

EDITORIAL COMMENT

THE SIXTH PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE

The Sixth of the International Conferences of American States belongs to history as this number of the JOURNAL goes to press. The conference opened in Habana on the 16th of January and closed on February 20th. Belonging to history, it will be for the future to determine its place in the series of inter-American gatherings. Outwardly it differs from its predecessors in three ways: first, a President of an American Republic other than that in which the conference was held graced its opening session; second, the representatives of the twenty-one American Republics were represented by their official delegates, took part in the proceedings and signed its Final Act containing the conventions and resolutions adopted during the session; third, representatives of American women seeking to bring about equal rights in each of the twenty-one Republics were present and presented their case, if not in a regular, at least in an extraordinary session of the conference.

The foreign president was Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States. To show the importance of the conference, at least in the opinion of his administration, he left Washington on January 13, arriving in Key West on the morning of the 15th, and in the harbor of Habana, aboard the S. S. *Texas*, in the afternoon of the same day, amid the plaudits of an immense throng of the good people of Cuba, who had gathered to do him honor. At three o'clock of the afternoon of the 17th, President Coolidge delivered his address at the conference. It was thus the first time that an American citizen while President of the United States had put his foot upon the soil of a foreign American Republic, and it was the first time that an American President had addressed an American audience other than in these United States of America.

It was natural that President Coolidge should speak of the discovery of America, and the interest which the Americans of our day still have in its discovery; but to few, if any, has it been given to express the common heritage in such an uncommon manner. It was natural also that President Coolidge should address himself especially to the people of Cuba, and no one could have done it in more generous and gracious terms. Finally, it was natural that President Coolidge should indulge in observations of a general kind, addressed in general terms to the larger audiences in the American Republics beyond the reach of his voice; and no one could have been happier than he in his choice of message to his invisible audience.

Here are his opening words:

No citizens of any of the Americas could come to the queen of the islands of the West Indies without experiencing an emotion of gratitude

and reverence. These are the outposts of the new civilization of the Western Hemisphere. It was among them that the three small ships of the heroic admiral came when, with the assistance and support of Spain, Columbus presented to Europe the first widespread, public and authoritative knowledge of the New World. . . .

The great discoverer brought with him the seed of more republics, the promise of greater human freedom, than ever crossed the seas on any other voyage. With him sailed immortal declarations of independence and great charters of self-government. He laid out a course that led from despotism to democracy. . . .

In the spirit of Christopher Columbus all of the Americas have an eternal bond of unity, a common heritage bequeathed to us alone. Unless we together redeem the promise which his voyage held for humanity, it must remain forever void. This is the destiny which Pan America has been chosen to fulfil.

This was President Coolidge's way of stating a common origin, a common heritage, and a common destiny.

Addressing himself to Cuba, he said:

The very place where we are meeting is a complete demonstration of the progress we are making. Thirty years ago Cuba ranked as a foreign possession, torn by revolution and devastated by hostile forces. Such government as existed rested on military force.

Today Cuba is her own sovereign.

What a President of the United States had solemnly proclaimed in Washington in 1898, that Cuba was to be free, sovereign and independent, a President of the United States had solemnly confirmed in Habana in 1928.

Finally, the message to the Americans:

Our most sacred trust has been, and is, the establishment and expansion of the spirit of democracy. . . . But we have put our confidence in the ultimate wisdom of the people. . . . We are thoroughly committed to the principle that they are better fitted to govern themselves than anyone else is to govern them. . . . It is better for the people to make their own mistakes than to have some one else make their mistakes for them.

. . . The surest refuge of the weak and the oppressed is in the law. It is preëminently the shield of small nations. . . .

In the international system which you represent the rights of each nation carry with them corresponding obligations, defined by laws which we recognize as binding upon all of us. It is through the careful observance of those laws which define our rights and impose our duties that international coöperation is possible. . . . Without the application of these there can be no peace and no progress, no liberty and no republic. . . .

The light which Columbus followed has not failed. The courage that carried him on still lives. They are the heritage of the people of Bolívar and of Washington. We must lay our voyage of exploration toward complete understanding and friendship.

The session which President Coolidge attended was a special session, and only one beside him, the President of Cuba, spoke, welcoming "the illustrious

person of his excellency, Calvin Coolidge, Chief Executive of the greatest of all democracies."

