations is concerned, I fancy nothing is needed to be added to the normal endeavors of the college in the inculcation of morality. In other words, I do not see that our purpose may be greatly advanced by special effort to present or emphasize the horrors, the miseries, the inhumanities and the crimes attendant upon war. Knowledge here and a proper attitude may be assumed as a necessary corollary of the regular day's business. Moreover, it is a rational sentiment we wish to develop, not an emotional sentimentality.

Assuming acquiescence in fundamental morals, the adjustment of conflicting international interests, as of conflicting individual interests, is clearly a purely intellectual proposition. The question is how this may be presented to the college community. I should answer—just as any other great intellectual proposition. No American college worthy of the name can, of course, be didactic in advocacy of one or the other side of any intellectual proposition. Absolute freedom of inquiry and absolute freedom of opinion in matters intellectual are of the essentials. Even if it were not so, sentiment otherwise created would be of little worth. The college may only provide, or, perhaps, insist, that inquiry shall be full and opinion genuine. Assuming proper training of the reasoning powers which arrive at right judgments, intellectual opinions are formed by, first of all, an examination of the facts. So far as college agencies are concerned, the student obtains his facts from his instructors from his textbooks and from the college library. Considering the immensity and the importance of this great intellectual proposition of international relations which is before the civilized world to-day no

college can well afford to fail to provide for its students all available literature and other means which may present the facts in the case. This involves no large expenditure of effort or of means. For the essential facts for present consideration are comparatively few and not difficult to obtain. Without going back over the entire history of human endeavor in social evolution leading up to the present status of the case, they are: That the great civilized nations of the world are now actually in amicable conference through regularly accredited representatives with a view to the establishment of some tribunal other than that of armed physical force for the satisfactory adjustment of conflicting international interests; that the desirability of arbitration, in some form as a substitute for war is conceded by all the nations; that its practicability only is at issue with no positive denial on any hand; that the form which the instrument of arbitration shall take, temporarily or ultimately, and the nature and extent of its powers, are details—vital, it is true, but details—which assuredly may be arranged if only the intelligent public sentiment of the nations—critical, if you please, but intelligent—stands back of their representatives, in full knowledge of their endeavors and ready to insist upon and acquiesce in the results. All the facts of the great Conferences should be available to the college student and all the literature in reference thereto should be furnished by the college library.

To arouse a sympathetic interest in an examination of the facts by the college student, in the multiplicity of matters exciting student interest, is a somewhat more difficult proposition. The method, I think, should depend somewhat upon the individual "atmosphere" of the college. Focussing attention by setting aside a special day or providing special occasions for presenting the subject to the students as a whole should, I think, be a suitable and effective plan in any institution, if the presentation is wisely done in a manner to lead to individual inquiry and examination—for it should be remembered always that the desired sentiment must be developed by *education*, not by didactic teaching. As a subject for prize essays, the matter will at least be kept standing in the student sight and a few good men will be led to careful and sympathetic inquiry, but general sentiment is not largely affected thereby unless, perhaps, the essays are published in college journals or used for college addresses. I am rather doubtful of the efficacy of college debate in clarifying a proposition requiring calm, unexcited deliberation for arriving at right judgment. My observation of student debates is that they are not unlike intercollegiate athletics in which the chief interest lies in the gaining of the victory rather than in the merits of the sport, and the most vociferous "rooters" are frequently those who know least and care least about the game except, possibly,

as an instrument of contention. And it is the "rooters" we are specially after.

I am inclined to think that perhaps the most effective and hopeful way to develop student interest is through the development, first, of Faculty interest, if this be possible. We sometimes forget that the student body is a variable function in the college organization while the Faculty is relatively a fixed quantity. I do not know that it is largely deserved, but the reproach is frequently directed against the necessary specialization of the modern college professor that it removes him to some extent from sympathy with ordinary human interests. It is probably true, especially in the larger institutions, that specialization puts many excellent men out of touch with communal college interests. And yet the fact remains that the teaching staff is the most powerful influence in college thought. I suspect that there are very many among the thousands of American college professors who, if approached on the subject, would make substantially the reply of the ordinary "man in the street": "Oh, yes; international arbitration is doubtless a very good thing—probably Utopian; I haven't had time to think much about it; war is, of course, what Sherman said it was; but—we have always had wars and probably always shall,"—and so he goes about his business and lets it go at that. If some enthusiasts in the Faculties would undertake missionary work among their colleagues I am inclined to think a powerful influence in American colleges would be developed favorable to intelligent consideration of the great question of the World's Peace. The ways in which it might legitimately be exercised are numerous and need not be detailed. May I venture, however, to suggest one simple way which might be found effective? In certain departments of the college—as History, Civics, Sociology or Law—the matter of international relations will be presented in the course of regular instruction and have critical and intelligent examination, but, as a rule, a comparatively small proportion only of the students is thus reached. In other departments it would seem that the subject could only be, as it were, lugged in by the heels. I do not know that this is necessarily so. A college may, not inaptly, be defined as an institution for inculcating the universality, the necessity and the reasonableness of law. Law Natural—the generalization from observed natural phenomena of the arrangement which preserves conflicting natural forces from disaster and permits orderly evolution of the physical Universe. Law Human—the generalization from the observed facts of human experience of the arrangement by which conflicting human interests are preserved from mutual destruction and the orderly evolution of human society ensuured. As the explanation of the nature of Law is a necessary part of the instruction in any department of the college,

opportunity is afforded to suggest, in any department, by way of illustration, the naturalness as well as the reasonableness of acknowledged Law rather than passionate force as governing the intercourse of nations, and to make mention, at least, of efforts now making to that end.

The summation of my argument is that to create a sentiment in the American college favoring international arbitration as a substitute for war, the college student should be provided with all the facts and suitable literature connected with efforts to that end and be urged to sympathetic examination of the interesting and inspiring intellectual propositions involved.

But perhaps I am mistaken; perhaps I go too far, in assuming that the average American college community concedes that arbitration, if practicable, is preferable to war in the settlement of international disputes. If so, then our only hope is in a complete moral regeneration, and, as contributory thereto, I venture to offer briefly one or two suggestions. Young, red blood is hot; passion is closely attendant upon virility; the fighting instinct inherited from our far-back ancestors is strong in youth. Indeed, if, by international agreement, enlistment in the armies of the world were limited to men over 40 years of age, we probably should have very few serious wars. The subjection of all these animal propensities to spiritual control is the object of the general moral training of the college, remembering that college sentiment is not largely formed by considerations which appeal only to the "goody-goody" or the "mollycoddle." So far as these animal tendencies affect individual relations, and, in accomplishing the severance, without destruction, of virility from passion, the ordinary discipline of the average American college is, no doubt, fairly successful. The most promising avenue of extension to international relations is perhaps through a better and more intimate knowledge of contemporaneous foreign peoples, which the college might endeavor, in various ways, to provide.

There is a very prevalent belief in the adolescent mind (not confined to the adolescent, however) that, after all, there are good results of war which, in some measure, may counterbalance the evil—as in the awakening of proper national aspirations, the solidifying of national sentiment, or the strengthening of national character. Even if this were true it would be but apology, not justification for war. War is dramatic and focusses public attention; so frequently is and does a murder; and many admitted crimes produce some results not altogether bad. It is not true, of course, that war is a *necessity* to any of these good ends or is ever largely a creditor in the balancing of good against evil. The truth would appear from an examination of the facts and there are certain departments of every college whose busi-

ness it is to present these facts. May I be pardoned a pertinent illustration in this connection? It is frequently proclaimed with much fervor that our poor, little, absurd Spanish war (for it was that, without disparagement of the heroism and valor displayed) was worth all it cost in the occasion it gave for restoration of fraternal feeling to the sections of our country previously unhappily estranged. Now, as a matter of fact, the fraternal feeling must, actually, previously have existed; it could not possibly have been created by the war. The war undoubtedly gave opportunity for its expression. But I am amused to remember (as I do distinctly) that identically the same thing was said and with as much enthusiasm (at least in my part of the country) on another, a previous dramatic occasion, when, by peaceful and orderly procedure there happened to be elected a Democratic President of these United States. We were then assured that, by reason of that fact, the war at last was over and the "bloody chasm" bridged. Of course the bridge was built when the present generation came upon the stage and were all looking furtively about for any appropriate occasion which would give us an excuse to call attention to it. As a choice of occasions even partisan differences must admit that the benefits to the country of Mr. Cleveland's comparatively uneventful administration far outweighed any possible benefit we have derived from the Spanish war, and the evils (if there were evils, which *I* do not admit) were insignificant in comparison. Confidentially, I venture the further opinion that all the militant forces recruited in the South during the Spanish war had no more (if as much) to do with the restoration of fraternal feeling than the quite respectable and influential army of Southern office-holders appointed under Mr. Cleveland's administrations.

The confusion of nationalism with patriotism, while not peculiar to youthful minds is a frequent accompaniment of youthful ignorance. Here in America we are, fortunately, at great advantage in the opportunity for promotion of Peace through patriotism. The hero who appeals to the normal collegiate imagination is not the physical weakling who does right because he fears the physical consequence of doing wrong, but the big, strong fellow; gentle because unafraid; conscious of his physical ability to take care of himself under any circumstances and chivalrous, good-natured and forbearing through knowledge of his strength. How amply fills the measure of such hero this great Republic! By blood and by tradition chivalrous, good-natured, generous and just. In power potential, the marvel of the world. In absolute confidence, in easily marshalled ultimate strength, able and content even to take the chances of "unpreparedness" for war, if necessary, to secure unquestioning recognition of a genuine desire for peace. And with it all, abounding opportunity to daz-

zle the nations with exhibition of virile strength—in gigantic industrial enterprise at home; in adventurous but peaceful exploitation of a great continent lying to the South and a frozen Empire subduing in the North. American youth need no foreign wars as spur to patriotism and national pride. And, above all, surely a stirring appeal is made to the national ambition and the national pride of the average young American collegian in the prospect now afforded of glorious fulfillment of the prophecy of the greatest of American seers in that the American scholar, the American Man-thinking, is at last quickening the “sluggard intellect of this continent to look from under its iron lids and fill the postponed expectation of the world with something better than” all the nations have ever yet conceived—a reasonable, practicable plan for present partial accomplishment and ultimate realization of the ages-old dream of poet, philosopher and sage, “The Parliament of Man; the Federation of the World.” (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have with us the Secretary of the Intercollegiate Peace Association, to the work of which Dr. Seelye referred in his report. We shall have pleasure in hearing from Mr. GEORGE FULK, of Cerro Gordo, Ill.

ENLISTING STUDENTS IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

REMARKS OF MR. GEORGE FULK

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: A large part of what I had wished to say is already a twice-told tale, but I am quite sure there are a few things which have not been even a once-told tale in this Conference. There is a little world which has not yet been heard from; that is, the student world. You will doubtless wish to know whether the students themselves are interested in the peace movement. I can best answer this by quoting the words of a student who was recently promoting a peace society in Indiana University. He said: “I never was interested in this peace movement before—not until I heard about it.” I hastened to assure him that he was perfectly human. Now you may take the key-note from this if you wish. The students are not interested in the peace movement, and never will be, until they hear about it. Now if you will permit me to give you briefly concrete evidence, I shall do nothing more.

The first peace society among students organized in the United States and successfully promoted, to my knowledge, was that on a student’s initiative in De Pauw University, a year ago last March. The first mass meeting of students held last year in the interest of the approaching Hague Conference was promoted by a students’ club, namely, the Common-

wealth Club, of the University of Chicago. Besides this one mass meeting twenty-two others were held in the universities of the Middle-West last year. The students participated in them enthusiastically, and their resolutions were combined in the form of a memorial and sent to The Hague Conference. It was my privilege to carry them and to present them personally to President Nelidoff. It was then that I observed for the first time that there was an element of sympathy for student interest and activity in this work which I have not seen or felt, and which I believe does not exist for any other organization working in this movement. There was something in the words and manner of President Nelidoff which convinced me that it was more than mere diplomatic courtesy which prompted him to say that he thought the most important work which could be done in this movement was that among students. This attitude of the President was only typical of all of the other delegates with whom I came in contact. Outside The Hague Conference, the press took up the memorial and reported it in a complimentary way. The second day after the opening of the Conference a large mass meeting of students, inspired by the Conference, was held at the University of Leiden. I was favored with an invitation and privileged to address the meeting. If it had been an American audience I should say it was an enthusiastic one; but knowing as I did the phlegmatic characteristics of the Dutch, I was constrained to feel that it was exceptionally enthusiastic. A month later a students' mass meeting was held at The Hague, promoted by students, presided over by a student, addressed by nobody but students, and having in attendance student representatives from practically every university in Holland. Before the close of The Hague Conference our little circle of Dutch students—I say *our* because we all lost the narrow sense of nationality in the larger consciousness of internationality—numbered fifty-six. On leaving Holland the students favored me with an introduction to students' societies in sixty-two other universities of Europe in the form of a circular letter of introduction to all the so-called consulates of "Corda Fratres" International Federation of Students. This organization of European students is part of the concrete evidence which I wish to furnish regarding the interest of students in the peace movement. Its history is as follows: In 1897 a student in Turin, Italy, sent out a circular appeal to the students of Europe to meet in a convention the following year to organize an international federation of students to work for the cause of peace. In response to this appeal a convention was held in Turin in November, 1898. An organization, known as "Corda Fratres" International Federation of

Students, was there formed, and, a few days later, proclaimed in Rome, in the *Forum Romanum*. The fundamental articles contained the following statements: "Each member, upon his entrance into the Federation, pledges himself upon his honor to employ unceasingly such means as his social position, his intelligence and his activity afford to promote the spirit of international union among the youth, and to second all the manifestations which he may believe useful in order to dissipate from any class of persons whatsoever the prejudices and hatred which render states reciprocally hostile and always on a war footing. * * *

The International Federation of Students also proposes to second by all the means in its power the work of peace and arbitration between nations. It is also the object of the Federation to put in correspondence the students themselves, and in particular those who devote themselves to the same branch of learning in order to facilitate means of information and scientific research, of which they may eventually have need, both before and after the doctorate; to insure reciprocally hosts and friends in the large cities, distantly located, upon the occasion of travels, individually and collectively, in foreign lands,—travels which will thus be more easily undertaken and accomplished."

