

The Peace Treaty and League of Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 31, 1919



WASHINGTON

1919

133035—19751

The Peace Treaty and League of Nations

SPEECH

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

OF DELAWARE



SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON

1919

1919-1920

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. OWEN.

THE PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is facing its greatest responsibility in the history of the Republic. We are face to face with the acceptance or the rejection of a treaty of peace with Germany, and the acceptance or rejection of a covenant establishing a league of nations and a new world order of liberty, justice, and humanity.

In a great enterprise of this character we must not permit ourselves to deal with the shadows; we should deal only with the substance.

The treaty with Germany establishes the disarmament of Germany as a great vital fact, absolutely breaks its military and naval power, its dynastic ambition and militarism, and compels reparation for the damage done by the German people. It compels the German and Austrian Governments to recognize the rights of subject peoples heretofore dominated by Germany and her allies. They are compelled to recognize the Poles, the Czecho-Slovaks, the Jugo-Slavs, and to recognize the new boundaries of these peoples and their right to self-government, their right of self-determination, and equitable treatment to their commerce and industry. The reduction of the military power of Germany is an event of the first magnitude. It is the reduction of the only great power which in modern times has entertained the ambition of world dominion; it is the reduction of the only great power deliberately building up a military force for aggrandizement, for annexation, for indemnity, and for profit. The reduction of German war power and lust for dominion by this war and by this treaty is one great fact that must color everything which follows. Above all, there is established by a world agreement the covenant of the league of nations with a force of sufficient financial, commercial, military, and naval power to command the peace of the world for all time.

I have studied the covenant of the league of nations with care. I have read many speeches hostile to this covenant, and have weighed the arguments against the covenant. I have found them very hypercritical, partisan, and without convincing force.

I am profoundly convinced that it is my duty as a Senator of the United States, representing the people of the United States, to give this covenant my support without amendment or reservation. I regard it as my duty to the world to support this covenant.

Mr. President, the peace of the world might have been secured by the conventions at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 if it

had not been for the military autocracies governing Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, whose representatives refused to agree to arbitration or to disarmament and who, when ready, violated all The Hague conventions and their solemn treaties with other nations in their violent attempt in 1914 to establish world dominion.

The great obstacle to world peace of 1899 and 1907 is happily removed.

These autocratic military governments are now disarmed. They will be compelled to accept the principles of international morality, and it may well be believed that with the overthrow of the military autocracies which governed these peoples, which dominated and drove them into battle, the people themselves will soon realize their deliverance and will appreciate and support with heartfelt loyalty the new world order.

Mr. President, the great conflict between military autocracy and the growing democracies of the world was almost unavoidable. The Romanoffs, the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Bourbons, by the Secret Treaty of Verona, had sworn, in 1822, to destroy the democracies of the world. That treaty, articles 1 and 2, provided:

ARTICLE 1. THE HIGH CONTRACTING POWERS BEING CONVINCED THAT THE SYSTEM OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IS EQUALLY AS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE MONARCHIAL PRINCIPLES AS THE MAXIM OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE WITH THE DIVINE RIGHT, ENGAGE MUTUALLY, IN THE MOST SOLEMN MANNER, TO USE ALL THEIR EFFORTS TO PUT AN END TO THE SYSTEM OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENTS IN WHATEVER COUNTRY IT MAY EXIST IN EUROPE AND TO PREVENT ITS BEING INTRODUCED IN THOSE COUNTRIES WHERE IT IS NOT YET KNOWN.

ART. 2. AS IT CAN NOT BE DOUBTED THAT THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS IS THE MOST POWERFUL MEANS USED BY THE PRETENDED SUPPORTERS OF THE RIGHTS OF NATIONS TO THE DETRIMENT OF THOSE OF PRINCES, THE HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES PROMISE RECIPROCALLY TO ADOPT ALL PROPER MEASURES TO SUPPRESS IT, NOT ONLY IN THEIR OWN STATES BUT ALSO IN THE REST OF EUROPE.

They immediately overthrew the limited monarchy in Spain and established an absolute monarchy under the same prince. They did the same thing in Italy with a view to establishing absolute monarchies throughout the world and keeping the people of the world as subjects, as political slaves, and as industrial slaves subject to the mastery of the ruling powers.

The Monroe doctrine was declared for the express purpose of checking this monarchical movement and preventing its extension to the Western Hemisphere. The Hohenzollerns were the leaders of this conspiracy from 1822 down to 1914, and down to the day when William II fled to Holland before the victorious powers of the democracies of the world.

