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An imposing building stands behind a large metal fence in the background of a postcard from 1913. The left-hand side of the building features a tower topped with smaller spires, and a clock in the center of the tower. Nine arches hold up the center of the building, topped by a sloping roof with a smaller spire. Another small spire appears on the right. The building is made of brick and stone, and looks almost like a modern-era castle.¹

This was the Peace Palace, in its inaugural year and already a major site at The Hague. The Palace, or Vredespaleis,² is still a prominent Dutch landmark and the structure that cemented The Hague as an international capital.³ Yet it was to serve a loftier role, as a symbol for the nascent internationalist movement. Architecture and public space, the most tangible and often the most lasting cultural output, is often the result or embodiment of political and social movements. To understand the political history of internationalism in its earliest era, we must examine the architectural and spatial culture it brought about.

This thesis uncovers the history of the Peace Palace and The Hague’s role in the early days of the internationalist movement. In the process of localizing the early twentieth century history of The Hague, this thesis examines the development of international imagery and culture through design. Here I will contend that the Peace Palace as we know it today was ultimately a result of tensions between internationalist ideas (cooperation, arbitration, modernity) and the pride of Old World nationalism. The final design by Louis Cordonnier and J. A. G. Van der Steur repudiates the feeling of modernity surrounding the idea of peace through arbitration. It is only marginally saved by Thomas Mawson’s design for the surrounding Gardens. Ultimately, I

² In this paper, with few exceptions, I will use the Anglicized place names when they exist, rather than original Dutch nomenclature (e.g. “The Hague” instead of “Den Haag,” “Peace Palace” in lieu of “Vredespaleis,” etc.).
³ For the purposes of this paper, I will define an “international capital” as a city serving as headquarters for one or more international bodies. Just as Geneva served as headquarters for the League of Nations and New York the United Nations, so too did The Hague in the pre-WWI era.
will argue that what happened in The Hague from 1899 through World War I encompassed both internationalism’s heights and, with the Palace design, its betrayal.

Many scholars have solely focused on the politics of the peace movement, either generally or specific to The Hague. These historians’ work adeptly analyzes broad-sweeping topics such as the clashes between nationalism and internationalism, internationalism and the law, and the movement’s connection to women’s groups and proto-feminism. Additional debate on the role of the West and whether internationalism was a means towards an imperialist end has been commendable and, indeed, informed the latter chapters of this thesis. Yet in these studies, The Hague and cities in general are merely backdrops for the success or (more often) failure of internationalism in its early stages, as opposed to vibrant urban spaces in their own right. While this thesis takes design and urban placemaking seriously, the literature has largely omitted this from the narrative.

For example, Glenda Sluga describes the traditional view of internationalism as “a story of idealogues and radicals—whether nineteenth-century pacifists driven by utopian dreams of a parliament of man or working-class revolutionaries urging the workers of the world to unite.” Yet she bases her definition upon the stipulation that idealism was replaced by realism. The “parliament of man” overcoming national boundaries morphed into international government both recognizing and transcending borders. Sluga briefly and tangentially touches upon the effect of international organizations on their headquarter cities in her first chapter. “The Swiss government, for example, was extremely aware of the symbolic capital that could be accrued

---


from the fact that its political capital Berne was the headquarters of many of these new public international unions,” Sluga writes.6 Here the effect of internationalism is harnessed and cultivated at the national rather than local level. Her analysis of the 1899 Peace Conference underscores this; here it is merely the meeting point for “Europe’s growing court of empires,” along with newer powers in North America and Asia.7 The “international sociability” in The Hague that year was the result not of citizens, per Sluga, but of English writer and peace activist William T. Stead.8 At one point, Sluga quotes from Bertha von Suttner’s diary entry from The Hague. Here, von Suttner proclaimed, “I have never before in the course of a whole year received so many letters, telegrams, and voluminous writings as now, while I am here at The Hague.”9 Indeed, in this analysis the city is no more than a receptacle and reception line for nationalist or pacifist visions, devoid of local actors or a built environment.

This is in part due to the analysis of internationalism as a reflection of nationalism. “Believing that both global connectedness and the destructiveness of contemporary nationalism cry out for an international alternative, and that we as historians must begin to fashion of a transnational history, I turn my attention here to the creation of a collective identity,” Leila Rupp writes in her article on international women’s organizations at the turn of the twentieth century.10 The cities in Europe and North America in which these organizations met simply underscored their Eurocentric power structures. Rupp does not explore how these sites informed the

---

organizations or vice versa.¹¹ Local elements cannot affect internationalism, per Rupp’s article, because internationalism is only seen through a national (or Western/non-Western) lens.

Meanwhile, internationalism from a local perspective has a scant body of literature. Judith Walkowitz engages the history of cosmopolitanism¹² in her article analyzing the work of Maud Allan and her dance piece “Vision of Salome” and its effect on early twentieth century central London. At times, Walkowitz connects Allan’s work to the theatres that staged it. The Royal English Opera House, which became the Palace Theatre of Varieties, was where “the two meanings of cosmopolitanism were spatially and concretely expressed.”¹³ An amalgamation of “a wide range of European and orientalist historical styles” on the Opera House’s façade played host to the erotic low culture of “cosmopolitan clubs” as the Palace became a variety theatre in order to evade censorship laws.¹⁴ But once again building design is a backdrop to the main event: in Walkowitz’s case, the politics of dance, and in Sluga’s milieu, politics itself.

Herman van der Wusten’s “‘Legal Capital of the World’: Political Centre-Formation in The Hague” also takes a local perspective, examining the development of international bodies at The Hague. “The Hague has seen a two-step inflow of judicial international organisations,” van der Wusten contends, beginning in the early twentieth century and recommencing around 1990.¹⁵ Van der Wusten adeptly examines the history of international organizations assembling and residing at The Hague, and makes sure to include local administration and communities in his

¹² Admittedly, cosmopolitanism differs from internationalism. The former operates on the idea of a single global community, as opposed to recognizing the importance and transcendence of national boundaries under internationalism. As a result Walkowitz’s article redoubles the lack of literature on internationalism and the built environment.
collection of “relevant actors.” Yet the article breezes through the history of international organizations at The Hague and embraces the “mythistory” of writers such as Arthur Eyffinger as a branding mechanism for the city. Even when discussing the insufficient size of the Peace Palace to “act as the residence for all the major institutions that now look for seats,” van der Wusten entirely overlooks the Palace’s design and location history, either locally or internationally.17

While building on the historical literature, this thesis will also make clear the importance of internationalism’s wide cultural output, examining design with the depth it deserves. Using English–language archival records, rare books, architectural plans, and secondary sources, I will analyze the use and creation of space for internationalism and the peace movement, along with supplementary local effects and material culture, in The Hague from 1899 through World War I (along with a brief epilogue focusing on the present day). Following a study of the pre-1899 history of The Hague as an international city, I will discuss the local and political effects of the First Peace Conference. Following this, I will examine entries to the Peace Palace’s open design competition, with close readings of the prize-winning and selected non-prize-winning plans. I will then discuss the 1907 Peace Conference and local presence of the peace movement in The Hague at that time, reaction to the Palace and its surrounding Gardens upon its opening, and the foundering state of internationalism during World War I. I will also analyze other case studies of developing national and international culture through design, by way of footnotes and the epilogue.

16 Van der Wusten, “‘Legal Capital of the World,’” 261.
17 Van der Wusten, “‘Legal Capital of the World,’” 261.
Chapter 1: Beginnings of the International Idea at The Hague (pre-1899 Conference)

In discussing The Hague’s history as a center for internationalism (particularly through international law and arbitration), some historians have mentioned the city’s village-like nature, along with the contributions of the philosopher and jurist Hugo Grotius, a native of Delft and denizen of The Hague in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The city “is often called ‘the largest village in the country’ by twentieth-century Dutchmen,” notes Mark Greenberg in his popular history of The Hague.\(^\text{18}\) Eyffinger, the former head librarian of the International Court of Justice, provides a litany of potential historic and cultural reasons for the city’s selection as site of the 1899 Peace Conference, and therefore its position as an international city. The Netherlands was neutral in this era; The Hague was a port city along the North Sea; the city “had a firm parliamentary tradition and had been the scene of many former international conferences.”\(^\text{19}\) The Hague’s bucolic qualities, furthermore, allowed the city to be “situated far from the whirlpool of high politics, near to the oceans and therefore easily accessible, and yet not that far from London…Berlin, Paris or even St. Petersburg.”\(^\text{20}\) Eyffinger lists the city’s history, surrounding national policy, and even the people (described as “peaceful and phlegmatic, liberal and sedate”) as reasons for The Hague’s selection to host the initial Conference and its rise on the international landscape.\(^\text{21}\)

Yet much of this florid rationale is, as Randall Lesaffer argues, “nothing but attempts at myth-making and instances of ‘Hague-iography,’ which add nothing to explaining how and why The Hague became the world’s main centre of international adjudication and arbitration.”\(^\text{22}\)

---

\(^{20}\) Eyffinger, The Peace Palace, 58.
\(^{21}\) Eyffinger, The Peace Palace, 58.
\(^{22}\) Randall Lesaffer, “The Temple of Peace: The Hague Peace Conferences, Andrew Carnegie and
Hague was chosen for three major reasons: its unique place in Dutch national governance, Russian *realpolitik* at the turn of the century, and recent successful gatherings on international law. The Hague serves as the government seat and home of the Dutch Parliament, yet it is not the capital; that title is held by Amsterdam, which in this role essentially serves as the country’s economic and cultural center. This afforded the city the facilities, but not the title, of a capital. This would prove crucial. Russian minister for foreign affairs N. V. Mouravieff advised Czar Nicholas II, “[it would be] advisable that the Conference should not sit in the capital of one of the Great Powers, where so many political interests are centered which might, perhaps, impede the progress of a work in which all the countries of the universe are equally interested.” This eliminated London, Paris, and Berlin. St. Petersburg was not considered as a matter of course. The threat of anarchists in Switzerland eliminated Geneva as a choice to host the Conference. Brussels and The Hague remained as the two strongest candidates.