At first the Federation was divided into national sections, but in 1905 it was reorganized in such a way that national lines were discarded and local associations, self-governing, made the units of the organization. There are now sixty-three of these, located in the principal university centers of Europe,—in practically all the countries except Germany, in which there are, however, local students' peace societies and the uniting of these with "Corda Fratres" is doubtless only a matter of time. The Federation has a membership now of fifteen thousand students. The Central Bureau is at Budapest. Six international congresses of the Federation have been held; at Turin in 1898; at Paris in 1900; at Venice in 1902; at Liege in 1905; at Marseilles in 1906; at Bordeaux in 1907. The next international congress will be held at The Hague one year from this summer. Invitations to attend this will be issued to the students of every university in the world. The Federation has issued, through the Inter-collegiate Peace Association, a special invitation to the American students to unite in the movement, either by the affiliation of existing students' societies or by the organization of new ones. This appeal has met with response from the students of Indiana University and the University of Wooster. In the former a peace society is in process of organization; in the latter a society has been perfected, beginning with seventy members—the first members of "Corda Fratres" in America. Initial steps have been taken in several other universities for the organization of similar societies at the beginning of the next college year.

President Seelye has incorporated in his report a statement of the work of the Inter-collegiate Peace Association for this year. I shall not repeat it, except to say that we now have organized activity in forty-five colleges and universities. Evidences of great possibilities in this work are coming to our Association constantly. The movement has certainly not sprung up and grown to the present extent to die a premature death. But in order to develop successfully it needs outside help. The American students say they have no money to properly sustain and promote the movement. If the American students have no money the European students surely have less. This does not mean that nothing was contributed to our cause. Last year the contributions were about two thousand dollars. This went to further the work in the individual institutions, to pay for printing, prizes, convention expenses, etc. Mr. Carnegie has been generously giving the second half of all financial contributions to our work. The problem which we beg to submit to the friends of peace is the securing of the first half of the necessary support of the students' peace movement. As a final word we shall say: "You give us money and we'll give you peace." (Applause.)

Mrs. EDWIN D. MEAD supplemented Mr. Fulk's remarks by stating that to her knowledge Mr. Fulk had given up a legal position to devote his services to the work of the Inter-collegiate Peace Association; that last year he had served without salary and paid his own expenses and that this year he was practically working for nothing and without clerical assistance. She closed with the suggestion that the friends of peace should raise at least ten thousand dollars which, when doubled by Mr. Carnegie, would place the Inter-collegiate Peace Association on a working basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have with us Dr. ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN, the United States Commissioner of Education, and we would all like to hear a few words from him on this subject.

UNIVERSAL EDUCATION ESSENTIAL TO PEACE

REMARKS OF HON. ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I did not know that I was to be called on, but since you have given me eight minutes, I will take a fraction of one. Two things I should like to say. In the first place, we hear the arbitration movement advocated as an economical movement; it will save the waste of war. That is all right, but let us never for a moment think of the arbitration movement as a cheap movement, for it will cost amazingly. The only thing that can be substituted for war is justice and universal confidence in justice. And that sentiment can be made universal

only by the largest expenditure of time and patience and thought and money in the educational systems of the world. If we are to have a lasting devotion to arbitration we must have much larger sums expended than are now expended upon systems of public education. Secondly, we need a program for a national government in the matter of expenditures. In these days a national government cannot keep its self-respect if, over a term of years, an increasing proportion of its expenditures goes to war. A national government cannot keep its self-respect unless an increasing proportion of its expenditures goes to education. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: JUDGE STINESS, Chairman of the Business Committee, is recognized.

Hon. JOHN H. STINESS: Dr. Seelye, in the report of his Committee, referred to the offer of a prize of \$50 by Mr. Chester DeWitt Pugsley, to be awarded by this Conference for the best essay on International Arbitration written during the coming academic year by a student of an American college or university, the judges to be the last three presiding officers of this Conference, or such persons as they may select. I am informed that Mr. Pugsley is himself a student and that this offer is made out of his own allowance. I move, therefore, that the offer be accepted, and that the grateful appreciation of the Conference be extended to the donor.

The motion of Judge Stiness was immediately seconded, and unanimously adopted amid applause.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have completed our discussion of the work among colleges and universities. We will now take up the adoption of the Conference Platform, which will be presented by JUDGE STINESS, Chairman of the Business Committee.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ARBITRATION

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN H. STINESS

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before presenting the platform which has been prepared by the Business Committee to be submitted to you for approval, I cannot repress a few words of reminiscence. It was only thirteen years ago that this Conference was organized for the purpose of propagating what at that time was considered almost a new idea, and one that had been held before that and even at that time only by dreamers. We have come at last to see a most marvellous change in the condition of the world and in the way in which this subject

is now treated. We were at that time striving to secure international arbitration only; and that by way of separate treaties, as the first, and probably the only, step that we would live long enough to see. We were trying to educate the people to the idea that war was not necessary; that international disputes should stand upon the same ground as disputes between individuals. It seemed such an impracticable idea that people looked upon us as a company of rather mild, but enthusiastic people; as dreamers, chasers of a rainbow. But after two or three years, all at once there came a sound from the East; and the Czar of Russia had summoned into actual existence that which had been known before only in poetry, the "Parliament of Man." It was a great step and yet the result of that Conference was not fully to accomplish all that was desired; but it was enough to change the foundations upon which we were standing.

Now we find that the "Parliament of Man" is no longer a dream; it has become an actuality. Twice we have seen the nations of the world gathered together for the purpose of considering the very subject which before the organization of this Conference would have been considered impossible. Not only that, but all the world has practically come to an agreement that the rule of action for nations as well as men is no longer the rule of might, but the rule of right. We have come to understand that the Supreme Ruler of the universe is the Prince of Peace, and not a god of battles. Noting this great advance and finding ourselves at this time presented with the report of the recent gathering of the nations we have great cause to say not what have we done, but what hath God wrought? So great a change, so speedy, so wonderful an achievement, could not have been brought about solely by human agency. It seems to be one of the times when a great movement is sweeping all over the world. We cannot tell how it has gotten its inspiration. We cannot tell how it has so prevailed but we realize the fact. And that fact is presented to us in the concrete form by the results of the recent parliament of the nations. It has been like other legislative bodies, not doing all that we had hoped. But great reforms move slowly; and in view of the last few years I think we can only wonder that so much has been accomplished and thank God for all that has been done. (Applause.)

The platform which I now present to you is a summary of what has been accomplished, of what this Conference now stands for, and of what it hopes still to accomplish. It is as follows:

(For a copy of the Platform see page 7)

THE CHAIRMAN: The adoption of the Platform will be moved by Mr. Justice DAVID J. BREWER, of the United States Supreme Court.

AMERICA'S DUTY IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

REMARKS OF HON. DAVID J. BREWER

Mr. President, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen; I move the adoption of this report as the Platform of this Conference. It is a recognition of what has been accomplished, and what are now existing facts. Some of us, at the Committee meeting, thought that a declaration in reference to the limitation of armaments would be appropriate. But we finally yielded in order that, in what it said, it might be a unanimous expression of the views of the Conference.

This is primarily not a peace but an arbitration Conference, and it is arbitration which we are seeking by this and successive conferences to bring about. At the same time, as Mr. Smiley has well said, there is a freedom of expression of views. Every one is at liberty to say what he thinks on these questions, and I am going to take advantage of that freedom to say that I believe in the limitation of armaments, and that it is both the privilege and the duty of this nation to lead in that direction.

I was much pleased to hear my friend, Judge Stiness, say that there seemed to be some overruling power moving along the lines of human action, and to-day bringing the disposition of the nations towards the successful accomplishment of the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. I believe in that. History is not a mere haphazard succession of unrelated and disconnected facts; but "through the ages one increasing purpose runs." There was in the keeping of this continent unknown to civilized nations for long ages, and bringing it to their knowledge only within the last four centuries, a purpose or purposes. Many have been suggested. One is that as at that time printing was invented this nation was to be the seat of the widest, most universal education and intelligence. It has become so. Again, the Bible was unchained and man was put in the settlement of all the great questions of life and eternity, face to face with his Maker; and it has been said that this nation was intended to be the one in which religion should be the most free and universal, most personal. And it has been. We have no state church; every man looks up into the blue heavens above him, in the faith that somewhere there is an infinite being, his Father, and his Friend, with whom directly he deals.

And it seems to me there was also a purpose that this republic should lead in the great cause of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. This is a composite nation. You go to Germany and the Germans control. There are a few others dwelling there, but it is a German nation. You go to Japan, and while it welcomes foreigners to dwell in its borders, yet it is a Japanese nation. But this republic was settled, not by one

race alone, but by Englishmen and Germans and Frenchmen and Swedes. Indeed, every nation on the face of the globe has sent some of its bravest and strongest and brainiest to help fashion this republic, and out of these composite races is being formed this nation which of all on the face of the globe most fully represents the brotherhood of man. And where there is that brotherhood there will be no fighting. It seems to me that one of the lessons we may draw from history is that the Almighty has in the counsels of eternity a purpose that this republic shall stand in the front of all the great nations on the earth, as leader in the cause of universal peace. And in order to establish and maintain that leadership she must lead in the limitation of armaments. It is either one of two things. Some nation must lead or else all will go on increasing the burden of naval and military expenses until the common people repudiate all government debts and there is one great revolution. So I think it is the privilege and the duty of this nation to lead in disarmament. (Applause.)

There is another thought. When the angels appeared in the heavens above the shepherds at Bethlehem, announcing the birth of the Prince of Peace, their song was, "Peace on earth, good will to men." While the record does not say that Mary, watching her babe in the manger, heard that angelic song, I am sure that she did, for there is no ear so acute to catch the faintest notes of a prophetic song in respect to her boy as the ear of his mother. Many foreshadowings gathered around His early days; and we are told that Mary "kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." When He came to the end of life His farewell words were, "Peace I leave with you."

Now there is no nation on the face of the globe in which woman is so pronounced and conspicuous a force as this. I do not now champion or prophesy woman suffrage but I note the fact, which is obvious to all, that within the last half century there has been a wondrous change in her life. She has come out from the seclusion of the home and taken her place in the public activities of the nation. In conferences, in associations and in a hundred other ways she is directly and powerfully influencing public thought. No longer do we say that by her silent influence over her husband or father, son or brother she is bringing things to pass, for her outspoken and visible activities, molding public opinion, shaping public acts are greater here than anywhere else in the world. Now the one person who stands most loyal to the cause of peace is the mother. No mother ever draws her baby boy to her bosom without a faith, a hope, that that boy shall not be brought up to become the spoil of the merciless bullet. She believes in peace and she is coming to take her great position as an active force in this republic; and it will be outspoken and strong for the peaceful settlement of national

disputes by arbitration rather than by war. Is there not in this, at it were, the finger of Providence pointing to the fact that America is to be the leader in this great cause?

Personally, I thank you, Mr. Smiley, for the privilege of coming here the last few years. I have gone away from every one of these conferences with a new inspiration, feeling more and more the solemn duty resting upon me to do in my humble way whatever I can for the cause of international peace. And I venture the assertion that of all this great gathering here, every one goes away with the feeling that you have inspired him or her to greater faithfulness in this noble work. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Platform will be seconded by Mr. Justice JOSEPH B. MOORE, of the Supreme Court of Michigan.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL AGREEMENT IN WORK FOR PEACE

REMARKS OF HON. JOSEPH B. MOORE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I hesitate to take any of your time after the very eloquent address of Justice Brewer in speaking with reference to this platform. As stated by him there was a difference in the committee as to what it was best to say with reference to the question of arrest of armament; and it has been indicated very clearly upon the floor of this great convention that there is an honest difference of opinion on that important question. At Lake Mohonk there is neither court nor policeman; and neither is necessary for the reason that this cultured audience of men and women not only believe in but they practice the doctrines of the Golden Rule. But unfortunately the area and numbers where that ideal state has been attained is not a large one in the world at large. When we listen to the orators, the seers, prophets and poets our heads are in the clouds, but there are some of us who believe that we must not forget that at the present time our feet should also tread upon the earth. As men and women who are all agreed that they would be glad to see the day when the spears should be beaten into ploughshares and the swords into pruning hooks, we must still recognize conditions as they are and go somewhat slowly into declarations we make as being the expression of this great Conference. We are all agreed in the result which ought to be attained, but it was thought by some members of the committee that the expression which went out from Mohonk should express the convictions upon which we could *all* agree, and which would appeal not only to the orators and the prophets, the seers and the poets of the country, but to the men who take perhaps a more practical and material view of the present situa-

tion, so that the influence which might be exerted by our declarations should appeal to all classes who were charged with the various responsibilities that press upon them to see to it that government is not a failure, that justice is brought about, and that the rights of each are carefully guarded.

I second the motion to adopt the Platform. (Applause.)

At the conclusion of Justice Moore's speech, the Platform was thrown open for discussion. President WARFIELD of Lafayette College moved that the Platform be referred back to the Business Committee for insertion of a plank favoring limitation of armaments. He was supported in this motion by Rev. CHARLES F. DOLE. A motion made by Dr. ST. CLAIR MCKELWAY to table Dr. Warfield's motion was withdrawn on the opening of discussion. A strong sentiment, both for and against the proposed plank, was evident, and on the suggestion of Mr. SMILEY that to incorporate any expression which did not represent practical unanimity would greatly weaken the influence of the Platform, Dr. WARFIELD withdrew his motion. The Platform was then adopted by a practically unanimous vote, only one member voting against it. (For a copy of the Platform, see page 7.)