This great war was fought by America on the principle that the peoples of the world had the right to govern themselves, and the allied Governments confirmed the American theory on November 5, 1918, as the basis of the armistice. The present dictated treaty of peace is the result and is before us.

This war was a war to establish right against might, justice and humanity against injustice and inhumanity; to establish the rule of conscience throughout the world against the rule of brute force, the right of men everywhere to govern themselves.

The principles of righteousness were successful, and in the final months of battle the great powers of the United States were

marshaled and thrown upon the battle field, giving vitality to the flagging forces of Great Britain, of France, of Italy, and of Belgium, and brought an imperishable glory to the American Republic as the world apostle of liberty and righteousness.

LEAGUE OF VICTORIOUS NATIONS.

Mr. President, on the battle field a league of victorious nations was established, led by the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, and Japan, and including 20 others. It may be fairly said that the sympathy of all of the nations of the world, of all the people of the world was finally aroused against the wicked lust for dominion exhibited by the rulers of Germany, and that finally on the inside of Austria and on the inside of Germany disintegration commenced because of the discontent of the Austrian and German people with the false leadership they had been compelled to follow. It was a pathetic scene when we saw the Czecho-Slovaks, who had deserted Austria and fought for the Allies, having passed around the world, reached Washington and marched before the White House as a tribute to the United States and as an evidence of their own devotion to the cause of justice and righteousness.

Mr. President, the still small voice coming from the Divine Spirit moves the hearts of all men and ultimately makes truth triumphant and justice victorious.

We have now, Mr. President, a league of nations in actual operation—a league of victorious nations, with their representatives in Paris completing the task imposed upon the world by William II.

A league of victorious nations, through their representatives, has presented to us a treaty of peace with Germany, with a covenant of a world league of nations approved by the representatives of 32 nations: United States, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, the British Empire (including Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and India), China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Siam, Czechoslovakia, and Uruguay.

Mr. President, 13 other great States—Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela—in effect Republics more or less advanced, are ready and have been invited to join the covenant of the league of nations.

Mr. President, I can not but believe that within a short period of probation Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria will be admitted to the league of nations, and that Russia—a united Russia, a great Republic of Russia, or perhaps several republics composed of Russian people—will gladly join the league when they shall have established orderly, democratic government.

All of these nations stand for peace and justice and sympathetic cooperation, and the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs—the governments based on militarism and lust for world dominion—are dead beyond the possibility of resurrection.

We are entering a new world order. The representatives of 32 nations have been conferring together since the 11th day of November, 1918, and have finally worked out with infinite pains a treaty of peace with Germany which is now before us (S. Doc. No. 49, 66th Cong., 1st sess.). It comprises 440 articles—a

volume of 194 pages. It is the most important treaty the world has ever seen. It deals not only with Germany but in effect it deals with the new nations that are brought into life by this peace treaty.

I shall support the treaty of peace as the best settlement found possible by the representatives of the great nations fighting together for liberty and justice.

We have a league of nations now, born of necessity, created by war, by the exigencies of life and death, and they are transacting business without any other charter than the charter of necessity. This treaty has not been carelessly drawn. The United States alone had a large number of expert men engaged in an advisory capacity to gather together the information for our peace commissioners, and it is quite a wonderful tribute to the excellence of this treaty and to its thoroughness and to its accuracy that the opponents have found in 440 articles so few of which they can complain. I shall refer to some of these objections later.

But, Mr. President, what I now wish to emphasize is that we have a league of nations working without a charter, establishing by military force the peace of Europe, a peace which is essential and necessary to the peace of the American people; that the league of victorious nations in arms through its representatives has finally reached an agreement. Germany has ratified the terms; Great Britain has ratified it; France in a few days will have ratified it, and so will Japan. Are these great voices of no persuasive force? It is a dictated peace, as I had the honor to advise the honorable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] it would be, when he denounced the armistice and President Wilson's question to the German people which preceded the armistice. It is as much a dictated peace as if the Allies had gone to Berlin after having devastated hundreds of cities and villages and marched over the bodies of hundreds of thousands of the slain.

Never was a greater assemblage of scholars, technical experts, historians, and trained statesmen assembled. Their work should command the respect of all thoughtful men who respect authority and are moved by competent argument.

Mr. President, the nations composing the league of victorious nations discovered that while they were bound together by the exigencies of war in framing the future relations of the nations of Europe with Germany and her allies, and compelling compliance to the decrees of the great Allies, it was essential to establish a league of nations that should embrace all the nations of the world, 32 of whom were already at the peace table joining in the making of peace with Germany, and it was well known that all the other nations in the world, except Germany and her allies and disordered Russia, were ready to adjust themselves to a world-wide league of nations for the preservation of the future peace of the world and for the very vital purpose of making effective the settlement with Germany and her allies, making a certainty that militarism should not again raise its martial head, and that Germany and Austria should respect the penalties imposed upon them and make reparations for the damage they had done.

