



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME OF THE CHURCHES are aiming to quicken the spirit of America in support of international peace through world organization. The Church Peace Union, with the World Peace Foundation, the Commission on International Justice and Good-will of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, are distributing "An International Program for America." The announcement sets forth that "the religious folk of America, disregarding differences of creed or party, should unite in the following action: I. Co-operation; II. Association; III. Participation." Under "Participation" it is urged that religious folk of America, disregarding differences of creed or party, should "commend cordially the proposed participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice," and "urge the President to call a conference of the nations to consider, in the spirit of mutual good-will and human brotherhood the grave problems which still menace the very fabric of civilization—such as armaments, economic chaos, and other obstacles to the peace of the world." This, the announcement urges, "is the minimum program." "The ultimate purpose of this program is to outlaw war and make its recurrence impossible." An outline of the scope and purpose of this effort can be obtained from the Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

SENATOR GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER closed an address before the Bar Association of New Hampshire, at Portsmouth, on June 24, 1922, as follows:

"In this imperfect way I am rehearsing to you what has gone on in my own mind as I have sought to relate my training as a lawyer to the discharge of my duty as a Senator. I pass over without mention various minor contrasts, which have interested me greatly, between the procedure to which we have been accustomed to in court and the procedure to which I suppose I shall become accustomed in the Senate. Such things are subordinate to my main purpose, which is to assert three propositions, as follows:

"My first proposition is that merely because dogmatism is for the time being in partial eclipse is no indication that there are not ultimate truths. Astronomical theories may at a given time be discredited, but the stars keep on shining.

"My second proposition is that during the eclipse of dogmatism those of us who are in senatorial office and hold fixed beliefs will do well to re-examine them for the purpose of interpreting them reasonably to people by whom they are not shared, instead of scolding vociferously those whose life problem is different from ours.

"My third proposition is that such fixed principles as the doctrine of Marbury against Madison, the right of private property, and the obligation to respect an unwelcome law, have had a sufficiently long trial in America to justify the hopeful belief that when the period of eclipse is passed the American people will announce with no uncertain voice their intention to stand fast in the ancient ways."

MR. JOSEPH P. TUMULTY, formerly Secretary to President Wilson, has recently returned to America after a trip through Europe. Upon his arrival in New York, Mr. Tumulty gave out a statement, in which he said:

"Unfortunately for the world, there is a kinship between European and American statesmen at the present time. Both are afflicted with low visibility. These dignified personages 'carry on' from day to day, apparently unmindful of the deep unrest throughout the world and of the yearnings for peace that lie in the heart of the average man of the world; and, failing to understand and interpret that yearning, they, by their indifference, allow conditions to grow worse until Europe is very close to chaos and revolution. They argue and engage in futile debate while the contagion of unrest broadens and extends its terrible sweep.

"There is too much logic in the reasoning of the conservative statesmen of today, both in the United States and Europe, and too little sympathy for the plight of the average man; the fact is that the average man in every country in the world is disgruntled, dissatisfied, and sorely harassed by the burdens of war and, finding that statesmen have failed thus far to set up and establish a suitable means of escape for those intolerable things that sap his strength and vitality and bring only misery to him and those dependent upon him, he has lost faith in government and those who administer it. His mind is therefore made a fertile field for all sorts of radical propaganda and programs. That is the terrible thing about the present situation in Europe, which daily grows more acute.

"What statesman in America will say that the tinder lying about in Europe will not soon be swept into a great world conflagration that will finally reach our own shores?"

THE AMERICAN RELIEF ASSOCIATION is now feeding a million and a half Russian children. Secretary Hoover, head of the organization, expressed the opinion, however, that there would be a large increase in the number for which the association will have to provide food before next June. He believes the number may reach 3,000,000.

THE BUREAU OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION is recognized by the United States Government in the act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, in the following language:

"For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration, \$4,000."

LETTER BOX

BOSTON, October 31, 1922.

MY DEAR SIR:

I note in Franklin K. Lane's letters, page 266, that President Wilson had a strong aversion to the term "allies" as applied to those with whom we fought the recent war. I regret to see that the Republican Administration appears to inherit his aversion. I am surprised, because it has historically been the Democratic Party which has stood for personal liberty and local and States' rights, while the Republican Party has, as its name indicates and as a protective tariff implies, stood for sacrifice of individual rights when clearly for the general good. We are already allied with many nations in the Postal Alliance. Is there any objection to "alliance" in itself or must not it be rather to the object which is the aim of the alliance or the means to be used in obtaining that end? What objection can there be to an

alliance which has for its aim the hindrance to the slave trade, or to any other trade outlawed by the nation with which it is to be conducted, or for the regulation of such commercial interests as the preservation of game or the provision for the submission of disputes to orderly and legal adjudication?

Very respectfully,

ALFRED C. LANE.

"Alliance," as used in all writings on international law, carries with it an agreement to use armed forces against some particular power or against any power or powers with whom an ally may go to war. Thus alliances are military in nature. It is alliances thus defined against which Washington, Jefferson, and the American statesmen since have been opposed. Of course the Universal Postal Union is not an alliance.—THE EDITOR.

