

EDITORIAL COMMENT

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY

The Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law convened in Washington in the New Willard Hotel at 8:30 o'clock on the evening of April 24 last, and when it adjourned on April 26, it had added to its record one of the most successful meetings in its lengthening list of creditable accomplishments and had witnessed for the first time important changes in its effective executive and administrative personnel.

This was the first meeting since the Society was organized in 1906 that it had met without the inspiring presence of its only President, the Honorable Elihu Root, who was in California by order of his physician. In his absence the meeting was opened by one of the distinguished Vice-Presidents of the Society, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States, who two days later was elected to the office of President, upon the retirement of Mr. Root as President and his elevation to the position of Honorary President. On that occasion the Society sent the following telegram of affection and appreciation to Mr. Root at his hotel in San Francisco:

The American Society of International Law, meeting in plenary session on this twenty-sixth day of April, nineteen hundred twenty-four, accepts with profound regret the retirement of its first and only President since its foundation.

Although distressed by the severance of official relations, the members are grateful for the eighteen years of affectionate association, and consider it an inestimable privilege to have been permitted from year to year to observe in the midst of their meetings the skill and precision with which your presidential addresses—each in its appropriate place—have contributed to the growth of the newer and progressive Law of Nations.

The Society and its members in taking this official farewell wish you not only health and happiness but many years of further service in the sacred cause of international law.

Denied the presence of Mr. Root, the members of the Society were treated at the opening session to a scholarly address by Dr. James Brown Scott, who eulogized Mr. Root's services to international law in the form of an epitome of his exposition of the subject in the various topics discussed in his seventeen annual presidential addresses before the Society. An attempt to summarize Dr. Scott's lengthy and brilliant paper would be futile. It will be found in full in the printed volume of proceedings of the Society.

As an indication of the illuminating contents of the document, Dr. Scott's concluding paragraphs will be here reproduced:

I would like to advert, in conclusion, to the remark which I quoted at the beginning of this address, that when Mr. Root's countrymen are as far removed from him as he is from the founders of the Republic, they will consider him as worthy of our Revolutionary Fathers. I desire very modestly to concur in this remark and its implications. And this address, which is longer than I had hoped, but shorter than it should be to set forth his many achievements, will fail of its purpose, if it does not show that Mr. Root's addresses delivered at the annual meetings of the American Society of International Law deal with the fundamentals of international life and of international development, and are, in very truth, the text of the new law of nations.

Happily for us, Mr. Root is in the afternoon, not the evening of life; his sun is in the Heavens, still high above the mountain-top, and the world is aglow with light!

Secretary Hughes thanked Dr. Scott in the name of the Society for his "very instructive review of a distinguished service." "The country is fortunate," he continued, "in having had the inspiration and the benefit of Mr. Root's long services. I share the opinion which Dr. Scott has voiced with respect to the estimate in the future of the value of Mr. Root's contribution to sound opinion and to the development of an appropriate appreciation of international institutions."

The Distinction Between Legal and Political Questions

The morning session on Friday, April 25th, was devoted to a report from the Committee on the Extension of International Law on the topic of "The Distinction between Legal and Political Questions." The report took the form of addresses by four members of the committee: Professor Charles G. Fenwick, of Bryn Mawr College, acting chairman in the absence of Professor Jesse S. Reeves, of the University of Michigan; Professor Edwin M. Borchard, of Yale Law School, Professor Quincy Wright, of the University of Chicago, and Professor Manley O. Hudson, of the Harvard Law School.

Professor Fenwick dealt with the subject in a preliminary way. He said that, in the usage of foreign offices, legal questions are those in which a dispute as to the respective rights of the parties is governed by a fairly definite rule of international law while, in contrast, political questions are those in respect of which there is no definite rule of international law marking the rights and duties in dispute. This distinction, he said, grew out of (1) the development of international law from usage and custom which are uncertain and inelastic; (2) the defective organization of the society of nations in the matter of an obligatory jurisdiction to develop an international customary law and of an international executive agency for the protection of rights recognized by law; and (3) the right of the individual state to be the ultimate arbiter in many "domestic" questions which react upon the

welfare of other states. The problem of the committee, he concluded, was to study carefully the conditions of international relations to which are due the distinction between legal and political questions which, he thought, was one of the fundamental problems in the development of international law.