Throughout the treaty of peace with Germany the proposed league of nations is charged with many responsibilities to see

that this treaty is carried out; that the boundaries fixed shall be respected. This treaty establishes new relations between Germany and all other nations in the most important particulars, with the new States, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Schleswig, with Russia and the Russian States, with the German colonies, with China, with Siam, Liberia, Morocco, with Egypt, Turkey, Bulgaria, and in respect to Shantung.

This treaty is of gigantic importance in disarming Germany, demobilizing her forces, limiting her army and navy, her armaments, her munitions, her materials of war, abolishing absolutely compulsory military service in Germany, preventing short enlistments in the army to train citizens as soldiers, limiting her fortifications, depriving her of the right to have military aeroplanes or submarines, authorizing interallied commissions of control, making sweeping provisions for reparation, and proposing proper penalties upon the criminal leaders who committed the hideous crime of the war of 1914.

This treaty of necessity deals with commercial relations, with property rights, contracts, judgments, ports, waterways, railways, navigation, and so forth.

Mr. President, the covenant of the league of nations substitutes law and order in place of anarchy between nations. We have had no such thing as international law. We have had merely international precedents, international ethics and agreements. No rule of human conduct not prescribed by competent authority and capable of enforcement deserves to be called a law.

The covenant of the league of nations is the beginning of international order and international law to govern relations of the citizens of one nation with the citizens of another nation. The covenant is drawn up with avowed purpose— to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security.

The most intense partisan bigotry will not challenge the nobility of this purpose. The means by which this noble end shall be accomplished is specifically laid down—

First. By the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war.

Second. By the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations.

Third. By the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments.

Fourth. By the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another.

These four proposals are the proposals of the first paragraph of the covenant of the league of nations, and whatever follows must be interpreted in the light of the purpose and the plan proposed to carry out the purpose of achieving international peace and security.

The 26 articles then lay out a plan for achieving international peace and security.

First it pledges every member (art. 10) not to invade the territorial integrity or existing political independence of any other member nation, and not only to respect this principle but to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. Abundant means for safeguarding the future peace of the world is provided as follows:

133035—19751

a. By recognizing the importance of reducing armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and international obligations;

b. By limiting the private manufacture of munitions and implements of war and providing a means for abating this menace to peace;

c. By giving full information with regard to the manufacture of armaments and military, naval, and air programs;

d. By establishing a commission to deal with the question of military and naval programs;

e. By providing for an immediate call of the council in case of war or a threat of war (art. 10);

f. By providing that members of the league shall submit disputes to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and that they will not resort to war until at least three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report of the council (art. 12).

g. By recognizing as suitable for arbitration—

First. All disputes relating to the interpretation of treaties.

Second. Any question of international law.

Third. The existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation.

Fourth. Or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach.

h. Provision is made that the members of the league will carry out in good faith any award that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a member which complies with the award (art. 13).

i. A permanent court of international justice is contemplated to be submitted to the members of the league for consideration (art. 14).

k. A further provision is made to settle disputes by providing that questions not submitted to arbitration shall be submitted to the council for full investigation and consideration.

l. Provision is made for an appeal to be made from the council to the assembly (art. 15).

m. If any member resorts to war in disregard of its covenants to arbitrate or adjust its differences with other nations under articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall, ipso facto, be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league, which undertake immediately to subject the offending nation—

First, to the severance of all trade or financial relations.

Second, the prohibition of all intercourse between other nationals and the nationals of the offending State.

Third, the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not.

These penalties are sufficient to deter any nation on earth from attacking another nation in violation of the covenanted agreements (art. 16).

n. Moreover, it is provided that it shall be the duty of the council in the case of an outlaw nation to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league (art. 16).

