

International Arbitration

The National Conference at Washington

From a Special Correspondent



OMEbody has described the progress of all great moral reforms that succeed as, first, the stage of agitation; second, the stage of fanaticism; and, third and last, the stage of "business." No thoughtful observer who witnessed the gathering in Washington last week of several hundred prominent Americans at the National Arbitration Conference, representing forty-four States, one Territory, and the District of Columbia, could fail to realize that the movement to abolish war between nations was reaching its final stage. Here was no group of mere enthusiasts, but a body of hard-headed, practical citizens—lawyers, merchants, editors, educators, publicists—every one of whom had proved, by the success he had made of his own life, his right to press his judgment upon others.

The call for this Conference had been addressed, not to the public at large, but to individuals, whose names had been selected with great care, so as to make the gathering truly representative, and give it a dignity inseparable from the personal character and standing of its members. It summoned the recipient, not to an international but to a National Conference; in other words, its authors realized that before approaching any other nation with an appeal for co-operation we must be prepared to produce proofs that the best thought and sentiment in our own land is behind the movement. Last, and most important of all, it contained these passages:

A widespread desire has been manifested both in the United States and in Great Britain for the establishment between these two countries of a permanent system of arbitration. . . .

In confining the present movement to the promotion of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, we are not unconcerned for the wider application of the principle involved. But, taking into consideration the importance and the value of practical results, it has seemed wise to concentrate our immediate efforts upon the attainment of a permanent system between the two great English-speaking peoples.

This was a master-stroke. It avoided the peril of overdoing a good thing; by narrowing the area of discussion it reduced the list of possible objections, besides making sure that the Conference could finish its work within the two days prescribed; and it touched the chords of blood-kindred and race pride, from which the response is never slow in coming.

The signatures to the call were not less noteworthy than its text. The first three represented the professional antipodes. The name of Melville W. Fuller, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was followed immediately by the names of Nelson A. Miles, the Major-General commanding the Army, and John G. Walker, the most noted Rear-Admiral of the Navy in active service. Thus law and the sword—heir and ancestor—joined in a movement to hasten the subsidence of the one and the supremacy of the other. After these signers came such as John W. Foster, who served as Secretary of State in President Harrison's Cabinet after an experience almost lifelong in various diplomatic fields, and whose latest achievement was the negotiation of a treaty of peace between China and Japan; Abram S. Hewitt, whose "Americanism" could no longer be questioned after he swept the New York City Hall of all national flags except the Stars and Stripes; Benjamin H. Bristow, the courageous Secretary of the Treasury who smashed the Whisky Ring; ex-Judge Charles P. Daly, the eminent geographer; Dorman B. Eaton, the author of the United States Civil Service Law; Charles W. Eliot, Timothy Dwight, Seth Low, and James B. Angell, distinguished as Presidents of the greatest universities in this country; Cardinal Gibbons; ex-Governor Russell, of Massachusetts, Charles Francis Adams, and Robert Treat

Paine; Oscar Straus, J. L. M. Curry, and James A. Broadhead, ex-Ministers of the United States at foreign courts; William E. Dodge, Marshall Field, Cyrus H. McCormick, William Preston Johnson, Horace Davis, Cyrus D. Foss, and a score more of equal eminence, from the foremost American cities and the four points of the compass.

More than common attention has been given to this preliminary because so much of the success of the undertaking depended on it. A mistake at the outset would have created a wrong impression of the movement, and given it perhaps a fatal check.

The first meeting was held at Metzert Hall on the afternoon of Wednesday, April 22. It was called to order by Gardiner G. Hubbard, as Chairman of the local Committee of Arrangements, and a brief address of welcome was delivered by John W. Foster, who said, among other things:

It seems a Utopian idea to anticipate a general disarmament of nations in our generation, and, until barbarism and the spirit of conquest and oppression shall be banished from the earth, governments will be forced to maintain armies and navies. But certainly among peoples who profess to be governed by the principles of a common Christianity, and especially between nations kindred in lineage, language, and institutions, a better method of adjusting the differences which must rise between them may be found than by the bloody arbitrament of war. The English-speaking race is by far the most numerous of the great Caucasian family, and to it is intrusted by Providence the highest interests of civilization and Christianity in the world, and if this Conference shall result in a permanent plan whereby their differences may be adjusted by arbitration, it will win for itself the fame of one of the memorable assemblies of all history.