Czar Nicholas would find The Hague to be a useful site to carry out his national aims through this international conference. Along with the potential of an arms reduction in Europe to allow Russia sufficient funds to expand infrastructurally into Siberia, “Saint Petersburg hoped that the conference would drive a wedge between Britain and Germany which had common strategic interests in stopping Russian progress in China.” With trains running to Berlin and the Scheveningen beach serving as a port connection to Britain, The Hague physically served as both a bridge and wedge between the two empires. In addition, the Dutch royal family had familial

---

relation to the czar. Finally, according to Russian adviser Friedrich de Martens, the “suitability of the Netherlands and the Dutch for the organization and guidance” would prove ideal for hosting the Conference. Indeed, Tobias Asser’s coordination of Conferences on International Private Law as early as 1892 showed that The Hague was amenable to a higher-profile international conference. Asser would play a role in the Peace Conferences and the Peace Palace, and would be remembered as a primary figure in The Hague’s ascendancy on the international stage. Overall, the city’s original design for government and diplomacy; Asser’s carving of a space for the study of international law in the Hague; and the Netherlands’ role as a place between imperial factions, all enabled The Hague to serve as the main city for this new internationalist era. With that, a new spatial language for internationalism would be born.

27 Lysen, History of the Carnegie Foundation, 76.
Chapter 2: The 1899 Peace Conference: Political and Local Effects

Once The Hague was selected as the site for the 1899 Peace Conference, the city welcomed delegates from twenty-five nations, journalists from around the world, and activists invested in the peace movement. Chronicles from the Conference show a great deal of conviviality amongst the delegates, taking to the serenity of The Hague and the city’s embrace of the peace idea. The major factor in this lay in the site of the Conference: the Huis Ten Bosch, the Dutch royal palace situated in The Hague’s historic woods. The Bosch afforded the delegates a level of seclusion from the public, the Huis gave the Conference a stately home, and the royal family and ordinary Hagenaars cultivated an atmosphere of peace. Frederick Holls, American delegate to the Conference, described the scene upon its opening:

For the purposes of the Conference the room had been arranged in the form of a parliamentary hall—four rows of concentric semi-circular tables, covered with green baize, affording just one hundred seats, from all of which the chair could be readily seen and addressed. The presiding officer’s chair itself had been placed in the bay window, flanked on either side by seats for the Russian delegation, or as the case might be, for the members of a committee making a report; and directly in front and between the chair and the body of the hall there was ample room for the secretaries and attachés. The seats were allotted to the respective States in alphabetical order, in the French language….

There was no room either for spectators or for journalists, except only a narrow gallery in the cupola, to which a very few invited guests were admitted on the opening and closing days of the Conference. At all other times, outsiders of every kind were strictly excluded, and visitors were not permitted even to inspect the palace during the sessions of the Conference or of any of its committees.29

Holls’ recollection depicted a hall that was designed for a group of elites to engage in secluded discussion, with a great degree of care in placing the delegates within the room. The Oranje Zaal had been transformed from a royal banquet hall to an orderly chamber for rigorous negotiation and diplomacy. Yet more than this, it was a space reworked for the purposes of discussing peace.

Prior to the Conference, the hall held paintings and souvenirs commemorating the Battle of Waterloo. Queen Wilhelmina removed them so as not to distract from the ideal of peace.  

Meanwhile, the Onden Doclen Hotel commissioned special stationery in support of disarmament: “a fierce design of cannon, rifles, bombs, swords, and bayonets…. A spider weaves its web at the point of the bayonets, the swords lie broken in two, while the cannon is spiked, and a dove, bearing the olive branch in its beak, sits calmly upon the muzzle.”

Delegates and peace activists took in the entirety of the city, per Mevrouw Hanken-Parker’s report from The Hague in the New York Times: “The throng that surges in and out of public buildings, museums, hotels, and homes is kaleidoscopic in color and change. All day long carriages block the way and crowds of men from the remotest corners of the world follow one another in astonishing order.”

Per Eyffinger’s look back on the 1899 Conference, delegates “mingled at receptions and theatres, frequented the Kurhaus and the seaside, and struck up lifelong friendships.”

Following the Conference, Holls told an audience in Montclair, New Jersey, of how the Spanish and American delegations socialized together, staying in adjoining rooms in the same hotel. “While the treaty was not floated through on Champagne,” he remarked, “many misunderstandings were adjusted at the dinner table.”

While some, such as Eyffinger, argue that the Conference’s very existence (and the decision to reconvene eight years later) was in itself a result worthy of celebration, it is necessary to examine and critique this treaty. At the opening session, three committees were

35 Eyffinger, “Living Up to a Tradition,” 34.
appointed to tackle each component of Czar Nicholas’ circular letter announcing the conference: disarmament, laws of war, and international arbitration.\textsuperscript{36} The second committee of the three, Mark Mazower notes, caused great consternation: “the acute differences of approach among the participants nearly brought proceedings to a halt. In particular, the Conference witnessed bitter arguments between the Germans, on the one hand, and the Belgians and Dutch, on the other, over the rules of military occupation.”\textsuperscript{37} The German delegation called for unquestioned obedience from occupied peoples, while the other delegates “wanted civilians to face no obligations but proposed stringent checks on the occupying power.”\textsuperscript{38} Ultimately, a compromise stated that occupied peoples were protected under international law, “confirming that military occupation was a temporary, provisional state of affairs among two sovereign states” as initially determined by the Concert of Europe.\textsuperscript{39} Yet even the most ardent peace activists did not report news of this squabble. “It cannot be supposed that these gentlemen are going to arrive at a unanimous conclusion,” wrote an uncredited correspondent for the Lend-A-Hand Society, “but it is certainly very gratifying that thus far no gulf has appeared dividing the assembly into two parties, but rather that the differences of opinion are such as might be expected, — say, might be hoped for, where nearly one hundred men are together.”\textsuperscript{40} By the end of June, over a month after the Conference’s opening ceremony, the European states remained deadlocked with regard to disarmament (the supposed reason for meeting at The Hague in the first place), if only due to the tangle of military alliances that would only grow through the 1910s.\textsuperscript{41} Yet work continued in that

\textsuperscript{36} “The Conference,” in \textit{The Peace Crusade} 1, no. 7 (May 31, 1899), 4.
\textsuperscript{37} Mazower, \textit{Governing the World}, 75.
\textsuperscript{38} Mazower, \textit{Governing the World}, 75.
\textsuperscript{39} Mazower, \textit{Governing the World}, 75–6.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{The Peace Crusade} 1, no. 8 (June 16, 1899), 5.
\textsuperscript{41} “The Hague Conference: From Our Own Correspondent,” in \textit{The Peace Crusade} 1, no. 9 (June 26, 1899), 2–3.
committee with a noted seriousness, as had the warfare and arbitration committees. The makeshift design of the Huis and the peaceful state of The Hague at large worked in spite of global tensions, engendering a drivenness for disarmament and peace.

One month later on July 29, the committees completed their work, and the delegates reconvened to approve the Peace Conference’s three conventions, three declarations, and one Final Act in a plenary session. The second convention concerns the rights and provisions of prisoners of war; prohibition of poisons and attacks on undefended towns, villages, and buildings; the aforementioned issue of military occupation, which essentially treated the occupier as a replacement of the occupied states in terms of responsibilities to the people (and preventing occupiers from forcing pledges of allegiance out of the occupied); and responsibility of neutral states with regard to internment of belligerent troops and care of their wounded. The third convention was merely a restatement of the Geneva Convention of 1864 on law of the sea and maritime warfare. Similarly, the declarations against the use of “projectiles the object of which is the diffusion of asphyxiating or deleterious gases,” “bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body,” and (for five years) explosives and projectiles dropped from a balloon were retreads of the 1868 Declaration of St. Petersburg.

---

42 “Another Letter From The Hague,” in The Peace Crusade 1, no. 9 (June 6, 1899), 5.
The jewel of the Conference was the First Convention, on “The Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.” “Desirous of extending the empire of law,” the delegates developed several methods of reconciliation between states. Along with “good offices and mediation” between belligerent states, and Commissions of Inquiry for “differences of an international nature involving neither honor nor vital interests, and arising from a difference of opinion on points of fact,” the convention called for a Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCoA) to be based at The Hague. Signatory powers were to select up to four arbitrators well–versed in international law to serve as members of the PCoA, but would not serve their full term at The Hague. Instead, the PCoA would simply maintain the list of arbitrators at The Hague. They would serve when two or more states had a dispute, either at a place of the states’ choosing or The Hague. While the Court was less robust than a full international tribunal, it allowed The Hague to continue serving as the seat of the “empire of law.”

