

violate the territorial integrity of Belgium she would at once take sides with the other. If "balance of power" consideration in Europe has preserved the integrity of Turkey up to the present time, without a neutralization treaty, why will not a treaty actually signed by all the great Powers making the Philippines neutral territory forever, be respected by the several nations signing it, since the one great subject ever held under jealous surveillance by the statesmen both of Europe and Japan, as well as of the United States, is the "balance of power" in the Pacific? Neutralization has long been recognized by the advanced thought of America as the key to the way out of the Philippine Islands.

So far as I can learn, I do not see why the great Powers will not welcome a treaty for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands; besides other reasons, because it would forever reduce by that much the possible area of war. The sincerity of the leading nations in their plea for peace will be found out in their answer to the question, "Will you consent to the neutralization of the Philippine Islands?"

To sum up, I assert: That

If the Philippine Islands were protected by a neutralization treaty whereby the signatory Powers would all promise the United States and each other not to seize the Islands, after they have been declared independent, an agreement the signing and faithful keeping of which the mutual jealousy of the Powers will most happily insure, my people can set up, at any time, and maintain forever a respectable government of their own, amply adequate for the protection of life and property and capable of fulfilling all international obligations.

* * *

GLOUCESTER.

From the Gloucester Fishermen's Institute Annual Report.

Maker of men, when men are worth
The highest price the times can hoard;
She tosses heroes on the deep,
As hands toss dice across a board.

To run the trawl, to fight the storm,
To face no peril, though he can,
To rate his life like frozen bait;
He asks no more—our fisherman.

He hurls upon the brutal gale
The spirit of his pioneer;
There is no alphabet in him
That halts to spell the pale word, fear.

Give us the sailor soul that dares,
Nor counts the cost, whate'er it be;
Give us the patience of the coast,
That weeps—a woman—by the sea.

BOOKS

AN AFTERMATH OF THE CIVIL WAR.

Reminiscences of the Geneva Tribunal. By Frank Warren Hackett. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1911.

This is a very readable account by an actor in it, of one of the most interesting international arbitrations that ever took place. Those of us old enough to remember the contention between Great Britain and the United States concerning the so-called "Alabama Claims," realize, as others cannot perhaps, how near the terrible calamity of a war between the two countries, the resentment of Americans and the pride of Englishmen brought us. Happily, the false sentiments concerning "national honor," which are a cheap substitute for true patriotism, did not bring about what at different stages in the controversy seemed imminent.

The greater credit for averting the danger and securing the inestimably valuable example of the two high-spirited nations settling by arbitration a grave dispute which had brought them to the brink of war, was due not to the arbitrators or to the counsel for the respective nations at Geneva, but to the Joint High Commission appointed by the two governments in 1871 which framed the Treaty of Washington providing for the Tribunal.

The gratitude owed to them impels me to recall their names. England was represented by the Marquis of Ripon, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Edward Thornton, Montague Bernard and Sir John MacDonald. The first two were prominent statesmen of Great Britain of opposite political opinions. Thornton was the British Minister to the United States, Bernard Professor of International Law at Oxford and MacDonald Premier of Canada. The Commissioners of the United States were Secretary of State Fish, General Schenck (Minister of the United States to Great Britain), Mr. Justice Nelson of the Supreme Court of the United States, Judge Hoar (then the Attorney General) and Senator George F. Williams of Oregon. These Commissioners approached their work in a spirit of mutual concession and good will, much at variance with the prevailing spirit on this side of the Atlantic at least. The treaty they negotiated provided for a tribunal of arbitration on "the Alabama Claims," and laid down for its governance three rules of international law concerning the duty of neutrals, which it may be noted were subsequently made also by Parliament a part of the local law of Great Britain.

But the great merit of the Treaty, after all, was that in skillfully chosen and dignified language it contained an apology by Great Britain, neither unbecoming in her to make nor in the United States

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

to receive. Mr. Sackett well says: "It was a manly thing for the British Commissioners to do, and the record stands for all time as a credit to a manly race."

With the signing and ratification of the treaty one great danger was passed. But another afterward developed.