Two days later, on January 18th, the ordinary or formal opening of the conference took place, under the presidency of Sr. R. Martínez-Ortiz, Secretary of State of Cuba. After his address of welcome, Dr. Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante y Sirvén, Cuba's most distinguished publicist and held in equal regard in all the Americas, was proclaimed president. After his address, excellent in form and convincing in substance, Sr. Alejandro Lira, of Chile, representing, as is the custom, the country in which the preceding conference had met, delivered an admirable address, in which he properly claimed the Pan American Conferences as the precedent of those larger and all-embracing which were shortly to convene at The Hague.

On February 20th, ending, as it had begun, on a Monday, the conference was solemnly adjourned. The Secretary of State, Sr. Ortiz, presided and delivered an address. Mr. Bustamante, president of the conference, delivered an address. He was followed by Mr. Varela, Minister of Uruguay to Washington and chairman of the Uruguayan delegation, who, according to custom, expressed the appreciation of his country as the place of meeting of the succeeding conference of the American Republics. The Argentine Minister to Cuba, Sr. Laurentino Olascoaga, who had succeeded Dr. Pueyrredon as president of the Argentine delegation, presented the appreciation of the countries represented, especially his own, to the Government of Cuba. He was followed by Sr. Silva Vildósola, delegate of Chile, who voiced appreciation of the press, and by Mr. Hughes, chairman of the American delegation, who expressed appreciation of the indispensable services of the Secretary General and of the members of his staff, whereupon, the Secretary of State, congratulating the conference upon its success, declared its adjournment.

Between the two Mondays, January 16th and February 20th, the conference began and completed its labors upon which its claim to remembrance must be based.

The Governing Board of the Pan American Union, composed of the diplomatic representatives of the American Republics to Washington, prepared in advance the program of the conference. It consisted of a number of topics which were referred to the eight commissions into which the conference was divided upon its opening:

- No. 1. Pan American Union
- No. 2. Public International Law and Frontier Police
- No. 3. Private International Law and Legislative Uniformity
- No. 4. Communications
- No. 5. Intellectual Coöperation
- No. 6. Economic Problems
- No. 7. Social Problems
- No. 8. Treaties, Conventions and Resolutions

In addition, there was what might be called a Directing Committee, or a Committee of the Whole, or, as it was called, a Committee on Initiative, composed of the chairman of each of the twenty-one delegations of the conference.

It was understood that each delegation was to be represented in each of the eight committees, at least by one member, or several if it chose, on condition that each delegation should have but a single vote. This was proper, as the legal equality of each of the republics required that there should be an equality of representation in the committee so far as voting was concerned. The extent to which equality pervaded the conference is perhaps best seen in what was, after all, a trifling matter. It is the rule that the chairman of the delegation of the country in which the conference meets shall be its president. It is also the rule that each country shall have a vice-president. In order that no country shall have a claim of right, or seem to have precedence over the others, the names of the countries are placed in an urn and drawn one by one, by the Secretary General. The order in which they are drawn determines the order of the vice-presidents. The slip containing the name of Peru was first drawn; the United States was No. 20, and Cuba last of all. If precedence entered into the matter, the United States would have been the last of all, inasmuch as Cuba had the presidency.

The Secretary General was appointed by the Government of Cuba. He was, of course, a Cuban, Sr. Néstor Carbonell, and a very competent one.

Commission No. 1 on the Pan American Union

For some years there has been a feeling that greater prestige and stability should be given to the Pan American Union, that it should owe its existence to a convention drafted by the conference and ratified as a treaty by each of the American Republics, instead of a resolution of the conference.

A project of convention was therefore, in accordance with a resolution of the fifth Conference, presented by the Governing Board of the Pan American Union and adopted in the last days of the session. The Pan American Union was not to be a political body. It was to be a Union of the Republics for general purposes of an intellectual and cultural nature. It was, therefore, expressly decided that it should not be political, and it is so denominated in the bond. No state was to dominate, and that it might be clear beyond peradventure, it was proposed that the chairman should not be elected or serve for more than a year, but was to serve according to the alphabetical order of the republics. This proposal was, however, defeated, so that the chairman and vice chairman are to be elected annually.