---

48 Mazower takes a dark view toward the concept of the “empire of law.” “Reciprocity was the fundamental condition for inclusion” within this realm, Mazower writes, “and in its absence, some argued that anything was permitted that was necessary to compel obedience from an enemy too maddened or ignorant to converse with” (Governing the World, 76). Yet it is clear from The Peace Crusade and Andrew Carnegie’s New Year’s 1915 letter (discussed below) that some hoped that the “empire of law” would be a sort of holy kingdom on earth, an empire governed not by the sword but by friendly relations. Therefore, in using the term “empire of law” in this paper, I use it with deference to the peace advocates’ view of it as millennial and not as a pejorative.


50 “Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.”

51 “Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.”

52 “Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.”
Chapter 3: Mr. Carnegie’s Conundrum: Founding and Funding the Palace

Ultimately, activists writing in The Peace Crusade viewed the Conference as a great success. It set the trajectory of international law beyond the laws of warfare, and called for a Second Peace Conference in the years following. “We lay wreaths at the tomb of Grotius, and we study his volumes,” wrote The Peace Crusade, “but nowhere have we any statement in words of what are even the principles on which international law is built. The present Conference will be helping forward the great cause if it will refer to two or three of the most accomplished students in its body the preparation of such a formal statement of the central principles which really govern the intercourse of states.” 53

Around the time the Conference occurred, Andrew Carnegie had concluded his sale of the Carnegie Steel Company for $480 million, 54 and left America for Europe “to think over the new task set, known in literature as ‘Mr. Carnegie’s Conundrum,’ how to best discharge the stewardship of [his] wealth….” 55 Stead took up the charge of influencing Carnegie’s philanthropic endeavors in a book-length piece. “Never before in the history of the world has a private citizen had the wealth of Croesus under his undisputed control,” wrote Stead. “Mr. Carnegie has no obligations, no liabilities…. He has no ambition to found a family with hereditary estates. Seldom or never has a millionaire been more undisputed master of his millions.” 56 Yet Carnegie, Stead rightly noted, was not going to simply give his money away. “He is profoundly impressed with the evils which come from undiscriminating charity, and the waste in the administration. He has declared his deliberate opinion that ninety per cent of the

53 “The Adjournment of the Conference,” in The Peace Crusade 1, no. 11 (July 26, 1899), 2. It should be noted that during the Conference the American delegation laid a wreath at the statue of Grotius in Delft, just outside The Hague, on July 4, 1899.
54 Based on conservative inflation estimates this would be worth nearly $12 billion in 2014 dollars.
55 Eyffinger, The Peace Palace, 43.
money given in charity is wasted; and this, he maintains, is an underestimate."\(^{57}\) Carnegie wished to develop libraries, universities, hospitals, churches, and public halls and baths.\(^{58}\) These institutions were to outlast him and, just as important, serve as symbols for a new era of social progress.

The wish to build institutions with his riches, along with Carnegie’s longstanding support for pacifism (and particularly peace through arbitration),\(^{59}\) made him a prime candidate to build a monument to peace. “Those who were present at the Hague Conference this summer admitted,” Stead remarked, “that while the governments showed an astonishing readiness to concur in the principle of the Arbitration Convention, there was no hope of securing the application of that Convention unless the deliberations of the Conference were followed by a vigorous propaganda of peace among the people.”\(^{60}\) A deus ex machina would be needed to develop this “propaganda of peace”: someone who believed in arbitration, was not engaged in international crime, and had the funds to develop a “network of peacemaking agencies.”\(^{61}\) The one man that met all three criteria was Carnegie. Stead called upon him to develop a “Bureau of Peacemakers, which would be created and maintained for the express purpose of averting war, allaying disputes, and assuaging the passions which make war inevitable,” and to furnish an “International Library, rendering accessible every work of reference on any point of international law that might arise to trouble the peace of nations.”\(^{62}\)

\(^{57}\) Stead, *Mr. Carnegie’s Conundrum*, 102.

\(^{58}\) Stead, *Mr. Carnegie’s Conundrum*, 82–5.

\(^{59}\) Stead, 120. Indeed, Lysen notes that in Carnegie’s piece “Triumphant Democracy,” he contended that “A league of peace to which each continent will send delegates to decide international differences is not quite so far in the future as may at first sight appear. This would remove from the world its greatest stain—war between man and man” (*History of the Carnegie Foundation*, 12).

\(^{60}\) Stead, *Mr. Carnegie’s Conundrum*, 119.

\(^{61}\) Stead, *Mr. Carnegie’s Conundrum*, 120.

It was the latter idea that piqued Carnegie’s interest. Carnegie “was prepared and willing to offer $100,000 for the land and the building, and $150,000 for the procurement of ‘the best obtainable library on international law and diplomacy.’”\(^63\) This library would be most useful for the PCoA and other international law scholars at The Hague. As Holls noted to PCoA Secretary-General Leonard Ruysseenaers in a letter dated August 25, 1902, “It is not [Carnegie’s] intention to have an elaborate, ostentatious building. On the contrary, he thinks it would comport more with the dignity and efficiency of the Court if the Library should be modestly, though elegantly and comfortably housed, as near as possible to the building provided for the Court itself.”\(^64\) Yet some, such as American diplomat Andrew White, wanted it to be not just a library, but a symbol of peace through law as well. “Were such a fabric to be created [i.e., the Peace Palace or “Temple of Peace” built], men would make pilgrimages from all parts of the world to see it,” White noted in a letter dated August 5, 1902. “It would become a sort of holy place, prized and revered by thinking men throughout the world, and to which, in any danger of war between any two countries, the minds of men would turn naturally and normally.”\(^65\)

This “sort of holy place” would become the “Temple of Peace” Carnegie ultimately had in mind when he drafted a check for $1.5 million\(^66\) to a new foundation (or stichting) to work in concert with the Dutch government in late April 1903. The Palace “was to be the symbol of ‘peace through law,’ even a kind of centre of a secular cult of peace.”\(^67\) Baron William Gevers noted Carnegie’s intentions for the building to the Dutch foreign minister a month later. The design “should be open to international competition,” and “the Peace Palace should stand alone, if possible, preferably surrounded by trees, and situated so that the impression it would make

\(^{64}\) Lysen, *History of the Carnegie Foundation*, 32.
\(^{66}\) About $34.4 million in 2014 dollars.
\(^{67}\) Lesaffer, “The Temple of Peace,” 31.
would not be detracted from by neighbouring edifices….” In addition, Carnegie would have preferred, per Baron Gevers, that he work directly with the queen, due to “the experience he had had with municipalities and local commissions, whose lack of expedition in the carrying out of his plans had so frequently caused him disappointment.” Carnegie would provide the funds to the Dutch national government, who would then choose a site and conduct the building process. This was in line with his general maxims on philanthropy, as noted by Lesaffer: “The first maxim implied that Carnegie, in making a donation, would set a clear purpose but then leave the management of the donation to others and not interfere any more. The second was that the beneficiary of the donation would also contribute towards the achievement of the goal.” Yet in spite of Carnegie’s *modus operandi*, The Hague’s municipal government, and locals in general, would indeed enter the fray in the first of many disputes related to the Palace: choosing a location.

---

68 Lysen, *History of the Carnegie Foundation*, 55. Notably, this is the first time the term “Peace Palace” was used, according to Lysen, rather than Carnegie’s preferred “Temple of Peace.” This difference in nomenclature—of a “Palace” as opposed to a “Temple”—may speak to many of the designs’ similarity to an older European royal court rather than a modern monument to the future of peace, as I will discuss in full below.


Chapter 4: Siting the Palace

In the introduction to the eight-volume collection of designs from the international competition for the Peace Palace, the process of settling on a location is described as follows:

The Dutch Government, wishing to show how greatly it was pleased with the establishment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague, and full of thankfulness for Mr. Carnegie’s considerable donation, with the help of the States General, placed a sum of 700,000 guilders at the disposal of the Committee with which to buy five Hectares of grounds covered with trees, which had formerly been part of the Royal Park known as “Zorgvlied” [Zorgvliet].

This rosy retelling concluding with the selection of the wooded area in Zorgvliet as almost a matter of course is at best a gross misrepresentation of the process that went into procuring a site for the Palace. In the end, the Dutch royal government, its military, the Carnegie Foundation, the city council of The Hague, and ordinary Hagenaars all played a role in the placement of the Palace, with Zorgvliet serving as a useful, though by no means universally heralded, option.