Professor Borchard was of the opinion that the distinction was quite recent and had its origin in the growth and practice of arbitration. He doubted that the existence of an applicable rule of law is important to the conclusion to adopt the judicial process. "If the question does not affect what the nation may deem to be its vital interests, or if it finds that it has less to lose by a judicial settlement than by war or any other political method," it will be submitted to judicial determination. "On the other hand, if the question does affect the nation's vital interests, its origin in a treaty or its dependence upon a recognized rule of law, will not induce its voluntary submission to arbitration." After considering the utility of the distinction, Professor Borchard concluded:

The prevalent conviction, not without some historical foundation, that there are certain questions of vital or political interest which can only be settled by force should be counteracted by the assertion, sustained not by history but by reason, that there are no questions which inherently demand solution by force and that self-restraint, inspired perhaps by a realization of unhappy physical consequences even to the victor, may convert almost any international difference into a legal question.

Professor Wright held that there are "three conditions under which states hesitate to appeal to law: (1) where there is no law covering the dispute, (2) where there is no tribunal which can be relied on to apply the law impartially, (3) where the application of law would not give the results which the state wants."

As to the first condition he thought that "in practically all questions international as well as national courts can find a rule, a principle or at least a standard of law to apply if they take the time, though doubtless on many questions it would take a brave man to prophesy before the event just what that rule, principle or standard would be."

The second objection he hoped has been remedied by the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague.

The real difficulty, he said, was presented by the third condition as "statesmen frequently avoid submission of disputes to law, not because they do not know the law, but because they know it too well. They frequently desire to support claims that they feel are justified by economic interest, political expediency, or even sound morality, but which they are fully aware are not justified by law." Such questions, he said, were political questions and "the difficulty can only be met by developing the law so that it will afford full protection to all claims which are really sound from an international point of view."

He then considered at length whether the United States in asserting the Monroe Doctrine relied on economic, political, moral or other claims not as yet recognized by international law. He concluded that the doctrine is in the main supported by international law and treaties, though its most recent interpretations rely on political considerations alone.

Professor Hudson, who, due to his inability to reach Washington in time, delivered his address on Saturday morning, expressed the view that there is no hard and fast rule to be drawn between legal and political questions; that law is generally the hand-maiden of policy, and it is particularly important in international law that we should frankly avoid the inadequacy of logic for the solution of the problems which have to be handled; that law is not merely a matter of evolution, but of service along with other human agencies to develop a solution of current problems which will serve general peace.

He considered the nature of the questions involved in the bombardment of Corfu by Italy to enforce demands for an indemnity for the murder of Italians at Janina upon the boundary commission sent there by the Conference of Ambassadors at Paris. The Italian Government's position, based on legal grounds and supported by juristic argument, Professor Hudson thought, was in truth a political position, taken for political reasons and that there was not very much to gain by attempting to isolate the legal features of the question and dealing with them apart from the political features.

The afternoon of Friday was given over to a meeting of the Executive Council, and at 4:30 P.M. the members of the Society were received by the President of the United States in the White House. About seventy-five members attended the reception and received a cordial handshake from President Coolidge.

The Recognition of New States and Governments

The session on Friday evening, April 25th, was devoted to addresses on the subject of "The Recognition of New States and Governments." Mr. Edward A. Harriman, Lecturer on International Law at George Washington University Law School, considered the definition of recognition and the distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* recognition, the use of which terms he thought was misleading in international law. Taking up the attitude of the American Government toward recognition of Soviet Russia as his special topic, Mr. Harriman described Soviet Russia as a government with a written constitution, with courts and with a religion called Communism. "Like other religions, Communism calls for missionary work, and the Bolshevik Government has supported missionaries in many other countries for the purpose of spreading the religion of Communism, with the intention of overthrowing the existing bourgeois governments of the unbelievers." Mr. Harriman stated that there is no such thing "as the right of a government to recognition, or the duty of another government to recognize it. . . . The question is one solely of national policy." "If it is the policy

of the United States to recognize the fact of the existence of a new government," he said, "the Soviet Government is clearly entitled to recognition. If, on the other hand, the character of that government is to determine the policy of the United States in recognizing it, there is ample evidence in the history of that government to justify a refusal of recognition. The government which has abolished God, abolished private property, repudiated its debts, confiscated hundreds of millions of the property of foreigners and executed millions of its opponents, can hardly be said to have acted in accordance with American ideals."