This provision is similar to the provision in article 10 that where any nation is exposed to an exterior aggression of its territorial integrity or existing political independence by another nation, the council shall advise as to the means by which the obligation to preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of nations shall be fulfilled.

o. Article 16 makes further provision that in the case of an outlaw nation the members of the league shall cooperate in financial and economic ways to minimize the harm done by a blockade and boycott of the offending nation.

p. Article 17 provides for the settlement of disputes between nations not members of the league, and provides for the coercion of any nonmember which assails a member nation contrary to the principles of the league.

q. Publicity of treaties is provided for as a safeguard against secret treaties (art. 18).

r. The assembly is authorized to advise the reconsideration of existing treaties that may involve or endanger the peace of the world (art. 19).

s. The members of the league are to cancel and set aside obligations or understandings among themselves which are inconsistent with the principles of the proposed league, and they agree not to hereafter enter into engagements inconsistent with the principles of the league (art. 20).

t. The league is intrusted with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest (art. 23).

u. The very great and important principle is laid down in the proposed covenant that the people in German colonies and territories where the people are not yet able to stand by themselves shall have their right of development placed under the authority of the league of nations as a sacred trust of civilization, and that mandatories shall be established comprising nations trained in the art of government which shall exercise the responsibility, under a charter issued by the council in behalf of the league, determining the degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory, and providing for annual reports, and recognizing the principles of justice and the right of the people who are governed to primary consideration.

v. Some very important principles are laid down in section 23, pledging the member nations—

(a) To endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose to establish and maintain the necessary international organizations—

(b) Pledging the members to undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control.

(c) That they will intrust the league with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.

(e) That they will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league.

(f) That they will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

That they will encourage and promote voluntary Red Cross organizations (art. 25).

Mr. President, this covenant provides for the settlement of every international dispute that can honestly arise. It provides for the disarmament of nations to the limit of safety. It provides a gigantic penalty of international boycott and blockade of any nation which, contrary to the principles of the league, invades the territorial integrity or political independence of another nation. It lays down the principles of justice and humanity. It pledges the nations of the world to the great principles of peace and international justice and international understanding. And above all the old enemies of peace and justice are powerless and made incapable of future mischief.

Those who have been opposing the league have not been able to point out in a single instance where they could improve upon the precautions taken by this great covenant to prevent war in future.

We are face to face with either accepting the covenant or rejecting it. If I should take part in rejecting it, Mr. President, my conscience would never cease to distress me as having failed in a great crisis of the world's history to do what I could to establish peace on earth, good will toward men.

Mr. President, the covenant of the league of nations is the consummation of a century of the aspirations of the good men of the world. It is the work of many hands. The doctrine of disarmament and of arbitration would have been adopted at The Hague in 1907 except for Germany and her allies.

It is absolutely inconceivable that any existing democracy on earth would disregard the principles laid down in this league. They would have no motive, in the first place. They would not dare, in the second place.

PRESIDENT WILSON.

The political enemies of President Wilson should not throw themselves in blind fury against the covenant of the league of nations on the theory that it is his child, conceived by him and brought forth by him, and therefore deserving a merited slaughter. The principles of the league are those of The Hague conventions brought down to date. It represents the best opinions of the whole civilized world. As far as the covenant of the league of nations is concerned it is full of wisdom and virtue. It is a child conceived by all the lovers of men.

I was one of those, and I assume the responsibility, who urged President Wilson to go to Paris and to use his prestige as President of the United States to bring about this covenant. I think he is entitled to very great credit for having succeeded in bringing back a covenant fundamentally sound, which will accomplish the purpose of world peace, world order, and world prosperity. History will give him a credit which his political opponents would now deny.

OPPOSITION TO THE COVENANT.

Mr. President, one of the first principles which I learned as a Member of the Senate, in its capacity to pass upon foreign treaties, was this—

That in the Senate of the United States party lines should cease at tidewater.

133035—19751

I have been profoundly disappointed to find the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. LODGE], ignoring this sound principle with his round robin, marshaling all the Republican Senators whom he could influence to protest against the covenant establishing the league of nations, making hostile speeches against it, and leading other Senators to do the same thing.

The opponents of the league have proven too much.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] undertook to demonstrate that the league would be controlled by the Catholic Church by controlling a majority of the votes of the assembly and that the Catholic Church would thus rule the world.

Another Senator undertook to prove in the same way that the colored races would control the league of nations, and therefore control the world.

Other Senators to their own satisfaction have shown that Great Britain would in like manner control the league and therefore control the world.

These Senators might do well to reconcile their own differences before they ask the people of the United States to follow a leadership that leads in all directions at once.

But, Mr. President, they are completely put to confusion by a fair interpretation of the covenant itself. The action of the league (art. 2) must be effected through the instrumentality of an assembly and of a council. It is expressly provided in article 5 that—

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant or by the terms of the present treaty, decisions at any meeting of the assembly or of the council shall require *the agreement of all the members of the league represented at the meeting.*

In other words no decision except by unanimous vote.