From the beginning, a wooded area was deemed preferable, as it would have allowed the same seclusion and tranquility from the city that delegates enjoyed during the 1899 Conference at the Huis Ten Bosch. In a letter to de Martens, White called for the Palace to be placed in the Bosch itself: “What the Netherlands Government ought to do, it seems to me, is to assign a proper position and site to the proposed building at The Hague, in the Park [Bosch] if possible, and perhaps not far from the House in the Wood.” But the Dutch minister of public works would not allow felling of trees in the Bosch. In September 1903, a special commission was convened by the minister of foreign affairs’ office, and by February 1904, the Commission provided a list of potential sites. This included the plot in Zorgvliet; the Alexanderveld about 750

---

72 For a visual representation of the potential sites, please see the map found in the Appendix.
73 Lysen, History of the Carnegie Foundation, 60.
74 Eyffinger, The Peace Palace, 55.
meters to Zorgvliet’s east; a meadow between the streets Benordenhoutscheweg and Wassenaarscheweg, likely the block near the Bosch and the Oosterbeek estate; and two sites along the canal to Scheveningen on what is now the Koninginnegracht. Further interest was given to the Scheveningen Bosch, in particular the dunes near the Waterpartij area, which were equidistant (at about 2.5 kilometers) from the beach, to its north, and the historic center city, to its south. Still more interest was given to the Malieveld, the Dutch military’s historic drill ground. De Martens in particular was a supporter of this location, due to the poetic nature by which it would replace war with peace and arbitration. Indeed, the very sight of the Palace at the Malieveld would have served as a piece of “permanent propaganda.”

The Carnegie Foundation, meanwhile, had designs on yet another site: the Koekamp (Deer Park), on the southwest corner of the Bosch. Under their plan, announced to the Dutch government in August 1904, the nationally owned “park ranger’s house” would be razed to make way for the Palace. This plan had support from Alexander Frederik de Savornin Lohman, who chaired the minister of foreign affairs’ special commission. In a letter the week following the February 1904 report, Savornin Lohman suggested a site “in the Hague Woods, on the road behind the Malieveld, running from the Park-ranger’s lodge to Benoordenhoutscheweg. On making that suggestion he expressed the anticipation that the State, as owner, might probably make a gift of that site.” While the Foundation did not mention the road from the lodge to the Bosch entrance on Benoordenhoutscheweg, this addition would have inevitably led to cutting down a part of the Bosch.

75 Lysen, History of the Carnegie Foundation, 78.
77 Lysen, History of the Carnegie Foundation, 78, 83.
78 Lysen, History of the Carnegie Foundation, 78.
The Palace would not come at the cost of The Hague’s spatial and cultural heritage. And the Hagenaar public would not stand for such an act by the Foundation, the city, or the royal government. “Even before the question was dealt with in the Municipal Council, the residents of The Hague became greatly agitated,” Lysen says. “‘Keep your hands off our Woods!’ was the general strain of many articles in the local press, while numbers of private individuals and several societies forwarded addresses of protest against any menacing incursions into The Hague’s natural beauty spots.” On September 19, 1904, The Hague’s magistrate forbade construction in the Koekamp. Meanwhile, Dutch military authorities railed against plans to build the Palace on even part of the Malieveld. Aldermen in The Hague were also against the Malieveld plan. Following this, plans were in place to purchase the meadow along Benoordenhoutscheweg from the Countess van Bylandt, with a bill introduced to the States General in November 1904. However, further protest from Hagenaars led to the abandonment of the Benoordenhoutscheweg plan. By the end of 1904, more than a year after Carnegie’s donation, the Peace Palace still had no set location, and Brussels was being considered as an alternate site for the PCoA.

Yet de Martens, in a letter to the minister of foreign affairs in December 1904, made clear that “it is only the country of Hugo de Groot [Grotius] and of [Cornelius van] Bynkershoek that has an unimpeachable right to house the seat of the Court of Arbitration,” and the siting process continued. After an inexplicable revival of the Koekamp and Malieveld plans, followed by
their final rejection by the Municipal Council on January 23, 1905,\(^{87}\) the Zorgvliet site was purchased that August. “It was remarkable that, after all, following upon much deliberation, the choice should fall on the site that was previously mentioned in the very first place by the Advisory and Preparatory Commission,” Lysen opines.\(^{88}\) Yet this was likely due to the fact that Zorgvliet was a site of compromise and convenience, rather than one ideal for excellent design. As a London-based architectural journal noted a month following the purchase, upon receiving a translated copy of the report “Judgments of the Dutch Experts on the Location of the Peace Palace,” the site was regarded locally as “most unsatisfactory.”\(^{89}\) According to the report, the site was too small, too close to land owned by speculators, and likely to be surrounded by small houses rather than buildings of similar purpose and stature. “A Peace Palace, to be worthy of such a lofty title,” the article contended, “ought to be not only a great building, but a building with spacious and stately surroundings; if it has not these it will be a failure.”\(^{90}\) As will be argued below, a failure was indeed erected on the plot at Zorgvliet.

\(^{90}\) “The Peace Palace at Hague.”
Chapter 5: The Design Competition and the Betrayal of the International Idea

As per Carnegie’s request, an open international competition began on August 15, 1905, to choose the design of the Peace Palace and its library. One such announcement of the competition appears in the August 26, 1905, issue of the Royal Institute of British Architects’ journal. According to the announcement, the building was to cost 1.6 million guilders (or £133,000). The competition called for a series of drawings as part of the plan: “the situation of the building with its surroundings”; plans for each floor; all four façades; two “vertical sections showing the main staircase, both the large and the small court of justice and the library (that part of the building where the books are stored)”; a detail of the front façade; the main staircase; a section of the large court of justice in detail; and a perspective drawing of the building with its surroundings. Along with this, “a short explanatory notice” about the design and a letter including the designer’s name inside an envelope noting the designer’s epigraph or “motto” (which would be clearly noted on the plans) was to be enclosed with the drawings.

Both the courthouse and library were to have two stories along with a basement. The library was to “be built so as to form a separate part of the Peace Palace, with its own main entrance from the Park, and an interior communication with the Court House [i.e. a corridor] on the principal story.” The courthouse basement was to include, along with lavatories, cloakrooms, waiting rooms, and store-rooms, the “dwelling of the concierge, containing four rooms and a kitchen,” two adjoining spare rooms, a room for the caloriferes that would heat the

92 “The Hague “Palace of Peace” International Competition,” 605. This would be about $11.5 million in 2014 dollars.
building, and a stenographers’ room. The principal story of the courthouse was to include a “great hall with main staircase,” a smaller stair to the basement, and a “doorkeeper’s room.” The primary rooms on this story would be for legal proceedings. The Large Court of Justice was to be 280 to 300 square meters, with a removable podium and gallery either along a side wall or at the end. Finally, an anteroom for the Large Court was an optional component of the design.


97 Intriguingly, the competition did not call for a specific design for the courtroom, beyond the size, podium, and gallery. Theoretically, then, it could have been built as a traditional Western courtroom—rectangular, with a center dais for adjudicators facing the parties to the case and gallery—or have a new design. Development of a new court design to match this new era of international peace through law could have better served the Palace, much as individual states aimed to effect new eras of development and modernity through design of new government centers. Two modern examples of this concept stand out: Brasilia, the capital of Brazil, and Chandigarh, the state capital of Punjab in India.

Chandigarh was borne out of both political necessity and cultural opportunity. As part of the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947, the two new countries split Punjab, with the original capital of Lahore within Pakistani borders. As a result, no city on the Indian side had the infrastructure for government functions. Therefore, it was decided that a new city would be built from the ground up. French modern architect Le Corbusier designed the new city, primarily focusing on government buildings. His use of glass and manipulation of light through the use of building angles is most captivatingly seen in Magnum photographer Marc Riboud’s 1956 photograph (Magnum Photos). A Punjabi official, hair wrapped in a turban, walks past a wall of concrete and whimsically placed glass to another part of the complex; a stream of light cuts through the building, landing on an enrobed man, also in a turban. (See Appendix for photograph.)

Meanwhile, as a provision in the first constitution of Brazil in 1891, Brasilia was envisioned to modernize the vast inland portion of the country by moving the capital away from the coast. However, it would not be designed or built until the 1950s and ’60s, with the election of Juscelino Kubitschek. Kubitschek’s “fifty years’ progress in five” platform won him the presidency in 1955, and as part of this plan Brasilia was front and center. Le Corbusier protégé Oscar Niemeyer’s government buildings represent this quantum leap well. Much like Niemeyer’s UN Building in New York, these buildings are gleaming white stone and glass structures, with sweeping curves best seen in the National Congress Building, in which both houses sit in hemispherical structures, flanking two high-rise towers (see Appendix for photo). In his book Futebol Nation, David Goldblatt connects the development of Brasilia with the brutalism and modernity of the Maracanã, the Brazilian national soccer stadium, and the Brazilian footballing style of the time. Led by Pelé and Mane Garrincha, Brazil “contrast[ed] the angularity of European football with the rounded sweetness of Brazil’s,” Goldblatt argues, with the 1958 World Cup–winning team—itself a heavily Kubitschek–funded project—mirroring Niemeyer’s sense for Brazilian modernism (Goldblatt 96–99).