The next speaker was Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs of the Department of State, who took as his special topic the recent attitude of the American Government toward recognition of Greece. Mr. Dulles first contrasted the policy of the United States one hundred years ago in the recognition of the new revolutionary states in Latin America with the recognition of Greek independence growing out of the revolution during the same period. He then gave an historical background of the non-recognition of the Greek sovereigns between 1921 and 1924 and considered the arguments for and against recognition. He explained the character of American relations with Greece during the period of non-recognition, and ended with the recognition of the Greek Government in April 1924. He drew the following conclusions:

1. The Greek precedent indicates the important influence of considerations of general policy upon recognition. It is impossible to fix definite rules or to state that, given a certain situation, recognition should inevitably follow. It must constantly be borne in mind that, while circumstances may justify recognition, there is no legal duty to accord it.

2. The Monroe Doctrine and the policy of non-intervention in Transatlantic affairs have had a very distinct influence upon this country's practice in dealing with the recognition of new states and governments in Europe. In the case of Greece there resulted from these policies a disinclination to follow a separate course of action with respect to the recognition of a particular régime at a time when other Powers withheld recognition and the local situation was far from stable.

3. The Greek precedent also brings out clearly the modern tendency to be less technical in international dealings in matters relating to recognition and non-recognition. Principles of common sense are applied and, while recognition retains its importance in regulating formal international relations, under modern practice it is being demonstrated that, even in the absence of recognition, intercourse may, by mutual understanding, continue and diplomatic relations be maintained. Non-recognition, plus a severance of diplomatic relations, as in the case of Russia, differs essentially from non-recognition plus a maintenance of diplomatic relations, as in the case of Greece.

The last speaker on the subject of recognition was Professor John H. Logan, of Rutgers College and the State University of New Jersey, who discussed the American attitude toward Mexico. He pointed out two stages

in the development of this attitude, the first ending with the recognition of General Diaz in 1877 as to which President Hayes, in a message to Congress, said that the custom of the United States, when such changes of government had occurred in Mexico, was "to recognize and enter into official relations with the *de facto* government as soon as it should appear to have the approval of the Mexican people and should manifest a disposition to adhere to the obligations of treaties and international friendship." The attitude of the United States Government toward General Huerta when he came to the head of the Mexican Government in 1913 was stated by Professor Logan to mark a new policy, by requiring an assurance that outstanding questions between the two countries would be dealt with in a satisfactory manner before recognition would be granted. This departure from previous practice was further emphasized by President Wilson's declaration in 1916 that "the Government of the United States will refuse to extend the hand of welcome to anyone who obtains power in a sister republic by treachery and violence" and by the withholding of recognition from the Obregon Government for three years because of his refusal to make a treaty which would secure American property rights in Mexico.

Professor Logan concluded: (1) that recognition should not be used as a punitive or threatening instrument, nor for achieving what might be achieved in a more friendly way; (2) the question of recognition should not be allowed to become associated in the public mind with any idea of intervention; (3) the principle of the treaty provision adopted at the Central American Conference in Washington, December 1922, against the recognition of governments which come into power through a *coup d'état* or revolution so long as the freely elected representatives of the people have not constitutionally reorganized the country, should be extended so as to become an American system, subscribed to by all.

The session on Saturday morning, April 26th, was devoted to a discussion of the papers dealing with the distinction between legal and political questions. The discussion was long and animated and it was necessary to bring it to a close at eleven-thirty o'clock in order to transact the necessary business of the Society. The business meeting will be dealt with in this comment after describing the papers delivered at the annual dinner.

The Annual Dinner

One hundred and eighty members and their guests assembled at dinner at the final gathering which brought the meeting to a close. The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States, the newly elected President of the Society, presided as Toastmaster. In the course of his opening remarks, Mr. Hughes pointed out the striking distinction between municipal law and international law with respect to the ease with which the former is manufactured, whereas the latter "is the hardest thing in the world to make." Although we are endeavoring to overcome the difficulties due to

the enormous increase in the volume of municipal law, he said, we are doing all we can to magnify and extend international law. Uncertainty is common to both, however, he continued, and when we think of the great labor involved in the efforts to have reasonable uniformity of laws in the States of the Federal Union with its homogeneous people, it is not strange "that we meet difficulty in the development of law in the international field, with different nations, with different histories and traditions, and with distinct and conflicting conceptions of national interests." The only effective way, he said, for the maintenance of peace and the reign of law "is through the increased disposition of peoples to be reasonable and fair," and that duty begins at home. He concluded as follows:

We are in a unique position at this time. There is no menace to our security and there is no reason why we should have the slightest apprehension as to our ability to take care of ourselves. There is no reason for any reluctance to be just. Why should we not present to the world an example of a people dedicated to justice, to international justice? What is there in the way of our expressing as a nation the generous sentiments which animate us as individuals? There is really nothing that we need to sacrifice in order to obtain the good will of all peoples on the earth and thus open the way to make our contribution to the advancement of international law.

Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, President of Johns Hopkins University, who was the next speaker, spoke of the contacts of the East with the West. These contacts with which we are most familiar, he said, have been of the last 250 years, during which the East has been subjected to the political and economic domination of the West. Outside of this period, he continued, we are apt to go back to the classical period of 2,000 years ago, but he called attention to the period in between when there was no European military Power which could stand against the power of the East and when Mongol or Turkish armies always were in Europe as invaders or conquerors, "so that if we take a long enough view of history . . . I think we can see that the claim of Europe to its inherent military superiority of the East is a vain one." Dr. Goodnow pointed to the testimony of European travellers and writers who had visited the East which showed that during the period before the Renaissance the East had a civilization that far outranked the West. The superior civilization of the latter since the Renaissance, he said, was due to scientific development, but, he continued, "there is no reason for supposing that there is any inherent difference between the East and the West, and the East is now showing that it is capable also of adopting scientific principles and applying scientific methods." He thought that the white races should reform their ideas with regard to their inherent intellectual superiority in the interest of friendly relations with the East.

The next speaker was the honorable Edwin B. Parker, Umpire of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, who gave an

account of the work of the Commission. He said that the Treaty of Berlin of August 25, 1921, restoring friendly relations between the United States and Germany, and the agreement of August 10, 1922, constituting the commission, are unique in international relations for

this is the first instance in recorded history where a treaty, restoring friendly relations between belligerents, prescribes what the vanquished nation shall pay for, and leaves the amount to be paid to judicial ascertainment by a tribunal in the selection of which both nations have a voice and before which both are fully heard.

The terms of this treaty are consistent with the practical idealism that carried America into the war. Here are found no annexations, no penalties, and no punitive indemnities, but only provisions for compensation or reparation for damage inflicted, which is the essence of justice.

The last speaker of the evening was the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, of Georgetown University, late Pontifical Relief Envoy to Russia, who described the situation in Russia and expressed his views as to the conditions of eventual intercourse between that country and the United States. "It is absolutely beside the mark," he said, "for those entrusted with the destinies of the American commonwealth to be bombarded with evidence . . . purporting to establish the great trade possibilities in Russia, or the practical failure of Communism, or the new economic policy, or the attempts to establish a public school system, or balance the budget and stabilize the currency," for "these particular signs of a return to right reason still leave the depths of the Russian problem untouched." He said that an entirely new state of conditions has been created by the Soviet Government which render the old criterion of recognition inadequate. The United States is asked to recognize, "not Russia, which no longer exists as a treaty-making Power, but a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the World . . . intended to embrace, eventually, the entire world, every other country, including America, being invited to join as a constituent state, and whenever the invitation is refused, the recalcitrant country is to be forced into the Union by revolutionary uprisings."

Even if such subversive propaganda be not conducted in America, the speaker continued, the conditions under which foreigners must live and do business in Russia under Soviet law are such as to deprive them of what Americans regard as their inalienable rights, and which cannot be considered as falling within the zone of negotiable issues. Among the disabilities of foreigners in Russia, he mentioned the inability to acquire property and the confiscation of property formerly owned, the requirement for the admission of the state as a partner in business enterprises, the deprivation of control over the raising and education of children, and the inhibitions against helping one's native country if it happens to be a section of the international bourgeoisie which do not allow equal rights to the Communist system of ownership. "In fact, in all his dealings with Soviet justice, which is admittedly

class justice, the American taking up residence in Russia must never overlook the fact that his life, as well as his property, is to all intents and purposes at the disposal of the Central Executive Committee."

Business Meeting

The business of the Society was transacted at the Saturday morning session of the Society, at three meetings of the Executive Council held in the afternoon of April 25th, the morning of April 26th, on May 22d, and at a meeting of the Executive Committee held on May 13th.

