SIR:

The Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace proposes to take whatever steps may seem wise and practicable to aid in securing the prompt ratification by the Senate of the United States of the pending treaties of general arbitration with Great Britain and France.

It is proposed, in the first instance, to invite a number of representative citizens to serve as members of a Citizens Committee on the Ratification of the Arbitration Treaties, 1911-12. This committee will be purely honorary, and its purpose will be to influence public opinion and to give moral support to the President and those members of the Senate who are now engaged in earnestly supporting the ratification of the Treaties. The committee will be constituted of men chosen without regard to political affiliations, without regard to place of residence, and without regard to calling or profession. The aim will be to make it as nearly representative as possible of the most enlightened citizenship of the country. Mr. Joseph H. Choate has consented to serve as Chairman of such a Committee.

Members of the committee will not be asked to assume any financial or other obligation, but it is hoped that they will consent to exercise their influence in the places of their residence and with the Senators from their several States, in favor of the prompt ratification of the pending Treaties.

In addition to the organization of this Citizens Committee, it is proposed to arrange for mass meetings throughout the country, to explain and endorse the Treaties, and to furnish the periodical press with accurate information regarding the Treaties, their purpose and their scope.

Particular attention may at this time be called to the arguments in support of the Treaties submitted to the Senate by Senators Cullom of Illinois, Root of New York, and Burton of Ohio (see Senate Document No. 98, August 21, 1911), and to the explanatory articles by Professor John Bassett Moore in the Independent for August 17, 1911, and by Governor Baldwin of Connecticut in the Independent for August 31, 1911.

It gives me the greatest possible pleasure to invite you to serve as a member of the proposed Citizens Committee on the Ratification of the Arbitration Treaties.

The honor of an early and I trust a favorable reply is kindly requested.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

Acting Director of the
Division of Intercourse and Education

Dr. Harry P. Judson
Chicago, October 17, 1911

Dear President Butler:

Your circular letter of the 10th inst. received. I shall be pleased to serve on the committee to which you refer. It is only just to say that I should not personally be disappointed if there should be some modification in the treaties, but the modification I would have in mind would not affect their ratification in all essence.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson

President Nicholas Murray Butler,
Columbia University, New York.
Chicago, October 13, 1921

Dear President Butler,

I am writing to take immediate action on the committee to which you referred.

As you know, I am unable to continue in the position of President of the Institute.

I am not only in need of your approval, but I am sure that I would be pleased and honored to serve as President of the Institute in the future.

I am confident that I can make a valuable contribution to the Institute.

Your early reply will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

H. J. Johnson
March 15, 1913.

The undersigned, members of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, invite the attention of their fellow-citizens to the following statement concerning the grave international discussion which has arisen over the exemption of American coastwise vessels from tolls on the Panama Canal:

On November 18, 1901, a treaty “to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans” was concluded between the United States and Great Britain, at the request and on the initiative of the United States. The essential provisions of the treaty were (1) that “the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States,” and that “the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal”; (2) that “the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these Rules, on terms of entire equality”; (3) that the plant for operating the canal and the canal itself shall be “neutralized,” and shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents; (4) that the United States shall be at liberty to maintain an adequate military police along the canal; and (5) that “no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the High Contracting Parties under the present Treaty.”

The concluding of this treaty—commonly spoken of as the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty—was a necessary preliminary to the construction of any Isthmian canal by the United States or under its auspices; because by a previous convention between the same parties concluded in April, 1850, the United States and Great Britain had bound themselves that neither would “ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over” an Isthmian canal or “maintain any fortifications commanding the same,” or exercise dominion over “any part of Central America.” The contracting parties further agreed to
protect the canal from "interruption, seizure, or unjust confiscation," and to guarantee its neutrality.

This convention—commonly spoken of as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty—made at the request and on the initiative of the United States, established the general principle of the neutralization of any Isthmian canal which might be constructed, a principle which the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty reaffirmed.

The great design of both treaties, that of 1850 and that of 1901, was to promote the construction and maintenance of a ship-canal between the two oceans, for "the benefit of mankind, on equal terms to all," and to protect the neutralized canal effectively when built. In urging on the British Government the making of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, the American negotiator said to Lord Palmerston: "The United States sought no exclusive privilege or preferential right of any kind in regard to the proposed communication [that is, a canal or railroad], and their sincere wish, if it should be found practicable, was to see it dedicated to the common use of all nations on the most liberal terms and a footing of perfect equality for all. That the United States would not, if they could, obtain any exclusive right or privilege in a great highway which naturally belonged to all mankind." This statement expresses accurately the avowed intention and resolve of the United States from 1850 to 1912 concerning any Panama Canal. All treaties on the subject are based on this intention and resolve, many times reiterated by official representatives of the American Government.