The Conference then adjourned until 8 P. M.

Sixth Session

Friday Evening, May 22, 1908

THE CHAIRMAN: The first part of this evening's session will be devoted to the subject of the press in connection with the international arbitration movement. We are fortunate in having with us as speakers gentlemen representing two of the oldest and most respectable journals in the country. I have pleasure in presenting as the first speaker Mr. ROLLO OGDEN, Editor-in-Chief of the *New York Evening Post*.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRESS TOWARD THE PEACE MOVEMENT

ADDRESS OF MR. ROLLO OGDEN

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smiley, Ladies and Gentlemen: In spite of the Chairman's complimentary allusion, for which I express my acknowledgments for myself and the newspaper for which I work, I still cannot but feel, in common with every other newspaper man present at this Conference, I presume, that I find myself in a position which is defensive, or at least apologetic. In the midst of all the instruction and stimulus to be derived from the proceedings and addresses of this Conference, there has been one note sounded which could not but fall rather reproachfully upon the ear of any one connected with the press. It has been audible in the remarks of missionaries and clergymen, lawyers and statesmen and university presidents; and there was even in the address of the Japanese Ambassador this morning, a delicate and veiled allusion to irresponsible critics, which I suppose looked at the press. The sentiment I refer to is, either tacitly implied or openly expressed, that modern journalism, the newspaper of today, is to be counted among the chief enemies of the peace of the world. Indeed the very order of your program here, the placing of us editors at the final meeting, seems to me to wear something of the air of a court proceeding, wherein after presenting indictment and piling up evidence, you call upon us to make the best defence possible. A very sensitive and conscience-stricken journalist might even feel that this was the solemn moment when the Conference bade us rise and answer the question, "What have you to say why sentence of death should not be pronounced upon you?"

Well, ladies and gentlemen, there is little for us to do, I think, but to cast ourselves upon the mercy of the court! We must confess, if we are honest, that the freedom of the press has not in all particulars worked out as its early champions hoped. It was expected to bind nations together. Too often, unfortunately, it has helped to set nations against each other. The press, when free and cheap and universal, was expected to represent reason and humanity in its treatment of international relations; but not seldom, I am sorry to say, it has made itself the instigator and the vehicle of international hatred. Now, I am here to say that when that work is done deliberately, no expression of abhorrence or loathing for it can be too severe. I know of no rôle less worthy of a man, and more fitting a fiend, than that of a newspaper which sets itself to provoke hostility and to precipitate war between nations that ought to live together in peace. Compared with that I consider poisoning wells innocent and honorable. And your true war-breathing editor is a combination of cowardice and greed; he takes precious good care that his own carcass be kept out of danger, but expects to coin money out of the blood of soldiers and sailors, and out of the misery of widows and orphans. So that if there come war, as a result of the excitement he inflames, his only part in it is like that of one of those infamous creatures who haunt great battlefields after fall of night, to rob the wounded and rifle the pockets of the dead, to fill his own.

Now, my friends, having spoken thus plainly of those misguided newspaper men and those unfortunate newspaper types which are a terror to civilization and a disgrace to their own profession, you will not accuse me of withholding the truth or speaking with undue partiality when I go on to say that, after all, a great deal of the inflammatory course of the newspaper in the discussion of foreign relations does not spring from pure malice. It arises partly from a perverted conception of what the function of a newspaper ought to be, and it arises also from false standards of what is interesting and what is important. And those false standards, I beg you to notice, are shared as much by the readers as by the conductors of a newspaper. Unfortunately, as our poor human nature goes, crime is regarded as more exciting than humdrum virtue; so war is more exciting than peace, international quarrels more exciting than adjustment through arbitration. As there exists this feeling in the conductors of newspapers, responding to the popular appetite which calls for excitement, you are to remember that much that seems wicked and cruel may be not after all the desire of the proprietor of the newspaper to induce war, but the desire to give his readers something which they will think to be sensational. When you consider this temptation, I think you will be inclined to be somewhat charitable to even those editors who instead of extending olive branches to the nations are given to throwing fire-brands!

My friends, I have been thinking to-day of a test that might be applied to this Peace Conference, respecting this very matter, out of which I am not quite sure how we should all come. Suppose that when we broke up to-night the door yonder should be thronged by newsboys carrying extra editions of newspapers with startling headlines, announcing as a tremendous sensation that the pending arbitration treaty with Japan had been ratified by the Senate. Now, how many of you would fail to say that such a ridiculous splurge over an unimportant event was simply foolish? On the other hand, suppose that when we went out the newsboys had a huge bundle of papers containing telegrams stating that there had been an armed collision in Honolulu between the Japanese and Americans, and a dispatch asserting that the Japanese fleet had sailed. How many papers do you think the boys would have left? How much talk of war would be heard all over the place—even in this home of peace! Why, I am afraid that the Conference itself would be almost dissolved by such a war scare.

Now, I am not speaking of this fostering of international prejudice and excitement to excuse it, but I am endeavoring to explain it, to show the nature of the temptation into which thoughtless editors, dependent upon their sales and upon their counting-room, so easily fall. I do say that whatever the motives or whatever the purpose, such continued excitements between nations are dangerous. And of this opinion I find very ample confirmation in the reading of the recent biography of John T. Delane, who for so many years was editor of the *London Times*, from 1841 to 1877. That is a very striking biography. It has a direct bearing upon the beginnings of a great newspaper; and its beginnings, like the origins of most of us, have shaped its future in a very marked way. You all know how the *London Times* of last year was pouring out cynicism and misrepresentation upon the Hague Conference. You all know the unfortunate position which it has taken in regard to the relations between Germany and England, and other very critical foreign affairs. I speak of this to show that a paper need not be in its method sensational to be harmful, because the *Times* has been a highly respectable paper, because it keeps the police news and the ordinary run of crime reduced to a minimum, and its pages are very clean and inoffensive. But it has been a very mischievous influence in all that relates to the peaceful settlement of international disputes. If I may say so, partly mixing my metaphors but not my colors, it has shown that it is not necessary that one should be yellow in order to be read!

The great rise of the *London Times* under Mr. Delane occurred at a time when England, under the leadership of Lord Palmerston in particular, was entering upon a course of continual meddling in the affairs of Europe. Time and again the country was

brought to the verge of war. Throughout it all, the Ministry was using the newspaper; the editor was in constant touch with the Foreign Secretary, gaining information from him and making adroit insinuation or dangerous utterance which was all the while imperilling peace. Well, the thing went so far at one time that Lord Palmerston himself had to write a letter of protest to Mr. Delane, which appears in this biography. In it he warned the editor that of course he understood that his paper must live upon excitement, but he said that these continual excitements as between nations might easily run into exaggeration and friction and danger and, if continued, might lead to war. Hence he bade him make some effort in the cause of peace. The *London Times* was probably the greatest single influence in bringing the English people to embark upon the Crimean war, as Kinglake showed in a brilliant chapter of his "Invasion of the Crimea." It was the continual insistence of the *Times*, the great representative English newspaper, the great organ of the middle classes of English opinion, that the safety of England never could be secured until the Russian power on the Black Sea was broken, which finally, in spite of protests and appeals of John Bright and Mr. Gladstone, and even of the prime minister himself, Lord Aberdeen, plunged England into that miserable and needless war. I say needless war, because forty years later Lord Salisbury himself stood up in the House of Lords and said it was all a mistake, and that England in that bloody and costly and direful war put her money on the wrong horse! But the point I am trying to make is that even in that case, Mr. Delane affirmed (and I presume with a great deal of truth) that he was speaking not out of his own judgment alone, but that he was giving the opinion of the middle class of England, the great non-conformist groups, the pious, God-fearing English men and women, whose desire he endeavored to ascertain and whose wishes he sought to express. I suppose there was much truth in that, and this brings us back afresh to the need of a change of emphasis, not only in the conductors of newspapers, but in those who purchase them, a change of emphasis and a new test as to what is important, what ought to be magnified and what ought to be made the basis of appeal and presentation. We need a new standard of what is thrilling, what is exciting, and what is glorious. Why, the Emperor Napoleon himself, who (if any man ever did) tore out the heart of military glory for himself, felt vaguely in his time that France was too much carried away with the military obsession. He made the suggestion, and I do not know if it was ever carried out, but it was a fruitful suggestion that there ought to be *espions de la vertu*, individuals in search of goodness, reporters sent out to run down acts of peace, journalists seeking for the exclusive news

about the triumphs and achievements of peace. Now something of that sort is coming to-day. Something of that sort is here. We have our glorification of the heroes of peace, and we ought to have more, and will have more. But the thing to aim at is such a change of mental habit, such a change of general temper, as will create a new atmosphere about the journalist, and will bring to bear upon him a new popular demand to which he cannot fail to respond.

I recall with interest a little incident in our own office three years ago, at the time of the signing of the treaty of peace between Russia and Japan, at Portsmouth. It happened that the first news came just after twelve o'clock. Now, in the afternoon we usually expect, as a matter of custom, a little lull in receiving news, and at twelve o'clock the telegraph operator goes out to lunch, as nothing is expected for half an hour. At that moment, the operator was, in fact, out of the office, but it happened that a young man was there who could read the telegraph by sound, and he heard the ticking which told him that a treaty had been attained and that the news would soon come in the bulletins. He rushed outside, crying out, "We have a treaty! There is a peace!" Well, that incident I do not wish to exaggerate; it was primarily, no doubt, a sort of professional elation over the early receipt of exclusive news. But, after all, my friends, it was in a small way a sort of precursor of that wave of joy and pride which spread over this land when we learned that the great instrument of peace had been signed in our country, and at the prompting of our government. If we were only able to make such a thrill and excitement at the laying down of arms, and have such an ecstasy at a great achievement of peace—if we could make it not the infrequent thing but the usual thing, not the exceptional thing but the typical thing, we should soon bring about a general temper and a changed habit of mind, which in these respects are the necessary prerequisites to a better press. For, my friends, imagination still rules the world. If our thoughts are bloody, our words and our deeds will be also. But if we train ourselves to make our deepest interests, our brightest hopes, our fondest aspirations center about the march of the world to higher achievements of peace and beneficence, why, then, wars will cease among men, because men will cease to think about wars, and we shall come to peace as a settled and constant presupposition of our lives—peace being the light of all our seeing, the master light of all our day. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: As our second speaker on the subject I present Mr. HAMILTON HOLT, of New York, Managing Editor of *The Independent*.

HOW THE PRESS MAY BE MADE A GREATER INFLUENCE FOR PEACE

ADDRESS OF MR. HAMILTON HOLT

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Three years ago, an invited delegate to this Conference had an interview with President Roosevelt, in which the President said, "What I want is a Senate that will give me arbitration treaties and a House that will give me battleships."

Now I am not going to say whether this utterance of the gallant Colonel of the Rough Riders and the recipient of the Nobel peace prize, is supreme wisdom or a mere presidential paradox, or whether even it may be dismissed by the short and ugly word nonsense. But I want you to remember that President Roosevelt at the present moment is the typical American citizen; and I think he is just as truly a child of the spirit of the age in politics and statesmanship as perhaps Kipling is in literature. Now the poets and the prophets and the philosophers of all times have agreed with Thomas Jefferson, that war is the greatest scourge of mankind; and yet the typical, the average people still seem almost to prefer war to peace. I do not know exactly how to explain it, but there is something within the heart of every man that thrills more profoundly when he sees the veterans march by on Memorial Day bearing their tattered flags to the cemetery than the Amalgamated Hod-Carriers parading on Labor Day; and there is something within the heart of every woman that still makes her prefer brass buttons to gold shirt studs. It was so at least in my case when I was an undergraduate and once went to a dance with a West Point man.

So in any popular appeal to the emotions; those who sing "Peace, Perfect Peace," and those who sing "The Army and Navy Forever," are pretty evenly matched. Now is it surprising, therefore, that the press which is supposed to represent and to reflect public opinion still almost prefers war to peace? But I think the press is more derelict than some of the other agencies that stand for enlightenment and civilization, because they are not doing their share in this peace movement. I sometimes have been tempted to say that with the exception of the average diplomat the average journalist is the only man congenitally incapacitated from understanding the philosophy of the peace movement. Of course the average diplomat does not like it because when international affairs are conducted by the international courts, parliaments and executives he will be out of a job. But the journalists do not like it because there is nothing sensational in it; it does not sell copies the way a war scare does; and it is humdrum, like prison reform and taxation. When the Czar of Russia called together the first Hague Conference the press of the world

almost unanimously considered it the pious dream of a weak sentimentalist; indeed the only magazine article that I am aware of that had any conception whatsoever of the greatness and importance of that first Conference was one we published in *The Independent* from the pen of our novelist, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. There was not a man I know of who had sense enough to see that. And then when the great Court eventuated from the Conference, there was a certain newspaper acclaim for the time being, but that soon died out. Then the newspapers said we were going to have disarmament as a result of last summer's Conference, and then when we did not get it they said the whole Conference was a failure. But they were not entirely to blame, because the work of the Conference was of a very technical nature and almost every proposition did not pass in the way it was introduced and it would require technical understanding and rather long explanation to show the people what it was. So on the whole an impression has gone abroad that the Hague Conference was a failure.

But to show that it is not entirely from ignorance that the press does injustice to the peace movement I recall the annual meeting in New York the other day of the New York Peace Society, in which Rev. Frederick Lynch, who is here, read a long report of the work of our society during the year; and in the course of that report he especially felicitated the ladies on the work that they had done for peace. He said that they had done so well that if they had been at the Hague very likely the Hague would have done better. And yet one of the newspapers in New York which prints only "the news that is fit to print," put in large head-lines the next morning, "Clergyman Advocates Sending Ladies to the Hague." And that was about all that was said of the meeting, though Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Mead, Dr. Jefferson and Mr. Lynch gave splendid addresses full of thought and information. And only at this Conference two days ago there was made the most important official announcement since the Hague convened. I refer to the answer of Dr. Scott to a query from the floor when he said that Secretary Root hopes to establish the Great Permanent Court of the Hague before the next Conference convened in 1915. If I had been an editor or a reporter on a daily paper I would have flashed that all over the world. But I have seen no notice of it whatever in any paper.

