

BOARD OF EDITORS OF THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY, State University of Iowa.
ROBERT LANSING, Watertown, N. Y.
JOHN BASSETT MOORE, Columbia University.
WILLIAM W. MORROW, San Francisco, Cal.
LEO S. ROWE, University of Pennsylvania.
OSCAR S. STRAUS, Washington, D. C.
GEORGE G. WILSON, Brown University.
THEODORE S. WOOLSEY, Yale University.
DAVID J. HILL, The Hague, European Editor.

Managing Editor

JAMES BROWN SCOTT, George Washington University.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

THE SECOND PEACE CONFERENCE OF THE HAGUE

The second Hague peace conference is no longer a matter of speculation, it is now a certainty. Invitations have been issued to and accepted by the recognized states of the world, and chosen representatives of these states will meet at the Hague on the afternoon of June 15, 1907.

The first conference was looked upon as an experiment and many there were who shook their heads in doubt. It did not wholly justify the hopes of its friends and well-wishers. It did not produce a general disarmament, neither did it succeed in limiting armaments nor in placing a limit upon the expenditures necessary to preserve peace by force. It did, however, discuss these great problems and relegated them, unsolved though they were, to the consideration of a future and perhaps more favorable conference. They are in the nature of unfinished business and will doubtless be considered and treated as such.

If war was not abolished and the era of universal peace ushered in, a serious and successful attempt was made to give definiteness and consistency to the laws of war on land, and to the sick and wounded upon the seas there were extended the humane principles of the Red

Cross, which principles have done so much to mitigate the horrors incident to warfare. The crowning work of the conference was, however, the establishment of a tribunal to which litigant nations might resort for the peaceful and judicial settlement of difficulties which, if unsettled, might justify in the minds of some an appeal to the sword. If war cannot be abolished, unnecessary suffering should be eliminated, and difficulties between nations which might easily lead to war may be settled by the resort to a tribunal clothed with the power to examine the facts and on the facts as found to give redress. The first conference showed the possibility of discussing in the abstract questions of international importance. Great as was its service, it was but a first and conscious step in the line of progress. For the actual work accomplished by the conference of 1899 reference is made to the supplement in which the French and English text of the final act is given preceded by documents necessary to its intelligent understanding.

The first conference looked forward at no distant date to a second meeting of the nations. As Europe seemed unwilling to take the initiative, President Roosevelt on October 21, 1904, gave voice to the universal desire of this country that a second conference might assemble in order to take up and advance the work so auspiciously inaugurated by the conference of 1899. The late John Hay as secretary of state, issued the following circular to the representatives of the United States accredited to each of the governments signatory to the acts of the Hague conference:

SIR: The peace conference which assembled at the Hague on May 18, 1899, marked an epoch in the history of nations. Called by his majesty the emperor of Russia to discuss the problems of the maintenance of general peace, the regulation of the operations of war, and the lessening of the burdens which preparedness for eventual war entails upon modern peoples, its labors resulted in the acceptance by the signatory powers of conventions for the peaceful adjustment of international difficulties by arbitration, and for certain humane amendments to the laws and customs of war by land and sea. A great work was thus accomplished by the conference while other phases of the general subject were left to discussion by another conference in the near future, such as questions affecting the rights and duties of neutrals, the inviolability of private property in naval warfare, and the bombardment of ports, towns, and villages by a naval force.

Among the movements which prepared the minds of governments for an accord in the direction of assured peace among men, a high place may fittingly be given to that set on foot by the Interparliamentary Union. From its origin in the suggestions of a member of the British house of commons, in 1888, it developed until its membership includes large numbers of delegates from the parliaments of the principal nations, pledged to exert their influence toward the conclusion of treaties of arbitration between nations and toward the accomplishment of peace. Its annual conferences have notably advanced the high purposes it sought to realize. Not only

have many international treaties of arbitration been concluded, but, in the conference held in Holland in 1894, the memorable declaration in favor of a permanent court of arbitration was a forerunner of the most important achievement of the peace conference of the Hague in 1899.