HASTINGS, ENGLAND, *December 8, 1922.*

MY DEAR SIR: I take this opportunity of expressing my own high appreciation of your publication, especially of recent issues, so full of instructive articles and valuable information, which are bound to exercise a most salutary influence on those who "have eyes to see and ears to hear." Though I receive quite a number of English and continental periodicals championing the same cause, your journal always brings a fresh breath from across the ocean, some new viewpoint, broad-minded and impartial, which it is good for us Europeans to learn, if not always to assimilate.

JAAKOFF PRELOOKER.

DEUTSCHE FRIEDENSGESELLSCHAFT, BERLIN.

MY DEAR SIR: When we met in Vienna I told you how difficult is the pecuniary situation of the German Peace Society. Meanwhile things became much worse by the horrible depreciation of the mark. We make really heroic efforts to maintain our work by our own forces; we have increased the obligatory contributions of the members to 120 times as much as in the time before the war, and besides we have collected voluntary contributions of more than 100,000 marks a year. But all this is not sufficient to keep up the mere existence of our Bureau.

I made an appeal to the Carnegie Endowment for a yearly subvention of \$1,000 for the Peace Society and \$2,000 for our peace "Kartell" (the National Council of all German peace organizations). I hope we will succeed, but the Executive Committee at Washington will first hear the European Bureau. If at the end of all deliberations we succeed, there will pass a considerable time anyhow. In the meantime we have not the means to exist.

The English Peace Society, without having been approached by us, has accorded to us a subvention which was a good help for us. Now the idea comes to me that the American Peace Society might do something similar. If I am correctly informed, you receive from the Carnegie Endowment a yearly subvention of \$15,000. One per cent of this subvention would be sufficient to secure our existence for two or three months. For such a help we would be very thankful indeed.

It will not be necessary for me to explain how important it is for the international movement that the organization in Germany does not break down during the present catastrophe.

If for some reason or other it should not be possible for your Society to comply with my request, it might not be impossible for you to find private individuals interested in the peace movement who are willing to lend us a helping hand.

Permit me to anticipate the cordial thanks of our organizations.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUIDDE.

MR. RALSTON ON MR. STOWELL'S BOOK

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE has been favored by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston with the following careful study of the work on "Intervention in International Law," published recently by Mr. Ellery C. Stowell:

In this volume Mr. Stowell has industriously and successfully gathered data relative to many interventions which have taken place between nations, for purposes of redress, expiation, indemnity, security, or punishment, devoting much attention particularly to humanitarian intervention. In our point of view and in the present chaotic state of what passes under the name of international law, the book has the value resultant upon industrious labor and judicious collection of instances. We cannot believe, however, that it is written upon the theory of international law which, with growing civilization among men, must be accepted, if sound reason and the highest ideals of justice are to prevail. The author accepts too readily, we conceive, the principle that might makes right, coupling this with the idea that that which has been done by nations, if repeated sufficiently often, makes law. Of course, as to things indifferent in themselves the practices of nations may make sound customs, but the practice of the stronger to lay down rules of action for the weaker, which is almost universal in cases of intervention, is quite another matter. This distinction Mr. Stowell ignores, but may only be criticised for this to the same degree that other writers who feel that they are laying down international law may be subjected to the same criticism. Our position in this respect may be elucidated by examining some extracts from Mr. Stowell's work. He says, for instance:

"It sometimes happens that a weak or harassed government is unable or unwilling to compel its nationals to observe international law. In such a situation the State whose nationals or whose interests are endangered may act directly to compel the observance of international law."

If Mr. Stowell had simply said that in such cases States often use violence, he would have been more nearly correct, and if he had observed that nations only so act when they feel themselves to be very much stronger than the nation supposed to be in default, he would have made an observation justified by the instances he cites.

Mr. Stowell points out the difficulties which arise within a community when individuals seek revenge on their own account, and he finds that thereby the "avengers were constantly embroiling the community in order to gratify their more selfish lust for revenge." That an infinitely greater and more intolerable evil exists when a nation becomes its own avenger, and that such action is in itself a violation of true international law, Mr. Stowell, we regret to say, does not appreciate. Particularly he regards a supposed loss of prestige as a justification for bloody intervention. Exactly why this should be true when similar actions are not justified on the part of an individual in like case, or why the wholesale slaughter of men to restore prestige should be more virtuous than individual killing, does not appear.

An illustration of the repetition of the old idea that superior force is its own law is furnished by Mr. Stowell when he says that in settlement of the Alabama claims the American demand for indirect losses was not allowed, "but if war, instead of arbitration, had settled the controversy, there would have been no legal objection to the collection of the indirect losses, provided that the result of the recourse to arms had been sufficiently favorable to the United States." It was by virtue of a general principle of law, thoroughly recognized in England and in the United States, as between private individuals, that indirect losses were not allowed. In other words, they were not treated as either legal or right. A successful war, however, in Mr. Stowell's opinion, would have changed the legal situation and converted that which was originally illegal into legality. It cannot be admitted that anything which may properly be called law can be changed in its nature by a show of superior force, and so long as what passes as international law recognizes the contrary it will fail to be a science or worthy of respect.