In their examination of parliament house design, the Dutch design firm XML devotes a special page to Chandigarh, one of the few regional capitals analyzed. The regional parliament building is in what XML describes as the “flawed style,” with legislators’ desks facing each other at three sides, and with the parliament head’s chair as the fourth side on a dais. Gallery seats surround the legislators in a two-tiered circular fashion, with the balcony looking out not only on the legislators but towards the base of the building’s dome, a spectacle of red, yellow, and brown leading to a skylight. In contrast, the Câmara dos Deputados (lower house) in Brasilia, also in the “flawed style,” features classroom–style seating for the legislators, with the leader’s seat on a raised stage flanked by clerk’s tables. The building is dark and spare, with the national colors of yellow and green only seen in the leader’s seat and the court-like structure behind. A gallery rings around the house (in a fashion not unlike the Maracanã’s seating bowl), looking down upon the Deputados far below. Indeed, both Chandigarh’s and Brasilia’s parliamentary buildings were designed with an aspiration of modernity (and modernism), with Chandigarh’s gaudier and Brasilia’s more minimalistic. (XML)

Perhaps it can be argued that, since these designs arose a half-century following the Peace Palace, means of designing to national culture—which could, in turn, be extrapolated to effect international culture and ideas—did not
Meanwhile, the Small Court of Justice was not to include a gallery, and measure 140 to 150 square meters. A council room would adjoin each courtroom, each 40 to 45 square meters and including a waiting room, wardrobe, and lavatory. Nearby, there would also be a room for each of the two parties in a given case, also forty to forty-five square meters each. Finally, a chancery room, once again forty to forty-five square meters in size, was to adjoin the Large and Small Courts, including a booklift to the upper story, which would serve primarily as the PCoA’s offices. A room of approximately ninety square meters was to hold the PCoA’s Administrative Council, including a long table for thirty to thirty-five people. Offices for the president and general secretary would be nearby, along with a waiting room, lavatory, and rooms for secretaries and clerks. Four study rooms, an archive room or rooms98, and messengers’ rooms rounded out the facilities in the courthouse as prescribed by the competition rules.99

Adjacent to the courthouse, the Library building would hold most of its constituent rooms in the Principal Story, including a fireproof bookroom measuring 500 square meters. The room would hold 10,000 meters (about six miles) of books, which could be consulted in the two reading rooms, each sixty square meters in size. Each reading room would also adjoin an office for distribution of library books, and would be supplemented by a map room, catalog room, two small rooms for clerks (twenty-five square meters each), and offices for the librarian and sub-librarian. The Upper Story, meanwhile, would serve as the headquarters for the Carnegie

---

98 Whether the booklift was to connect to either the study rooms or the archive room(s) is not made clear in the competition procedures.
Foundation, and was to include a boardroom and chancery room. The competition rules show that the building’s primary utility was no longer the best library for the study of international law. Instead, it became a building to actually carry out international law proceedings.

By the competition’s conclusion in February 1906, 216 designs from around the world were sent to The Hague; all but two (which arrived after the deadline) were accepted. Much in the spirit of the First Peace Conference, the competition jury was an international panel of elite architects and architectural scholars, and consisted of Carnegie Foundation chairman Abraham van Karnebeek; Thomas E. Collcutt, then president-elect of the Royal Institute of British Architects; Dr. Pierre Cuijpers, the architect of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam; Ernst Eberhard, the chief architect serving the German Kaiser; Carl König, professor at the Technische Hochschule in Vienna; Henri-Paul Nénot, president of the Society of French Architects; and William Robert Ware, a professor of architecture at Columbia University, who founded the architecture programs at Columbia and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cuijpers also served on the Committee to design and build the Palace, which included Savornin Lohman, Tobias Asser, and Ruysseenaers, along with Constantine Muyskens, an honorary member of the Society for Promoting Architecture; Abraham Salm, an architect at the Society for Promoting Architecture; and two Architects of the State, Cornelis Henrik Peters and D. E. C. Knuttel.

---

turn, the Committee was placed under the purview of a council of Dutch ministers of the state and other government officers.105

The jury began its work at The Hague on May 3, 1906, first visiting the Zorgvliet site on which the building would rest.106 Each member then studied the designs individually, and reassembled to examine them as a single body, winnowing the list of submissions to a long list of forty-four designs.107 These designs were examined further until on May 11 the jury decided the winner and five other prize winners.108 The jury’s selection came, as noted in their report, “by a vote of majority, which in several cases was only a bare majority.”109 The reason for this was quite clear, as Eyffinger writes: “not a single design out of the two hundred and sixteen was found suitable for consideration as the definite plan for the building.”110 In looking for an architectural symbol of the new political era, the jury came up almost entirely empty. Per the report, the designs could easily be divided into three categories: in which the library and courthouse are in separate buildings, connected by a corridor; in which they occupy the same building, “which in some of them are lighted from external courts, that are enclosed only on three sides”; and those in which the library and courthouse are in the same building, and lighted from internal courts and enclosed on all sides.111 Any innovation, any representation of the new age of international law, therefore, would be found on the building façades, and not the general design of the Palace.

---

105 International Competition of the Carnegie Foundation, *The Palace of Peace at the Hague*, 2–3. Van Karnebeek and Savornin Lohman were also added to the Committee by the queen, along with a member of the House of Commons and the Secretary General to the Minister of Finance.


Yet even with regard to the design’s façades, the old rather than new was embraced. The contest winner was Lille architect Louis Cordonnier for design number 213 (epigraph “S’G,” for S’Gravenhage, a former name for The Hague). In the report, the jury noted that to Cordonnier, “in as much [sic] as The Hague has been chosen as the permanent seat of the Court of Arbitration, the building should in style follow the local traditions of XVI [century] architecture.” However, in separating the library and courthouse, “it has failed to give a sufficient unity of character to the two different portions of the structure.” Indeed, the jury makes clear that Cordonnier’s design won by the slimmest of margins, and that “these considerations [regarding sixteenth century design] finally prevailed with the majority of the Jury.” However, as Eyffinger writes, local critics made clear that The Hague’s architectural history was not sixteenth century based. Instead of building off the new era in The Hague inaugurated by the 1899 Conference, the jury decided to rely on an invented architectural history based on Europe’s past to choose a stale winner for the competition.

Examining the design, particularly keeping in mind Cordonnier’s previous work, makes this clear. Four towers, one at each building corner, are covered with gold features below three sets of smaller spires and arches, topped by a needle with three orbs. The two towers at the main façade potentially serve as belfries. Three arches mark the courthouse entrance, which also features a center spire topped with a golden winged statue. The smaller library building is found in the rear of the Palace, connected by an arched corridor and with its own smaller entrance. On
the whole, the design resembles a castle, though largely made of brick rather than stone.\textsuperscript{118} The unoriginality of Cordonnier’s design is compounded when reviewing his prior work. As Arjan Hebly and Cees Boekraad note in their book on the history of the Peace Palace and the construction of the new Peace Palace Library (to be discussed in the epilogue below), “Cordonnier’s plan turned out to be a collage of parts of the many buildings that he had realized in Northern France,” such as the Chamber of Commerce building in Lille, which features the exact same set of belfry spires as the Peace Palace design, “pasted onto the floor plan of the town hall he had designed in Duinkerken,” which features a similar belfry and brickwork.\textsuperscript{119} Indeed, as Eyffinger writes, Cordonnier “had proved static in his ideas and uniform in their execution through the decades.”\textsuperscript{120} This culminated in the winning Peace Palace design, bereft of the vision at the heart of the Palace and creatively bankrupt.

The other five honored plans were flawed. The Second Prize recipient, French architect Alexandre Auguste Louis Marcel (no. 194, motto: “PAX,” in gold letters), had a design featuring a multi-arched entrance, flanked by five arches on either side. A large double door with “PAX” inscribed within a triangle is within the center arch. A winged statue and a dome (lined with urn-like effects) sits above the entrance, topped by a spire. In all, the façade is an homage to Greco-Roman design, as is the building’s main staircase, which is flanked on either side by a colonnade. Similarly, the T-shaped design for the Palace (with the library serving as the bottom of the T) resembles classic cathedral design; here, the two Court Houses of Justice serve as the transept. Yet these allusions to the Western architectural canon seem simply derivative rather


\textsuperscript{119} Hebly and Boekraad, \textit{A New Home for the Study of International Law}, 15. See Appendix for photographs of the Lille Chamber of Commerce and the Dunkirk Town Hall.

\textsuperscript{120} Eyffinger, \textit{The Peace Palace}, 69.
than constructive. Marcel does not build to a new design idea befitting the Palace. Indeed, the jury opined that the plan departs “from the noble simplicity which should characterise a building devoted to the serious and dignified purposes of the Peace Palace, without at the same time evincing any special originality of treatment.”

The Third Prize design, by Franz Friedrich Wilhelm Wendt of Germany (no. 132, motto “Concordia Parvae res crescent, discordia maximae dilabuntur”\textsuperscript{122}), suffers from similar deficiencies. The main façade is essentially a facsimile of the Roman Pantheon, though with a taller rotunda. Wendt’s oval-shaped Small Court of Justice is intriguing, breaking away from a traditional rectangular court, but otherwise does not offer much beyond a stale classical revival. The jury concluded, after the faintest of acknowledgments that “this design meets the requirements of the programme,” that the exterior is “somewhat still and monotonous.”\textsuperscript{123} The Fifth Prize–winning design, by the New York–based team of Howard Greenley and Herbert Olin (no. 79), suffers the same issue, with yet another rotunda and relief on the façade, and two sets of five columns flanking the entrance. The plan’s one other design feature, a wide-stepped plaza facing the main entrance, was also seen in Cass Gilbert’s neoclassical design for the Minnesota State House, which opened the year prior (and is mimicked further in Gilbert’s final masterpiece, the United States Supreme Court Building of 1935).\textsuperscript{124} Much as their First Prize–winning colleague, Marcel, Wendt, and Greenley and Olin’s designs are simply derivative and lack a new design idea to represent the new era of internationalism.