At the session held on Saturday morning, April 26th, the Society, in addition to electing Mr. Root Honorary President and Mr. Hughes President, as previously stated, elected the following Vice-Presidents and members of the Executive Council to serve until 1927:

Vice-Presidents

Hon. Chandler P. Anderson	Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge
Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin	Hon. John Bassett Moore
Mr. Charles Henry Butler	Hon. William W. Morrow
Mr. Frederic R. Coudert	Hon. Oscar S. Straus
Hon. Jacob M. Dickinson	Hon. George Sutherland
Hon. George Gray	Hon. William H. Taft
Mr. Charles Noble Gregory	Dr. James Brown Scott
Hon. David Jayne Hill	Prof. George Grafton Wilson
Hon. Robert Lansing	Mr. Theodore S. Woolsey

Executive Council to serve until 1927

Prof. Cephas D. Allin, Minn.	Mr. Frank L. Polk, N. Y.
Mr. William C. Dennis, D. C.	Hon. Henry W. Temple, Pa.
Prof. Manley O. Hudson, Mass.	Mr. Charles Warren, D. C.
Prof. John H. Latané, Md.	Mr. Lester H. Woolsey, D. C.

Dr. James Brown Scott had previously given notice to the Executive Council of his intention to withdraw from the office of Recording Secretary of the Society and Editor-in-Chief of the *American Journal of International Law*, and the following statement of appreciation of his services, prepared by a committee of the Council, was read by Mr. A. K. Kuhn, unanimously approved by the Society and ordered to be printed in the *Proceedings*:

After eighteen years of faithful and untiring service, Dr. James Brown Scott has indicated a desire to retire from his long service as Recording Secretary of the Society and as Editor-in-Chief of its JOURNAL. The Executive Council does not wish the occasion to pass without an expression of its profound regret at the loss of Dr. Scott's services in both these offices, and desires the members of the Society to understand that only after persistent efforts to have him reconsider his

purpose and his determined refusal so to do that it has been willing gracefully, though reluctantly, to accept the situation.

Dr. Scott was not merely one of the founders of the Society, but the one upon whom the chief burden fell in executing the plan and in carrying it forward to success. He brought to the Society from the beginning, and has continued to evidence throughout, a genius for organization, high scholarly ideals and an untiring industry without which the Society could not have been the force that it now is in the study of international law and in the establishment of better international relations on the basis of law and justice.

As Dr. Scott is by no means retiring from his activities in the Society, but only from the burdens of active office, it is not intended to review his achievements or public services, but only to emphasize that he has never permitted other positions in government and unofficial service to interfere either with the efficient administration of the Society's affairs as Secretary, nor with the scholarly direction of its JOURNAL, to which he contributed not only numerous articles but the chief body of editorial comment. That both phases of the Society's activities should have continued successfully through the difficult years of the war is due to the wise counsel of our distinguished President, Mr. Root, and others, but particularly to him upon whom, in large measure, the detail work fell. We are especially indebted to Dr. Scott for systematically and ably bringing to the notice of our members both the problems confronting our government and the solutions arrived at in that period, so momentous in its effects upon international law.

The committee asks that this memorial be received by the Society, and be printed in the *Proceedings* as a mark of its deep appreciation of his long years of faithful service and of its hearty good wishes for his happiness and continued usefulness.

On behalf of the committee appointed by the Executive Council at its meeting last year¹ to consider an amendment which would clarify the meaning of Article VII of the Constitution, Mr. Kuhn also read the following draft of an amendment which will be duly notified to the members of the Society for action at its next annual meeting:

Resolved, That Article 7 of the Constitution of the Society relating to resolutions be and the same is hereby amended by inserting after the first two words of that article, the following clauses:

"Relating to the principles of international law or to international relations," so that the article will read as follows:

"All resolutions relating to the principles of international law or to international relations which shall be offered at any meeting of the Society shall, in the discretion of the presiding officer, or on the demand of three members, be referred to the appropriate committee or the Council, and no vote shall be taken until a report shall have been made thereon."

In this connection, the Society adopted the following resolution offered by Mr. Kuhn:

Resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed by the President to make a study of the Constitution of the Society with a view to con-

¹ Proceedings for 1923, p. 137.

sider the advisability of amendments thereto for bringing it more into line with the experience and needs of the Society after the eighteen years of its existence, and that the amendments proposed by it be printed in the notice of the next annual meeting as required by the amendment clause, for action by the Society at its next annual meeting.