Ex-Senator George F. Edmunds was chosen permanent President of the Conference, and, in expressing his thanks for the honor, drew attention to the facts that the assemblage before him represented the largest civilized body of men and women in the world; that the United States were one of the richest and most powerful of nations, and had least to fear from war; but that this very strength, wealth, and civilization marked the American people as the one to give the cause of universal peace its first impulse. One of the most impressive object-lessons witnessed by the world now, he added, is the contrast between the gigantic standing armies of Europe and our own miniature military establishment; the day must come, in the course of human progress, when foreign nations will reduce their war force to the footing of ours, and maintain it only for police service. He then introduced the Rev. Dr. L. T. Chamberlain, of New York, who laid especial stress upon the modesty of aim which the Conference should keep in view. Said he:

This gathering has not been summoned with design of either dictation or rebuke. Nor for an instant do we forget that we are in the presence of those whom the people, ourselves included, have elected to the control of National affairs. We claim for ourselves no monopoly of patriotic intensity, nor any exclusiveness of philanthropic breadth. We assemble that the conviction of the American people respecting the need of some system of arbitration between this country and Great Britain may be most clearly and appropriately certified, not only to our own Government, but also to the Government and the people over the sea.

War may cease through a cessation of the causes of war, yet valor take on new splendor and fortitude be lifted into greater grandeur. With the prevalence of mutual right-dealing there may well come an end of mutual slaughter. We are not under the delusion that an agreement between two nations to favor arbitration, or even the adoption of a properly defined system of arbitration, is a panacea. No scheme, however framed, will be either self-executing or all-healing. Back of juridical adjustments, to insure worthy concord between even two nations, there must be magnanimity and truth. Yet this Conference believes that with the declared presumption, the ordained facility, the familiar procedure on the side of mutual adjustment, magnanimity and truth

will be the more fostered and a resultant harmony will be the more assured.

The chief speaker at the evening session was Carl Schurz. He argued that in a war conducted on modern lines their wealth, ingenuity, and courage would make the Americans invincible. Moreover, no foreign power could go to war with them without exposing itself most temptingly to attack by its neighbors at home. Therefore, said he:

We may depend upon it with absolute assurance that, whether we are armed or not, no European power will seek a quarrel with us; that, on the contrary, they will avoid such a quarrel with the utmost care; that we cannot have a war with any of them, unless we wantonly and persistently seek such a war; and that they will respect our rights and comply with all our demands, if just and proper, in the way of friendly agreement.

To the demand of some youthful enthusiasts for a war to lift our people out of their materialism and stimulate their heroic spirit, he responded:

What a mocking delusion it is! To lift a people out of materialism by war! Has not war always excited the spirit of reckless and unscrupulous speculation, not only while it was going on, but also afterwards, by the economic disorders accompanying and outlasting it? Has it not always stimulated the rapid and often dishonest accumulation of riches on one side, while spreading and intensifying want and misery on the other? Has it not thus always had a tendency to plunge a people still deeper into materialism? Has not every great war left a dark streak of demoralization behind? Has it not thus always proved dangerous to the purity of republican governments? Is not this our own experience? And as to awakening the heroic spirit—does it not, while stirring noble impulses in some, excite the base passions in others? . . . The old Roman poet tells us that it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country. It is noble, indeed. But to die on the battle-field is not the highest achievement of heroism. To live for a good cause, honestly, unselfishly, laboriously, is at least as noble and heroic as to die for it, and usually far more difficult.

I have seen war; I have seen it with its glories and its horrors; with its noble emotions and its bestialities; with its exaltations and triumphs, and its unspeakable miseries and baneful corruptions; and I say to you, I feel my blood tingle with indignation when I hear the flippant talk of war as if it were only a holiday pastime or an athletic sport. We are often told that there are things worse than war. Yes, but not many. He deserves the curse of mankind who in the exercise of power forgets that war should be only the very last resort even in contending for a just and beneficent end, after all the resources of peaceful methods are thoroughly exhausted.