In the summer of 1912, Congress passed a bill fixing the tolls to be paid for passing through the Panama Canal—constructed by the United States and approaching completion—but added a section which exempted American coastwise vessels from paying tolls, thus giving American coasting vessels a privilege which no other vessels would enjoy, and diminishing the probable income of the canal in operation.

After an interval of several months, Great Britain has presented to the Government of the United States a protest against the exemption of American coastwise vessels on two principal grounds. First, that such an exemption is inconsistent with the provision of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty that the canal shall be open to vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality; and secondly, that the exemption of American coastwise vessels would inevitably tend to increase the charges on all other vessels using the canal, to the disadvantage of all other nations in comparison with the United States, a disadvantage which might increase in the future, since the higher the rates the greater would be the privilege of exemption from paying them.

The British arguments are calm and free from exaggeration, and prove that the action of Congress in exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of canal tolls involves a construction of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty which is fairly open to question. A difference has arisen concerning the interpretation of a treaty.
On the 4th of April, 1908, the United States and Great Britain made another treaty in which they agreed that "differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two Contracting Parties and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of the 29th of July, 1899, provided, nevertheless, that they do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two Contracting States, and do not concern the interests of third Parties." The question whether American coastwise vessels shall pay tolls for passing through the canal cannot possibly be said to affect either nation's vital interests or independence, or the "honor" of either of the two governments. Clearly, a difference relating to the interpretation of a treaty has arisen between two governments which have agreed to submit such differences to The Hague Court of Arbitration.

In a special sense the United States is bound to observe faithfully and without question the treaty of April, 1908; for the United States has been among governments the great advocate of arbitration, has practised it in important cases, and has urged it strongly on all other governments. The United States cannot refuse to arbitrate the difference which has arisen concerning the proper interpretation of the Hay-Paunceforte Treaty, without turning its back on a very honorable chapter in its own history, and damaging throughout the world the cause of free institutions. The Republic ought to be the most scrupulous of all governments in the exact observance of treaty obligations. It must be absolutely faithful to its word, even to its own hurt.

Assuming that the difference which has arisen concerning the construction of the Hay-Paunceforte Treaty must be arbitrated unless the cause of the difference can be withdrawn, we desire to urge on our fellow-citizens the expediency of promptly repealing that action of Congress which gave rise to the difficulty.

Granting that some American shipping interests might be benefited by the exemption of coastwise vessels from canal tolls, since the term coastwise now includes voyages half round the globe, America surely has much larger interests which would be greatly served by the prompt abandonment of any interpretation of the Hay-Paunceforte Treaty against which Great Britain can enter a reasonable protest. The United States has an immense interest in the sanctity of contracts, and in the strict observance of all international conventions and treaties. It has an immense interest in the faithful observance of any treaty between two or more nations which has been entered into "for the benefit of mankind." It is true that in times past many treaties have not been strictly observed; that others have been suffered to lapse quietly; and that some have been violated by one or more of the parties, too impatient to wait for a new convention. Despotic and monarchical governments have often sinned in these respects, and republics have been accused of like conduct. All
the more reason that the American Republic should do no act under a treaty which can be even questioned by candid and honorable men. In the efficacy of international agreements lies the chief hope of the world for progressive civiliza-

The further promotion, in a method of uncertain value, of the interests of American coastwise shipping interests already protected by the possession of a complete monopoly as against all other nations, is a doubtful matter of commercial improvement. The whole country considered, the pecuniary advantage would not be large, and might easily be completely offset by accompanying disadvantages; but whatever advantage might come to this well-protected industry, it would be as nothing compared with the interests of the whole United States in carrying out the noble work of building a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans for the common advantage of all nations.

The greatest interest of the United States as a free nation is to represent worthily before the world the principles of civil and religious liberty and the public efficiency and well-being which those principles develop, and thereby to promote the adoption of these principles the world over. This is a great ma-

terial as well as a great moral interest. In comparison with this large interest, the interest of the United States in its coastwise vessels sinks into insignificance. By securing the repeal of that part of the act of Congress on the Panama Canal which provided for the exemption of American coastwise ves-

sels from the payment of tolls, the American people would embrace a precious opportunity to prove that they understand their highest interest, and recognize their duty to promote it “for the benefit of mankind.”