\textsuperscript{122} A Latin proverb from Sallust’s \textit{Jugurthine War}, meaning “In harmony, small things grow; in disharmony, the greatest are dissipated.” X.6, in Gaius Sallustius Crispus’ \textit{Catiline’s War, The Jugurthine War, Histories}, trans. A. J. Woodman (London: Penguin Classics, 2007), 57.
\textsuperscript{124} International Competition of the Carnegie Foundation, \textit{The Palace of Peace at the Hague}, plate 22. This is not to say that Greenley and Olin simply lifted their design from the Minnesota State House, merely that it was a hallmark of classical-revivalist design in America in that era. See Appendix for images of the two Gilbert buildings.
Only the Fourth Prize recipient, Austrian architect Otto Wagner’s “L’art de L’Epoque” (no. 17), delivered anything resembling a novel design amongst the top-five entrants. Wagner’s explanatory essay, the jury noted in their report, “explains that a Palace of Peace, being something new, seems to him to require novel methods of artistic treatment.” To be clear, this is not entirely achieved in the building design itself: Wagner’s plan called for a fairly standard structure, with an inner courtyard connecting the Large and Small Courts of Justice on the building’s wings and the Library at the rear, and towers topped with small domes at each corner of the building. Yet Wagner’s design succeeds in two ways. Instead of relying on a central design element, Wagner’s plan places his central landmark outside the building itself in an expansive plaza. A tall column topped by a statue of a woman with outstretched arms leads to a series of minimally decorated double doors. The plaza preceding the column, as seen from above, has a central path and two semicircular walks, its shape resembling a lyre. One could read the column and plaza as allusions to Greco-Roman culture, and yet the building itself stands apart from that canon. Wagner’s design is by no means perfect, and the originality of the building itself is indeed somewhat lacking. But the effort to develop a cohesive design representing the new age of internationalism is clear. That the Jury prioritized the sixteenth century elements noted in Cordonnier’s explanatory essay over the need for new ideas as argued by Wagner shows their failure to recognize the importance of the Peace Palace as a symbol for international law and arbitration.

Yet other designs, not recognized by the jury beyond their longlist of forty-four entries, show further originality and modernism. One of the most notable, for both design and designer, is Eliel Saarinen’s design for the competition. Father of neo-futurist architect Eero Saarinen,
Eliel’s design centers on two features. A boxy portico, with minimal flourish and in front of Art Deco-style relief sculpture, is flanked on both sides by a colonnade featuring the same neo-Doric column. It is dwarfed by a massive tower, topped with a gleaming, unadorned dome, which almost resembles a globe. Compared to the more Greco-Roman inspired domes mentioned above, Saarinen’s is detached from the canon, thereby feeling more universal and in line with the Peace Palace’s mission. The floor plans show it to be a compact building, with the courthouse and library part of the same structure. In all, Saarinen’s work is a stylized, monumental, and futuristic design. It would have served as an imposing symbol for peace through law, had it been built.\textsuperscript{127}

Other designs varied in quality. Some were fanciful plans that would have looked out of place in The Hague, albeit positively. Félix Debat’s design includes one of the few non-European design features among the competition entries: a ten-step pyramid, reminiscent of Chichen Itza. A seated statue tops the pyramid.\textsuperscript{128} Budapest designer Emil Tory’s design featured not only an Egyptian-style pyramid at its center, but also two towers flanking the portico topped with majestic lions looking skyward. A sculpture of Atlas holding the world stands atop the portico.\textsuperscript{129} While his building is relatively simple in design, with a U-shape and a pyramid-topped tower as the sole flourish, Ferdinand Grauer’s plan features a large reflecting pool, setting back the Palace and allowing for a contemplative space.\textsuperscript{130} Finally, although Henrik Eykman and Paul Horrix’s design of a World Capital in The Hague (ringed by an octagonal “world center for peace”) was

\textsuperscript{128} International Competition of the Carnegie Foundation, \textit{The Palace of Peace at the Hague}, plate 41.
\textsuperscript{129} International Competition of the Carnegie Foundation, \textit{The Palace of Peace at the Hague}, plates 43–44.
\textsuperscript{130} International Competition of the Carnegie Foundation, \textit{The Palace of Peace at the Hague}, plate 72.
fanciful to the point of being, in Eyffinger’s words, “quixotic,” it regardless presented an idealist vision for what the Peace Palace and The Hague could be.¹³¹

Ultimately, the fallout from Cordonnier’s selection was tremendous. In May 1907, Dutch architects petitioned the States General with grievances regarding every step of the Peace Palace’s design process: the Zorgvliet site, the terms of the competition, and the winner chosen and report of the jury.¹³² Realizing the high cost of Cordonnier and the fact that, in the words of the American Peace Society, it was “in style like a chateau in the north of France” and not a design befitting The Hague, the commission brought in the Dutch architect J. A. G. van der Steur of Haarlem.¹³³ Van der Steur would change the design slowly, but dramatically. As Lysen writes, “the separate library building was eliminated…. Other comprehensive changes with respect to the original plans were: the removal of the north corner tower and the bringing of the large Courtroom more to the front. As usual those alterations involved rough drafts, hence new ideas, and little by little, a totally different edifice.”¹³⁴ The design of the Peace Palace today shows this change over time: while the brickwork remained the same and the main façade emerged largely intact, the four towers were cut to one, featuring two sets of four spires framing a campanile, which includes a large clock.¹³⁵ While there would be a design in place and construction readied in time for the Second Peace Conference in 1907, it still did not elicit praise from the Dutch architecture world or from the commission. Instead, it was one endorsing Old World empire over the new “empire of law.”

¹³² Eyffinger, The Peace Palace, 74–75.
¹³⁵ See the Appendix for photos of the Peace Palace taken as part of my research visit to The Hague in May 2016.
Chapter 6: The 1907 Peace Conference

As the plans for the plot in Zorgvliet were mulled over and revised, the peace movement left the Bosch and fully entered the city proper. Following its establishment at the First Peace Conference, the PCoA met in four tribunals: the USA-Mexico Pious Fund Case of 1902; Germany, Great Britain, and Italy’s case against Venezuela in 1903–4; the House Tax Case brought by France, Germany, and Great Britain against Japan decided in 1905; and the Muscat Dhows Case between France and Great Britain in 1904–5. The Court met in a private house downtown in The Hague near a busy marketplace, a far cry from the seclusion of the Huis Ten Bosch. Similarly, when the time came for the czar to convene the Second Peace Conference in 1907, the site chosen was the Ridderzaal (Knight’s Hall) in the Binnenhof.

As Eyffinger notes, this Conference featured more nations than its predecessor: forty-four in total, out of the fifty-seven claiming sovereignty at the time. Yet it could be argued that the term “Peace Conference” is something of a misnomer considering the conventions adopted at The Hague in 1907. While the Conference began on June 15 with the “purpose of giving a fresh development to the humanitarian principles which served as a basis for the great international assemblage of 1899,” the Conference concluded in late October with thirteen conventions, eleven focusing on codifying the laws of war. Along with further defining laws of neutral powers

---

136 Manley O. Hudson, “The Permanent Court of Arbitration,” The American Journal of International Law 27, no. 3 (July 1933), 447–50. Note that in the first three cases, arbitration was requested by either a European power or the U.S. against a non-Western state: the United States requested clarity over whether the concept of res judicata (i.e. final judgment) had been applied with regard to a previous arbitral award to Mexico, which the PCoA confirmed; the three kingdoms requested preferential payment of Venezuela’s debts, with which the Court complied; and France, Germany, and Great Britain called for exemption from taxes except where explicitly stipulated in leases in perpetuity against Japan, which was granted.


139 Eyffinger, The Peace Palace, 78. As Betsy Baker writes in the Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law, however, in terms of regional representation, all of Africa was shut out of both Peace Conferences. The Latin American contingent saw a great increase in the 1907 Conference, with nineteen countries attending.

and rights at sea, the Conference agreed to form an International Prize Court as a kind of appeals tribunal for naval prize courts at national levels, such that “the hardships consequent on naval war would be mitigated.” A convention was drafted to develop a Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice, meant to serve in parallel with the PCoA as a regularly seated body at The Hague, but was not ratified. Otherwise, the sole amendment to the “Pacific Settlements” convention from 1899 only stated that invited powers to the Second Peace Conference “may adhere to,” but were not bound to, the convention. Even rhetorically, the 1907 Conference took a darker turn than its predecessor: “peace” is mentioned only 327 times in the minutes of the Conference’s plenary sessions, as opposed to over 1,500 mentions of “war.” Just as the Bosch provided an environment for pacifist debate, the Ridderzaal served as a space for staring down a great war viewed as inevitable.

This is none too surprising given the global political climate between the two Conferences: a series of wars, in particular the Russo-Japanese War (which, it should be noted, was ended via arbitration led by Theodore Roosevelt), could not be prevented by the means of pacific settlements outlined in 1899. As James Brown Scott, future head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and delegate to the 1907 Conference opined, “It is an unfortunate fact that these wars were not prevented by good offices, mediation, or the system of arbitration created by the First Conference; but we must never forget that each nation must determine for itself its political policy, and that, while it may yield to good offices and

mediation, arbitration is primarily for the solution of legal questions….”\textsuperscript{145} Even from such a fervent believer in international law and peace as Scott, the predominant shift away from the prevention of war to the mitigation of war’s horrors was clear.