Now the trouble with newspapers is that they think it is more important to chronicle the fact that a young American millionaire has re-established coaching in London; or the daughter of a well-known Washingtonian, on the principle, I suppose, that iron is good for the blood, was seen to put a tack under a person sitting in the Senate gallery, than to report such trivial subjects as the building up of a scheme of law that will eventually abolish war.

I have only three practical suggestions by which the friends of peace can cooperate with the press. There may be others but I simply give these three. If we make history ourselves and make it striking and obvious enough I think the average editorial intelligence will be able to grasp it; and we will get what notice we deserve. The great Arbitration and Peace Conference held in New York a year ago, was probably the most important unofficial gathering ever held in the United States. We collected afterwards over 11,000 clippings from papers in the United States alone about it and some man of a statistical frame of mind figured out that if they were put end to end they would extend two miles in length. So let us make history ourselves, and then the omniscient editors will report it.

Second, the various peace societies might establish press agents to look after the newspapers. Now press agents, as a rule, do more harm than good to any cause they represent. They bore editors, Nevertheless, if we get men with tact and let them meet the editors personally, and if possible get the editors to rely on them as their peace experts, a great deal of good can be accomplished. The Fabian Society in London and the Christian Scientist in New York in this way have "worked" the press to a very profitable extent. In London, for instance, the Fabian Society actually changed the policy of one of the great daily papers by simply getting thirty or forty of its members from various sections of London to send post-cards criticizing an editorial. I am sure all the editors here will bear me out when I say that whenever we criticize Christian Science, a very polite and smiling gentleman comes in and says, "My dear sir, inasmuch as you have given so much of your very valuable space to Christian Science, we think it only fair that you should allow us to state the truth." The editor who has a conscience (and there are such), finds it rather difficult to meet this answer; and the result is that a great deal is printed about Christian Science that would never be if it were not for this smiling and gentlemanly press agent.

The third suggestion is that I think the time has come or very nearly come, when we can form a society of the progressive newspaper owners and editors to cooperate with similar societies that are founded or will be founded in various nations of the world. If such a society were established in this country, it would cooperate immediately with those ten or a dozen affiliated papers in Germany, who have agreed to print authoritative articles about England and the United States. A distinguished committee has already been established in England, headed by the Lord Mayor of London, to cooperate with the German papers. But I believe we have formed no society in this country as yet. The plan is for each one of the committees to see that the papers in their own

country print authoritative material about the other two countries, and then these articles will be reprinted and published in book form and afterwards distributed and circulated among the secondary schools of the three countries. Such a committee could and should go much further, however. It could arrange, for instance, for the interchange of visits between editors of Japan and the United States, France and the United States, and South America and the United States. If we could get some of the Japanese editors here, and some of us could go over there, I believe all this infamous war talk that has been so invidiously and mysteriously prevalent of late would instantly cease. At present we have not a single paper in this country which has on its staff a man who can read Japanese; and who therefore can tell the American people what the Japanese people think from reading Japanese papers.

Now these are the three practical suggestions that I have to make. If by these methods or any others the editors can be influenced to push forward with the other peace workers, then as Victor Hugo said, the time will soon come when the only battlefield will be the market opening to commerce and the human mind opening to new ideas. But if nothing else will stir the editors then Mr. Smiley must invite them to Lake Mohonk. That will surely bring them a change of heart. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to turn to the part of religious organizations in this movement. Our first speaker on this subject is the Rev. FRANCIS H. ROWLEY, Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Boston.

THE ABILITY AND DUTY OF THE CHURCHES TO AID MORE ACTIVELY THE ARBITRATION AND PEACE MOVEMENT

ADDRESS OF REV. FRANCIS H. ROWLEY, D.D.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been asked to speak upon "The Ability and Duty of the Churches to aid more actively the Arbitration and Peace Movement."

As I can see it there should be no need for such an address in a Conference like this. It ought to be taken for granted that the churches are at the forefront of every endeavor to find a permanent substitute for war as a means of settling the quarrels of nations. That's one of the things for which they exist. It ought to be impossible to conceive of them in any other way than as the acknowledged leaders in promoting that spirit of humanity and Christian neighborliness that must at length induce nations to adjust their differences through arbitration, rather than by appeal to the savagery of brute force.

Alas, that this cannot be taken for granted! Only this month a bishop of a Christian church has declared that as war always has been, so it always will be, and the thing for us to do is to be prepared for it. Though the Spirit that created the churches, and on the whole pervades them, has been the one transcendent factor making for peace—and for everything else that has meant mankind's better day—organized Christianity, Christianity as an ecclesiastical institution, has again and again had to be dragged up out of its indifference or its opposition to many a cause the Spirit behind it has espoused, and persuaded to lend a hand. Soon or late the Church gets onto every battle-field for the right. So it will be here. She will yet arrive, as Blücher did at Waterloo, and once more there will be what Victor Hugo said there was when Napoleon fell, “a change of front on the part of the Universe.”

Seldom in the history of the Christian Church has there been opened to her a more superb opportunity to serve mankind than that that is now calling her to reinforce and carry forward this movement in the interests of the world's peace. Even should there be among her ministers or her members those still prepared, under certain conditions, to justify war, yet no man fit to be called a Christian can refuse for an instant to admit the obligation we are under to avert the horrors of war, if it be possible, by arbitration. If war must be, then let it be only after the last possible means has been exhausted that could have saved so dread and desolating a calamity.

There are three ways at least in which the churches can add to the power and momentum of the movement this Conference represents: First, their ministers and their teachers, with their rare opportunities to reach the generation of to-day and the generation that shall be to-morrow, can make clear the real meaning and purpose of arbitration. Just what this word embodies in the language and discussion of our time multitudes do not know. And what arbitration has already accomplished in averting war, in cultivating a kindlier international spirit, in revealing the possibilities along the path toward which it points, here our churches should be the instructors of their people. Few nobler themes can demand attention at the hands of the Christian ministry than the significance of such gatherings as those at The Hague. What those historic assemblies in the name of Peace have actually achieved in deepening the desire of the nations to live together as friends and not as foes, it is time the people in our churches were led to understand. Too widely prevails the idea that it is folly to expect governments to act save in their own selfish interests. Again and again the claim is made, that, however individuals in a nation might be willing to do the righteous thing for the sake of peace and good-

will, in their united capacity as a government, they can never be counted on to see any good higher than their own aggrandizement. It was the late Prime Minister of Great Britain who said "The bonds of mutual understanding and esteem are strengthening between the peoples"; and Mr. Root has recently told us that this growing sense of the right relations that should exist between nations is influencing them "in countless cases to shape their own conduct against their own apparent interests." Utterances like these, made by the leading statesmen of the world, are growing significantly common. The very knowledge of this, clearly in the minds of the people of our churches, would predispose them to larger hope as to the outcome of friendly conference.

All this, as a vital part of that broader world-view that is characterizing our time, the people of our churches should know. In opposition to the reiterated declarations that the Hague Conferences have proved failures, that arbitration is impracticable, that nations may not be expected to treat each other as sane and honorable men may do, let the churches, through their ministers, set the actual facts, and so become persistent, intelligent educational centers training the men and women of to-day and to-morrow into enthusiastic friends of arbitration.

Second, the churches, through their ministers and teachers, may aid the movement for the world's peace by laying upon the hearts of their people what has been so well called, "the moral damage of war." I may not plead here against all war. I am not asked to free my soul with respect to the question whether anything but evil may be hoped for from such an inferno as that into which men plunge when they strike for each others' throats in the wild carnage of war. But here I may plead with those who stand as leaders in the world's great moral conflict to open to all who will read it the book that tells the story of the moral relapse a nation suffers when it resolves to stain its hands with blood, and of the inhuman and degrading passions that are unleashed in the breasts of those who go forth to do a nation's fighting. Here, silence on the part of the Church, is treason against her Lord. For whatever worthy patriotism, at the declaration of war, may have inspired the soldier to maintain his country's cause; whatever high sense of duty may have stirred within the souls of those who have stood behind him with their sympathy and treasure, no sooner has the fatal word been spoken that joins the opposing forces in deadly onslaught, than revenge, hatred, cruelty, injustice awake to trample beneath their feet every divine and ennobling impulse of the human heart. Those who have come back from this dark realm of strife and bloodshed have confessed it all. They are our witnesses. The man who, to-day, counts himself a lover of his

kind, to-morrow, on the field of battle, becomes an infuriated foe who hears only the call within him of the beast, roused from its slumber, but still "red in tooth and claw."

How few of the young men who are making up the companies of many of our state military associations, attracted by the natural fondness for brass buttons and gold lace and the glamor of parade day,—how few of these, bound to become leaders among men, and now within reach of the voice of the Church, dream of the moral peril to which they will subject themselves should the nation in a moment of infinite folly and under the sting of wounded pride, suddenly demand from them that, instead of playing soldiers they actually undertake the soldier's work of destruction and death! Here is a field of service our churches are morally bound to enter. They owe it to their people and above all to their youth that they should know the dehumanizing influence of war upon the nation itself and the nature of the perils that threaten the moral life of the soldier. "Live and let live," writes a clear-headed Austrian officer, "is no device for an army. If the soldier is to be good for anything as a soldier he must be exactly the opposite of a reasoning and thinking man."

Third, the churches can do more than any other forms of organized activity toward advancing the cause of peace and arbitration by the fuller declaration of those principles of the Christian faith that should determine the relation every man should sustain toward his neighbor, whether that neighbor live across the street or across the sea, and whether he be white or black, or red or yellow. Let us not mistake. Education may do much for peace; the representatives of commerce may do much to abolish war; appeals to selfish interests may be made, and not in vain; but the Spirit incarnate in him we call the Prince of Peace, this, and this alone, is the power unwearying and undying that can lift us as a nation to that high level where war will be tolerated no more. If half the time that has been spent defending theological and sectarian positions had been devoted to the teaching of those truths in the light of which, by the very charter of the church, men must learn to know themselves as members of one great family, bound by the sacreddest of obligations to feel toward their fellows of every land and clime as brothers, a thousand wars "that have stained the world incarnadine," could never have been.

Here is the great breeder of war,—the perverse and selfish heart of man disloyal to its divine impulses. *My* rights, *my* aggrandizement, *my* pleasure, *my* wealth, *my* power, *my* country right or wrong,—for these, first, with all the intensity of our brute inheritance, forgetful of that nobler self and its pleading voices, have we been ready to fight. Over against this stands

the Spirit of that "Strong Son of God, Immortal Love," the Spirit of sacrifice and service. To plant the leaven of this Spirit in the heart of the world, to awaken in men the God that slumbers in every human soul,—this is the sublime mission of the church.

The church can go farther than the great Declaration of 1776 that urges upon us "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." It must go farther and teach us that we are not worthy the Christian name until "the brotherhood of man" is something more than a phrase to juggle with. Is man a fighting animal? Grant it. He is also a child of the Eternal, born to love rather than to hate. I have listened with sorrow to the expressions of fear lest the swarming sons of toil who have sought our shores, and who have no representative here to speak for them, should turn upon us and rend us. Social workers in the heart of more than one great city of our land and amid men who come day by day blackened and dwarfed from mine and mill, tell me that the wonder is ever present with them that these multitudes who have crossed the sea from Italy and from Austria and from Poland and Russia are so good and true at heart. They, too, bear the image and superscription of the divine. Are they the dangerous forces that threaten the Republic? Or does the peril threaten from the too-often proud, hard and unbrotherly masters of wealth and industry who seem unmindful of the fact that these, for the most part long-suffering and patient toilers are their human brothers with rights as sacred and inviolable before God as their own? Appeal to the divine within your fellow, to his sense of justice, fair play and kindness, and it will answer you as quickly and responsively as the animal within him will answer when you assault or plunder. I would dare attempt to prove this, had I time, from the history of man's relation to man. Love is not the supreme fool of the universe but the infinite wisdom and the all-conquering power.

Can you imagine any power for peace equal to the Christian church if she were to rise to her high opportunity? What like her could spread abroad the spirit that compels respect for the opinions of others, and that insists upon the divine thought of man's relation to man? Were she true to her holy calling, as true she will yet be, she could outrival all the peace societies of earth in hastening that day when arbitration shall abolish war.

How can we reach the rank and file of the Christian ministry, and the teachers in our Sunday schools, and win them to the cause that seems to us so rational and righteous, transforming them from those not against arbitration into determined and devoted champions of it? He who answers that question brings into the field the allies that decide where victory shall claim the day.

Permit me to close with the words of a great preacher, dead now nearly half a century, a man too far ahead of his time to have won, in this respect as in many others, the ear of the Christian Church, but one who could read the future with the vision of a seer: "Let the world have peace five hundred years," said Theodore Parker, "the aristocracy of blood will have gone, the aristocracy of gold will have come and gone, that of talent will also have come and gone, and the aristocracy of goodness, which is the democracy of man, the government of all, for all, and by all, will be the power that is." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to hear from a gentleman who has addressed audiences in almost every part of the world, Mr. JOHN R. MOTT, General Secretary of the World's Student Federation.

THE RELATION OF THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION TO THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION MOVEMENT

ADDRESS OF MR. JOHN R. MOTT

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Why have we ground to expect that the Young Men's Christian Association will be an increasing power in promoting the realization of the objects of this Conference? The very extent of the Association movement awakens such expectations. It embraces nearly one million young men banded together into eight thousand separate Associations planted in the influential centers of over fifty nations. The character of the personnel of the movement strengthens this expectation. It is composed of young men abounding in aggressiveness and enthusiasm. A majority of them are at the vision-forming period of life. They are responsive to the highest ideals, and ready to devote themselves with heroism to their realization. It is composed of young men representing all the important walks of life. It embraces young men of all the Christian communions as well as men of no religious affiliations, but who are in sympathy with the principles and general program of Christianity. This movement possesses an organization and agencies which enable it to render highly efficient service in any great propaganda. It has an *esprit de corps* resulting from world-wide union of kindred spirits inspired by a great objective. Its program seeks to bring the spirit and principles of Christ to bear upon young men of the world and to have Christ dominate them in all their relationships; commercial, industrial, civic, political, national, international, and religious. To enlist the sympathy and active co-operation of such a movement must tell mightily for victory. "It is an inspiring sight," said Disraeli,

“to see a nation saved by its youth.” Is it not more inspiring to witness the young men of all lands and races united in the promotion of the sublime ideals of international peace and good will?