Upon the recommendation of the Executive Council, the Society elected to honorary membership M. Charles Lyon-Caën, formerly Dean of the University of Paris, a member of the Institute of France, perpetual Secretary of its Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, and President of the Curatorium of the Academy of International Law at The Hague.

Before adjourning the Society adopted a resolution in memory of the late Justice William R. Day, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society, who died on July 9, 1923.

At the meeting of the Executive Council which followed immediately after the morning session of the Society, Admiral William L. Rodgers was elected chairman of the Council and the following members were elected to the Executive Committee:

Chandler P. Anderson	David Jayne Hill
Charles Henry Butler	James Brown Scott
Charles Noble Gregory	Judge Kathryn Sellers
George Grafton Wilson	

Dr. Scott subsequently declined to serve, and Mr. Robert Lansing was elected to the vacancy at the meeting of the Council on May 22d.

Mr. Charles Henry Butler expressed his desire to retire from the office of Corresponding Secretary, which he had held since the organization of the Society, and the following resolution of appreciation of his services was adopted:

The Executive Council of the American Society of International Law at its meeting on April 26, 1924, desires to express its regret at Mr. Charles Henry Butler's retirement from the post of Corresponding Secretary, which he has held from the organization of the Society on the 12th day of January, 1906, until the present day.

It avails itself of this occasion to express formally its appreciation of Mr. Butler's services, not only as Corresponding Secretary, but as a member of the Council, of the Executive Committee, and the other committees of the Society since its organization, and expresses its great pleasure that the services rendered without stint to the Society in all its activities will be continued by Mr. Butler in his capacity as Vice-President of the Society, and as a member of the Executive Council and of the Executive Committee.

The Honorable Charles Cheney Hyde was thereupon reelected Treasurer, Mr. George A. Finch was elected Recording Secretary, and Mr. William C. Dennis, Corresponding Secretary. At this meeting and at the meeting on May 22d, the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW was elected as follows:

Honorary Editor-in-Chief: James Brown Scott, Washington, D. C.

Editor-in-Chief: George Grafton Wilson, Harvard University.

Managing Editor: George A. Finch, Washington, D. C.

Chandler P. Anderson, Washington, D. C.

Edwin M. Borchard, Yale Law School.

Philip Marshall Brown, Princeton University.

William C. Dennis, Washington, D. C.

Edwin D. Dickinson, University of Michigan.

Charles G. Fenwick, Bryn Mawr College.

James W. Garner, University of Michigan.

David Jayne Hill, Washington, D. C.

Manley O. Hudson, Harvard Law School.

Charles Cheney Hyde, Washington, D. C.

Arthur K. Kuhn, New York City.

Ellery C. Stowell, Washington, D. C.

Quincy Wright, University of Chicago.

The appointment of committees was referred to the Executive Committee, and at a meeting held on May 13th, the Committee appointed the following:

Standing Committee on Selection of Honorary Members: George G. Wilson, Chairman; Charles Cheney Hyde, Ellery C. Stowell.

Standing Committee on Increase of Membership: Oscar S. Straus, Chairman; Philip Marshall Brown, Arthur K. Kuhn, John H. Latané, Cephias D. Allin.

Committee on Annual Meeting: Lester H. Woolsey, Chairman; Philip Marshall Brown, David Jayne Hill, John H. Latané, Charles Warren, Judge Kathryn Sellers, Thomas Raeburn White; ex officio: William C. Dennis, Corresponding Secretary, and George A. Finch, Recording Secretary.

Committee for the Extension of International Law: Jesse S. Reeves, Chairman; Edwin M. Borchard, Charles G. Fenwick, Charles Cheney Hyde, Manley O. Hudson, Fred K. Neilsen, Quincy Wright.

The full text of all addresses, a verbatim report of the oral discussions, as well as the minutes of the meetings of the Executive Council and Executive Committee and the financial reports, are printed in the volume of *Proceedings*, which is ready for distribution to all members and others who have sent in the subscription price (\$1.50).

GEORGE A. FINCH.

THE NEW IMMIGRATION LAW AND THE EXCLUSION OF JAPANESE

The Act approved May 26, 1924, to be cited as the "Immigration Act of 1924," is the first formal exclusion act adopted by the United States in respect to Japanese immigrants. A practical, as distinct from statutory, method of exclusion has been in effect since 1908 through the voluntary policy adopted by Japan in pursuance of the "gentlemen's agreement"; but after sixteen years of operation this method has now been superseded.