Mr. Schurz declared that he had heard but one objection to a permanent arbitration system which made the slightest pretense to statesmanship:

It is that we are a young and aspiring people, and that a binding arbitration treaty would hamper us in our freedom of action.

Let the light be turned upon this. What is it that an arbitration treaty contemplates? That in all cases of dispute between this and a certain other country there shall be an impartial tribunal regularly appointed to decide, upon principles of international law, of equity, of reason, what this and what the other country may be justly entitled to. And this arrangement is to be shunned as hampering our freedom of action!

What will you think of a man who tells you that he feels himself intolerably hampered in his freedom of action by the ten commandments or by the criminal code? What respect and confidence can a nation claim for its character that rejects a trustworthy and well-regulated method of ascertaining and establishing right and justice, avowedly to preserve its freedom of action? Shame upon those who would have this great Republic play so disreputable a part! I protest that the American people are an honorable people. Wherever its interests or ambitions may lead this great Nation, I am sure it will always preserve that self-respect which will prompt it rather to court the search-light of truth and justice than, by skulking on dark and devious paths, seek to evade it.

The economic contrasts between peace and war were presented in a striking manner by Edward Atkinson. In Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, and Belgium, he said, the production of the staple necessities of life, such as food, fuel, timber, metal, and fiber, is insufficient to keep up with domestic consumption:

What is the result of these conditions upon the commerce of this country, for which we may demand a peaceful way across the sea for all future times? Our huge and increasing exports

have during the last ten years consisted to the extent of 80 per cent. of the excess of food and fiber which we could not consume at home. Sixty per cent. of these exports have been bought of us by Great Britain and her colonies; 23 per cent. by France, Germany, Holland, and Belgium—these being the several countries whose power of purchase has been augmented by science and invention. Only 17 per cent. of our exports have passed to all other lands; less than 4 per cent. to South America.

These prosperous conditions of our agriculture are due to the interdependence of nations and to the maintenance of peaceful commerce upon the high seas; yet under this pressure of jingoism, and in pursuance of a policy of aggression and warfare, this country has wasted \$7,000,000 or more in the construction of two basely named "commerce-destroyers." These ships are fit for nothing except to plunder and destroy the vessels by which our abundance is distributed, on which the whole prosperity of this country rests. There is no shipping of any moment at the present time upon the high seas to be destroyed except that of our most valuable customers. Could anything be more grotesque than such folly?

The closing speech of the evening was that of President Angell, of Michigan University, on the humane and philanthropic aspects of the subject. It was a sad commentary on Christian civilization, he said, that, nineteen centuries after the coming of the Prince of Peace, nations so often resort to the methods of brutes and savages rather than to the methods of rational beings and brethren for the settlement of disputes. He continued:

We have gathered here to consider what can be done by this Nation to secure the peaceful and righteous settlement of controversies between us and Great Britain, if not between all nations. Our temperament and our history make it easy and natural for us to lead now in the attempt to substitute arbitration for war wherever it can be properly substituted. We have generally sought to avoid war, even when we have had to bear great wrongs. We have had but two foreign wars in one hundred years; but, war once begun, no men have shown more bravery and skill on land and sea than the American soldiers and seamen.

At the morning session of Thursday, a paper by Professor John B. Moore, of Columbia University, was read, arguing that the very existence of a general system of national arbitration would tend to diminish the necessity for resorting to it.