The only exceptions provided for by the covenant are in respect to matters of procedure, the appointment of committees (these arrangements may be decided by a majority) (art. 5), and in the case of an appeal to the assembly of a pending dispute it is provided that a decision may be arrived at if concurred in—

by the representatives of those members of the league represented on the council and of a majority of the other members of the league, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute.

In other words, the decisions of the assembly or of the council in relation to international affairs must be unanimous. Where is the possibility of the dominance of any nation over other nations represented on the council or in the assembly? Where is the danger of dominance by England, the Catholic Church, or the colored races when no action can be taken except by unanimous consent?

Great stress has been laid upon the number of votes given to Great Britain as in the cases of Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Canada, and India, while only one is given to the United States.

The answer to this is that since a unanimous decision is required it is not of the slightest importance; and, second, that in so far as mere votes are concerned, the United States has a number of small nations whose support could be relied upon, as Cuba, Haiti, San Salvador, Panama, Liberia, Nicaragua, Hon-

duras, and Guatemala, whose population is negligible but whose dependence upon the United States is of such a character that their cooperation with the United States can be as much relied upon as the cooperation of Canada with Great Britain.

But there is nothing in the argument one way or the other. The argument is specious, it is fallacious, it is misleading, and unworthy of being presented to the American Senate. A few votes are of no importance where all must agree.

ENTANGLING ALLIANCES.

The opponents of the covenant establishing the league declare with suspicious zeal that we are violating the advice of our revered Washington and ignoring his warning against entangling alliances.

The entangling alliances to which Washington referred were agreements, common in his day, making offensive and defensive alliances between one autocracy and another, between rival groups of monarchies. He was very wise to advise the United States to keep out of such difficulties where nations were controlled by military and dynastic ambitions and selfish intrigue.

Our revered Washington had not the faintest conception of the present covenant establishing a world order by the democracies of the world as a result of the complete overthrow of the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanoffs. So far is membership in the league of nations under the present covenant from being an entangling alliance, it is an association which will make impossible any entangling alliances such as those contemplated by Washington.

The present covenant precludes the possibility of military, dynastic alliances. The present covenant establishes peace on earth, establishes a just and fair relationship between all nations, with all the nations of the earth pledged to maintain the political integrity and the existing political independence of every single member nation. I agree with Senator Lodge's speech of June 9, 1915, at Union College, that "there is no escape from the proposition that nations must unite to prevent war," and disagree with his present attitude. Is it not strange he has made no constructive proposals?

MONROE DOCTRINE.

Without a gleam of humor there are opponents of the league who have the hardihood to confront the intelligence of mankind with the astonishing proposal that the present covenant would abolish the Monroe doctrine. These unhappy statesmen think the Monroe doctrine is a charter establishing suzerainty over the Central and South American Republics and that it is a species of overlordship by which the United States has a right to manage and control the policies of the other Republics on the Western Hemisphere. This un-American conception has been highly mischievous just to the extent that it has had the temerity by mysterious innuendoes to formulate itself. It has caused the Republics of South America and of Central America to look upon the United States as the Colossus of the North, ready to invade their territory and their existing political independence whenever a pretext arises for the purposes of profit—commercial, financial, or political.

This is the doctrine which the Germans have used in the Argentine, and Chile, and Brazil, and Colombia, and throughout the South American Republics and the Central American Republics, for the purpose of discrediting the United States and breaking down our just influence with these neighboring Republics whose faithful friend we always have been and whose faithful friend we always shall remain.

The Monroe doctrine is this: That the United States will regard it as an unfriendly act for any foreign nation to attempt to establish on the Western Hemisphere its system of government or to interfere with the political independence or policies of the Republics on the Western Hemisphere.

This doctrine has been somewhat expanded to mean that the United States would not be indifferent to an attempt on the part of a foreign Government to acquire additional lands on the Western Hemisphere.

The Monroe doctrine does not give the United States any rights of suzerainty. The rights of the United States have been somewhat expanded, by the necessities of the case, as in Haiti, under the same principle which is recognized in article 22 of the pending covenant, establishing mandatories over communities showing themselves incapable of orderly self-government. But this is an entirely different principle from the Monroe doctrine, and the Monroe doctrine may fairly be construed to preclude a foreign nation from exercising the rights of a mandatory on the Western Hemisphere.

Article 10 pledges all the members of the league to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the member nations, and this is a powerful confirmation of the underlying principle of the Monroe doctrine, forbidding foreign nations and all other nations to invade the territorial integrity or to interfere with the political independence of the Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

But the covenant goes further. It actually recognizes, in terms, the Monroe doctrine (art. 21), which is all any reasonable man ought to desire; and this great covenant of the league of nations, instead of weakening the Monroe doctrine, would strengthen it, confirm it, and cause it to be acknowledged by all the world.

