

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 30, 1919

Replying to the Speech of
Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge
of Massachusetts of
August 12, 1919



WASHINGTON

1919

135555—10825

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

SPEECH

BY

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

OF OKLAHOMA



SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 20, 1919

Printed by the Senate of the United States
at the Government Printing Office
August 22, 1919



WASHINGTON

1919

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. OWEN.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 12 last, the honorable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, and the chosen leader of the majority party in this Chamber, delivered a very carefully prepared argument against the league of nations. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized as a learned scholar and a very studious historian, and an argument which he delivers after the debate has proceeded for months may fairly be regarded as the ablest possible presentation of the case against the league of nations. If this argument can not stand an analysis, the case of the opposition to the covenant falls to the ground.

The honorable Senator lays down the first proposition:

That mankind from generation to generation is constantly repeating itself.

And says:

We have an excellent illustration of this fact in the proposed experiment now before us of making arrangements to secure the permanent peace of the world.

Thereupon he calls attention to the alluring promises made in the treaty of Paris of November 20, 1815, and the high purposes alleged in the treaty of the Holy Alliance, and shows historically that wars followed and not peace. He argued by necessary inference that these promises of peace and assurance of high purposes did not produce peace but war, and therefore that the declaration of purposes found in the present covenant of the league of nations would naturally be followed by war, because "mankind repeats itself."

The Senator quotes in derision the preamble to the covenant, and says:

Turn to the preamble of the covenant of the league of nations, now before us, which states the object of the league. It is formed—

"In order to promote international cooperation, to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international laws as the actual rule of conduct among governments and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another."

The Senator then said:

No one would contest the loftiness or the benevolence of these purposes. *Brave words, indeed. They do not differ essentially from the preamble of the treaty of Paris (1815), from which spring the Holy Alliance.*

In other words, Mr. President, the promises made by the treaty of the Holy Alliance having led to war, these promises will also lead to war, because "mankind repeats itself."

The obvious fallacy of this argument is that the *alleged* "purposes" of the Holy Alliance had nothing to do with the consequences which ensued from that alliance. War did not result from the virtuous promises made to the people by the Holy Alliance. The Holy Alliance made willfully, deceitful, and false promises of brotherly love and peace in order to deceive the people of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and thus prevent them from going into a revolution as the people had done in France under like conditions of tyranny and brute military power. The fact that wars followed the treaty of the Holy Alliance was because this treaty was between military dynasties, made by monarchical autocracies, each controlled by intrigue, by rival armaments, and by ambitious secret purposes. They were lined up against other similar governments at that time not greatly in advance of them in structure of government or in conception of liberty and popular rights. England, however, was becoming steadily more democratic, and soon withdrew from the treaty of Paris. France ultimately withdrew from the Holy Alliance. The cause of war was wrapped up in the treaty of the Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia because of their then several secret, dynastic, military ambitions. There was during that period no available or possible provision in the world providing for conciliation and arbitration in the settlement of international disputes. There was no means of promoting progressive disarmament, and the ambitions and the lust for power, unrestrained by law, unavoidably led to war as a necessary consequence. There was no adequate restraining power in all the world and no forum where the organized opinion and power of mankind could make itself effective for peace as there is available now.

The Senator from Massachusetts has shown himself unable to discriminate between the unavoidable consequence of war of governments based on tyranny and brute force, such as Russia, Prussia, and Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and the consequences favorable to peace of governments based on the consent of the governed, on justice and liberty, such as the United States and Canada, the South American Republics, Australia, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and Italy. Such blind leadership might easily prove to be a national calamity.

The Senator from Massachusetts has failed to discover what every student of history ought to know, who has a discerning mind and an intelligent comprehension, that the instability and wars of military dynasties had an adequate cause, and that these causes rest in the "Rule of the Few" moved by intrigue, by gross human selfishness, by ambition and lust for the property of other people, leading them to develop great armies nominally for defense, but always secretly for offense, so well described by Von Bernhardt, in his description of the Hohenzollers and of Frederick II. Everybody seems to know this except the Senator from Massachusetts. The stability of Republics and their power for peace is not based on preambles nor lofty promises of high purposes, as the Senator from Massachusetts seems to think. They are based upon sound principles affecting the structure of government, which go to guarantee justice and liberty and humanity and the organized righteous self-government of the people. These are the principles which guarantee stability. These are the principles which not only promise but will make sure the peace of the world.