President Gates, of Amherst College, said that if arbitration once became the established rule for settling disputes between nations, and it was understood that in every case the nation with the strongest cause, and not the nation with the strongest army, would win, one of the great incentives to war would be wiped out. The proposed plan recognizes all States as personalities, each equal to every other, in the sense that its rights under international law are entitled to the same respect whether it be a great power or a weak one. The first point to be gained is to bring two of these States, kindred in blood and language, out of their bondage to brute violence and under the permanent sway of reason and high moral sentiment. And he added:

The condition of Europe to-day is not so much a condition of peace as of temporary truce. War is delayed, but is constantly anticipated. The maintenance of peace by universal preparation for war involves terrible burdens. The industrial interests of the civilized world will not always patiently bear this load. Every laboring man and every toiling woman in Europe goes to the day's work carrying on burdened shoulders the load of a full-armed soldier, who, if not fighting, still eats and never works. This burden has set the people questioning. Never before has war been compelled to give so strict account of itself. Never before has there been so stern a challenge of its reason for being. The world is threatened with a great revolutionary outburst of brotherly feeling!

General O. O. Howard also spoke at this session, saying that he was heart and soul in sympathy with the purposes of the Conference. It would be necessary, of course, to keep up an army and navy, even in this country, as a National police force, but neither of them need be made any larger than now.

At the afternoon session the Conference, after a spirited debate of some hours, adopted the following report from its Committee on Resolutions:

This National Conference of American Citizens, assembled at Washington, April 22, 1896, to promote international arbitration, profoundly convinced that experience has shown that war

as a method of determining disputes between nations is oppressive in its operation, uncertain and unequal in its results, and productive of immense evils, and that the spirit and humanity of the age, as well as the precepts of religion, require the adoption of every practicable means for the establishment of reason and justice between nations; and considering that the people of the United States and the people of Great Britain, bound together by ties of a common language and literature, of like political and legal institutions and of many mutual interests, and animated by a spirit of devotion to law and justice, have on many occasions, by recourse to peaceful and friendly arbitration, manifested their just desire to substitute reason for force in the settlement of their differences, and to establish a reign of peace among nations; that the common sense and enlightened public opinion of both nations are utterly averse to any further war between them; that the same good sense, reinforced by common principles of humanity, religion, and justice, requires the adoption of a permanent method for the peaceful adjustment of international controversies, which method shall not only provide for the uniform application of principles of law and justice in the settlement of their own differences, but shall also, by its example and its results, promote the peace and progress of all peoples,—does hereby adopt the following resolutions:

1. That, in the judgment of this Conference, religion, humanity, and justice, as well as the material interest of civilized society, demand the immediate establishment between the United States and Great Britain of a permanent system of arbitration.

2. That it is earnestly recommended to our Government, as soon as it is assured of a corresponding disposition on the part of the British Government, to negotiate a treaty providing for the widest practicable application of the method of arbitration to international controversies.

3. That a committee of this Conference be appointed to prepare and present to the President of the United States a memorial respectfully urging the taking of such steps on the part of the United States as will best conduce to the end in view.

In accordance with the closing resolution a committee was appointed, consisting of George F. Edmunds, Chairman; James B. Angell, Gardiner G. Hubbard, J. L. M. Curry, and Henry Hitchcock.

The sessions of the Conference were not without their modicum of spice. On the reading, for example, of a letter from Andrew Carnegie expressing regret at his inability to be present and inclosing a check for \$1,000 as his contribution toward the expenses of the meeting, a member from Missouri moved that the check be returned, since Mr. Carnegie was in the business of making and selling material for war; but a Pennsylvanian made a brief and somewhat spirited answer, and the motion was promptly tabled.

At another time, E. V. Smalley, of Minnesota, spoke resentfully of the over-meek tone of the proceedings. He believed that the American people would not wish to check the growth of the American navy. "It is idle," said he, "to think that all nations will lay down their arms and dwell like brothers in a church. We cannot carry out our mission to extend the rights of man all over the globe without becoming a great sea power."

Mr. Schurz took up the challenge at once. "When it is said that our Union must become a great sea power," he exclaimed, "what does it mean? It means that we must have a naval armament equal to that of Great Britain and France combined. Are you ready, gentlemen, for that?" A loud chorus of "No!" "No!" was the response. "I am as impatient as any one," continued the speaker, "to see the American flag floating in all the waters of the world, but I want it to float over our commerce rather than our navy. I want to see American ships carrying our merchandise, our ideas, and our civilization everywhere, no matter whether they carry our guns or not."