The annual conference of the Interparliamentary Union was held this year at St. Louis, in appropriate connection with the World's Fair. Its deliberations were marked by the same noble devotion to the cause of peace and to the welfare of humanity which had inspired its former meetings. By the unanimous vote of delegates, active or retired members of the American congress and of every parliament in Europe with two exceptions, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Enlightened public opinion and modern civilization alike demand that differences between nations should be adjudicated and settled in the same manner as disputes between individuals are adjudicated, namely, by the arbitrament of courts in accordance with recognized principles of law, this conference requests the several governments of the world to send delegates to an international conference to be held at a time and place to be agreed upon by them for the purpose of considering:

1. The question for the consideration of which the conference at the Hague expressed a wish that a future conference be called.

2. The negotiation of arbitration treaties between the nations represented at the conference to be convened.

3. The advisability of establishing an international congress to convene periodically for the discussion of international questions.

And this conference respectfully and cordially requests the president of the United States to invite all the nations to send representatives to such a conference.

On the twenty-fourth of September, ultimo, these resolutions were presented to the president by a numerous deputation of the Interparliamentary Union. The president accepted the charge offered to him, feeling it to be most appropriate that the executive of the nation which had welcomed the conference to its hospitality should give voice to its impressive utterances in a cause which the American government and people hold dear. He announced that he would at an early day invite the other nations, parties to the Hague conventions, to reassemble with a view to pushing forward toward completion the work already begun at the Hague, by considering the questions which the first conference had left unsettled with the express provision that there should be a second conference.

In accepting this trust, the president was not unmindful of the fact, so vividly brought home to all the world, that a great war is now in progress. He recalled the circumstances that at the time when, on August 24, 1898, his majesty the emperor of Russia sent forth his invitation to the nations to meet in the interests of peace, the United States and Spain had merely halted, in their struggle, to devise terms of peace. While at the present moment no armistice between the armies now contending is in sight, the fact of an existing war is no reason why the nations should relax the efforts they have so successfully made hitherto toward the adoption of rules of conduct which may make more remote the chances of future wars between them. In 1899 the conference of the Hague dealt solely with the larger general problems which confront all nations, and assumed no function of intervention or suggestion in the settlement of the terms of peace between the United States and Spain. It might be the same with a reassembled conference at the present time. Its efforts would naturally lie in the direction of further codification of the universal

ideas of right and justice which we call international law; its mission would be to give them future effect.

The president directs that you will bring the foregoing considerations to the attention of the minister of foreign affairs of the government to which you are accredited and, in discreet conference with him, ascertain to what extent that government is disposed to act in the matter.

Should his excellency invite suggestion as to the character of the questions to be brought before the proposed second peace conference, you may say to him that, at this time, it would seem premature to couple the tentative invitation thus extended with a categorical programme of subjects of discussion. It is only by comparison of views that a general accord can be reached as to the matters to be considered by the new conference. It is desirable that in the formulation of a programme the distinction should be kept clear between the matters which belong to the province of international law and those which are conventional as between individual governments. The final act of the Hague conference, dated July 29, 1899, kept this distinction clearly in sight. Among the broader general questions affecting the right and justice of the relation of sovereign states, which were then relegated to a future conference, were: the rights and duties of neutrals; the inviolability of private property in naval warfare; and the bombardment of ports, towns, and villages by a naval force. The other matters mentioned in the final act take the form of suggestions for consideration by interested governments.

The three points mentioned cover a large field. The first, especially, touching the rights and duties of neutrals, is of universal importance. Its rightful disposition affects the interests and well-being of all the world. The neutral is something more than an on-looker. His acts of omission or commission may have an influence—indirect, but tangible—on a war actually in progress; whilst, on the other hand, he may suffer from the exigencies of the belligerents. It is this phase of warfare which deeply concerns the world at large. Efforts have been made time and again, to formulate rules of action applicable to its more material aspects, as in the declarations of Paris. As recently as the twenty-eighth of April, of this year, the congress of the United States adopted a resolution reading thus:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the congress of the United States that it is desirable, in the interest of uniformity of action by the maritime states of the world in time of war, that the president endeavor to bring about an understanding among the principal maritime powers with a view of incorporating into the permanent law of civilized nations the principle of the exemption of all private property at sea, not contraband of war, from capture or destruction by belligerents.

Approved, April 28, 1904.

Other matters closely affecting the rights of neutrals are: the distinction to be made between absolute and conditional contraband of war and the inviolability of the official and private correspondence of neutrals.

