

France and Belgium have completed an accord that has drawn the two countries intimately together, the French judge voted on one side and the Belgian judge voted on the other. If this decision was the result of political maneuvering, it was a strange and inept kind of maneuvering. I am not arguing that we ought to agree with the decision. There are not a few decisions of the United States Supreme Court with which we disagree. My argument is that to use this decision as a further excuse for staying out of the World Court represents a kind of intellectual dishonesty from which we, as a great nation, should pray to be delivered.

#### *Comments of the Objectors*

The struggle for new social machinery is always difficult to win. Let me read to you the comments of some of the objectors:

“We resist every idea of having our suits decided by foreigners.”

Probably you think that is Mr. Hearst talking in the *New York American*. You are mistaken. It was Judge Todd of Kentucky in 1802 and he was speaking of the United States Supreme Court.

“This court has no more right to meddle with our questions than has the court of King’s Bench in London.”

Perhaps you imagine that is an excerpt from an editorial in the *New York Evening Sun*. You are wrong. It came from a paper called the *United States Telegraph* which was published in 1831, and again the comment related to the United States Supreme Court.

“We know and feel our strength and we will not have our rights destroyed by an alien court.”

Doubtless you think this is from the *Saturday Evening Post*. You are mistaken. It is from the *Boston Gazette* in 1808 and once more it related to the United States Supreme Court.

Civilization is the process of moving from one set of loyalties to another. As we grow, the loyalties become larger and wider. If we are going to live in the twentieth century, we cannot keep our feet in the eighteenth century.