What are the principal hindrances in the way of the realization of the high aims of this Conference? Without doubt, ignorance of the subject of international arbitration in its important practical bearings, is one of the two principal obstacles. The other which, in some ways is the greater and more serious, is the wrong attitude, feelings and spirit which characterize so many of the people of the different nations. This manifests itself at times in real animosities or enmities. In all cases it manifests itself in national or racial prejudice toward other nations or races. It manifests itself too frequently in pride and selfish ambition, in envy and jealousy, in suspicion and lack of confidence. How shall we overcome or change these wrong feelings, this undesirable spirit, this unfavorable attitude? Only by laying siege to the hearts as well as the minds of the people. The campaign of education by pulpit, by press, by school and college, by conference and convention, emphasized so convincingly in our sessions, is certainly essential. But of equal importance is it that there be a campaign of friendship. This is an indirect way of accomplishing our great aims, but you will agree with me that flank movements are often the most effective. Let us continue to emphasize arbitration treaties and other international agreements, peace and arbitration conferences and congresses, palaces of peace, the helpful offices of commerce and travel, educational campaigns concerning these vital and momentous matters, and the spread of the spirit of democracy; but surely we are agreed that the most fundamental thing of all, that which will make all these other agencies and means operative and truly effective, that which alone can create and maintain the right atmosphere in which to secure international arbitration, that which will do so much to make it truly effective, yes, that which will even obviate the necessity of invoking its offices, is the bringing about of the right disposition, the proper attitude of heart as well as mind, the generating of the right spirit in the lives of the people.

The chief service of the Young Men's Christian Association will be along this indirect, though absolutely invaluable line. True, it can and should do much along direct lines by its lecture platform, in its debating societies and discussion clubs, through the wise use of literature, and by its convention and conference deliverances. But many-fold more potent and important will be what it does indirectly in creating and maintaining right feelings toward each other among the young men of the different nations.

How is the Young Men's Christian Association actually uniting

the young men of different nations and filling them with right sentiments, feelings and spirit toward each other? I need not add that in developing genuine Christian character in the lives of the most potential class in all these nations—the young men—and bringing their lives under the sway of Christ and His principles, the Association is advancing indirectly, but most effectively, the realization of the aims of the arbitration movement. Moreover, in establishing friendships between the future leaders of the nations, the Associations are doing untold good in this direction. In this connection, let us limit our thought for a time to the student department of the Association movement, and the affiliated student societies in connection with the World's Student Christian Federation. These already embrace a membership of about one hundred and twenty thousand students and professors. These members influence intimately scores of thousands of other students and professors. Moreover, hundreds of thousands of students who have graduated were, as undergraduates, influenced powerfully by these societies. The membership of this movement includes nearly all of the coming ministers and missionaries of the various churches. It includes also a very large and increasing proportion of the future lawyers, jurists, statesmen, editors, professors, doctors, educated men of wealth, and other influential classes. It should not be overlooked that it also includes the future officers of both army and navy. You may not be familiar with the fact that both at West Point and Annapolis we have large and efficient Young Men's Christian Associations. To-morrow I go to visit the one at West Point which has had during the past year over two hundred cadets in its Bible classes. The strongest and most influential young men of the Academy are active leaders in this altruistic organization. They are being prepared to throw the full weight of their large influence in their chosen calling on the side of the principles of Christianity. The student Association movement, thus constituted, by means of its forty or more conferences held each year in different parts of the world, by means of the tireless activity of its hundreds of traveling and local secretaries, by means of the constant process of intervisitation by students of the universities of the different countries, and by means of its many publications of the different sections, is rendering an enormous service to the cause of international peace and good will by throwing strands of friendship between countless hearts of these future leaders of church and state. In talking with President Diaz of Mexico, I was impressed by his comment concerning the valuable influence of the Young Men's Christian Association. He said that its principal service was being rendered in uniting men of the different nations in the years of young man-

hood which constitute the period in which the most enduring friendships are formed.

By the positive, constructive method of emphasizing the truths on which the young men of the different nations are agreed and minimizing the things on which they differ, the Association movement is doing much to draw them together in friendly confidence. It has been my privilege to visit at least forty-two different countries. I have been impressed in each country that I have visited with the way in which the people of that country have honestly considered that their country was unique and peculiar and different from every other country, but I have been even more impressed by the fact that when the young men of these countries have come to know each other they have found that there are many more things on which they agree than on which they differ. The striking thing in this connection is that the things on which they most largely agree are the deepest and most vital matters. Who can measure the federative power of great ideas? In passing let me emphasize the value of the method and spirit of the Association in calling attention habitually to the good traits of the different nationalities, thus cultivating the attitude of looking for and finding the good in the young men of all nations and races. It is this attitude which facilitates the forming of friendships and the developing of confidence. One of the principal ways in which the Young Men's Christian Association is accomplishing the friendly union of the young men of the nations is by summoning them to great and difficult undertakings. There is nothing like common difficulties, obstacles and opposition to fuse together men of like purpose and spirit. The more difficult the undertakings to which young men are called, the better it will be for the realization of the purpose we have in view. You make a cause hard for young men and you are most likely to make it triumphant. Jesus Christ never hid His scars to win a disciple. Professor James of Harvard has pointed out that "What we now need to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war; something heroic that will speak to men as universally as war does, and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved itself to be incompatible." This voices a great truth. The need which Professor James has in mind is well met by the Young Men's Christian Association in summoning right thinking young men of all nations who are interested in Christ and His plans, to make the colleges and universities strongholds and propagating centers of pure Christianity; to make Christ and His program known and accepted among all peoples; and to influence young men to bring the principles and spirit of Christ to bear on every relationship of society.

That what I have been saying is not theoretical, but eminently practical, is shown by the actual experience of the Associations. Of this many examples might be given. It is impressive to recall that the first enterprise to bring together the French and German students after the Franco-Prussian War was the Christian student movement. At the time of the Boer War the only movement in South Africa which was not wholly divided or destroyed by that great convulsion was the student Christian Association movement. This also was the agency which succeeded in bringing together for the first time after the war the Christian forces of both British and Dutch South Africa. It did so by summoning them to the great task presented by the masses of heathenism pressing upon them on the north. During that dark holiday period when the war clouds hung over Britain and America at the time of the Venezuela trouble, the British student movement cabled £200 to an American worker to make possible the extending of his journey to Australasia in order that he might enlist the students of that part of the world in the unselfish plans for the extension of Christ's Kingdom. This demonstrated that the ties of friendship established by this movement between the students of Britain and America were strong enough to stand when subjected to the greatest strain. During this time when the relations between Sweden and Norway are so greatly strained it has been interesting to observe that the Christian student movements in these two separate countries have been first in seeking to draw together the people.

An interesting recent illustration of the manner in which the Association movement is promoting right feelings between the students of different races as well as nations is seen in connection with the emigration of Chinese students to Japan and also to western countries. When I was in Tokyo, in 1901, I was told that there were then less than a score of Chinese students in Japan. In 1907 the Chinese Ambassador in Tokyo reported to us that there were at that time about sixteen thousand Chinese students in Tokyo alone. The Association movement recognized that the presence of this large number of Chinese students in a foreign city presented a great opportunity. We have, therefore, selected and sent over to Tokyo a staff of about twenty able American, European and Oriental Christian workers who know the Chinese language, to work among these students. They seek to befriend them and to serve them in every way in their power. They make a special point of acquainting these students with the principles and program of Christianity, emphasizing the indispensable relation which Christianity sustains to all that is best in Western civilization. Besides the large numbers of Chinese students who have been going to Japan to study, an increasing number are coming to America and Europe for the same pur-

pose. Besides these Chinese students in Japan and in Occidental countries there are large numbers of Indian and Korean students. Our movement is organizing this work so as to come into helpful, friendly relations with all these Oriental young men who come to the West as well as to Japan. We shall make every effort to see that they are introduced to our best Christian homes and that they are led to see the best side of the life of Western nations. Who can measure, what this will mean in our future relations, for example, to China?

Let me call attention to a gathering held in April, 1907, in Tokyo which well epitomizes the spirit and method and practical helpfulness of the Christian Association movement, especially in its work among students of the different nations. I refer to the conference of the World's Student Christian Federation. It was attended by strong delegations from twenty-five nations. This included every country of Protestant Christendom, the leading countries of Roman Catholic and Greek Christendom, and all the Oriental nations. While the Occidental delegations were very representative of our best university and college life, the gathering was pre-eminently Oriental. Anyone familiar with the facts, looking over that interesting assemblage, could have said, "Here are present the flower of the Asiatic church. Here are to be found the springs of aggressive Christianity in Asia. Here is a company of Oriental leaders who could do more to advance Christian civilization in Asia than many fold their number of others who might have been assembled." It was the first world's conference, either secular or religious, ever held in the Far East. It is a striking fact that the idea which assembled the first world's gathering in these Eastern lands was not that of commerce or diplomacy, but of Christianity. It will interest you to note in passing that before the first Hague Conference the World's Student Christian Federation had held three world's conferences of students and professors. The Tokyo gathering received marked recognition from the Japanese Imperial Government in its different departments and from the other leaders of that nation. Rulers of other powers also seemed to vie with one another in their expressions of appreciation of the significance of the Conference. No message awakened more enthusiasm than the letters of strong approval from President Roosevelt and Secretary Root. Other religious bodies, notably the great Buddhist Conference of three thousand delegates meeting at the same time in Tokyo, sent deputations to us to assure us of their good will. It would be difficult to overstate the significance and influence of this world's gathering of representatives of the educated classes. I shall not attempt to give even in outline what it has accomplished, but shall call attention simply to one result. The delegates of the twenty-five nations came from the five days

of intimate fellowship in the Conference with a larger understanding of each other, with a keener and more sympathetic appreciation of the points of view of each other, with a growing confidence in each other and with a growing affection for each other. Moreover, the conviction became clear and strong to all the delegates that we are essential to each other. To use a fine phrase of Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, that great mediator between the East and the West who was, in my judgment, a great international statesman, we became fully convinced that "The essential unity of the human race can be discovered and realized only through Jesus Christ, our Lord." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to hear from the Rev. FREDERICK LYNCH, Pastor of the Pilgrim Church of New York.

INFLUENCES WORKING FOR PEACE

REMARKS OF REV. FREDERICK LYNCH

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been asked to say something of what has happened in the world during the last two or three years in the realm of international hospitality, and I accede to that request because I think that what we need more than anything else is knowledge. I have listened to a great deal of exhortation here,—and I have felt like going out whenever it began as soon as I could. For what we need here is not exhortation but truth. No one here wants war. We all want peace. The battle for arbitration has been won. What we want now is knowledge that out of knowledge may grow great faith.

I will tell you some of the things that have been accomplished. I wonder how many of you know that two or three years ago a large group of German editors came to England as guests of the English editors and spent several weeks there. Ever since then there has been quite a different tone in the attitude of German papers toward England. Afterward several English editors went to Germany, as the guests of German editors, and after they got home there was a change in the attitude of the British papers toward Germany. There has been a different tone between the British and German papers ever since, and that alliance to which Mr. Holt referred is probably the outgrowth of that visit of the editors.

I wonder how many of you have noticed the exchange that is going on between the universities of Europe and this country. You all have heard of it, but you do not know how common it is growing and how much it is going to grow in the future. President Butler is going abroad this fall; next year we are going to send another professor in exchange for one who is coming over here; you know of the Roosevelt and Kaiser Wilhelm professorship. That is going to grow, and all that makes for peace. What

we want is to know one another and then wars will cease. The people who are fighting one another are strangers, as a rule. If we could invite fifty Japanese to this country, and keep them here six weeks, and give several dinners in their honor before they went home, there would be no more war talk between Japan and the United States.

I wonder how many of you know what is going on to-day between Germany and France? That just week before last twenty-five French students from Paris went to Berlin to be the guests of twenty-five German students for six weeks, and twenty-five German students went to Paris to be the guests of twenty-five French students for six weeks—and some people will tell you that there is no change of attitude between Germany and France! How many of you know that the German Emperor immediately upon that occasion appointed a committee, with the President of the Prussian House of Lords at its head, to try and bring about a new feeling of cordiality between Germany and France, and sent Richard Straus, with the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, down to Paris, where the program was made up half of German music and half of French music and played in the Paris Opera House where twenty years ago they hissed a piece of German music off the stage.

I wonder how many of you know what is going on in the exchange of pulpits between the countries of Europe and this country—and that is to go much further. One suggestion I have to make in this matter of churches is that there ought to be an exchange of pulpits between the cities of London and New York, extending over a month or two months. I wish also that Mr. Walsh would come and take my pulpit for one month and speak every night to New York people and let me go over to Scotland and have my say there. I think all such exchanges would cement the good relations already existing between Scotland and America, were that possible.

The last thing I want to say is that one thing the peace workers must emphasize is that if part of the money that is being appropriated for battleships could be appropriated for this international hospitality great good would come of it. Do you know that the little country of Denmark shames the United States by having appropriated last year two thousand dollars to be spent in this international hospitality? We ought to introduce a peace budget into Congress here and have appropriated a sum of money so that the government might officially invite guests from all the countries of Europe, and it would do more to preserve the peace of the world than all the battleships that could be sent round the globe! (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Turning now to other subjects, Mrs. MEAD wishes to say a few words.