Joseph H. Choate
Andrew D. White
Charles W. Eliot
John L. Cadwalader
Elihu Root
Luke E. Wright
Charlemagne Tower
R. S. Woodward
Austen G. Fox
J. G. Schmidlapp
Robert S. Brookings
Oscar S. Straus
Samuel Mather
James L. Slayden
Charles L. Taylor
Henry S. Pritchett
William M. Howard
Cleveland H. Dodge
Robert A. Franks
Nicholas Murray Butler
Arthur William Foster
James Brown Scott
Chicago, April 23, 1913

Hon. F. C. Lowden, 
Oregon, Illinois.

My dear Mr. Lowden:—

Enclosed I am sending you a document which is being distributed by the Carnegie Peace Foundation. The fortifying of the Panama Canal seems to me an imperative necessity. The propaganda carried on by Mr. Carnegie's hired men is very active, and of course is backed up by ample funds. Of course we all agree on doing everything to maintain international peace, but we should not commit the insensate folly of allowing ourselves to be exposed to attack by predatory nations better equipped than we for war. This is not a question of theory or of sentiment, but of plain fact, which the least observation of things as they are in the world ought to make entirely clear to anybody. What is the positive campaign which is carried on for the enlightenment of people in the direction of national defense?

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER

Brooklyn, New York

February 22, 1919

Mr. Captain Jones,

Attn: Manager of Post Office

Dear Captain Jones,

I am writing to you about the arrangement of the post office.

The post office is located in the downtown area of Brooklyn, and it is very important to maintain a clean and organized environment.

I have noticed that the post office is often crowded, and it is difficult for customers to find the service they need. I would like to suggest that we consider expanding the post office to accommodate more customers.

Also, I have noticed that the post office is often open during the hours when there are not many customers. It would be more efficient to close the post office during these hours and save on utilities.

I hope you will consider my suggestions. I am available to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

H. J. Johnson
January 4, 1915.

President Harry P. Judson
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois

My dear President Judson,

This will introduce to you Mr. LeRoy Arthur Sheetz, who is making a trip to a few of the more important universities for the purpose of organizing International Polity Clubs for the serious study of the conditions underlying war and peace. Clubs of this type are already in successful operation at Oxford and Cambridge, and at Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, and other institutions in the East.

The Carnegie Endowment feels that no more effective use of its resources can be made than the encouragement of the careful study by University students of international questions, and Mr. Sheetz is making this trip under the auspices of the Endowment.

What we have in mind is neither the formation of additional peace societies on the one hand, nor on the other hand of any organizations which could be regarded as violating in the slightest degree the attitude of neutrality enjoined by President Wilson. We do feel however that the terrific conditions in Europe make this the one time of all others for our best American students to give careful and intelligent consideration to the factors, political, social and economic, underlying states of peace and war.
It is of course not our intention to bother you personally with the details of this matter, but we should greatly appreciate it if you could turn Mr. Sheetz over to one of your younger colleagues who would himself be interested in what we are trying to do, and who would be in position to put Mr. Sheetz into communication with a few of the real leaders of student opinion at Chicago.

Trusting that we may have your cooperation in this matter, and with best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
If in the course of our discussion you do not support the position of the Senate, may we perhaps express a preference to you personally. It is of course of your interest to have me express my interest in what we are going to do. And who would be in position to make the speech into communication with a few

of the best leaders of student opinion at Chicago.

The more I think about this the more I see that we may have your cooperation in this matter.
President Harry Pratt Judson,
The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of March 6 and 7 and to thank you for bringing out the two points of difficulty with regard to the subject of extension courses on international relations.

My letter of March 5 was intended rather to outline the possibilities of such instruction than to lay down any hard and fast lines. With reference to the number of hours per week, a time equivalent on some other basis would of course serve the same purpose.

It has been our thought that courses on international relations in which the subject of international law should not predominate but should play a very minor role would be of great advantage in the near future. It is probable that the demand for instructors and professors on this subject will soon largely increase. Not knowing of any satisfactory syllabus on the broad subject of international relations it has seemed advisable for this Division with the cooperation of a number of able authorities on the subject to prepare for publication a new syllabus as an aid to lecturers.
I am pleased to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 5 and 7 and to thank you for bringing to the attention of the University of Chicago the need for an international fellowship to enable one or two selected students from the various countries to come to this country for a period of one year.