There was in some quarters a feeling that the diplomatic representatives of the American Republics in Washington would not be as free as "undiplomatic" persons appointed for the special purpose. In the end the resolution took the following form:

The Government of the Pan American Union shall be vested in a Governing Board composed of the representatives that the American Governments may appoint. The appointment may devolve upon the diplomatic representatives of the respective countries at Washington.

Besides his own country, a member of the Governing Board may serve as special representative of one or more countries, in which case such representative shall have as many votes as countries represented.

The American Republics therefore have a free hand in the choice of their representatives.

The Fifth International Conference of American States, held in 1923 in Santiago de Chile, had provided that in the absence of a diplomatic representative the state affected could appoint a representative. This was a wise resolution, inasmuch as it might happen that the Government of the United States would not recognize a government of one of the other republics, and therefore that republic would have no representative. This has happened in the past, but it cannot happen in the future.

It was also proposed that the Secretary General should not be a permanent official; that he should serve for a year and be a national of each of the countries in their alphabetical order. This proposition was wisely rejected.

It was further proposed that the Union should endeavor to remove the "tariff barriers" of the American Republics. This proposition met with general opposition, inasmuch as the tariff is a matter of domestic regulation in all countries, and beyond, it would seem, the functions of a non-political union. It was therefore rejected.

It was proposed and adopted that the members of the Union should be free to withdraw at any time, but that they should pay "their respective quotas for the period of the current fiscal year." It is to be hoped that no American Republic will avail itself of this provision.

It is generally understood that the preamble to a convention does not have the effect of an article. This does not mean, however, that it is without importance. The preamble to the Constitution of the United States does not confer power, but it states the purpose of its framers in such a way as to affect the interpretation of articles conferring power. Much time was devoted by the commission to the preamble of the convention on the Pan American Union which was ultimately adopted and unanimously in the following form:

The American Republics, whose moral union rests on the juridical equality of the Republics of the Continent and on the mutual respect of the rights inherent in their complete independence, desirous of promoting efficaciously the harmonious development of their economic interests, and the coördination of their social and intellectual activities, and recognizing that the relations between peoples are regulated by law as well as by their legitimate individual and collective interests;

Agree to continue their joint action of coöperation and solidarity by means of periodic meetings of the International American Conferences

as well as by means of organs established in virtue of international agreements, and through the Pan American Union, which has its seat in Washington, and whose organizations and functions shall be regulated by the present Convention, . . .

By resolution it was wisely provided that the Union should continue to operate as heretofore with certain modifications of present procedure taken from the convention until it should be ratified by all the American Republics.

Commission No. 2 on Public International Law and Frontier Police

Twelve projects of public international law had been drafted by the Commission of Jurists meeting in Rio de Janeiro in 1927, in accordance with a resolution of the fifth of the American Conferences. These projects were submitted to the Conference at Habana, and formed the basis of discussion. In the end, seven conventions based upon the projects of Rio were adopted: (1) The Status of Aliens; (2) Duties of Neutral States in the Event of Civil Strife; (3) Treaties; (4) Diplomatic Functionaries; (5) Consular Agents; (6) Maritime Neutrality, and (7) Asylum.

The first two of the Rio projects, on the Fundamental Bases of International Law, and States, gave rise to prolonged discussion. Article 3 on States provided that "No state may intervene in the internal affairs of another." It was proposed by the reporter on these two projects, the distinguished delegate from Peru, Victor M. Maurtua, to replace this abstract formula with the following concrete statement, involving a duty as well as a right:

Every nation is in law and before law the equal of every other nation belonging to the society of nations, and all nations have the right to claim and, according to the Declaration of Independence of the United States, "to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

Unable to agree upon a formula of general principles acceptable to all, the Conference referred the matter to the Seventh Conference. It is to be said, however, that the exchange of views will constitute a valuable document.

There were two resolutions of supreme importance adopted by the commission. The first, introduced by Mr. Gonzalez Roa on behalf of the Mexican delegation, was immediately accepted by Mr. Hughes on behalf of the delegation of the United States. The second resolution is the result of an exchange of views in the commission by Mr. Lira, on behalf of Chile, Mr. Maurtua, on behalf of Peru, and Mr. Hughes, in the form of a report produced by a subcommittee to which the matter was submitted.