As for the duties of neutrals toward the belligerents, the field is scarcely less broad. One aspect deserves mention, from the prominence it has acquired during recent times; namely, the treatment due to refugee belligerent ships in neutral ports.

It may also be desirable to consider and adopt a procedure by which states non-signatory to the original acts of the Hague conference may become adhering parties.

You will explain to his excellency the minister of foreign affairs that the present

overture for a second conference to complete the postponed work of the first conference is not designed to supersede other calls for the consideration of special topics, such as the proposition of the government of the Netherlands, recently issued, to assemble for the purpose of amending the provisions of the existing Hague convention with respect to hospital ships. Like all tentative conventions, that one is open to change in the light of practical experience, and the fullest deliberation is desirable to that end.

Finally, you will state the president's desire and hope that the undying memories which cling around the Hague as the cradle of the beneficent work which had its beginning in 1899 may be strengthened by holding the second peace conference in that historic city.

The replies to the circular were encouraging and showed as usual that the president had correctly interpreted the popular desire, but with a graciousness well-nigh unprecedented in world-politics he yielded the initiative to the emperor of Russia.

The president most gladly welcomes the offer of his imperial majesty to again take upon himself the initiation of the steps requisite to convene a second international peace conference, as the necessary sequence to the first conference, brought about through his majesty's efforts, and in view of the cordial responses to the president's suggestion of October, 1904, he doubts not that the project will meet with complete acceptance and that the result will be to bring the nations of the earth still more closely together in their common endeavor to advance the ends of peace.

The Czar Nicholas, freed from the embarrassment of a war at the extremes of his empire, immediately devoted himself to the self-imposed mission of peace. On the twelfth of April, 1906, Baron Rosen submitted to the secretary of state a tentative programme for the work of a second conference. The document in full reads as follows:

Mr. Secretary of State: When it assumed the initiative of calling a second peace conference, the imperial government had in view the necessity of further developing the humanitarian principles on which was based the work accomplished by the great international assemblage of 1899.

At the same time, it deemed it expedient to enlarge as much as possible the number of states participating in the labors of the contemplated conference, and the alacrity with which the call was answered bears witness to the depth and breadth of the present sentiment of solidarity for the application of ideas aiming at the good of all mankind.

The first conference separated in the firm belief that its labors would subsequently be perfected from the effect of the regular progress of enlightenment among the nations and abreast of the results acquired from experience. Its most important creation, the International Court of Arbitration, is an institution that has already proved its worth and brought together, for the good of all, an areopagus of jurists who command the respect of the world. How much good could be accomplished by international commissions of inquiry toward the settlement of disputes between states has also been shown.

There are, however, certain improvements to be made in the convention relative to the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Following recent arbitrations, the jurists assembled in court have raised certain questions of details which should be acted upon by adding to the said convention the necessary amplifications. It would seem especially desirable to lay down fixed principles in regard to the use of languages in the proceedings in view of the difficulties that may arise in the future as the cases referred to arbitral jurisdiction multiply. The *modus operandi* of international commissions of inquiry would likewise be open to improvement.

As regards the regulating of the laws and customs of war on land, the provisions established by the first conference ought also to be completed and defined, so as to remove all misapprehensions.

As for maritime warfare, in regard to which the laws and customs of the several countries differ on certain points, it is necessary to establish fixed rules in keeping with the exigencies of the rights of belligerents and the interests of neutrals.

A convention bearing on these subjects should be framed and would constitute one of the most prominent parts of the tasks devolved upon the forthcoming conference.

Holding, therefore, that there is at present occasion only to examine questions that demand special attention as being the outcome of the experience of recent years, without touching upon those that might have reference to the limitation of military or naval forces, the imperial government proposes for the programme of the contemplated meeting the following main points:

1. Improvements to be made in the provisions of the convention relative to the peaceful settlement of international disputes as regards the court of arbitration and the international commissions of inquiry.

2. Additions to be made to the provisions of the convention of 1889 relative to the laws and customs of war on land—among others, those concerning the opening of hostilities, the rights of neutrals on land, etc. Declarations of 1899. One these having expired, question of its being revived.

3. Framing of a convention relative to the laws and customs of maritime warfare, concerning:

The special operations of maritime warfare, such as the bombardment of ports, cities, and villages by a naval force; the laying of torpedoes, etc.

The transformation of merchant vessels into war ships.

The private property of belligerents at sea.