The possibility of such a fellowship may lead to the establishment of a permanent program of exchange for students of various countries, with the University of Chicago as its headquarters.

Please let me know immediately if you are interested in the establishment of such a program.

President Harry P. Bean
The University of Chicago
to lecturers and students. Naturally there has been no thought of imposing such a syllabus on the instructors as a fixed outline to be followed.

The foregoing development of my letter of March 3 may make it seem to you to be advisable to give consideration to the proposal made in that letter.

Yours very truly,

Henry S. Harrell
Assistant to the Director
Chicago, March 18, 1916

Dear Sir:—

Your favor of the 14th inst. is received. The University of Chicago provides courses in international law and diplomacy, covering the question of international relations, and is already planning for some general lectures next year on these subjects. I may give a course myself, as this is my own field. While I appreciate the generous suggestion of a subsidy, I think we should not need it, on the one hand, and on the other, possibly there might be a little more feeling of independence here if the lectures were given entirely on our own basis.

With sincere appreciation of your suggestion, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.R.J. — L.

Mr. Henry S. Haskell,
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,
407 W. 117th St., Sub-Station 44, New York City.
Dear Sir:—

Your letter of the 16th inst. is received.
The University of Chicago maintains sore in person a
section in the field and is already planning for
international relations, and I am already planning to
some extent lectures next year on those matters. I
may give a course myself. as I am to my own belief
I appreciate the general importance of a university,
I think we ought not need it, but I do not need, nor do the other
departments. the course might be a little more decisive or indispensable
were it the lectures were given especially on our own plane.

With sincere appreciation of your expectations I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P. L. — L.

Mr. Henry S. Haskel
Gentleman in Charge for International Peace
40 W. IVth St. Sec. 1-L. New York City.

President Harry P. Judson,

University of Chicago,

Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

I beg to advise you that the Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is prepared to give financial assistance within certain prescribed limits to enable courses of instruction in the general subject of International Relations to be carried on in extension teaching departments of certain universities which have, or can properly establish, a satisfactory organization for work of this kind.

What is proposed is that during the academic year 1916-1917 there be given a course of this kind for not less than two hours a week throughout the academic year, the two hours to be given either in a single period or divided into two periods, according as local preference and conditions may make desirable. For such a course, organized and carried on as herein described, the Carnegie Endowment will make a subvention of $500. The university responsible for the course of instruction will receive this payment and will itself arrange in its own way for any additional
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

404 West 42nd Street
New York City

May 6, 1919

Professor Harold L. Jacoby
University of Chicago
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

I beg to assure you that the Division of International Peace
and Education of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
is preparing to give financial assistance within certain limits
sufficient to enable some degree of cooperation in the general
advice of International Relations to be carried on in Europe.

We have been asked to undertake the formation of a suitable international organization for work
on the proper execution of a satisfactory program to work
of this kind.

What is required is first and foremost the encouragement and
interest of friendly governments and organizations that may work
for such a purpose. A definite policy of granting aid to such
organizations now exists, and we shall be glad to
advise on their selection and assistance in any way possible.

The Carnegie Endowment will make a statement of its
activities responsible to the Carnegie Corporation, and will receive
an annual amount which shall enable it to meet
the requirements of the program in the way best for the
interest of the nation.
tional cost and for the fixing and collection of appropriate fees. The officer in charge of the work is of course to be selected by the university in question, but it is requested that his name be submitted to the Division of Intercourse and Education for approval before final appointment.

The purpose of this instruction is not merely to present in general and popular form the fundamental principles of international law, but to offer to students, and to others who may wish to follow such a course, general information and instruction on the whole subject of modern international relations as these are presenting themselves in the field of economics, trade, finance, literature, science and other ways. The general aim of the instruction is to develop what has been called "The International Mind" among our own people, with a view to helping them to think in terms of international relations and to appreciate with increasing knowledge and insight the significance of events throughout the world which have an international bearing.

I should be glad to be advised not later than April 1, whether the University of Chicago would care to enter upon an arrangement of this kind for the next academic year. The Division of Intercourse and Education has in contemplation the preparation of a syllabus for the general guidance of lecturers and students in these courses, and we should value very highly any suggestions both general and specific as to the scope and contents of such a syllabus.

Very truly yours,

Henry S. Haenell
Assistant to the Director
I know you may for the time and collection of information be very busy.

The officer in charge of the work is of course to be selected by the University in consultation with the President, but it is recommended that he is more in sympathy with the Division or Interdepartmental Center.