After the Tribunal provided for had been created and had met, contention arose over the interpretation of the language which defined the claims to be submitted to it. The protocols for the Treaty had recited that there were involved claims, already presented, for the destruction of private property by the Confederate cruisers which England had allowed to escape, to the amount of fourteen million dollars, and that "in the hope of an amicable settlement no estimate was made of the indirect losses, without prejudice to the right of indemnification on their account in the event of no such settlement being made." These "indirect" claims were understood to be the cost of the United States as a nation of the prolongation of the war and of the pursuit of the cruisers, and to individuals of the enhanced marine insurance premiums and of the transference of the merchant marine of the United States to Great Britain.

The representatives of Great Britain before the Tribunal naturally interpreted the language of the protocols to be a waiver of the indirect claims in any peaceful solution that might be found; the Americans professed to believe the waiver had reference only to the contingency that the Treaty itself, instead of providing a tribunal of arbitration, should, as originally suggested, name a gross sum to be paid in satisfaction of the demands of the United States.

There was perhaps a misunderstanding between the Commissioners. But one familiar with the course of the negotiations and proceedings can hardly escape an uncomfortable feeling that the action of the American Agent, Bancroft Davis, and of the American Counsel, approached very closely the danger line of unjustifiably sharp practice in pressing on the Tribunal at the beginning of the hearings all the "indirect claims."

Mr. Hackett, extremely loyal to Mr. Davis and to Caleb Cushing, whose Secretary he was, will not hear of this, and in these "Reminiscences," not for the first time, enters into a vigorous defense of them and their colleagues in the conduct of the arbitration. Space is lacking to go into the question. Mr. Hackett treats it fairly, vigorously and entertainingly, if not quite convincingly, in this book.

The course taken by the Agent and Counsel for the United States at all events came near wrecking the arbitration in part, and rendering this method of settling disputes with the United States one to be avoided rather than attempted by other nations. But happily great sanity, good sense and dignity, characterized the attempts of the responsible home

administrators of both governments to save the treaty and the arbitration, and the suggestion of the American arbitrator, Charles Francis Adams, that the Tribunal declare that it was of the unanimous opinion that even if such "indirect claims" came within the provision of the Treaty and were insisted on by the United States, they could not be held by the Tribunal to constitute in public law good foundation for an award of compensation, finally saved the situation. The Counsel of the United States then declared that in the face of this statement they would not insist on the indirect claims and that they might be excluded from consideration.

The story of this crisis through which the Arbitration passed and its happy result, is perhaps the most important part of Mr. Hackett's book; but very far from lacking interest are the more personal reminiscences and pictures of the arbitrators and their characteristics, especially those of the most notable and probably the ablest member of the Tribunal, not excepting even Mr. Adams—Lord Chief Justice Cockburn. The other members of the Tribunal, Count Sclopis of Turin, ex-President Staempfli of the Swiss Republic, and Baron d'Itajuba of Brazil, despite the favorable opinion of them expressed by Mr. Hackett, may not have been, perhaps, too severely characterized by Lord Tenterden, the Secretary of the Joint High Commission and the Agent of Great Britain before the Tribunal, as "commonplace people," but they certainly did not deserve Cockburn's description of one of them as "ignorant," of another as "vapid," and of the third as "indolent."

Whatever they were, however, their memory is deserving of the high regard of all civilized peoples, for in the apt language of Mr. Davis in his "Report of the Arbitration" to the Secretary of State—language which he applied to President Grant—they "assisted in presenting to the nations of the world the most conspicuous example of the settlement of international disputes by peaceful arbitration."

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN.

* * *

SATIRE IN FICTION.

Nonsense Novels. By Stephen Leacock, author of "Literary Lapses." Published by John Lane, Bodley Head, London, and John Lane Company, New York.

Professor Leacock is the man to fill that long-felt want for a Comic Economics. He is professor of political economy at McGill University, Montreal, which qualifies him on the technical side, and his "Nonsense Novels" prove his competency for the comic part. One might say that any attempt at satirizing economic text books would be in the nature of an anti-climax, since so many satirize themselves; but if in these "Nonsense Novels" Professor Leacock's humor rises, with comical-