THE LEAGUE HAS NOT STOPPED WAR.

The opponents of the proposed covenant say that it has not stopped war; that there are a dozen wars pending now.

Nearly all of the so-called wars pending are civil wars, and not really international wars. A few are over disputed boundaries or disputed authority.

The league of nations has not yet been established. The United States has not yet approved the covenant. But the league of victorious nations, which is giving birth to the league of all nations, has stopped the greatest war in history, the war in Belgium, in France, in Italy, in Greece, in Serbia, and in Germany, in Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and demobilized their armed forces.

The gigantic armies of the Teutonic allies are demobilized. The great warring armies are rapidly returning to civilized pursuits, and the smaller civil disputes which remain will rapidly adjust themselves when the great nations of the world act.

RESERVATIONS.

The opponents of the league having observed that article 1 provides that the members of the league are those who shall accede without reservation to the covenant now insist upon reservations which would exclude, by the conditions of article 1, the United States from membership in the league of nations.

Reservations are not necessary to the covenant as drawn and are objectionable because by the terms of the covenant itself any reservation to article 1 would exclude the United States from membership in the league of nations and possibly defeat the covenant itself by leading to other reservations and withdrawals.

Instead of making reservations which would temporarily exclude the United States from membership in the league it would be much better to ratify the treaty of peace with Germany and let Senators who have doubts remaining pass resolutions at the same time stating what the interpretation of the Senate or of Senators may be. This would be ratification with an explanatory interpretation of the meaning coincident to it by those who think this necessary. But no reservations should be attached to the ratification of the treaty itself, for the reason that it would exclude the United States from membership in the league if this were done, or bring the covenant into great confusion by inviting 50 nations to make reservations and amendments, to be in turn submitted to other nations and invite new amendments or reservations.

Mr. President, I think it should be remembered by the Senate that the sovereignty of the United States is vested in the people of the United States; that the Senate and House of Representatives merely occupy a position of temporary authority. No Congress can bind a succeeding Congress. Any Congress can, by act of Congress, repeal any treaty which is made. That is the law of the United States, as repeatedly construed by the United States Supreme Court. The effect of a treaty in the way of a promise to another nation only carries with it as valid and binding a moral obligation. A moral obligation, of course, is sufficient to bind the representatives of the people of the United States, but if, when they ratify this treaty with Germany, they should on the same day and in a separate instrument pass a resolution stating what, in the opinion of the Senate, is the limitation upon the power of the Senate, what is the interpretation of the Senate in agreeing to the covenant, it would completely meet every possible objection at any future time that the United States was not living up to its moral obligation, if any nation in the future should put upon the covenant a meaning which the Senate of the United States now believes they would have no right to put upon that covenant. In other words, we can meet the moral aspect by an independent resolution passed on the same day, without interfering with the ratification of this agreement, free from amendment or reservation.

I am in favor of ratifying it without amendment and without reservation, and I do not think it is even necessary to have a resolution such as I have described, although for those who are timid and fearful of a moral responsibility to nations in the future they can reconcile themselves to themselves and to the world by taking that course.

The league of nations—

First. Will prevent future war.

Second. Will establish world peace.

Third. Will promote international law and international understanding and international morality.

Fourth. Will promote international industry, commerce, and finance.

Fifth. Will promote higher conceptions of liberty and justice and humanity.

Sixth. Will save the enormous expenditures and waste in life and property of preparation for war and of war.

Seventh. The economic penalties of the present covenant are sufficient to prevent war without the use of international police; the international police being in existence does not imply and probably would not require its employment, except on very rare occasions.

Eighth. It will promote democracy throughout the world, the rule of the people, and make the Government responsible to the need, the welfare, the health, the happiness, the prosperity of the people.

Ninth. It will make international agreements relative to finance, commerce, and industry easier of accomplishment.

Tenth. It will give a new dignity to human life and exalt it above the conception of mere property, so that property would be considered as secondary to human life.

Eleventh. It will mean the freedom of the seas and freedom of international waterways, and a new birth of freedom throughout the whole world.

Twelfth. It will promote genuine democracy and end Bolshevism.

Thirteenth. It will stop civil wars that are now raging in certain demoralized portions of the world.

Fourteenth. It will promote the better interests of those who labor throughout the world, of those who create values and give them a larger part of the values which they create.

Fifteenth. It will put an end to dynastic ambition and to military atrocity forever.

Sixteenth. It will end the rule of the few over the many and establish the rule of the majority for the happiness of the majority and of the minority as well.