ARMAMENTS AND POLICE FORCES NOT ANALOGOUS

REMARKS OF MRS. EDWIN D. MEAD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Permit me to make a friendly suggestion regarding the irrelevancy of much that is said here from year to year by good men who do not distinguish between national and international problems. We are here solely to consider international problems; and when civil war, strikes, riots and the need of police and militia are discussed, the fraction of the peace problem which we are considering here, namely, the end of war *between* nations is confounded with what is in a totally different category—the end of all forms of violence *within* nations. I deplore this not merely for the waste of time, but because there should be clear ideas as to these different categories. Before we end all possibility of internal disorders, economic, social and educational conditions must change the world over. But a thousand years before riots will all cease, or the possibility of civil war end, we can stop war between nations. No one here wants to abolish police or militia. They keep the peace, and never attack the police and militia of another state. But rival armies and navies are created to attack each other. For these we can and shall find substitutes. Let us stick to our subject, and not wander so far afield. We have nothing here to do with civil war or riots. World organization, Hague Conferences and Hague Courts can affect them only very indirectly. Long experience has shown me that we shall prevent much apathy and scepticism if we do not get befogged and confuse the problems of securing peace *within* nations with the problem of securing peace *between* nations. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to hear from a gentleman well known both in civil and naval circles, REAR ADMIRAL FRENCH E. CHADWICK, of Newport, R I.

NAVIES AS PEACE PRESERVERS

REMARKS OF REAR ADMIRAL FRENCH E. CHADWICK

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: To begin with, the Navy has no apologies to make to a certain class of minds, either for its existence or its duties, and I think it pertinent that I should ask the following question: Is the view of the Navy, and I suppose incidentally that of the Army, offered here by some, a retrospect or a prospect? If the former, what is their view of American independence; of the preservation of the Union; of Italian or German unification? For without armies and navies these things had never been. Had there been no navy to help in 1781, no French fleet to bar the entrance of the British Admiral Graves,

to the Chesapeake, Yorktown would not have occurred; and those who fought the revolution would have been men without a country.

Nor would there be the Union of to-day, had there not been a fleet which prevented the establishment of Southern finances by preventing the export of cotton, and starved and throttled the South into inanition. Had the South been free to come and go on the ocean, there would have been a *de facto* Southern confederacy and this continent would be bristling with bayonets to-day, as is Europe. A speaker this morning spoke of "squandering money upon navies." Does he apply the word to the cost of de Grasse's fleet? or to the cost of that which so effectually blockaded our Southern coast? Why, if it is a mere question of "squandering" does he not turn his attention to the waste of more than \$600,000,000 yearly in fires which a proper civilization would not allow to occur, and in fire protection which should not be needed. And this is waste pure and simple. You get no return. We spend upon the Navy yearly about \$1.30 per capita; we burn \$2.33 per capita against 37 cents of Europe; our total waste for fires and fire protection is over \$7.00 per capita; and it is pure waste. We have not the pleasure of knowing that we get any return whatever for our money. Expenditure upon the Navy is but a triviality in comparison with such extravagance.

There is yet another phrase to which I take exception. The "carnage of war," which reduces to absurdity of exaggeration in face of our railway slaughter. In one year we kill on our railways many more than were killed in the three years of the Boer war; well on to twenty times more than were killed on both sides in our war with Spain, nearly twice as many as at the great battle of Gettysburg, and we wound and lame by the hundred thousand. Don't let us stick too much to what after all is but a minor note. The great extravagances of the world are not in armaments, which have their uses—they are in drink, in destruction by fire, in destruction of our forests and in other ways which I do not care to attack for fear of going farther than some of my friends here would like, except by mere mention; I mean the intimate connection of our gigantic pension list and protection.

The greatest single force in the support of law and order to-day in the world is the Navy. In speaking thus I include other navies as well as our own. We can take no stand in diplomacy without its aid. As well expressed by Mr. E. J. Phelps, one of the greatest of your brotherhood of lawyers, and one of the greatest ambassadors we ever had abroad, the Navy is the right arm of diplomacy. Some of you may not know that the work of the State and Navy Departments is in intimate connection; that much of the actual diplomacy of the country is carried on by naval officers, and in a way, which, so far as I know, has always given

satisfaction to the Department of State. Mr. John Hay, whose memory all here must reverence, himself said to me, speaking of a number of difficult questions dealt with by naval officers in Central America, in a period of over two years, that no officer had made a single mistake! The naval officer is perforce an international lawyer, and unlike most lawyers, he can never afford to make a mistake. International law is in fact, in a preeminent degree, made by naval officers; for nine-tenths of the cases, I should say, are naval cases. And I believe I am right in saying the greatest International Law School in the world is that of our Naval War College, this branch of which is presided over by our distinguished colleague here, Mr. George Grafton Wilson. I call it the greatest, because the men who attend its Conferences, which, published in a yearly volume, are rapidly expanding into the most valuable of international law libraries, are frequently the men who have acted in the cases considered. It is a conference of judges upon their own cases, with full criticism.

The Navy is essentially a peace preserver. I can recall no action of a naval officer, or of an army officer, taken of his own initiative, which has brought war; its diplomacy has always been a diplomacy of peace. Even the cruise of our battleships to the Pacific is one which has told for peace and good-will through the length and breadth of the two Americas, and I may say the world. It has gone farther to show our fellow Americans of the South what we are like, what we are, than anything that has ever occurred. For their ignorance of us has been as great as our ignorance of them, and this is saying much. Nothing has ever gone farther to establish kind and cordial feeling toward us. I am as much a peace lover as any one, but we should remember that we are not here as a peace society, but as a society for international arbitration which we hope shall make for peace; and while organizing for peace, we must not forget the necessity of organization for possible war. For while holding individual views on these subjects, we must remember that human nature does not change in a night.

There is no use in crying peace, when there is no peace. The world moves from plane to plane, chiefly by convulsions. Its phases of evolution are arrived at by revolutions which are sometimes peaceful; more often bloody. That of 1776 was one of the latter sort; that of 1787 was peaceful; that of 1861 was bloody beyond modern compare. We are now again rapidly approaching another convulsive period. Explosives, mechanism as applied to manufacture and transportation, universal schooling and the newspaper (not least) have in the progress of the last century, changed the mentality of mankind. There is certain before long to be a new readjustment. Shall this be bloody or peaceful? As luminously pointed out by one of the ablest minds of this country,

by Mr. Brooks Adams, in an address before the faculty of the Law School of the University of Boston, an address which all would do well to read, it depends upon whether we shall be able to produce a mentality fitted for the direction of the new conditions higher than we now see any great sign of. We did so in 1787, when we produced Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and the outcome was the Constitution. We failed to do so in 1861 and the readjustment came in blood. If, as in 1861, we shall fail in this coming period, we shall need all that the army and navy can do to prevent a destructive readjustment. These two services are the great arms of conservatism, which more often than not, help to save mankind from itself. I would instance the case of the Paris Commune. One cannot imagine the appalling desolation which would have come in 1871 had not the French army interposed. Are such things so far distant that they cannot be remembered? When you can arrange such revolutions by academic discussion, you may perhaps do without the armed forces of the law, but as yet I see no signs of such an outcome. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. SAMUEL J. BARROWS, of New York, wishes to present a resolution.

The following resolution was offered by Dr. BARROWS, seconded by Dr. ST. CLAIR MCKELWAY, of Brooklyn, and unanimously adopted by the Conference:

“The members of the Fourteenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration express their grateful appreciation of the generous hospitality of their hosts, Mr. and Mrs. Albert K. Smiley, and Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Smiley. We congratulate the founder of this Conference, Mr. Albert K. Smiley, upon completing his eightieth year with his eye undimmed and his natural forces unabated. We rejoice with him that in the Autumn of his long and righteous labors in behalf of the Indian and in the cause of peace he is able to see the ripening sheaves of the seed he has sown. For him there can be no more glorious benediction than that which comes from the gradual fulfilment of his prayer for international peace through international justice.

“The Conference also expresses its thanks to the statesman, historian, and diplomatist, Hon. John W. Foster, for the courtesy and ability with which he has presided; to its Secretaries, Messrs. Woodruff and Phillips; to its Treasurer, Mr. Alexander C. Wood, and to all others who have contributed to the success of this Conference.”

Mr. SMILEY responded briefly to the resolution, expressing his gratification at the excellence of the addresses and discussions of the Conference, and repeating the statement so often made by him, that the Conferences will be continued. “If I do not live to be a hundred years old,” he said, “I have a brother who has a wife and children. This Conference is going on and, to use a military phrase, we are going to fight it out until we win.”

THE CHAIRMAN: I appreciate very highly the resolution you have adopted in reference to my services as your presiding officer. Whatever success I have had in discharging this duty is due in large measure to your forbearance and courtesy. It has been for me a pleasing service to preside over such a distinguished body and to listen to such able and interesting addresses as those with which we have been favored.

In closing our sessions, allow me a few observations. We have heard speak only a comparatively small number of this large assembly, but by your very presence in this place, now becoming historic, you have contributed much towards advancing the great cause of international arbitration and universal peace. It is gratifying to note that this Conference has been the means of producing some notable addresses, which will prove, I have no doubt, a valuable contribution to the literature of this great cause in which we are enlisted. Our coming together has afforded us an opportunity to make delightful acquaintances which will be prolonged through our lives. We have had impressed upon us what one noble Christian man can do for the betterment and happiness of his fellowmen. As we go from this beautiful and hospitable mountain home, we shall seek in our more humble way to follow the example in this respect which Mr. Smiley has set us.

We will now rise and join in singing our parting hymn: "God be with you till we meet again."

At the conclusion of the hymn **THE CHAIRMAN** declared the Conference adjourned without date.

MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE

- AMMIDON, D. C. and MRS., Board of Trade, Baltimore, Md.
ARBUCKLE, JAMES, Latin-American and Foreign Trade Association, St. Louis, Mo.
ARBUCKLE, JOHN, 315 Clinton Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
BAILEY, MRS. HANNAH, Winthrop Centre, Me.
BAILEY, HON. JOHN M. and MRS., 118 Lancaster St., Albany, N. Y.
BAKER, O. M. and MRS., 7 Dartmouth Terrace, Springfield, Mass.
BAKEWELL, PROF. C. M., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
BARRETT, HON. JOHN, International Bureau of the American Republics, Washington, D. C.
BARROWS, DR. SAMUEL J. and MRS., 135 E. 15th St., New York, N. Y.
BARTON, PROF. GEORGE A., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
BATCHELOR, REV. GEORGE, *The Christian Register*, Boston, Mass.
BEALS, REV. CHARLES E., American Peace Society, Boston, Mass.
BOYLE, EDWARD MORTIMER, 31 Nassau St., New York, N. Y.
BRACQ, PROF. J. C. and MRS., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
BREWER, HON. D. J. and MRS., United States Supreme Court, Washington, D. C.
BRIDGMAN, REV. H. A. and MRS., *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.
BRIDGMAN, R. L. and MRS., State House, Boston, Mass.
BROWN, DR. ELMER ELLSWORTH and MRS., Department of Education, Washington, D. C.
BROWN, REV. W. ADAMS and MRS., Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
BURNHAM, GEORGE, JR., 214 N. 34th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
BUTLER, S. P. and MRS., Business Men's Association, New Haven, Conn.
CALVERT, REV. DR. JOHN B. and MRS., *The Examiner*, New York, N. Y.
CHADWICK, REAR ADMIRAL F. E. and MRS., Twin Oaks, Newport, R. I.
CHESTER, WALSTEIN R., Massachusetts State Board of Trade, Boston, Mass.
CHURCH, W. C. and MRS., *The Army and Navy Journal*, New York, N. Y.
CLARK, PROF. JOHN B. and MRS., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
CLOTHIER, ISAAC H. and MRS., 8th and Market Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
COLBY, PROF. JAMES F., Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
COLLINS, RICHARD S. and MRS., 117 E. 61st St., New York, N. Y.
COOMBS, HON. WM. J. and MRS., 63 S. Portland Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
COXE, HON. MACGRANE C., 63 Wall St., New York, N. Y.
CRAVEN, J. V. and MRS., West Chester, Pa.
CROSBY, JOHN and MRS., Minneapolis, Minn.

- DENNIS, WILLIAM C., care State Department, Washington, D. C.
 DICKSON, A. W. and MRS., Board of Trade, Scranton, Pa.
 DOLE, REV. CHAS. F. and MRS., 14 Roanoke Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
 DRAPER, DR. ANDREW S. and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
 DUDLEY, COL. EDGAR S., U. S. A., West Point, N. Y.
 DUTTON, PROF. SAMUEL T., Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- EASTMAN, REV. S. E., Chamber of Commerce, Elmira, N. Y.
 ELY, ROBERT E. and MRS., 23 W. 44th St., New York, N. Y.
- FAGNANI, DR. C. P., Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
 FAIRLIE, DR. JOHN A., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 FARLEY, A. C. and MRS., Merchants' Association, Boston, Mass.
 FARQUHAR, A. B., York, Pa.
 FISHER, PROF. IRVING, Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.
 FISK, EVERETT O., 4 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass.
 FOSTER, HON. JOHN W., 1323 Eighteenth St., Washington, D. C.
 FOXCROFT, FRANK and MRS., *The Living Age*, Boston, Mass.
 FREAR, HON. W. F. and MRS., Executive Mansion, Honolulu, Hawaii.
 FULK, GEORGE, Cerro Gordo, Ill.
- GARNER, DR. JAMES W., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 GITCHELL, B. H. and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Binghamton, N. Y.
- HALL, REV. DR. HECTOR and MRS., Troy, N. Y.
 HALLOCK, WM. W. and MRS., *The Christian Work*, New York, N. Y.
 HARBOUR, J. L., 3 Bowdoin Ave., Dorchester, Mass.
 HARRIS, REV. DR. H. RICHARD and MRS., The Clinton, Philadelphia, Pa.
 HART, DR. JAMES A., Chamber of Commerce, Colorado Springs, Colo.
 HAWKINS, D. E., Chamber of Commerce, Syracuse, N. Y.
 HEFFORD, HON. R. R., Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo, N. Y.
 HIGGINS, A FOSTER and MRS., 100 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 HIGGINSON, REAR ADMIRAL F. J. and MRS., Cold Spring, N. Y.
 HOILE, JAMES T. and MRS., Manufacturers' Association of New York, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- HOLCOMBE, HON. CHESTER and MRS., 99 Atkinson St., Rochester, N. Y.
 HOLT, HAMILTON and MRS., *The Independent*, New York, N. Y.
 HOOKER, MR. ELON H. and MRS., 40 Wall St., New York, N. Y.
 HOOVER, MATTHEW H. and MRS., *The Union-Sun*, Lockport, N. Y.
 HOWLAND, WM. B., 287 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.
 HOYT, ALBERT and MRS., Antwerp, N. Y.
 HOYT, ALBERT E. and MRS., *The Argus*, Albany, N. Y.
 HULL, DR. WM. I. and MRS., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
 HUNTER, DEXTER and MRS., Board of Trade, Jacksonville, Fla.
- JACKSON, HON. FREDERICK H. and MRS., Board of Trade, Providence, R. I.
 JEFFERSON, CHAS. E. and MRS., 121 W. 85th St., New York, N. Y.
 JONES, WM. B. and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Albany, N. Y.