The length of time to be granted to merchant ships for their departure from ports of neutrals or of the enemy after the opening of hostilities.

The rights and duties of neutrals at sea, among others the question of contraband, the rules applicable to belligerent vessels in neutral ports; destruction, in cases of *vis major*, of neutral merchant vessels captured as prizes.

In the said convention to be drafted, there would be introduced the provisions relative to war on land that would be also applicable to maritime warfare.

4. Additions to be made to the convention of 1899 for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva convention of 1864.

As was the case at the conference of 1899, it would be well understood that the deliberations of the contemplated meeting should not deal with the political relations of the several states, or the condition of things established by treaties, or in general with questions that did not directly come within the programme adopted by the several cabinets.

The imperial government desires distinctly to state that the data of this programme and the eventual acceptance of the several states clearly do not prejudice the opinion that may be delivered in the conference in regard to the solving of the questions brought up for discussion. It would likewise be for the contemplated meeting to decide as to the order of the questions to be examined and the form to be given to the decisions reached, as to whether it should be deemed preferable to include some of them in new conventions or to append them, as additions, to conventions already existing.

In formulating the above-mentioned programme, the imperial government bore in mind, as far as possible, the recommendations made by the first peace conference, with special regard to the rights and duties of neutrals, the private property of belligerents at sea, the bombardment of ports, cities, etc. It entertains the hope that the government of the United States will take the whole of the points proposed as the expression of a wish to come nearer that lofty ideal of international justice that is the permanent goal of the whole civilized world.

By order of my government, I have the honor to acquaint you with the foregoing, and awaiting the reply of the government of the United States with as little delay as possible, I embrace this opportunity to beg you, Mr. Secretary of State, to accept the assurance of my very high consideration.

ROSEN.

Nothing remained but to obtain the consent of the nations to this tentative programme and to fix the date for the meeting at the Hague. It was wisely recognized that all nations large and small have a common interest in the advancement of justice and peace. The invitation therefore was extended to the civilized world and it is pleasing to be able to state that the invitation was accepted in the broad, catholic and universal spirit in which it was extended. It will not perhaps be out of place to mention that the invitation to the South American republics was due in no small measure to our secretary of state. It is frequently asserted that the United States looks upon the Central and South American republics as subject to its tutelage. Mr. Root, however, by advocating their admission to the Hague gives evidence of the desire of the United States for the advancement of our Southern neighbors and shows that far from confining them to the western world, our policy is to introduce them as equals in a conference of nations. It is no exaggeration, therefore, to state that the second Hague conference will be in the widest and fullest sense of the word, a world conference.

A difficulty, however, presented itself at this stage, for if the Pan-American conference was to be held at Rio de Janeiro during the summer of 1906, the representatives of the western world could not well take part in the European conference at one and the same time. The project therefore to hold the Hague conference in the summer of 1906 either had to be amended or the conference at Rio de Janeiro would have to be adjourned. At the request of the United States the meeting at

the Hague was postponed to avoid any possibility of conflict or interference. By universal agreement the conference has been called for the summer of 1907.

There has been much discussion as to the program to be submitted and discussed at the Hague, for while the conference is international in its nature, nations have from the nature of things national interests and it is a matter of great difficulty to harmonize these interests and unite upon a programme with which all may agree. The purpose of the conference is eminently practical. It is not a parliamentary body in which motions are voted by majorities. The condition of progress is not that one nation or any few nations may take a step in advance but that all nations may take the same step, and it is wiser to do a few things with the consent of all than to attempt many things which must necessarily meet opposition and fail of universal consent. A programme submitted to such a conference must be the minimum of desire if a positive and satisfactory result is to be secured. Progress is, however, the outcome of discussion and the reforms of the future will no doubt be the result of a present interchange of thought. For this reason various nations have insisted that special projects be discussed at the convention although they have not made their participation in the conference conditioned upon the acceptance of any or all of these. The nature and extent of these various propositions are expressed in the *note verbale* of the fourth of April, 1907, from the Russian ambassador to the secretary of state.

The undersigned, ambassador of Russia, by order of his government, has the honor to make the following communication to his excellency the secretary of state of the United States:

Before the second peace conference is called, the imperial government deems it an obligation to submit to the powers which have accepted its invitation a statement of the present situation.