Seventeenth. It will not impair the internal sovereignty of any nation.

Eighteenth. It will abate racial and class prejudices.

The future success of the league is forecast by the success of the British Empire, by the success of the Government of the United States with its 48 sovereignties, living in peace and in the most abounding prosperity the world has ever known, for the very reason that they have complete cooperation instead of selfish conflict one with another.

The rules of international law are simple and few and impersonal, and can be adopted by unanimous agreement of the representatives of the nations.

SHANTUNG.

A tremendous outcry has been made over Shantung by the opponents of the treaty of peace with Germany.

The treaty, in articles 156 to 158, turns over to Japan the rights which Germany had under the treaty of March 6, 1898.

By this treaty with Germany China retained sovereignty over the Shantung Peninsula, giving Germany, however, certain railroad and mining rights therein and leased for 99 years to Germany a special tract which only involved 208 square miles of land and 200 square miles of water at Kiaochow, the total being less than 1 per cent of the Shantung Peninsula, which has 55,984 square miles. The population of the leased area where Germany was permitted to exercise sovereignty involved about 200,000 people.

When the war of 1914 arose, Germany, with the port facilities on the Chinese coast, was in a position to destroy the transports bringing troops from New Zealand and Australia.

Japan, on the invitation of the Allies, having entered the war in 1914, took the German concession by military force, broke up the port which the German ships had, and cleared the Pacific Ocean of German ships, giving a free right of way to the British transports.

On May 25, 1915, at Peking, Japan made a treaty with China by which the Chinese Government agreed to recognize any adjustment made between the Japanese Government and the German Government as to Kiaochow, but with the understanding, reduced to writing, at the same time and place, to wit:

PEKING, May 25, 1915.

That the land and concessions and rights of sovereignty leased or ceded to Germany should be returned by Japan to China upon the conclusion of the present war upon the condition of opening the Kiaochow as a commercial port, permitting a Japanese settlement there and an international settlement, and that suitable arrangements should be made for the disposal of the German public establishments and properties.

This was excellently well set forth by Senator ROBINSON in July 24, 1919, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3264. Various Japanese authorities have recently referred to this obligation of Japan, which will undoubtedly be carried out in perfectly good faith.

Viscount Uchida, minister of foreign affairs of Japan, in his address of January 21, 1919, confirmed this understanding, as did Baron Goto, former minister of foreign affairs of Japan, in a statement made in New York May 6, 1919. The Associated Press report from Paris of April 30, 1919, is of like effect. Baron Makino confirmed this pledge on April 30, 1919.

Japan is a wonderful nation. It is a great nation, and is entitled to the respect of all the world, especially of the great Allies with whom Japan joined forces for the defense of civilization and righteousness.

It has not been possible for Japan to carry out the arrangement with China up to this date for the obvious reason that the treaty concluding the war between Germany and Japan has not yet been presented to Japan.

It is to be profoundly regretted that Senators occupying such high responsibility on such an occasion, where the welfare of the whole world is in the balance, should speak words reflecting upon a great and friendly nation, whose fidelity has been so serviceable and whose right to our confidence and trust has been abundantly established in the history of recent years.

I have every respect and confidence in Japan and have not the slightest doubt that Japan will carry out in good faith her agree-

ment with China, and it is the orderly way to settle the Shantung matter by providing that Germany shall make a formal relinquishment to Japan, which conquered it, in order that Japan may herself, having cleared the title of German claims, transfer these lands and sovereignty back to China, as Japan agreed to do.

INVADING OUR SOVEREIGNTY.

Some of the hostile critics of the covenant insist that our sovereignty would be invaded by the provisions of the covenant; that the assembly or the council would pass laws authorizing the Japanese or Chinese to immigrate into the United States. This whimsical conceit has nothing to justify it. The league of nations does not contemplate dealing with anything except international questions, and does not contemplate dealing with intranational questions. None of the member nations contemplate giving up their sovereignty. None of them had such a conception. The only way a decision could be arrived at under the covenant, even on such questions, is by unanimous vote (art. 5). It is grossly unreasonable to argue that 45 nations would unanimously vote a precedent to invade their own sovereignty, and no reasonable man believes it or can believe it if he is capable of logical, consecutive thought.

Moreover, Mr. President, the sovereignty of the people of the United States as vested in the people of the United States, is inalienable, indestructible, and incapable of invasion. The Congress of the United States can not invade the sovereignty of the people of the United States. It might commit political suicide and be kicked out of office. But one Congress can not bind a succeeding Congress, for the very reason that the sovereignty is vested in the people, and they change their servants at will, and they can, by an act of Congress, repeal any treaty the Senate can pass if the Senate should pass a treaty that was unacceptable to the American people.