- KENNEDY, JAMES S., Business Men's Association, Waltham, Mass.
- KING, GEN. HORATIO C. and MRS., 44 Court St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- KIRCHWEY, DR. GEORGE W. and MRS., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- KLINE, MAHLON N. and MRS., Philadelphia Trades League, Philadelphia, Pa.
- KNOX, WILLIAM H. and MRS., 59 William St., New York, N. Y.
- KUHN, ARTHUR K. and MRS., 308 W. 92d St., New York, N. Y.
- LALANNE, FRANK D. and MRS., National Board of Trade, 214 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- LANDER, JOHN B. and MRS., *The Globe*, New York, N. Y.
- LANSING, HON. ROBERT and MRS., Watertown, N. Y.
- LAPHAM, HON. OSCAR and MRS., 183 Waterman St., Providence, R. I.
- LEEDS, HENRY W. and MRS., Atlantic City, N. J.
- LEFEVRE, HON. FRANK and MRS., New Paltz, N. Y.
- LEIPZIGER, DR. HENRY M., Board of Education, Park Ave. and 59th St., New York, N. Y.
- LORENTZEN, PROF. CARL, New York University, New York, N. Y.
- LYNCH, REV. FREDERICK, Pilgrim Church New York, N. Y.
- MACARTHUR, REV. DR. R. S. and MRS., Calvary Baptist Church, New York, N. Y.
- MCCLEARY, WM. and MRS., The Board of Trade, Amsterdam, N. Y.
- MACCRACKEN, DR. H. M. and MRS., New York University, New York, N. Y.
- MCDOWELL, REV. JOHN and MRS., Board of Trade, Newark, N. J.
- McFARLAND, J. HORACE and MRS., Board of Trade, Harrisburgh, Pa.
- MCKELWAY, DR. ST. CLAIR and MRS., *The Eagle*, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- MCLANE, HON. JOHN and MRS., Milford, N. H.
- MAHONY, W. A. and MRS., Board of Trade, Columbus, O.
- MANDERSON, HON. CHAS. F. and MRS., 510 S. 38th St., Omaha, Neb.
- MARBLE, WM. A. and MRS., Merchants' Association, New York, N. Y.
- MARKS, MARCUS M. and MRS., National Association of Clothiers, 687 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
- MATTESON, HON. CHARLES and MRS., Providence, R. I.
- MEAD, EDWIN D. and MRS., 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
- MITCHELL, DR. S. C., Richmond College, Richmond, Va.
- MOORE, HON. JOSEPH B., Michigan Supreme Court, Lansing, Mich.
- MORRIS, ELLISTON P. and MRS., Germantown, Pa.
- MOTT, JOHN R. and MRS., World's Student Christian Federation, 124 E. 28th St., New York, N. Y.
- MOXOM, REV. DR. P. S., 83 Darthmouth Terrace, Springfield, Mass.
- MURPHY, DANIEL B. and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Rochester, N. Y.
- MURRAY, CHAS. B. and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati, O.
- MYERS, PROF. P. V. N., College Hill, O.

- NEEDHAM, DR. CHAS. W., George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
- OGDEN, ROLLO C. and MRS., *The Evening Post*, New York, N. Y.
- OLDS, CLARK and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Erie, Pa.
- OSBORNE, HON. THOS. M., Business Men's Association, Auburn, N. Y.
- PAINE, COL. GEORGE M., Oshkosh, Wis.
- PALMER, HON. HENRY W., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
- PARKER, LEROY, 310 Mutual Life Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.
- PATCH, A. WARREN, National League of Commission Merchants, 17 N. Market St., Boston, Mass.
- PATRICK, DR. MARY MILLS, American College for Girls, Constantinople, Turkey.
- PHILIPS, DR. G. M. and MRS., West Chester, Pa.
- PHILLIPS, H. C. and MRS., Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
- PIERSON, MISS MARY J., 318 E. 15th St., New York, N. Y.
- PLATT, E. P. and MRS., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- PUGSLEY, HON. C. A., Peekskill, N. Y.
- PUGSLEY, CHESTER DEWITT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- PUTNAM, GEO. HAVEN, 27 W. 23d St., New York, N. Y.
- RHEES, DR. RUSH, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
- RICHARD, DR. ERNST and MRS., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- ROGERS, ELIAS, Board of Trade, Toronto, Canada.
- ROGERS, DR. W. P., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- ROWLEY, REV. DR. F. H. and MRS., First Baptist Church, Boston, Mass.
- SCHAEFFER, DR. N. C. and MRS., Lancaster, Pa.
- SCOTT, DR. GEO. WINFIELD, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- SCOTT, DR. JAS. BROWN and MRS., State Department, Washington, D. C.
- SCUDDER, MYRON T. and MRS., New Paltz, N. Y.
- SEELYE, REV. DR. L. CLARK, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
- SHEPHERD, PROF. WM. R. and MRS., Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- SHUMWAY, F. P. and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.
- SIMMONS, J. EDWARD, 28 W. 52d St., New York, N. Y.
- SLOCUM, DR. WM. F., Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Col.
- SMILEY, ALBERT K., Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
- SMILEY, DANIEL and MRS., Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
- SMILEY, SARAH F., 2022 F St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
- SMITH, T. GUILFORD, 203 Ellicott Sq., Buffalo, N. Y.
- STALKER, PROF. M., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
- STINESS, HON. JOHN H. and MRS., 210 Governor St., Providence, R. I.
- STODDARD, DR. CHAS. A. and MRS., *The Observer*, New York, N. Y.
- STONE, I. L. and MRS., Business Men's Association, Battle Creek, Mich.
- STRONG, REV. DR. A. H., Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
- SUNDERLAND, REV. J. T. and MRS., Unity Church, Hartford, Conn.

- SUTTON, GEO. H. and MRS., Board of Trade, Springfield, Mass.
 SWAIN, DR. JOSEPH and MRS., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- TAKAHIRA, BARON KOGORO, Japanese Embassy, Washington, D. C.
 TALCOTT, JAMES and MRS., 7 W. 57th St., New York, N. Y.
 TAYLOR, REV. DR. JAS. M. and MRS., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 THAXTER, MAJOR S. W. and MRS., Merchants' Exchange and Board of Trade, Portland, Me.
 THAYER, HON. SAMUEL R., Minneapolis, Minn.
 TOMPKINS, REV. FLOYD W. and MRS., Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
- TREEN, WM. H. and MRS., Board of Trade, Lynn, Mass.
 TRUEBLOOD, DR. BENJAMIN F., American Peace Society, Boston, Mass.
 TRYON, REV. JAMES L., American Peace Society, Boston, Mass.
 TUCKER, WM. R. and MRS., Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa.
 TURK, R. S., *The Spectator*, Staunton, Va.
- VAN KLEECK, HENRY and MRS., Chamber of Commerce, Denver, Col.
 VAN NORDEN, WARNER, 8 E. 62d St., New York, N. Y.
 VAN SLYKE, REV. DR. J. G. and MRS., Kingston, N. Y.
 VILLARD, MRS. HENRY, 145 W. 58th St., New York, N. Y.
- WADHAMS, HON. FREDERICK E. and MRS., Albany, N. Y.
 WAITE, HENRY R. and MRS., American Institute of Civics, New York, N. Y.
- WALSH, REV. WALTER and MRS., Dundee, Scotland.
 WARFIELD, DR. E. D. and MRS., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
 WELLS, AMOS R. and MRS., *The Christian Endeavor World*, Boston, Mass.
 WHEELER, EVERETT P. and MRS., 731 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.
 WHITE, DR. HENRY C. and MRS., University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
 WHITE, THOS. RAEBURN and MRS., West End Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
- WILEY, HON. WM. H. and MRS., E. Orange, N. J.
 WILLOUGHBY, PROF. W. W., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 WILSON, DR. GEO. GRAFTON and MRS., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 WILSON, GEN. JAS. GRANT and MRS., 157 W. 79th St., New York, N. Y.
 WOOD, ALEXANDER C. and MRS., Board of Trade, Camden, N. J.
 WOOD, JAMES, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.
 WOODRUFF, CLINTON ROGERS and MRS., North American Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
- WOODS, WM. S., *The Literary Digest*, New York, N. Y.
 WYLIE, DOUGLAS M., Chamber of Commerce, Baltimore, Md.

INDEX.

(Names of speakers and writers in small capitals; titles of addresses in italics.)

- Albany Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
Albuquerque Commercial Club, 94.
Ammidon, D. C., 92.
American Peace Society, 11.
American Republics, International Bureau of, 47; cornerstone of buiding for laid, 13, 148.
American Society of International Law, 11.
America's Duty in the Peace Movement, 147.
Amsterdam Board of Trade, 92, 94.
Anderson, Luis, 43.
Arbitration, Achievements of, 145.
Arbitration and Statesmanship, Some Triumphs of, 28.
Arbitration, The Gains of During the Past Year, 15.
Arbitration Treaties, 7, 13, 17; importance of, 70.
Arbitration Treaties, The Influence of, 70.
ARBUCKLE, JAMES, 92; remarks of, 112.
Arkansas State Board of Trade, 93.
Armies and Navies a Necessity, 63.
Armies and Navies Still Necessary, 87.
Armaments and Police Force Not Analogous, 172.
Armaments: limitation of, 3, 13, 15, 148, 150; national commissions for study of, 29.
Asheville Board of Trade, 94.
Auburn Business Men's Association, 92, 94, 102.
Augusta Chamber of Commerce, 93.
Baltimore Board of Trade, 92, 94.
Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
BARRETT, JOHN, 2; address of, 47.
BARROWS, SAMUEL J., 2; presents resolution, 175.
Bartholdt, Richard, 71.
Battle Creek Business Men's Association, 92, 94.
Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, 95.
Binghamton Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
Birmingham Commercial Club, 93.
Boston Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
Boston Merchants' Association, 92, 94.
BREWER, DAVID J., 2; remarks of, 147.
Bridgeport Board of Trade, 93.
Brockton Board of Trade, 94.
BROWN, ELMER ELLSWORTH, 2; remarks of, 144.
Brown, J. C., 90.
Brunswick Board of Trade, 93.
BRYCE, JAMES, letter of, 70.
Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
Burlington Commercial Club, 95.
Business Men and International Arbitration, 95.

- Business Men, declaration of, 8, 88.
- Business Men, Influence of for Peace*, 117.
- Business Men, Interest of Aroused through Publicity*, 119.
- Business Men, relation of to arbitration movement, (88-119).
- Business Men Should be Interested in the International Arbitration Movement*, 96.
- Business Men, work of for peace, 117, 118.
- Business Organizations: cooperating with Mohonk Conference, 11, 89, 93; delegates appointed by, 92; relation of to arbitration movement, (88-119); report of Committee on, 89.
- Butler, S. P., 92.
- California State Board of Trade, 93.
- CALVO, JOAQUIN B., 38.
- Camden Board of Trade, 92, 94.
- Canadian Merchants' Association, 95.
- Canadian Retail Merchants' Association, 95.
- Cedar Rapids Merchants' Association, 93.
- Central American Court of Justice 12, 18, 49; described, 43-47.
- Central American Peace Conference, 10, 12, 18; described, 41-43.
- Central American Peace Conference, The, and The Central American Court of Justice*, 38.
- Central America, record of, in international arbitration, 39-41.
- CHADWICK, FRENCH E., 172.
- Charleston Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Charlotte Commercial Club, 94.
- Chester Board of Trade, 94.
- CHESTER, WALSTEIN R., 92; remarks of, 111.
- Cheyenne Industrial Club, 93, 95.
- Chicago Board of Trade, 93.
- Churches, The Duty of to the Peace Movement*, 159.
- Churches, the relation of to the peace movement, 159-164.
- Cincinnati Business Men's Club, 94.
- Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
- CLARK, JOHN B., 59.
- Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Colleges and Universities: relation of to arbitration movement, 120-144; report of Committee on, 120-123.
- Colleges May Promote International Arbitration, How*, 125, 135.
- Colleges, Power of Idealism in*, 123.
- Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce, 92, 93.
- Colorado Springs Merchants' Association, 93.
- Colorado Springs Real Estate Exchange, 92, 93.
- Columbus Board of Trade, 92, 94.
- Commerce, Navies and Peace*, 111.
- Commerce the Agent of Peace*, 98.
- Committees: general, 2; on business organizations, report of, 89; on colleges and universities, report of, 120-123.
- Congress, attitude of toward arbitration, 32.
- Contents, 4-6.
- Cook, Joel, 90.
- "Corda Fratres" International Federation of Students, 122, 142.
- Correspondents of Mohonk Conference, 11.
- Council Bluffs Commercial Club, 93.

