

throughout the month of March to canvassing for subscriptions. There were a few \$25,000 and \$50,000 subscriptions, but the bulk of the money came in small amounts. The subscribers were given preferred stock in the line, and the promoters hope in time to pay dividends. To protect the company from falling into the control of interests inimical to navigation, its management is vested in thirteen directors owning 2,000 shares of common stock, of a face value of one dollar a share. No director can sell without offering the stock to the rest of the board at its par value, and any director may be compelled to sell by the other members. Thus the directors are virtually trustees for the people of Kansas City.



INTERNATIONAL PEACE

It is not by deliberate design but by a significant coincidence that we publish in this issue the address by Mr. Roosevelt on "The Colonial Policy of the United States" and the paper by Dr. Scott on "An International Court of Arbitral Justice." These utterances on opposite sides of the Atlantic, undesignedly nearly simultaneous, indicate a unity of American sentiment on this subject. We think they indicate a unity of world sentiment.

Our colonial policy has been more than a policy: it has been an expression of justice and humanity. Our treatment of weaker neighbors, which Mr. Roosevelt so tersely and effectively describes, has been for them all, as for the Cubans, an endeavor to secure for them what they themselves want, a continuance of order, and consequent peace and prosperity. This has not been accomplished without opposition—chiefly from three sources: It has been opposed by those who think that any departure from the traditions of our fathers is full of peril, who do not believe that new days demand new duties; by those who measure National policies wholly by their effect on the Nation, who feared to give to the Porto Ricans and to the Filipinos the benefit of the American market, and who have only just now consented to do this act of justice to the latter people; and by those who think that all men are born with a capacity for

self-government, and that for one people to govern another people, even for their own good while they are acquiring the art of self-government, is tyranny and injustice. Great bodies move slowly, and it has taken some years for the idea to infiltrate the masses of the American people which Mr. Roosevelt assumes as axiomatic, that great nations exist to do great tasks in services to peoples who are their neighbors and need their aid.

If all the great nations would accept this maxim and act upon it, one of the chief causes of war would be eliminated. If Russia had been animated by this spirit in her dealings with Manchuria, there would have been no Russo-Japanese War. If the South had been animated by this spirit in 1850, and had followed the counsels of her true leaders then in her dealings with the African race, as she is now increasingly doing, there would have been no Civil War. If England under George III had pursued this just and generous policy toward her American colonies, there would have been no American Revolution. If William Pitt and Napoleon Bonaparte had been actuated by this spirit, the desolating Napoleonic wars would have been avoided.

That this is increasingly the spirit of the Great Powers will be evidenced to any one who will compare America's treatment of the dependent races to-day with her treatment of the North American Indians during the first half of the nineteenth century, or the policy of Great Britain in India under Lord Morley with her Indian policy under Clive and Hastings. When one nation is attempting to rob another nation of its territory, when a strong people are using their power to oppress a weaker people, the question at issue cannot be settled by arbitration. The question between the Boxer mob attempting to loot Peking and murder its foreign residents and the army marching to the foreigners' relief cannot be referred to an international tribunal. If a burglar is in my house, the question whether he shall carry off my goods cannot be peacefully referred to a court: he will not refer it, and I cannot. Before the nations were pervaded by a spirit of justice the controversies between them could not be settled by a court of justice. The

spirit of justice must precede courts of justice. The hope for peace lies primarily in this, that the civilized nations are transferring the emphasis of their thinking from national interests and national rights to national duties. In this great world movement, of which the world is hardly conscious, the Anglo-Saxon race has led the way. But there is no nation that is democratic in its spirit which has not experienced in some measure the transformation.

In this silent but radical revolution is to be found the secret of the world movement for an International Court of Arbitral Justice. So long as the nations desired to do whatever they had power to do, war was the arbiter; now that they are increasingly desiring to do what is just, tribunals are becoming the arbiter. For war settles questions of *power*; but only a disinterested tribunal can settle a question of *justice*. This is the reason why a few belated thinkers still doubt the practicability of organizing a Supreme Court of the Nations. They are not aware of the change which has silently taken place in national ideals and national ambitions. They are accustomed to say that human nature has not changed. They are mistaken. Human nature has changed. The sense of justice as between nations is far more powerful in all the great nations of the civilized world than it was a hundred years ago.

And in this fact, too, is found the answer to those who ask, How will the decrees of the Court of Arbitral Justice be enforced? There are sheriffs to enforce the decrees of a court, and behind the sheriffs a militia, and behind the militia the standing army. Where are the sheriffs and the militia and the standing army to enforce the decrees of a Hague Tribunal? Here is the answer, also, to those who desire to put at the disposal of the International Court an international navy.