The text of the first resolution, slightly modified in the form in which it was presented and adopted by the plenary session of the conference, and the text of the second resolution, without change, follow:

The Sixth International Conference of American States, considering:

That the American nations should always be inspired by a solid coöperation for justice and the general good:

That nothing is so opposed to this coöperation as the use of violence:

That there is no international controversy, however serious it may be, which cannot be peacefully arranged if the parties desire in reality to arrive at a pacific settlement;

That war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species;

Resolves:

1. All aggression is considered illicit and as such is declared prohibited;
2. The American States will employ all pacific means to settle conflicts which may arise between them.

The Sixth International Conference of American States resolves:

Whereas: The American Republics desire to express that they condemn war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations; and

Whereas: The American Republics have the most fervent desire to contribute in every possible manner to the development of international means for the pacific settlement of conflicts between States;

1. That the American Republics adopt obligatory arbitration as the means which they will employ for the pacific solution of their international differences of a juridical character.

2. That the American Republics will meet in Washington within the period of one year in a conference of conciliation and arbitration to give conventional form to the realization of this principle, with the minimum exceptions which they may consider indispensable to safeguard the independence and sovereignty of the States, as well as matters of a domestic concern, and to the exclusion also of matters involving the interest or referring to the action of a State not a party to the convention.

3. That the Governments of the American Republics will send for this purpose plenipotentiary juriconsults with instructions regarding the maximum and the minimum which they would accept in the extension of obligatory arbitral jurisdiction.

4. That the convention or conventions of conciliation and arbitration which may be concluded should leave open a protocol for progressive arbitration which would permit the development of this beneficial institution up to its maximum.

5. That the convention or conventions which may be agreed upon, after signature, should be submitted immediately to the respective Governments for their ratification in the shortest possible time.

Commission No. 3 on Private International Law and Legislative Uniformity

This commission has the honor of having adopted for the first time in history a code of private international law in an international conference composed of delegates plenipotentiary. It was drafted originally by Dr. Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante y Sirvén, of Cuba. It was modified in non-essentials by the Commission of Jurists at Rio, and by that body submitted to the Sixth of the American Conferences.

Among the resolutions adopted by the commission and approved in plenary session were two of far-reaching importance. The first resolution is thus worded:

The Sixth International Conference of American States resolves:

That there be created an inter-American Commission of Women charged with the preparation of a legal and any other report which may be considered necessary in order that the Seventh international Conference of American States may undertake the study of the civil and political equality of women of the continent.

Said commission shall be constituted by seven women of different countries of America designated by the Pan American Union and thereafter shall be completed by the commission itself until each country of America is represented thereon.

The second resolution is thus worded:

The Sixth International Conference of American States resolves:

1. The future formulation of international law shall be made by means of a technical preparation duly organized with the coöperation of the committees on investigation and international coördination and of the scientific institutes hereinafter mentioned.

2. The International Commission of Jurists of Rio de Janeiro shall meet on the dates set by the respective governments to carry on the work of codification of public and private international law, the Pan American Union being charged with the preparation of the pertinent resolution for the purpose of said meeting.

3. Three permanent committees shall be organized, one in Rio de Janeiro, for the work on public international law; another at Montevideo, for the work on private international law, and another at Habana to undertake the study of comparative legislation and uniformity of legislation. The functions of said organizations will be:

(a) To present to the governments a list of the subjects susceptible of codification and uniformity of legislation, including those definitely subject to regulation and formulation, and those which international experience and new principles and aspirations of justice indicate require prudent juridical development.

The presentation of this list shall be for the purpose of obtaining from the governments a statement as to the subjects which in their opinion might be the object of study as a basis of the formulation of conventional regulations or of organic declarations.

(b) To classify, on the basis of the aforesaid list and of the replies of the governments, the subject matter in the following manner: (1) subjects which are susceptible to codification because they have the unanimous consent of the governments; (2) subjects susceptible of being proposed as subject to codification because while not unanimously supported, they represent the predominant opinion of the governments; (3) subjects with respect to which there is no predominant opinion in favor of immediate regulation.

(c) To present the foregoing classification to the governments in order to ascertain their general views with respect to the manner in which the juridical problems of codifiable subjects can be brought up and resolved, as well as all information and juridical, legal, political, diplomatic and other antecedents which might lead to a complete understanding.