All the powers to which the imperial government communicated in April, 1906, its tentative program of the labors of the new conference have declared their adhesion thereto.

However, the following remarks have been made with respect to that programme.

The government of the United States has reserved to itself the liberty of submitting to the second conference two additional questions, viz: the reduction or limitation of armament and the attainment of an agreement to observe some limitations upon the use of force for the collection of ordinary public debts arising out of contracts.

The Spanish government has expressed a desire to discuss the limitation of armaments, reserving to itself the right to deal with this question at the next meeting at the Hague.

The British government has given notice that it attaches great importance to having the question of expenditures for armament discussed at the conference, and

has reserved to itself the right of raising it. It has also reserved to itself the right of taking no part in the discussion of any question mentioned in the Russian programme which would appear to it unlikely to produce any useful result.

Japan is of opinion that certain questions that are not especially enumerated in the programme might be conveniently included among the subjects for consideration, and reserves to itself the right to take no part in or withdraw from any discussion taking or tending to take a trend which, in its judgment, would not be conducive to any useful result.

The governments of Bolivia, Denmark, Greece, and the Netherlands have also reserved to themselves, in a general way, the right to submit to the consideration of the conference other subjects similar to those that are explicitly mentioned in the programme.

The imperial government deems it its duty to declare, for its part, that it maintains its programme of the month of April, 1906, as the basis for the deliberations of the conference, and that if the conference should broach a discussion that would appear to it unlikely to end in any practical issue it reserves to itself, in its turn, the right to take no part in such a discussion.

Remarks similar to this last have been made by the German and Austro-Hungarian governments, which have likewise reserved to themselves the right to take no part in the discussion by the conference of any question which would appear unlikely to end in any practical issue.

In bringing these reservations to the knowledge of the powers and with the hope that the labors of the second peace conference will create new guaranties for the good understanding of the nations of the civilized world, the imperial government has addressed to the government of the Netherlands a request that it may be pleased to call the conference for the first days of June.

The undersigned embraces this opportunity to renew to His Excellency, Mr. Root, the assurances of his highest consideration.

ROSEN.

It is of course impossible to predict the outcome of the conference. It is, however, safe to say that the Russian programme will form the basis of discussion and that progress will be along this line. The desire to discuss other topics whether or not they meet with such favor in the conference as to form a part of the final act, shows the seriousness with which the nations approach the conference and the importance attached to its proceedings and discussions.

The American commission as announced is as follows:

Joseph H. Choate, former ambassador to the Court of St. James;
General Horace Porter, former ambassador to France;

Uriah M. Rose, of Arkansas, former president of the American Bar Association, and now president of the Arkansas Bar Association;
David Jayne Hill, United States minister to the Netherlands; and
former assistant secretary of state;

Brigadier General George B. Davis, judge advocate general, U. S. A.,
and former professor of international law at the United States Military Academy;

Rear Admiral Charles S. Sperry, U. S. N., president of the Naval War College;
William I. Buchanan, former minister to Argentina and to Panama, and chairman of the American delegation to the Rio conference;
Chandler Hale, secretary to the delegation, and former secretary of the United States embassy at Vienna;
James Brown Scott, expert in international law, solicitor for the Department of State;
Charles Henry Butler, expert attaché, reporter of the United States Supreme Court.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION OF NORWAY AND SWEDEN

Mr. Lecky declared nationality to be the miracle of our day. The Italian school of international law is based upon nationality, and the sentiment is world-wide that a community of race, institutions and language somehow lies at the basis of statehood. It is clear that an autocrat who denies the right of self-government would naturally reject the plea of nationality, but the nineteenth century dealt roughly with the autocrat and it is not too much to hope that the twentieth century will turn him into a statesman. The congress of Vienna of 1815 adopted the principle of legitimacy, as distinct from nationality, in the settlement of the world's peace, but the legitimacy of the congress looked only to the ruler, not to the ruled. Popular understanding of legitimacy differed radically from that of the diplomat, and little by little the rights of the ruled to organize themselves into a community under a government suited to their needs has modified considerably the map of Europe.