The increased sense of justice and the increased power of public opinion are such that there is very good reason to believe that no such international navy will ever be required. The fact that something like a hundred and fifty international disputes have been referred to arbitration, and that in no case has the defeated party refused to abide by the

decree of the arbitrators, is significant. The commercial and industrial interests which are opposed to war are very great. They are reinforced by the growing sentiment of humanity, the growing sense of a human brotherhood which includes men of all races and nationalities, and a growing realization of the enormous waste of life and treasure produced by war. If some other and better way of protecting national rights and determining international questions than the method of war is established and proved to be practicable, the national sentiment for peace will be greatly reinforced, and the injustice threatened must be very clear or the popular passion aroused very vehement to lead any civilized nation to reject the adverse decision of a Court to which it has submitted its case.

But even should it do so, to put a navy at the disposal of the Court is not the only method left to compel submission to its decrees. The nations which have constituted the Court of Arbitral Justice have only to unite in a policy of non-intercourse. There is no nation in Christendom which could long resist such a policy put in force against it. The United States, owing to the size of its territory and the variety of its productions, is probably the most independent nation on the globe. Probably there is no other nation which has more fully within itself the resources necessary to a comfortable life. But if the United States should reject a decree against it from the Court of Arbitral Justice, and the other Powers, without firing a gun, were simply to say to the United States, You have cast yourself out of our world; no citizen of yours shall cross our borders; no goods of yours shall be received into our markets, no goods of ours shall go to your markets; no ship of ours shall enter your ports, and no ship of yours shall enter ours—not even the United States could successfully defy such an act of international excommunication. And if she should attempt to force her traffic upon her neighbors, she would have to encounter the allied fleets of the world.

We do not, then, imagine that the mere organization of a Court of Arbitral Justice will put an end to war. But the organization of such a Court, if all the

Great Powers unite in it, will demonstrate the existence in the civilized nations of a spirit of justice which will itself put an end to wars of conquest and oppression; and honest differences of opinion and conflicts of interest can be settled by the Court, which, to enforce its decisions, will need no other force than the moral power of an enlightened conscience and an international public opinion.



THE PRESIDENT AND THE RAILWAYS

The President has done an important service to the country in a wise way. He has prevented a number of Western railways from putting into effect higher rates without submitting them to the Government; he has induced the railways to abandon a proceeding which would have been a violation of the law; and he has at the same time given the country an object-lesson in the need for larger Governmental supervision of railways.

Last week The Outlook reported the action of Western railways in filing in concert a notice of advance in rates and the corresponding action of the Government in petitioning a court to issue an injunction against the railways. The suit by the Government was not a criminal prosecution against the railways for having violated the law. It was an injunction suit to prevent them from doing an unlawful injury. It was directed not against merely an increase in rates, but against an increase made by combination. When the presidents of several of these railways called upon President Taft, they were advised to withdraw the enjoined rates and abandon their agreement. They did so. They, moreover, announced that they would submit the proposed increased rates to the Inter-State Commerce Commission to decide as to their reasonableness, and would make no other advance until the Inter-State Commerce Bill now pending in Congress becomes law. Several Eastern railways, without waiting for injunction suits, followed the example of the Western railways, and went even further, for they promised to submit their case for increased rates to the Inter-State Commerce Com-

mission even if the bill should not become law.

If this bill, of which we give an account on another page, is passed, the Inter-State Commerce Commission will have power to investigate such rates of its own motion without waiting for complaints, and to suspend those rates from going into effect for several weeks until it reaches a decision as to their reasonableness.

In view of the action of the railways, President Taft at once, of course, abandoned the injunction suits. There was nothing to enjoin. The end had been accomplished. Moreover, he at once sent a special message to Congress urging that the provision enabling the Inter-State Commerce Commission to investigate all rate increases and to suspend such increases meanwhile should be made effective immediately upon passage.

By his prompt and wise action the President has turned a situation which was threatening into one which is greatly to the advantage of the public.

The Western railways, seeing in the Inter-State Commerce Bill future curtailment of their powers to make rates to suit themselves, decided to take time by the forelock. Before, then, the bill had a chance to become law they raised their rates. Under the present law they could not be restrained except by a slow process of complaints and hearings, during which the rates would still be effective. The railways, however, were incautious. By filing their rates in concert they gave evidence of an agreement in restraint of trade. In avoiding an Inter-State Commerce Law to come, they ran against a very real and very present Anti-Trust Law. The President took action. What is the consequence? The shippers are protected against an unregulated and unsupervised advance in rates. The railways have thankfully escaped a costly litigation. And the country has seen demonstrated the truth of the principle that railway freight rates should not go into effect until they have been approved by the people's agents.

For this triple result, secured through timely action, and illustrative of the value of the bill that Congress now has in hand, we believe the country will show its appreciation to the President.