- Court of Arbitral Justice, the International, 7, 13, 22-25.
- Court of Prize, the International, 7, 22.
- Dallas Commercial Club, 95.
- Dayton Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Debts, contract, collection of, 7, 17, 21.
- Democracy, peaceful influence of, 106-108.
- Denver Chamber of Commerce, 92, 93.
- Denver Real Estate Exchange, 92, 93.
- Des Moines Commercial Club, 93.
- Dickson, A. W., 93.
- Diplomacy, Upright, a Power for Peace*, 81.
- DOLE, C. F., 79, 150.
- DUTTON, SAMUEL T., 2; remarks of, 87.
- EASTMAN, S. E., 92; remarks of, 86.
- Education Essential to Peace*, 144.
- Education, place of in arbitration movement, 120-144.
- Elizabeth Board of Trade, 94.
- Elmira Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
- Elyria Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Enlisting Students in the Peace Movement*, 141.
- Erie Board of Trade, 94.
- Erie Business Men's Association, 94.
- Erie Chamber of Commerce, 93, 94, 115.
- Evansville Business Association, 93.
- Evansville Manufacturers' Association, 93.
- Farley, A. C., 92.
- FARQUHAR, A. B., 92; remarks of, 65, 108.
- Fisher, Irving, 92.
- Fitzpatrick, Charles, 71.
- Force, use of in collecting debts restricted, 7, 17, 21.
- Fort Wayne Commercial Club, 93.
- FOSTER, JOHN W., 2, 175; address of, 12; remarks of, 176.
- Foxcroft, Frank, 2.
- FREAR, W. F., 92; remarks of, 57.
- Freeport Business Men's Association, 93.
- Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, 93.
- FULK, GEORGE, 122, 144; remarks of, 141.
- Galveston Chamber of Commerce, 95.
- General Agreement Important in Work for Peace*, 149.
- General Arbitration Treaty, 10, 12, 15.
- Geneva Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Gitchell, B. H., 92.
- Great Lakes, The Lesson of the*, 115.
- Greensboro Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Hague Conference, a third provided for, 21.
- Hague Conference, The, a Power for International Amity*, 26.
- Hague Conference, the Meeting of, a Great Fact*, 34.
- Hague Conference, the second, 89, 101; number of states represented in, 20; outside aspects of, 26-27; work of, 7, 9-10, 12, 15-17, 19-26.
- Hague Conference, The Second, Outcome of*, 108.
- Hague Court: may be invoked by either litigant, 10, 16; will settle Newfoundland Fisheries question, 18.

- Hague Palace of Peace, cornerstone of, laid, 27.
Hague Peace Conference, the Second, 19.
 Hamilton Board of Trade, 95.
 Harrisburgh Board of Trade, 93, 94.
 Hart, Jas. A., 92, 93.
Hawaii's Interest in International Arbitration, 57.
 Hawkins, Delmer E., 92.
 Hefford, R. R., 92.
 Hoboken Board of Trade, 94.
 Hoile, James T., 92.
 HOLCOMBE, CHESTER, 81.
 HOLT, HAMILTON, 2; remarks of, 156.
 Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, 92, 93.
 Hoover, Matthew H., 2, 92.
 Hoyt, Albert E., 2.
 HULL, WILLIAM I., 26.
 Hunter, Dexter, 2, 92.
 Indianapolis Board of Trade, 93.
 Indianapolis Commercial Club, 93.
Influences Working for Peace, 170.
 Intercollegiate Peace Association, 11, 121, 133, 144; work of, 122.
 International Arbitration, prize for essay on, 121, 145.
 International Bureau of American Republics, 47; cornerstone for building of, laid, 13, 48.
International Commerce, The Ethics of, 112.
 International Conciliation, The Association for, 11.
 International Court of Arbitral Justice, 7, 13, 22-25.
 International Court of Prize, 7, 22.
 International forces working for peace, 170-171.
International Law and the World's Peace, 71.
 JACKSON, FREDERICK H., 93; remarks of, 119.
 Jacksonville Board of Trade, 92, 93.
 Jamestown Manufacturers' Association, 94.
Japan's Development a Work of Peace, 66.
 Japan, work of for arbitration, 66-67.
 Jones, William B., 92.
 Kansas City Board of Trade, 94.
 Kansas City Commercial Club, 94.
 Kennedy, James S., 92.
 KING, HORATIO C., 87.
 KIRCHWEY, GEORGE W., 2; address of, 71.
 KLINE, MAHLON N., 2, 90, 93; remarks of, 89.
 Labor, attitude of toward international arbitration, 59-62.
 LALANNE, FRANK D., 88, 92; address of, 98.
 Lancaster Board of Trade, 94.
 Latin-America, facts concerning, 51.
 Laurier, Sir Wilfred, 71.
 Lawrence Board of Trade, 94.
 Leadville Citizens' Improvement Association, 93.
 Leavenworth, Commercial Club, 94.
 Levering, Eugene, 121.
 Limitation of Armaments, 3, 13, 15, 148, 150; national commissions for study of, 29.
 Little Rock Board of Trade, 93.
 Lockport Board of Trade, 92, 94.
 Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 93.
 Louisville Board of Trade, 94.
 Louisville Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, 94.
 LYNCH, FREDERICK, 34, 170.
 Lynn Board of Trade, 92, 94.
 McCleary, William, 92.

- McDOWELL, JOHN, 92; remarks of, 117.
- McFarland, J. Horace, 93.
- McKELWAY, ST. CLAIR, 150, 175.
- McKeesport Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- McLANE, JOHN, 84.
- Mahony, W. A., 90, 92.
- Maine State Board of Trade, 94.
- MANDERSON, CHARLES F., 92; remarks of, 63.
- Marble, William A., 92.
- MARKS, MARCUS M., 92; address of, 96.
- Massachusetts State Board of Trade, 92, 94, 111.
- MEAD, EDWIN D., 2; remarks of, 28.
- MEAD, MRS. EDWIN D., 34, 144, 172.
- Memphis Cotton Exchange, 94.
- Memphis Merchants Exchange, 94.
- Members of the Conference, 177.
- Menomonie Commercial Club, 95.
- Meriden Board of Trade, 93.
- Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, 95.
- Minneapolis Commercial Club, 94.
- Mobile Chamber of Commerce, 93.
- Moline Business Men's Association, 93.
- Montgomery Commercial Club, 93.
- Montreal Board of Trade, 95.
- MOORE, JOSEPH B., 2; remarks of, 149.
- MOTT, JOHN R., 164.
- MOXOM, PHILIP S., 31.
- Mulock, William, 71.
- Murphy, Daniel B., 92.
- MURRAY, CHARLES B., 92; remarks of, 95.
- Nashville Board of Trade, 94.
- National Association of Clothiers, 92, 93, 96.
- National Association of Manufacturers, 92, 93, 108.
- National Board of Trade, 92, 93, 98.
- National Business League of America, 93.
- National League of Commission Merchants, 92, 93.
- Navies as Peace Preservers*, 172.
- Neutralization and Non-intercourse*, 34.
- Nevada Commercial League, 94.
- Newark Board of Trade, 92, 94, 116.
- Newfoundland Fisheries Case, the, to be referred to Hague Court, 18.
- New Haven Business Men's Association, 92, 93.
- New Haven Chamber of Commerce, 92, 93.
- New London Business Men's Association, 93.
- New Orleans Board of Trade, Ltd., 94.
- New Orleans Progressive Union, 94.
- Newport Commercial Club, 94.
- Newspaper, The, part of in international arbitration movement, 151-159.
- New York Board of Trade & Transportation, 94.
- New York, Manufacturers' Association of, 92, 94.
- New York Merchants' Association, 92, 94.
- New York, North Side Board of Trade of, 94.
- New York Produce Exchange, 94.
- Norfolk Board of Trade, 95.
- Northwestern Manufacturers' Association, 94.
- Oakland Chamber of Commerce, 93.
- Oakland Merchants' Exchange, 93.

- Officers and Committees of the Conference, 2.
- OGDEN, ROLLO, 2; address of, 151.
- Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- OLDS, CLARK, 93; remarks of, 115.
- Omaha Commercial Club, 92, 94.
- Organized Labor, The Part of in the Arbitration Movement*, 59.
- OSBORNE, THOMAS M., 92; address of, 103.
- Pan-American Interest in International Arbitration, 38-56.
- Pan-American Scientific Congress, the First*, 51-56.
- Pan-America's Work for International Arbitration*, 47.
- Patch, A. Warren, 92.
- Paterson Taxpayers' Association, 94.
- Pawtucket Merchant's Association, 94.
- Peabody, George Foster, 90.
- Peace and Greatness, The True Principles of*, 75.
- Peace Palace at The Hague, Cornerstone of laid, 27.
- Peace Preserved by National Calmness*, 86.
- Peace Program, A*, 79.
- Peace, Moral Grounds of*, 86.
- Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Conference, 11, 90.
- Philadelphia Board of Trade, 93, 94.
- Philadelphia Trades League, 93, 94.
- Phillips, H. C., 2, 120, 175.
- Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Platform of the Conference: adopted, 150; discussed, 147-150; text of, 7.
- Portland (Me.) Board of Trade, 92, 94.
- Portland (Ore.) Board of Trade, 94.
- Portland (Ore.) Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Preface, 3.
- Press, The Attitude of toward the Peace Movement*, 151.
- Press, The, Maybe Made a Greater Influence for Peace. How*, 156.
- Press, The, relation of to arbitration movement, 151-159.
- Preston, Elwyn G., 90.
- Prize for Essay on International Arbitration, offered by C. D. Pugsley, 121; accepted, 145.
- Prizes for Essays, 120, 122.
- Providence Board of Trade, 93, 94, 119.
- Public Sentiment a Growing Power for Peace*, 31.
- Pueblo Business Men's Association, 93.
- Pugsley, Chester DeWitt, offers prize, 121; prize offered by, accepted, 145.
- Quincy Chamber of Commerce, 93.
- Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Raleigh Retail Grocers' Association, 94.
- Reading Board of Trade, 94.
- Reports of Conference, how obtainable, 3.
- Resolutions: concerning Japan 70; of business men, 8, 88; of thanks, 175.
- RHEES, RUSH, 123.
- Richardson, Charles, 90.
- Richmond Stock Exchange, 95.
- Rochester Chamber of Commerce, 92, 94.
- Rogers, Elias, 2, 93.
- ROGERS, WILLIAM PERRY, 129.
- Roosevelt, President. Work of for Peace*, 33.
- Ross, George W., 71.
- ROWLEY, F. H., 159.

- Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, 93.
- St. Joseph Commercial Club, 94.
- St. Louis Business Men's League, 94.
- St. Louis Latin-American and Foreign Trade Association, 92, 94, 112.
- St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, 94.
- Salt Lake City Commercial Club, 95.
- San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, 93.
- San Francisco Merchants' Exchange, 93.
- Savannah Cotton Exchange, 93.
- SCOTT, JAMES BROWN, 2; address of, 19; remarks of, 35.
- Scranton Board of Trade, 93, 94.
- Seattle Chamber of Commerce, 95.
- Second Hague Conference, The, 89, 101; number of states represented in, 20; outside aspects of, 26-27; work of, 7, 9-10, 12, 15-17, 19-26.
- SEELYE, L. CLARK, 120.
- Senate, The, and the Arbitration Treaties*, 35.
- SHEPHERD, WILLIAM R., 51.
- Shreveport Progressive League, 94.
- Shumway, F. P., 92.
- Simmons, J. Edward, 2.
- SMILEY, ALBERT K., 175; remarks of, 9, 175.
- Smiley, Daniel, 2, 175.
- Spokane Chamber of Commerce, 95.
- Springfield Board of Trade, 92, 94.
- Springfield (Ill.) Business Men's Association, 93.
- STINESS, JOHN H., 2; remarks of, 145.
- Stone, I. L., 92.
- Students, Work of, for Peace, 141-143.
- Sutton, George H., 92.
- SWAIN, JOSEPH, 125.
- Swarthmore College, 125-129.
- Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, 92-94.
- Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, 95.
- TAKAHIRA, BARON KOGORO, 70; address of, 66.
- Tampa Board of Trade, 93.
- Territorial Rights Guaranteed by Treaty, 12, 30.
- Thaxter, S. W., 92.
- Topeka Commercial Club, 94.
- Toronto Board of Trade, 93, 95.
- Treaties of Arbitration, 7, 13, 17. importance of, 70.
- Treaty of Portsmouth, The*, 84.
- Treen, William H., 92.
- Troy Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- TRUEBLOOD, BENJAMIN F., 2; address of, 15.
- TUCKER, WILLIAM R., 88, 93.
- Universities and Colleges: relation of to arbitration movement, 120-144; report of Committee on, 120-123.
- University Students. How Interested in International Arbitration*, 129.
- Utica Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- Van Kleeck, Henry, 2, 92.
- VILLARD, MRS. HENRY, 86.
- WALSH, WALTER, 75.
- Waltham Business Men's Association, 92, 94.
- War and Democracy*, 103.
- WARFIELD, E. D., 37, 150.
- Watertown Chamber of Commerce, 94.
- West Virginia Board of Trade, 95.

Wheeling Board of Trade, 95.
 WHITE, HENRY C., 135.
 Wichita Chamber of Commerce,
 94.
 Wilkesbarre Board of Trade, 94.
 Williamsport Board of Trade, 94.
 Wilmington Board of Trade, 94.
 Winnipeg Board of Trade, 95.
 Wood, Alexander C., 2, 14, 92,
 175.

WOODRUFF, CLINTON ROGERS, 2,
 90, 175; remarks of, 33. .
 Worcester Board of Trade, 94.
*Work. Continual. Essential for
 Peace*, 87.
 Wylie, Douglas M., 92.
*Young Men's Christian Associa-
 tion. Relation of to International
 Arbitration*, 164.