The congress of Vienna yoked Holland and Belgium into the kingdom of the Netherlands, but revolution dissolved the unnatural bond. Greece longed for a government of its own, and Europe yielded. The outbreak of 1848 assumed proportions of a democratic and universal movement which gave the rulers pause. The expulsion of Austria from Italy and the union of the Italian states into a kingdom of Italy under a sovereign of its choice, the expulsion of Austria from Germany and the establishment of a German empire in accordance with the hope and aspirations of centuries, the creation of the dual monarchy of Austria upon race lines, and finally the collapse of the Ottoman empire and the establishment of distinct and independent sovereign communities in the Balkan peninsula, show at a glance that nationality may indeed be checked and controlled for a time but that it cannot in our day and generation be overthrown.

The importance of the principle of nationality in the modern conception of international law has been admirably stated by a recent and authoritative writer.

The third moral is that the principle of nationality is of such force that it is fruitless to try to stop its victory. Wherever a community of many millions of individuals, who are bound together by the same blood, language, and interests, become so powerful that they think it necessary to have a state of their own, in which they can live according to their own ideals and can build up a national civilization, they will certainly get that state sooner or later. What international politics can do and should do is to enforce the rule that minorities of individuals of another race shall not be outside the law, but shall be treated on equal terms with the majority. States embracing a population of different nationalities can exist and will always exist, as many examples show.

And even where the race forms but a portion of the larger political unit, a realization of the past and a hope of the future preserve intact a feeling of nationality. Wales has held its own, although it is an integral part of England. The national movement is spreading in Ireland and the world sees the strange and unprecedented spectacle of a people settling down to a grammar and dictionary to acquire a language which was once their own.

The most recent instance of the application of the doctrine of nationality to a concrete case is the separation of Norway and Sweden and the establishment of an independent kingdom of Norway based upon race and national ideals. For centuries Norway was independent and governed itself as it would; for centuries, that is to say from 1387 to 1814, it was either a part of Sweden or a province of Denmark. From 1814 till yesterday it was a junior partner in the kingdom of Norway-Sweden. In 1905 it emerged from dependence and took its place as an equal in the family of nations.

In 1814 when Europe was in arms against Bonaparte and the empire was in the throes of dissolution, Norway was ceded to Sweden, amid the protests of its people.

His Majesty, the King of Denmark, in behalf of himself and his successors to the throne and kingdom of Norway, forever renounces all his rights and claims to the kingdom of Norway in favor of the King of Sweden.

The coöperation of Sweden was worth more than a province.

The Swedes and the Norwegians were not on the best of terms and never had been. To be forced to join an uncongenial neighbor was too much for the blood of the discoverers of new worlds, and in a spirit of rebellion they elected Christian Frederick, heir of Frederick VI. of Den-

mark, king. Great Britain, however, in conjunction with the allied powers decided from reasons of policy that this independence was exhibited at an untimely moment, and Norway was forced to decree her own union with Sweden, November 4, 1814. The word of Bernadotte, marshal of France and crown prince of Sweden, was not to be trifled with.

In this union and the spirit exhibited by the Norwegians at the time, can be seen, perhaps, a forerunner of the action of dissolution, June 7, 1905. In the act of union Norway insisted upon securing absolute independence, with no other bond than an hereditary monarch who was to have his Norwegian as well as his Swedish council, and who was to spend a portion of each year in the land of the fjords. It was a "monarchy and defensive alliance for the protection of their mutual throne."

Since that time Norway has shown by her restiveness a strong dislike for foreign control, especially Swedish control. The fundamental law of the constitution, which, in true loyalty, "almost every peasant farmer nowadays has framed and hung up in the chief room of his house" did not secure the one important power that the Norwegians especially desired, the power to manage their own foreign affairs, especially those of a commercial nature. The foreign minister was almost always a Swede, though up to 1885 he was responsible to the king, Hence the Norwegians looked upon him as responsible to their sovereign. But in that year the Swedish parliament made the minister of foreign affairs directly dependent upon them and liable to them for his acts. With this change the people of Norway saw their last claim to the managing of their own foreign policies slipping into Swedish hands, and Norway was still more subordinate in international affairs and relations.

The consular service, above all, was a bone of contention. The two nations had one service in common, and Norway, with a thriving commerce, three times the size of Sweden's, with more coast line, and with the blood of the Vikings in her veins, struggled and fought for years for more freedom to develop, and for the last fifteen years specifically for a separate consular service to aid her own growing trade.