Chapter 7: Thomas Mawson and the Reclamation of Internationalism

Following the 1907 Conference, and the debacle that was the Palace’s open design competition, the Board of the Carnegie Foundation called a limited, invitational competition to design the Peace Palace Gardens surrounding the building. The Board asked three garden architects to participate: Leonard A. Springer of Haarlem; Henri E. de Wilde of Ghent, Belgium; and Thomas H. Mawson from London. As Mawson wrote in his memoirs, “This was an exciting experience, and one which aroused my enthusiasm to the utmost. Naturally, I was soon on my way to the Hague, accompanied by my eldest son.” After meeting van der Steur and Cordonnier, along with British Ambassador Sir Henry Howard, Mawson and his son and protégé Prentice got to work.

Mawson’s initial design, he noted in his book Civic Art, set out to “adjust [Cordonnier’s design] becomingly to the position it is to occupy.” Furthermore, Mawson also developed his design with the idea that “civic design and civic betterment ought, if rightly directed, to be contributory to national betterment,” mentioning Eykman and Horrix’s world capital design. “When we touch the subject of peace we have a project, and a most laudable one, which is free from all that pertains to either civic or national ostentation, and which, in its aim, is directed towards international betterment and the removal of universal evils.” As a result, the design is dominated with a theme of peace, and features a series of statues, monuments, and pavilions in commemoration of the peace movement. “The very word ‘Peace,’ ” Mawson argued, “leads the
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mind to something spacious and widespreading, and implies quiet stretches, open effects, and secluded avenues of meditation and tranquility.” Mawson also utilized sculpture and reflecting pools as a means of “suggesting the arts of peace.” A covered shelter divides the two paths. One leads toward a series of small sculptures and eventually an obelisk near the Palace. The other ends with the “Fountain of Peace,” modeled after the Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi (Fountain of the Four Rivers) in Rome; a large reflecting pool; and in a return to the initial ideals and nomenclature of the Peace Palace project, a “Temple of Peace.”

In August 1908, the board had made their choice, with Mawson winning the competition. Upon his victory, Mawson met van Karnebeek and the rest of the committee. They were “a most capable body of men, conscientious in the exercise of their responsibilities,” Mawson relates, “and before I was allowed to proceed with the work I was asked to present a carefully studied analysis of the cost.” His subsequent geographic report revealed conditions which were quite different from his original gardens design:

In the first place, the soil was almost pure sand, into which had to be incorporated peat soil brought from a distance. The water level, which was publicly controlled, was only two feet below the surface over a large section of the ground; and lastly, the varieties of trees and shrubs which could be relied on to flourish under these conditions were limited and different from those we actually planted in any of our home gardens.

With both topography and a cost-cutting initiative from the committee in mind, Mawson presented a revised design which was approved for construction. “As finally laid out,” Mawson wrote in his memoirs, the revised design “bears but little correspondence to the designs which
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won the competition.”¹⁶⁰ Gone was the obelisk and the Temple of Peace; the Fountain of Peace became a design larger in size, but more modest in ornamentation.¹⁶¹ The reflecting pool was also expanded,¹⁶² and in part connected a natural brook to the pool, lily pond, and canal.¹⁶³ A major presence in Dutch culture (what with the ubiquity of canals and reclamation of land near or below sea level) and in the greater “Hague-iography” (considering Grotius’ main work on freedom of the seas), water became a central theme of Mawson’s design, supported further by shade trees and long beds of colorful flowers.¹⁶⁴ Not only did both Mawson’s original and final designs use various design elements to convey and help contemplate the idea of peace, but it also frames the van der Steur/Cordonnier design such that, even in the faux-sixteenth century plan, the building approaches the symbol of peace it was initially envisioned to become.

¹⁶³ Mawson, *Civic Art*, 311.
¹⁶⁴ See Appendix for images from the Peace Palace Gardens, also from my research trip in May 2016.
Chapter 8: Constructing the Peace Palace: Reconciling Nationalism and Internationalism

As Mawson worked on the surrounding grounds, an all-Dutch construction team built the Palace. Following the cornerstone-laying ceremony on July 30, 1907, upon which the Palace was dedicated “To the Peace, by attaching the law, [and] the generosity of Andrew Carnegie,” construction commenced in earnest on December 14, by the contractor J. Knijnenburg of Scheveningen. By 1908, the concrete foundation and brick basement were constructed out of Zorgvliet’s sand dunes by G. Nollen & J. H. Heymerink of The Hague, with bricks made by a firm in Leiderdorp. The foundation was completed in 1909. The sandstone for the building came from the “Rotterdamsche Steenhouwerij” (Rotterdammer Stonecutters) in Rotterdam. Finally, the contractor to see out the building project was H. F. Boersma of The Hague. Even the more artistic features of the Palace were carried out by Dutch artisans. The sculptures were designed and constructed by Wim Retera of Amsterdam. H. Meskers built the Palace furniture. Finally, wood for the building came from, among other places, the Dutch East Indies. All this, in turn, immediately gave the Peace Palace a distinct touch of the Dutch nation and empire.

No clearer is the national and imperial pride for the building seen than in a photograph from the Palace bell-tower’s topping off, on September 12, 1911. Here eighteen men, many in
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hats and suits, celebrate their accomplishment by standing at the tower’s scaffold. Among them, four men sit atop the beams, and lift the Dutch tricolor flag.\textsuperscript{174} That this flag was raised atop a symbol of internationalism highlights the tensions between celebrating Old World empire and developing the “empire of law.” As discussed above, though, Cordonnier’s plan and van der Steur’s redesign foster this attitude, embracing an idea of sixteenth century history that connected more with nationalism and imperialism than with the peace movement.

Yet in the end it was not simply Dutch nationalism on display as the finishing touches were added to the Peace Palace. French diplomat and winner of the 1909 Nobel Peace Prize\textsuperscript{175} the Baron d’Estournelles de Constant proposed that each member nation of the PCoA provide “one of their national productions toward the construction of the Palace.”\textsuperscript{176} Each nation complied. Germany provided the gates to the Palace; Italy, the building’s interior marble; Mexico, the onyx for the grand staircase; Switzerland, the clock for the building’s tower; and the U.S., a group of statues in commemoration of the peace movement. Dutch nationalism was supplemented not by internationalism, but by a melange of nations and their nationalisms.

As part of the baron’s request, Great Britain provided four stained-glass windows depicting the story of peace.\textsuperscript{177} The British windows, entitled “Evolution of the Peace Ideal,” were designed by Robert Douglas Strachan, who depicted the long journey to the peace movement. The first panel depicted the Primitive Age, followed by the Age of Conquest, the

\textsuperscript{176} American Peace Society, \textit{The Palace of Peace at The Hague}, 5.
\textsuperscript{177} American Peace Society, \textit{The Palace of Peace at The Hague}, 5-6.
Modern Age, and the “Fulfillment of the Peace Ideal.” Yet instead of the fourth panel depicting the Peace Conferences or arbitration, this “Fulfillment” is more abstract, with characters seemingly from another time. In this scene, a monarch crowned with a horned green helmet looks down on the scene from the heavens. Every person depicted in this panel is white. This is in spite of the influence of the non-Western world on the Peace Conferences (especially in 1907, but also the Chinese delegation in 1899). The peace movement was within recent memory for Strachan, and yet he chose to include three panels featuring war, and a fourth depicting peace more in line with a European fantasy. These panels, a celebration of conquest and war rather than a condemnation, mark yet another injection of empire within the Palace. This would only increase as imperialism led the way to the first World War, actions the Peace Palace and its institutions were theoretically designed to prevent.


Chapter 9: The Peace Palace Opens

On August 28, 1913, over ten years after Carnegie’s donation, the Peace Palace was finally dedicated by Queen Wilhelmina in the building’s great hall, and handed over to the Dutch minister of foreign affairs. At the ceremony, outgoing Dutch Foreign Minister René van Swinderen called the Palace a “laboratory for the regeneration of moral forces,” but kept expectations for the success of the building as an institute for peace realistic. In his memoir, Mawson remembered the opening, exclusive only to 350 people, as “a magnificent function, performed by the Queen of the Netherlands in the presence of a great concourse of foreign ambassadors and other distinguished personages. I received many congratulations upon our work, which I must admit looked exceedingly well even at this early stage.” The following day, Carnegie unveiled a statue of peace advocate Randal Cremer, one of four original statues accompanying the Palace along with Grotius, Stead (who died on the Titanic), and King Edward VIII. In front of two thousand people, Carnegie declared the Palace “a perfect gem worthy of its mission!… worthy of its holy mission of establishing Peace through law over the whole world.” Peace activist Frederick Lynch described the building in even more vivid prose, calling it a “sublime hall of justice, home of lasting peace, capital of the new world.”

Yet other members of the peace movement had dimmer views of the building. “It is recognized as an imposing architectural ornament,” the World Affairs Institute noted in their journal The Advocate of Peace. “But there are some who refer to it slightly as ‘quite a nice

place’ in which to continue ‘the colossal sham known as The Hague Conference.’”