A permanent committee of twenty-five was appointed to carry forward the work and arrange for further conferences if necessary, consisting of Charles C. Harrison, Herbert Welsh, and J. H. Converse, of Pennsylvania; Henry Hitchcock, of Missouri; John Randolph Tucker, of Virginia; Judge D. M. Key, of Tennessee; ex-Governor J. S. Pillsbury, of Minnesota; Horace Davis, of California; Alexander T. Humphreys, of Kentucky; William E. Dodge, L. T. Chamberlain, John B. Moore, George L. Rives, and Carl Schurz, of New York; Lyman J. Gage, William C. Gray, and W. A. Fuller, of Illinois; Charles Francis Adams, Charles W. Eliot, and Edward Atkinson, of Massachusetts; Charles E. Fenner, of Louisiana; Simeon E. Baldwin, of

Connecticut; Josiah Crosby, of Maine; Fleming Du Bignon, of Georgia; Chancellor A. T. McGill, of New Jersey; Oscar R. Hundley, of Alabama, and W. H. Taft, of Ohio.

After the adjournment of the Conference, on Thursday evening, a mass-meeting was held at the Grand Opera-House, which was addressed by several eminent speakers. John Randolph Tucker discussed international arbitration from the point of view of a lawyer. President Eliot condemned the "war spirit" in unmeasured terms. "There has recently been imported from Europe," said he, "an idea utterly repugnant to us, called 'Jingoism'—a detestable word for a detestable thing. I should be at a loss to say which party in this country is the greater offender in this respect, and I particularly grieve that foremost in the enormity are sundry graduates of Harvard University. Can anything be more offensive to industrious, sober, hard-working American citizens than this chip-on-the-shoulder attitude—this brutality coupled with a despotic militarism?"

Bishop Keane, Rector of the Catholic University of Washington, followed.

"I am not here to blame the President or Congress," he remarked. "I do not believe it is our purpose or our right to blame either of them. But we, as American citizens, are free to say that it is a pity that things are as they are, compelling the President and Congress to talk of war with another civilized nation."

"It has been shown in the United States that all nationalities can live under one government with peace and prosperity. The world is sick of the international hatred and the armed militarism in the Old World. Hatred is of the world below, and it must go, and with it must go militarism."

President Patton, of Princeton, expressed his profound faith in the success of international arbitration, which he declared would be enforced and made practicable "by the gradual evolution of an international conscience."

No attempt to formulate a definite plan for an international tribunal was made by the Conference, but a plan of the New York State Bar Association was presented to President Cleveland, on the day the Conference met, by a committee of the Association. It is as follows:

1. The establishment of a permanent international tribunal, to be known as the International Court of Arbitration.

2. Such court to be composed of nine members, one each from nine independent States or nations, such representative to be a member of the supreme or highest court of the nation he shall represent, chosen by a majority vote of his associates because of his high character as a publicist and judge, and his recognized ability and irreproachable integrity. Each judge thus selected to hold office during life or the will of the court selecting him.

3. The court thus constituted to make its own rules of procedure, to have power to fix its place of sessions, and to change the same from time to time as circumstances and the convenience of litigants may suggest, and to appoint such clerks and attendants as the court may require.

4. Controverted questions arising between any two or more independent powers, whether represented in said International Court of Arbitration or not, at the option of said powers, to be submitted by treaty between said powers to said court, providing only that said treaty shall contain a stipulation to the effect that all parties thereto shall respect and abide by the rules and regulations of said court, and conform to whatever determination it shall make of said controversy.

5. Said court to be open at all times for the filing of cases and counter-cases under treaty stipulations by any nation, whether represented in the court or not, and such orderly proceedings in the interim between sessions of the court, in preparation for argument and submission of the controversy, as may seem necessary, to be taken as the rules of the court provide for and may be agreed upon between the litigants.

6. Independent powers not represented in said court, but which may have become parties litigant in a controversy before it, and by treaty stipulation have agreed to submit to its adjudication, to comply with the rules of the court, and to contribute such stipulated amount to its expenses as may be provided for by its rules or determined by the court.