The Senator loosely argues that since "mankind repeats itself," and since the Holy Alliance made virtuous "promises" and war followed, therefore that the virtuous promises of the present covenant of a league of free nations can mean nothing but war. The Senator argues from the false premise that the promises of the autocrats of the Holy Alliance were sincere. They were not sincere. They were wickedly false. I wondered, when the learned Senator was quoting the treaty of the Holy Alliance with its virtuous "promises," that he did not also quote the secret amendments to the treaty of the Holy Alliance of 1822, which disclose the infinitely wicked deceit of these promises—the secret treaty of Verona, in which the "holy alliance of liars" pledged their undying hostility to the democracies of the world and the freedom of the press. Since the Senator thinks it was the virtuous "promises" of the Holy Alliance that led to war, let me call his attention to their pledge to destroy the democracies of the world, and he will see, I trust, an abundant cause for war necessarily involved in the treaty of the Holy Alliance with its secret amendments at Verona, not because of their virtuous promises but in spite of them. Their secret purpose was war.

Listen to the philosophy and historical admonition of the secret treaty of Verona:

"The undersigned, specially authorized to make some additions to the treaty of the Holy Alliance, after having exchanged their respective credentials, have agreed as follows:

"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.

You can only put an end to a government by war.

"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." (Vol. 53, pt. 7, p. 6781, 64th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 25, 1916.)

The King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria were the real autocratic monarchs behind this deadly compact to destroy the democracies of the world and establish "world power" for themselves and their allies as the military autocrats of mankind.

Here these military autocrats, who had offered themselves to the people of Europe as the servants of Christ and the guardians of the peace of Europe, were, in fact, secretly pledging themselves to murder unoffending people of other lands who had the temerity to believe in representative government and in the liberty of a free press. They instantly made war on the unoffending Spanish and Portuguese people and the innocent Italian people, and put them all under absolute monarchies, and would have done the same thing to the South

American Republics but for Great Britain and the Monroe message.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts really believe that it was the virtuous "promises" of the Holy Alliance that led to war, or the "secret" purposes and ambitions of these military monarchical despots who were secretly plotting to rule the world by brute force? There is a vast difference, Mr. President, between the promises of an honest man or an honest government, of sincere well-meaning democracies, and the promises of trained liars, murderers, and self-seeking despots. And I feel fully justified in describing the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs and the Romanoffs in these plain terms.

The Senator from Massachusetts believes that the promises of these royal scoundrels may be justly compared with the promises and aspirations of the honest organized democracies of the whole world, basing an alliance not upon their pretenses of justice and liberty, but upon the demonstrated fact that they are truly willing to die for liberty and justice.

The Senator from Massachusetts really believes in the rule of the representatives of the people over the people in the rule of the few over the many. He would draw a wide distinction between "representative" government and government "by the people." He does not believe that the people of a State have a right to instruct or control their elected Representatives or to initiate and pass the laws that they want or to veto laws they do not want. *He thinks that for the people to express their opinion upon a public question is dangerous to the principle of constitutional government.*

Am I hasty in making this charge against the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate? I most certainly am not. The Senator from Massachusetts may have forgotten, but I have not forgotten, his famous speech in Boston on September 15, 1907, for I had been but two days in the Senate when, on December 18, 1907, Senator Hale, of Maine, had printed 20,000 copies of this famous speech of the Senator from Massachusetts as Senate Document 114, Sixtieth Congress, first session. This speech was delivered in opposition to a bill then pending in the Massachusetts Legislature known as the "Public-opinion bill." The "Public-opinion bill" proposed to permit the people of Massachusetts the astounding liberty of expressing their opinion upon a public measure—but not exceeding four measures in any one year. This bill Senator Lodge violently opposed on the ground that it would overthrow the constitution of Massachusetts and destroy representative government. I shall not challenge the Senator's integrity of mind or his integrity of purpose in making this speech. I shall assume that he honestly believed that the opinion of the people was dangerous to constitutional government. In all events, this was his argument.

Twenty thousand copies of his speech were sent into Maine in order to defeat a campaign then pending for the initiative and referendum in that State.

The Senator said in criticizing the public-opinion bill that it—*would mean nothing less than a complete revolution in the fabric of our Government and in the fundamental principles upon which the Government rests.*

That it—*would undermine and ultimately break down the representative principles in our political and governmental system.*

135555—19825

With the assistance of Kingsbury B. Piper, secretary of the State Referendum League of Maine, I prepared and had printed as a memorial to Congress the answer of the State Referendum League of Maine to the Senator from Massachusetts (Senate Document 521, 60th Cong., 1st sess.). I caused 20,000 copies to be printed and I franked them to Maine, and when the people of Maine came to pass upon the validity of the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts that *the people should have no right to express their opinions on public questions*, either by public-opinion statute or by the initiative and referendum, they decided against the argument of the learned Senator from Massachusetts, and the honorable Senator from Maine who circulated the famous Boston speech against the public-opinion bill did not find it desirable to stand for reelection.