The purpose of the information is not merely to learn and to report any progress from the fundamental principles of information. It is, in fact, to do that and to ensure that proper information can be made in order to follow such a course. By extension of the whole field of modern information science, as these and the prehistoric disciplines in the field of economics, these disciplines, information science and of course, the social scientist, will be the instruments of our knowledge and our power. Our concern is the world which we can reflect.

I am not yet to develop a theory for the field, but I suggest that the information of the instruments of the world which we can reflect.

The division of the field for the next several years is to demonstrate any possibilities and in cooperation with the organization of information is a challenge for the society which in these years sees no answer to the problem with any information.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
March 6, 1916

President Harry Pratt Judson,
University of Chicago.

My dear President Judson:

I have the letter of March 3rd addressed to you by the assistant to the director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. I shall be glad to see you about this at your convenience. Meanwhile I am writing this to say that their proposition seems to me not wholly unrelated to the composite course which I have entitled, "Studies in Present International Relations" and to which we are inviting you to contribute one of the lectures. I suppose that I am right in understanding that the letter addressed to you contemplates lectures to be given outside of the University premises rather than in the University class rooms to our own students.

It seems to me that there will be some difficulty in the adoption of a general syllabus, for lecturers competent to discuss these matters would I should think, hardly be willing to conform to any general syllabus or outline not prepared by themselves.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

NB/H
March 6, 1936

Prezident Harry B. Jordan

University of Chicago

My Dear President Jordan:

I have the honor to present the report of the committee on

the development of the International Relations

Center to present International Relations

and to request we invite you to contribute one

hundred thousand dollars to be given outright to the

University for the International Relations Center.

I know you will be one of the first.

It seems to me that there should be some

difficulties in the adoption of a general principle

of new courses of instruction in the University

without the consent of the University.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
April 2, 1917.

Dr. Harry Pratt Judson,
President, University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear President Judson:

Professor Wilson has no doubt informed you of the action of the Executive Council of the Society at its meeting on March 10th in disapproving the holding of a summer conference on international law and the awarding of fellowships in international law by the Society. It was therefore decided to establish the fellowships directly by the Division of International Law of the Endowment.

In view of the action of the Executive Council of the Society, Professor Wilson does not think it would be proper for the Standing Committee to take any part in the establishment of fellowships by the Endowment. He has, however, indicated his willingness personally to cooperate with me in the matter and I have invited him to be one of a committee of three to pass upon the applications and make the awards. I am writing you to invite you also to be a member of that committee, and am sending a similar invitation to Professor Raleigh C. Minor of the University of Virginia. I hope very much that you will cooperate with me in making the awards. I do not believe it would be advisable for me, because of my connection with the Endowment, to have any say in selecting the successful candidates.

The fellowships have already been announced and April 21st is the limit up to which applications may be received. Professor Wilson has
suggested that he would be willing to come to Washington a few days in advance of the annual meeting of the Society this month and assist in making the awards. The annual meeting will be held April 26th to 28th, and, if you are willing to serve on the committee and can find it convenient to come to Washington a few days before the meeting, I would consider it a very great favor.

In the hope of which, I am

Always sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Director.
suggested that we have a willing to come to Washington a few days.

In advance of the January meeting of the Society please send me note of

In Washington the meeting will be held in April Secret to start and

any "If you are willing to serve on the Committee may can kindly

part to come to Washington a few days before the meeting I would consider

It a very great honor.

In the hope of which I am

Yours sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Chicago, April 9, 1917

Dear Mr. Scott:

Your favor of April 2d was received while I was in Washington. In accordance with our conference in your office I beg to confirm the statement that while I appreciate the courtesy of your invitation my engagements are so strenuous that I cannot act on the committee to which you refer. Indeed, I think it is quite likely that I shall not attend the meeting of the Society of International Law this month. Just now I am not interested in talking about international law, but am more interested in seeing whether the United States by force of arms can determine that there is to be an international law in the future.

Very truly yours,

H.F.J. - L.

Director James Brown Scott
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
2 Jackson Place
Washington, D. C.
Office, April 8, 1924

Dear Mr. Scott:

Your letter of April 8th was received.

While I was in Washington for the conference in your office I had to continue the statement that while I appreciate the courtesy of your invitation my occupancy of the position of the chairman of the committee to which you referred I think it is important to inform you that I am unable to attend the meeting of the Society of International Law this month and am not interested in attending a meeting of the United States Delegation to the Conference on International Law in the future.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Director, Committee on International Law
Washington, D.C.