I shall not criticize the rhetoric or the verblage of the covenant. This covenant is wise. It is thoughtfully drawn. In its substance it is splendid. In its purpose it is glorious.

A perfect contract between scoundrels is worthless. An imperfect contract between trustworthy friends, who have fought and bled together in a common love of justice and liberty, is of very great value.

Are we justified in trusting the British people to faithfully and justly interpret this covenant? Did not that first wonderfully heroic army of British die almost to the last man in Flanders defending liberty and justice against the armed Hun? Did not the British sailors and men of war and destroyers ride through the misty darkness of the North Sea for five years, day and night, in storming seas defending the world against Teutonic aggression? Have they not shown themselves for a century our faithful friends?

It was Canning, the prime minister of England, in 1822, who served notice on the Holy Alliance that the British Government would not stand for the invasion of the liberties of the struggling Republics on the Western Hemisphere. It was through Canning and the influence of the British Government that Monroe was informed and encouraged to send his great message to Congress establishing the Monroe doctrine.

133035—19751

Shall we be afraid of France and refuse to trust France? Did they not, when this Republic was struggling for its liberties in the beginning come with all the force they had and all that we required to establish our liberties upon this continent? Did they not cede to us a mighty continent in the Louisiana Purchase? And have they not been faithful to the uttermost in defending civilization against the Teutonic allies?

Shall we doubt Italy? The Italian people have shown themselves to be glorious in war and magnificent in peace. When Paris was about to be struck down by the advancing field-gray troops of Germany, coming like swarms of locusts down upon the Marne, it was Italy that told the French statesman, "You need not guard the borders between France and Italy. Italy will not stand by Germany in a war of aggression." Italy made a treaty with Germany and Austria, a defensive alliance, against aggression on Germany and Austria, but not by Germany and Austria on undefended borders of others or any unprovoked assault upon their neighbors. Shall we question Italy when the Italians by tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands died for a common cause with us?

An agreement between scoundrels is worthless, no matter how well drawn. An agreement between these great nations who have common ideals and common purposes is worth while. It is a great step forward, no matter how awkwardly, how immaturely, how poorly drawn. The language and the rhetoric might be finer perhaps, but the purpose is there, the substance is there, and the covenant deserves the support of the American people.

Some of the critics of the league of nations complain it is not strong enough. I deny it. It is as strong as need be.

THE LEAGUE PROVIDES ABUNDANT FORCE.

The league provides a world-wide boycott, a world-wide blockade—commercial and financial—by land and by sea, and cuts off the citizens of any outlaw nation from communication with any other part of the world. This is the most gigantic penalty ever proposed in history.

The effect of the war with Germany was to destroy the value of the bonds issued by her and her allies, and reduce such bonds to the level of waste paper. This will serve to be a sound warning to the citizens of any future proposed aggressor nation that they can not afford to finance a war against the world with an overwhelming prospect of complete loss of every dollar invested in such a nefarious enterprise.

While it is impossible to think of a force much greater than a world-wide blockade and boycott against an outlaw nation, still the league goes further and provides that armed forces of all the nations of the world can be summoned, in addition to world-wide blockade and boycott, to reduce the outlaw nation to subjugation, to peace, and to recognition of international duties and international justice.

Moreover, it is to be assumed that since democracy had its modern birth, with the printing press and the French Revolution, and has grown like the green bay tree in the last 100 years until it has assumed to establish this covenant of a world-wide league for the purpose of protecting itself, there is no possibil-

ity of any nation in the world having the temerity to assail a democratic world and to put itself in the attitude of an outlaw nation.

There is not the slightest danger of Japan doing so, and if she did the powers visible at her very doors could be used to restrain Japan from any unlawful aggression against the peace of the world or of any of the other nations of the league.

The force is sufficient to safeguard the peace of the world, and far-seeing men will realize the gigantic character of the force which can be summoned through this league for the protection of mankind.

The league will safeguard the peace of the world, as well as our own. It will end war. It will not interfere with our sovereignty. It is the blessing of God descended on earth.

Mr. President, we are entering upon a thousand years of peace; into an era of great world prosperity; into an era where the productive capacity of man is being multiplied in a very wonderful way so that within the generation the time will come when every man, every industrious man, will be able to supply himself and his family with shelter, with clothing, with abundant good food, and be afforded an opportunity for education and for leisure to enjoy the providence of nature. Let us be devoutly thankful for the opportunity to bind the world together in bonds of amity and peace.

133035—19751