It was on May 28, 1905, that King Oscar officially denied the right of Norway to this separate representation abroad by vetoing a measure to provide for a distinct consular service to Norway, even after a joint committee from the two nations had recommended its passage. The Storting (the Norwegian parliament) immediately proclaimed that the king had violated the constitution, thereby dissolving the union and dethroning himself. The cabinet resigned and the Storting expressed itself as follows:

WHEREAS, All the members of the council of state have laid down their offices; Whereas, His Majesty the King, has declared himself unable to establish a new government for the country; and Whereas, The constitutional regal power thus becomes imperative, the Storthing authorizes the members of the council of state who retired today to exercise until further notice as the Norwegian government the power appertaining to the king in accordance with Norway's constitution and existing laws, with those changes which are necessitated by the fact that the union with Sweden under one king is dissolved in consequence of the king having ceased to act as Norwegian king.

With this condition of affairs the Swedish government attempted to deal. The voice of the Swedish upper house was the strongest in opposition to a peaceful settlement; in fact this aristocracy of landed men was almost the only power for the enforcement of the union upon Norway against her will. Perhaps they did not or would not see the centuries of opposition to Sweden which ninety years of union had been powerless to overcome, or the differing desires and needs of the two people shown in the first case not only by the struggles for political freedom but by the tendencies leading away from the old religions and dogmas; and in the second place by the demand for free trade in Norway, as against the protective tariff of Sweden.

The separation was the outcome of natural causes, it was the breaking out of old feelings, long suppressed, when restraint was imposed on the right to manage the historical and traditional vocation of the Norsemen, their commerce and its development.

And so, without ostentation, but with firmness, and no doubt with a glance at the framed constitutions in the "chief room of the house," the people on August 13, 1905, by a vote of 368,000 against 184 decided that Norway should again be free to take her place in the family of nations under her own king and with her own unaided hand at the tiller. Sweden acquiesced finally and on September 23, 1905, the treaty of Karlstad (see Supplement) was signed.

Norway's first thought seems to have been a look backward to Denmark from whom she had unwillingly parted in 1814 and from whom she had tried to choose a ruler in the abortive attempt at establishing an independent government at that time. In spite of any fleeting dreams of Emperor Wilhelm that he might see a German prince on the Norwegian throne, or those that some of the more enthusiastic Norsemen may have had of a republic, the country chose and elected by popular vote to reign "by the grace of the people and not by divine right," as one writer explains, Prince Charles of Denmark, who became King Haakon VII. The separation was complete, and the very

name of the king linked the Norway of today to the Norway of the traditional past.

The present is secure, but what of the future? A glance at the map shows the geographical importance of Norway. It is indeed true that Sweden and Denmark control the entrance to the Baltic. It is, however, a fact that Norway cannot be overlooked in this connection. For although the canal at Kiel may serve a great purpose, the natural entrance and outlet to and from the North Sea and the Baltic lies between Denmark and Sweden with Norway looming up large on the horizon. A family alliance with Great Britain is no doubt a great protection; the fear and jealousy of the Russian is likewise no mean political asset, while the uncertainty of the relations of France and Germany may prevent any fear of aggression from Germany even supposing the desire were present. The geographical and political situation would seem, therefore, in the nature of things to neutralize the northern kingdoms. Their importance lies in their geography, and paradoxically speaking, their very weakness is their strength.

THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF KOREA

For centuries Korea has been a battle-ground between China on the one hand and Japan on the other, and lately within the memory of the present generation, indeed but yesterday, it has been the cause of war between Russia and the Island Empire. It was the cause of the war of 1894 between China and Japan by means of which the latter took its place among the nations, and more recently it was the cause of the war of 1904-1905 between Russia and Japan at the conclusion of which Japan emerged as a great world-power.

The possession of Korea means much to others, to itself it means little or nothing. It is a prize to be contended for, and its destiny seems to depend upon the wish and strength of others. It at one time and for centuries depended upon China, at another depended upon Japan. For a few short years, from 1876 to 1894 it tasted the sweets of independence. By the treaty of peace, amity and commerce of February 27, 1876, between Korea and Japan the independence of Korea was recognized as far as Japan was concerned. Its various ports were opened to Japanese trade and a diplomatic minister was to reside at Seoul.

The independence of Korea was still further recognized by the treaty of peace, amity, commerce and navigation of May 24, 1882, between the United States and Korea and, internationally speaking, the independence of Korea was then recognized by two of the great powers.