(d) To request and obtain from the national societies of international law their scientific opinion and their general views regarding the regula-

tion and formulation of the juridical questions which are the objects of these committees.

(e) To organize all the foregoing material and remit it together with drafts of projects to the Pan American Union, which shall submit them to the scientific examination of the Executive Council of the American Institute of International Law so that it may make a technical study of said drafts and present its conclusions and formulas, with full explanations, in a report on the subject.

4. Likewise, the opinion of the Inter-American High Commission as a technical adviser, shall be consulted in economic, financial and maritime matters.

5. When the studies and the formulas above mentioned have been presented, the governments shall be advised, and they may order a meeting of the Commission of Jurists, if they consider it proper, or the inclusion thereof in the program of a future international conference.

6. In order to include in the program of the International American Conferences matters susceptible of codification or of legislative uniformity or to include them in the program of the Commission of Jurists, in the event that it be so agreed, it shall be necessary that the governments shall have become acquainted with the projects and antecedents referred to, at least one year in advance.

7. The three committees above mentioned shall be formed by the governments with members of the respective national societies of international law. They shall communicate with the governments and the Executive Council of the Institute through the Pan American Union.

8. When considered opportune, a commission of jurists versed in the civil legislation of the countries of America may be constituted in order that it may proceed to study said legislations and prepare a uniform project of civil legislation for the countries of America, especially of Latin-America, selecting the means to obviate the inconveniences resulting from the diversity of legislation.

9. To the extent permitted by its by-laws, the Pan American Union will cooperate in the preparatory work referred to in the preceding articles.

Commission No. 4 on Communication

This commission adopted a convention on aviation, and resolutions dealing with the regulation of international automotive traffic; the means for facilitating the development of fluvial intercommunication between the nations; international regulations of railway traffic, and the adoption of the original Andean route of the Pan American railway; the convocation by the Pan American Union of a technical conference to study questions of establishing steamship lines and the elimination of unnecessary port formalities, and a recommendation that the signatories of the Electrical Communications Convention of 1924 and the Radiotelegraphic Convention of Washington of 1927, ratify as soon as possible.

Commission No. 5 on Intellectual Coöperation

Among the positive results of this commission are a convention establishing a Pan American Geographical Institute, in Habana, and one for the creation

of an Inter-American Institute of Intellectual Coöperation, likewise in Habana. These two institutes deal with fields in which the American Republics can collaborate upon a basis of exact equality without involving political consideration.

There is also a proposal for an American bibliography, and the complete publication of Rufino J. Cuervo's *Dictionary of Construction and Regimen of the Spanish Language*. By way of comment, it may be said that Cuervo's dictionary as far as it goes is the great standard of the Spanish world. It was published in part in 1886-1893. Its completion and publication will be an international event of no mean importance.

Commission No. 6 on Economic Problems

A number of resolutions were passed, among others, one dealing with uniformity of consular fees and the standardization of consular procedure; a report on the Chambers of Commerce advocating a special study of the development of relations among commercial organizations of the American states; the adoption of certain recommendations concerning emigration and immigration, and the recommendation of the convocation of a special conference on trade-marks.

Commission No. 7 on Social Problems

The name of this commission was changed to Commission on Hygiene and Social Problems. Some nineteen resolutions or recommendations, all of value and some of far-reaching importance, were adopted.

Commission No. 8 on Treaties, Conventions and Resolutions

This commission had but a single topic dealing with "the action taken by the states represented at the previous Pan American Conferences on the treaties, conventions, and resolutions adopted at said conferences." The report of the commission was informative, resulting in the following resolution:

The Sixth International Conference of American States resolves:

Whereas: (a) It often happens that the programs of Pan American Conferences contain important subjects not accompanied by the technical studies pertinent thereto, the more so if it is a matter of the revision of treaties or conventions;

(b) It is necessary to enlighten the judgment of the delegates, calling their attention to the most important points of the subject inserted:

1. To recommend to the Pan American Union that in inserting in the programs of the conferences subjects related to the modification or alteration of conventions or treaties, it direct that technical studies on the subject be made within a reasonable length of time.

2. The Pan American Union shall submit to the International American Conferences series of propositions based on the text of the technical studies and which shall serve as a safe basis for the discussion.

