

sea, shall serve to deprive such vessel of like hospitality in the Panama Canal Zone for a period of three months, and *vice versa*."

SECRETARY BRYAN'S PEACE PLAN

Previous editorials in the Journal have reported the progress made from time to time by Secretary of State Bryan in the negotiation of treaties for the advancement of peace in the form devised by him, namely, by providing for commissions of inquiry to pass upon international disputes to which arbitration treaties do not or are not applied or upon any other difference which can not be adjusted by diplomatic methods. For the convenience of our readers, the present editorial will give a brief résumé of what has so far been accomplished.

Up to the present time, 35 nations have accepted the plan in principle, namely, Argentina, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Persia, Portugal, Russia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela. A comparison of this list with the nations invited to the Second Hague Peace Conference shows that only 10 have failed to accept the plan in substance and among these one first-class power only will be found, namely, Japan. It is not likely that Japan was omitted from the list of nations which were invited to adhere to the plan, and the absence of its name from the list of acceptances is no doubt due to the unsettled state of certain well-known questions outstanding between the two governments. Among the remaining 9 nations which have not accepted are found four Balkan States, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Roumania, and Serbia, which appear to have been too much occupied with warlike affairs to give serious consideration to other matters. Turkey has also failed to accept, probably for the same reason, and Luxembourg and Siam likewise do not appear on the list of acceptances. All of the American republics are included in the list of acceptances except two, namely, Colombia and Mexico. In the case of the latter country, the absence of a government recognized by the United States is obviously the reason for the failure of that nation to be included in the plan at the present time, and the outstanding dispute between Colombia and the United States growing out of the separation of Panama is probably the reason for Colombia's non-appearance on the list.

Of the 35 nations which have accepted the plan in principle, 30 have already actually signed treaties. Twenty-one of these, with the dates of signature of the treaties, are listed in the editorial on page 566 of the Journal for July, 1914. On August 29th a treaty was signed with Paraguay, and we noted in a comment in the last number, page 876, the signature on September 15th of treaties with China, France, Great Britain and Spain. Since then treaties have been concluded as follows: Russia, October 1, 1914; Ecuador, Greece and Sweden, October 13, 1914, making 30 treaties in all. This leaves only 5 treaties to be negotiated with the countries which have accepted the plan in principle, namely, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Cuba, Germany, Haiti. It will be noted that 3 of these are countries engaged in the European war, and treaties with them are likely to be postponed until they again turn their attention to the pursuits of peace.

Of the treaties actually signed, all of them have received the advice and consent of the Senate to their ratification, excepting those with Panama and Santo Domingo. The special relation which the United States has assumed by treaty toward those countries is no doubt the cause of the delay in the action of the Senate. The dates on which the Senate's favorable action was taken upon the treaties are as follows:

August 13:

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Persia, Portugal, Salvador, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

August 20:

Peru.

September 25:

France, Great Britain, Spain.

October 13:

China, Russia.

October 20:

Ecuador, Greece, Sweden.

October 22:

Paraguay.

Of the foregoing treaties, ratifications have been exchanged of 10, as follows:

Bolivia, January 8, 1915; Costa Rica, November 12, 1914; Denmark, January 19, 1915; France, January 22, 1915; Great Britain, November 10, 1914; Guatemala, October 13, 1914; Norway, October 21, 1914; Portugal, October 24, 1914; Spain, December 21, 1914; Sweden, January 11, 1915.

THE PURCHASE OF VESSELS OF WAR IN NEUTRAL COUNTRIES BY BELLIGERENTS

The recent attempt of a belligerent engaged in the European war to place contracts with American manufacturers for the construction and purchase of submarines and its abandonment at the suggestion of President Wilson raise interesting and somewhat technical questions involving the neutral obligations of the United States, especially as a submarine may be completely constructed, launched and leave the jurisdiction of the United States under its own steam, or in tow, or it may be carried as cargo in parts or as a whole on board a merchant vessel. The remarkable evolution in the types of the engines of modern warfare is so recent and rapid that questions concerning them are likely to arise at any time for which no authoritative precedent may be found, and the present question, if it had not been settled by the voluntary action of the manufacturers,¹ would have necessitated the application of principles rather than an appeal to precedents for its solution.

¹ The official statement which ended the incident, issued by the Secretary of State on December 7, 1914, reads: "When information reached the State Department that the Fore River Company was planning to build a number of submarines for one of the allies, inquiry was made to ascertain the facts. As a result of the inquiry, Mr. Schwab called at the State Department last week with his attorney, and laid before the department what his company had planned to do, stating that before undertaking the work he had secured the opinion of a number of international lawyers, and was keeping within the requirements of neutrality as outlined by them.

"I stated to him that the President, basing his opinion upon information already obtained, regarded the work, as contemplated, a violation of the spirit of neutrality, but told him I would lay his statement before the President, and then give him a final answer.

"On Friday I had a conference with the President, and he instructed me to inform Mr. Schwab that his statement only confirmed him in the opinion previously formed that the submarines should not be built. Within a few minutes after my return from the White House, Mr. Schwab called me by long-distance telephone, and told me