Furthermore, the symbolism of the Peace Palace became muddled, appearing as both a triumph of international law and as part of a celebration of Dutch pride. Indeed, 1913 also marked the centennial of Dutch liberation from France and the return of the House of Orange. As A. M. Luijt’s poster celebrating this anniversary and “exhibitions in 30 towns” shows, the Peace Palace played a role in the celebration. Luijt’s poster features four major figures: two in the foreground, two in the back. On the left, a man holds the Dutch tricolor, upon which an extra orange ribbon (most likely representing the royal house) dangles. On the right, three women (one holding an olive wreath) stand in front of eight tulips, the national flower. Further in the background, a man holding a horn of plenty and a cow appear to represent Dutch agriculture. Finally, and most imposingly, in the background emerges the Palace, with a banner celebrating Holland unfurled in front of the clocktower.

Just as the dedication marked the Palace’s debut as an international institution, by its opening it was cemented as a national symbol.
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Chapter 10: The Peace Palace in World War I

Meanwhile, the Palace and its tenant bodies were proving to be vastly ineffective in preventing heightened nationalism from bubbling into war. This was depicted incisively in a postcard from 1914, just as the war was commencing. Below the caption “Hebt U het Vredespaleis reeds van binnen gezien?” (“Did you already see the inside of the Peace Palace?”) the façade of the Palace’s courthouse unfolds to show a scene of fierce battle. Two soldiers strike at another pair with bayonets, as a soldier on the right is shot down. Much as the tone of the 1907 Conference was in mitigating the effects of war rather than preventing them, the Palace at this time was seen as a symbol of the peace movement’s ineffectiveness.186

Indeed, Hudson lists zero cases in the PCoA during the war. A case between the Netherlands and Portugal over the island of Timor, decided in June 1914, was followed by a case regarding religious properties in Portugal. This case, brought by France, Great Britain, and Spain, was lodged in 1913 but not decided until 1920.187 Meanwhile, though the World Peace Congress met prior to the opening of the Peace Palace, a Third Peace Conference for 1916 would never be held. Working with Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, Scott began planning the Conference on July 31, 1914. With war breaking out in Europe the next day, Scott rued this moment retrospectively as “the final action in the matter of the Third Hague Conference.”188 Work continued on the Conference, ineffectively, through the summer of 1915, through correspondence with Bryan, peace activists around the world, and the Institute of International Law based in Ghent.189 Regardless, the Third Peace Conference would not occur while the world
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was still at war, and the PCoA was serving minimal use at this time. While Dutch neutrality
during the war kept the nation intact and the Palace standing, The Hague’s main body for
ensuring peace was silent during the war and undoubtedly affected by it.

Yet peace activists, including Carnegie himself, were somewhat hopeful for arbitration’s
effect, even as the war plunged further into bitter stalemate. “Is this, the most terrible, most
destructive and most uncalled for of wars to be the last between civilized nations? It certainly
should be and can easily be made so,” Carnegie contends in his 1915 New Year’s letter, “War
Abolished—Peace Enthroned.” To Carnegie, the PCoA was “a World Supreme Court…which
has been in successful operation for fifteen years.” Following the assumed armistice to come
between the warring nations, “the majority of enlightened people in all civilized lands would
realize that permanent world peace would be Earth’s greatest blessing,” and could be established
by nations (especially the largest ones, who were to lead this movement) accepting arbitration
instead of war. Carnegie believed that “the Brotherhood of Man would then have arrived, and
life on this earth flash forth glimpses of heaven.” Ever an optimist, Carnegie believed that in
the face of the Great War, not only could arbitration at the Peace Palace prevent further war, but
the world could move closer to the millennium.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the New York–based sister
organization to the Carnegie Foundation, offered similar sentiments in an open letter dated
February 16, 1915. “We wish to say for all friends of peace that the dreadful war now raging
affords no just cause for discouragement, no discredit to past efforts, and no reason to doubt that
still greater efforts in the future may be effective and useful,” read the letter, signed by such
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luminaries of the peace movement as White, Scott, and Elihu Root. Benjamin Trueblood of the American Peace Society looked backward as well as forward in his optimism for arbitration: the 1899 Conference’s provision for good offices allowed for the Roosevelt–led negotiation that ended the Russo-Japanese War, and “most of the first-class powers” had cases heard at the PCoA. From the 1899 Conference, “we have been given…the auspicious beginnings of a recognized international judicial order, which only needs patient employment and fuller development to put an end to the international chaos and violence which have hitherto so largely prevailed.” Despite the bloodshed of the war, the peace movement in The Hague and around the world believed that the city and its constituent organizations would remain at the forefront of the movement, the Peace Palace as its lasting if troubled symbol.

---
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Epilogue: Building New International Ideals at The Hague

These pacifists would be proven wrong, by and large. Following World War I, Geneva served as the headquarters for internationalism and the home of the League of Nations. “The Netherlands apparently did not have the time, the energy or the ambition to host the League,” write Peter van Kriecken and David McKay. “Yet in the end, The Hague also received a share of the glory. The first Assembly in Geneva adopted the Statute of a Permanent Court of International Justice to be established in The Hague alongside the existing Permanent Court of Arbitration.” Following the foundation of the United Nations in 1946, the PCIJ was replaced by the International Court of Justice, which operates in the Peace Palace today along with the PCoA.

In the past ten years, two buildings have been erected in The Hague for international institutions: a new Peace Palace Library, designed in 2004 and opened in 2007, and the permanent premises of the International Criminal Court, designed in 2009 and opened in 2015. Both processes experienced minor roadblocks similar to the original Peace Palace’s design and construction process, but ultimately led to buildings better representing a modern vision. Unlike the original Peace Palace, the design competition for the Library garnered only eight designs: three from Dutch designers, and five internationals. Of these, English architect Michael Wilford’s design won the competition, and soon after he and the Carnegie Foundation engaged in a construction process in which “openness was the magic word,” along with “a worry-free approach on the part of the architect.” Changes to the initial design led to a building 1.7 meters higher than van der Steur’s building for the Academy of International Law, built in the 1920s in
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situ. Local residents said that this would block their view of the Palace and protested the project, to no avail.\textsuperscript{199}

The building is a stunning combination of Cordonnier’s Old World vision and present-day postmodernism. The Library exterior uses the same brick color, mortar, and incised joint cut design as the original Palace,\textsuperscript{200} and is cut by a glass skybridge enrobed in stainless steel.\textsuperscript{201} A reliance on glass, and a resulting theme of transparency, connect well with the mission of the Library (to serve as an enlightening source of information on international law and the peace movement for scholars and jurists) and provide a necessary contrast from the original Palace.\textsuperscript{202}

As The Hague celebrated the opening of the new Peace Palace Library, the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute (the treaty which led to the foundation of the ICC) decided in December 2007 that the Court, which had been stationed in temporary quarters in The Hague since its foundation in 2002, should have a permanent home.\textsuperscript{203} The site for the permanent premises rests on the former Alexanderkazerne (Alexander Barracks) of the Dutch military, in a low-rise area not far from the Scheveningen dunes. After the location was provided by the Dutch government, a worldwide design competition was held in 2008 and 2009, garnering 171 designs.\textsuperscript{204} From the 171, nineteen were chosen for the final round by the ICC and the Dutch Government Buildings Agency; three prize-winning designs were chosen from this short list.\textsuperscript{205}

The winning plan, by Dusseldorf-based firm Ingenhoven Architects, featured a complex of
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thirteen white rectangular buildings and four ovoid structures, all on a gleaming white plaza, connected by a grid-like latticework on the buildings’ roofs.\textsuperscript{206} The Ingenhoven design was very futuristic, not unlike the vision seen in Brasilia and Chandigarh.

Yet to the surprise of the architectural community, the design committee instead selected the second-place winner of the competition, a design by the Danish firm Schmidt Hammer Lassen, as the plan for construction.\textsuperscript{207} SHL’s design features six glass and steel buildings connected by a corridor and separated from The Hague by a reflecting pool. The tallest building, the Court Tower, houses the main courtroom (which features a viewing gallery separated by a large glass window), and is clad with a metal grid dotted with plants. The building grounds feature an array of grasses and wildflowers, with plants from all 120 states parties to the Court. In all, SHL’s design aims to present elements of transparency and connection to the planet itself, just as the Court aims to protect the world from crimes of war and against humanity.\textsuperscript{208}

The ICC’s new home casts further into relief the disconnect between the Peace Palace’s founding mission and its failure of a design. The peace movement had a massive effect on The Hague, transforming it from a quiet resort city and royal court to the household name for international law. Yet the opportunity was, by and large, a wasted one. Among the designs submitted to the open competition for the Palace, some attempted (and few succeeded) in matching the international idea to a modern design. Yet the final plan, a tribute to an idealized sixteenth century European empire, mirrored the eventual nationalist fervor that would lead to World War I. While later projects, along with the Peace Palace Gardens, would revitalize the

\textsuperscript{206} Winston, “Ingenhoven Architects wins International Criminal Court competition.”
\textsuperscript{208} Schmidt Hammer Lassen Architects, “The International Criminal Court,” http://www.shl.dk/the-international-criminal-court/. The checkered short history of the ICC—including the persistent claims of an overwhelming focus on African war crimes, as opposed to crimes committed by Western actors—should not go without mention. However, they are far beyond the scope of this paper to be discussed in detail.
representative design of international law, the Peace Palace represented a turn away from what initially put The Hague on the map.
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