

unselfishness has been due, the Porte may be inclined to think, not to consideration for Turkey, but to the difficulty of deciding upon a partition satisfactory to all the claimants. On the other hand, the Porte has only European dissension to thank if the traditional Turkish misrule in her European provinces and the persecutions to which the Christian population of the vilayets has been from time to time subjected, have not long since cost her the loss of those territories. International law, it is true, does not recognize the rights of an individual apart from his citizenship in a given state, hence under strict law a state may subject a certain portion of its own subjects to greater burdens than it puts upon others, without being accountable before the nations; but if these burdens reach the point of persecution, and especially if they are attended by physical violence, so as to outrage the feelings of the citizens of other states, who are bound to the sufferers by ties of race or religion, it may well be a question whether foreign nations may not intervene in the interest of their own domestic peace.

---

WILLIAM T. STEAD, 1849-1912

Among the victims of the *Titanic* disaster of April 14, 1912, was William T. Stead, and the JOURNAL cannot allow this issue to go to press without a brief statement of his services to the cause of international peace. Mr. Stead's activities as a journalist and as a man interested in all good causes are too well known to require comment, but his services in connection with the First and Second Hague Conferences, unofficial though they were, are not his least title to remembrance. He attended the First Conference in 1899, secured adequate notices of its work in the journals and published in French a well-known account entitled *The Conference at the Hague*. In 1907 he attended unofficially the Second Hague Conference and, as in 1899, secured notices in the press, which went far to counteract the imperfect and often hostile accounts which appeared in the newspapers generally. He prepared and published in French, at his own expense, a volume entitled *Le Parlement de l'Humanité*, a sort of "Who's Who" of the Conference, with portraits of the delegates, and during the entire course of the Conference he issued in French, at his own expense, a daily journal entitled the *Courier de la Conférence*, which was, and still remains, the best daily account of the proceedings of the Conference, as well as of the hopes and aspirations of

its members. These various works were but a fraction of his literary activity. They are, however, sufficient in themselves to give him an honored place in the hearts of all who believe in the Hague Conferences and see in them the instrumentality of creating an international law, which will regulate, according to the principles of justice, the foreign relations of nations.

APPROVAL OF THE DECLARATION OF LONDON BY THE UNITED STATES  
SENATE ON APRIL 24, 1912

It will be recalled that the Second Hague Peace Conference adopted a convention for the establishment of an International Prize Court, but that certain of its provisions were objected to by certain of the signatory countries, which nevertheless approved the idea and the convention as a whole. The United States considered unacceptable those provisions which authorized and required an appeal in prize cases from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to the International Court of Prize to be established at the Hague.<sup>3</sup> For this reason an alternative procedure was proposed by this government, which, while allowing a direct appeal from courts of last resort, would nevertheless permit certain countries to submit to the Hague court the questions involved rather than the judgment itself of the national court of last resort. An additional protocol to this effect was drawn up and signed by representatives of the various governments at The Hague on September 19, 1910, and the additional protocol has since been approved by all the signatories to the convention. On February 15, 1911, the Senate of the United States advised and consented to the ratification of the original convention as modified by the additional protocol, so that, as far as the United States is concerned, the objection to the establishment of the International Prize Court has been removed.

In the next place, a difficulty arose as to the law to be applied by the International Prize Court. Article VII provides that, if the question in issue has been regulated by a treaty between the countries in litigation, the provisions of this treaty should be binding upon the court. The meaning of the treaty would undoubtedly be subject to interpretation, but the law would exist in a tangible shape which the court was to interpret and apply. This provision is clear and has given rise to no controversy.

<sup>3</sup> Articles III and VI of the original Prize Court Convention.