The decision to preserve the Pan American Union as it had developed in the forty years of its existence, without returning to its humble beginnings, and without embarking upon political and unchartered seas, and to establish the Union by convention instead of resolutions capable of being made and unmade in each successive conference; the unanimous declaration that aggressive warfare is a crime against humanity and that all of the conflicts between the American states should be settled peaceably; the adoption of the principle of compulsory arbitration for the settlement of differences involving a legal right, saving, however, domestic questions and disputes affecting the sovereignty and independence of the contracting parties, and withholding from arbitration the matters "involving the interest or referring to the action of a state not a party to the convention"; the solemn promise on the part of the twenty-one republics to send to Washington within a twelvemonth juriconsults clothed with plenipotentiary powers to conclude a convention to render the agreements effective, and by means of an additional protocol to enable those of the republics caring to do so, to bind themselves to submit all differences of every category to arbitration, with those willing to accept the larger obligation; eleven conventions—nine of them dealing with public international law, are in effect nine chapters of a code of international law for the Americas: a code of the conflict of laws composed of 437 articles; agreements upon laws and ways of communication; agreements upon intellectual coöperation, with the exchange of professors and students between and among the American Republics; and some sixty resolutions—these are the positive results of the Sixth International Conference of American States meeting but a month, in the city of Habana.

The workers in the field must indeed have been alert and active when they garnered such a vast and promising harvest. The great outstanding feature is that the Sixth Conference met and adjourned with a promise of a Seventh Conference, and the friends of Pan Americanism hope that the seventh will be but the next of an infinite series of conferences of the American states. The conference is greater than any of its measures, however great they may be; and the Pan American Conference has stood the test of time; it has stood the test of criticism; and by its works has justified its creation. Bolívar of the South thought of an America with international conferences; Blaine of the North has transmuted thought into fact. As Sr. Varela said in the closing words of his address in the last session of the Sixth International Conference of American States, "Let us salute the future, which is the province of the generations of America."

The American delegation was composed of Charles Evans Hughes, Noble Brandon Judah, Henry P. Fletcher, Oscar W. Underwood, Dwight W. Morrow, Morgan J. O'Brien, James Brown Scott, Ray Lyman Wilbur, and Leo S. Rowe. Each and every one of them went to Habana to collaborate with the delegations of the other republics, and to take part in the deliberations so as to advance the projects presented by other delegations, without

presenting projects of their own. The American delegation acted as a unit on every occasion, without a difference of opinion on any subject, and the American delegation was its chairman, Charles Evans Hughes.

JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

THE NEW ARBITRATION TREATY WITH FRANCE

The Senate has given its advice and consent to the ratification of the new arbitration treaty between the United States and France, which was signed on February 6, 1928, on the understanding, however, that it does not impose any limitation on the so-called Bryan Peace Treaties, and notes to that effect were exchanged between the two governments before ratifications were exchanged.¹

This treaty is put forward as a model which the Government of the United States desires to adopt in substitution for the so-called Root Arbitration Treaties, not only with France, but with a number of other Powers with which the Root Treaties have either expired, or are about to expire, by reason of the time limitation imposed by their own terms.

The preamble of the new treaty recites:

Desirous of reaffirming their adherence to the policy of submitting to impartial decision all justiciable controversies that may arise between them;

Eager by their example not only to demonstrate their condemnation of war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations, but also to hasten the time when the perfection of international arrangements for the pacific settlement of international disputes shall have eliminated forever the possibility of war among any of the Powers of the world;

The two governments have accordingly concluded this "new treaty of arbitration enlarging the scope of the arbitration convention signed at Washington on February 10, 1908, which expires by limitation on February 27, 1928, and promoting the cause of arbitration."

Unfortunately, and perhaps inevitably in the circumstances, this new treaty of arbitration does not seem entirely adequate for the accomplishment of the ambitious program set out in the preamble.

In considering the question of how far this new treaty makes any useful or important additions to our previous arbitration and conciliation treaties with other Powers requiring compulsory investigation, or arbitration of pending, or future questions, it is necessary to review briefly its antecedents and historical background and then to compare its terms with those of our other treaties for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

Disregarding arbitration treaty projects signed on the part of the United States but not ratified, the most noteworthy of which are the project adopted

¹For the text of the treaty and exchange of notes, see Supplement to this JOURNAL, pp. 37 and 39.