As will be seen, this plan contemplates a general agreement among the leading nations of the earth, instead of the simple Anglo-American treaty upon which the efforts of the Conference were directly focused.

F. E. L.

The Outlook's Vacation Fund



THE first sign of spring rouses to activity all who are interested in vacation work. The summer days are not far off, with their possibilities of rest and recreation for busy workers. Some, fortunately, can arrange their vacations with the greatest liberty. To others there are restrictions that represent financial limitations. The vast majority have no choice. They must spend their vacations where others make it possible. This latter class are from that stratum of our social structure where the environment offers the least possibility of light, air, space, privacy, beauty. That a little child should lack these essentials of life—for no life can be complete that lacks them—is cruel. That youth should be deprived of them is the misfortune of the community, for they make for character. Give light, air, space, privacy, beauty, to every human being, and you have given him that which best ministers to good government. The success of the vacation work that is founded on the principle that these essentials are the God-given rights of every man proves the truth that the trend of every human being, independent of his environment of poverty, is to respond to these opportunities for spiritual growth. It was consistent with the intelligence

girls. When the offer of this property was made, the editors decided that it would be carrying out the wishes of the young girls who had sent the money to use as much of it as was necessary to furnish the house placed at their disposal, and offered by them to the Working-Girls' Vacation Society. The house was opened May 29, 1892, each room expressing the friendship of the pupils of several schools for the working-girls. The decorations were all the work of the school-girls, and were in the colors of the schools providing them.

At the close of the first season the generous owners of Cherry Vale offered to enlarge the house, and the summer of 1893 found this beautiful house ready for occupancy. As soon as the announcement was made that more rooms were to be furnished at Cherry Vale, more schools offered to furnish them, so that the large house stood only as a larger expression of the consciousness of the sisterhood of the women of the nineteenth century. The rooms were furnished with white beds, a pretty bureau washstand for each bed; with dainty rocker, and stand. The windows were draped with white curtains tied back with ribbons, and so arranged, where more than one bed was in a room, that each bed commanded space about the window. Each washstand was provided with a folding screen. Pincushions, bureau-covers, splashes, whisk-brooms, shoe-bags and



Cherry Vale

of the managers of the Working-Girls' Society of New York that they should have established the permanent work of the Society on this basis. In the beginning they were compelled to send the girls, who went into the country under their charge, into farm-houses. The best possible terms were made, and the greatest care exercised in the business arrangements, but it was impossible to secure and maintain the conditions that would minister to the needs of the whole nature. Each house represented the standard and character of the people who owned it. At no time were the managers wholly satisfied. They could not secure the funds necessary to buy and maintain houses that they could control.

In 1892, when the income of The Outlook Vacation Fund had been under the control of the Society for two years, a friend of The Outlook offered the use of the property now known as Cherry Vale to The Outlook for working-girls. This offer was extended to the Working-Girls' Vacation Society and accepted. The original house was small. It accommodated but seventeen girls. The furniture was the gift of the pupils of a number of private schools in the country. The money used in furnishing the house was in the bank accumulating to buy a house for the Working-Girls' Vacation Society, to be used for working-

duster-bags were provided for each bed. Each occupant cared for her bed and the space about it. The rooms often represented the innate refinement that must make the conditions imposed by lack of space a crucifixion to thousands of working-girls. Parlor, library, and dining-room, as dainty and refined as the bedrooms, were furnished by schools, both in Cherry Vale and Elmcote—the second acquisition of the Working-Girls' Society.

In 1894 another friend of The Outlook offered a small house and several acres of land for the use of the working-girls. This offer was transferred to the Working-Girls' Society, and the balance of the furnishing fund left from Cherry Vale, with a few outside donations, furnished the house in time to open it in 1894. The season was a success, and proved that Orange County was a good section in which to locate a vacation house.

In 1895, early in the spring, a much larger house was hired, about a mile and a half from the small house. The house was painted, papered, and furnished by the school-girls of the country. Some schools furnished everything in one room, even the painting and papering. Other schools could not provide the money for everything, but met part of the expense in 1895, and promised to complete their rooms in 1896. Elmcote was opened the first week