In the State of Massachusetts, in the last election, when the people were selecting their delegates to a constitutional congress there was a campaign in behalf of the initiative and referendum. I had prepared by the National Popular Government League, by Judson King, secretary, an argument for this great measure of popular government, and caused it to be printed as Senate Document 763, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, which was used in the Massachusetts campaign in favor of the initiative and referendum. An overwhelming majority of the delegates who had favored it were elected, and even the president of Harvard, who opposed it, was defeated. Senator Weeks opposed it, and he was defeated, and Senator WALSH, who favored it, was elected, and is now present in the Senate.

I commend the judgment of the people of Maine and Massachusetts to the considerate judgment of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts. His leadership against popular government has failed both in Maine and in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The Senator from Massachusetts does not believe in the wisdom of the people. He does not believe that the people have the intelligence to initiate laws they do want or to veto laws they do not want, and therefore he does not have any great degree of confidence in the stability of a league of the great democracies of the world or their ability to make sure their own peace. He looks upon them with less confidence than he did upon the military autocracies that framed the treaty of the Holy Alliance, for the Senator favored a league in 1915 when the autocracies were in full flower.

I am devoutly thankful that there are hundreds of thousands and millions of Republicans in the United States who do not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts in this view, and that there are on this floor splendid Republican Senators who do believe in popular government and in the right of the people to govern and who have confidence in democracies.

And I pause to say, Mr. President, that those who believe in popular government are deeply desirous of having passed through the Senate a thoroughgoing corrupt-practices act, and I appeal to the Senator from Massachusetts to give his support to such a bill in order that the "*representative system*" of selecting Senators and Congressmen may not be perverted by the corrupt and sinister influences that by money and fraud are able unduly to influence the nomination and election of Congressmen

and Senators. For six years the Progressive Senators on this floor have been trying to get a thoroughgoing corrupt-practices act, but have not been able as yet to do so. Why? I will leave to those who opposed it and to those who do not favor it and to those who secretly throw the weight of their influence against it to answer that question before the end of the next session of Congress.

The Senator's whole argument is based upon his inability to perceive the difference between the relative trustworthiness of democracies and autocracies, and in his violent assaults upon the league he tries to show that we ought to have no league of nations at all. He goes so far as to denounce the banner of the proposed league of nations of the free nations of the earth, of our wonderful Allies, of our heroic Allies, who died for liberty and justice and civilization as a "mongrel" banner, and he attaches to the league of nations the unmerited stigma of "Bolshevism" as illustrating wicked "internationalism" as contrasted with his own admirable "Americanism."

Mr. President, all good Americans believe in Americanism in its highest and purest and truest meaning.

Mr. President, a man can be a good citizen of a town, of a county, of a state, of a nation, and of a world without inconsistency. He can love his home and be utterly devoted to his own nation, and be a glorious American, and yet be generously disposed and favor international justice and liberty and good neighborhood, and the means of attaining them.

The galleries always applaud when a Senator strikes an oratorical pose and thunders forth his sturdy Americanism, and the Senator from Massachusetts did not fail to strike this popular chord. The Senator gloriously said:

Call me selfish if you will, conservative, or reactionary; but an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first.

Fine! This is magnificent. The galleries bursted with applause, but, Mr. President, in June, 1915, at Union College, the Senator was still an American whether "selfish, conservative, or reactionary," and he told the world then in language clear and forceful—and I use his own words—that—

Nations must unite as men unite to preserve peace and order.

He stated that nations must be so united as to be able to say to any single country—

You must not go to war.

Fine! This is splendid, but a flat contradiction of his present attitude that nations must *not* unite to preserve peace and order; that they must *not* be so united as to say to any single country "You must not go to war."

The Senator's Americanism at Union College did not prevent his making an earnest argument in favor of a league of nations, and when he made the argument in favor of a league at Union College it was fine Americanism. It was fine Americanism when Theodore Roosevelt made the same argument in receiving the Nobel prize at Christiania in 1910. President Taft shows his fine Americanism when he loves America and loves his fellow men throughout the world and stands for a program of assured peace through the honest cooperation of all the great democracies of earth.

It is fine Americanism when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and other patriotic Republicans and Democrats stand on this floor and urge a league of free nations.

The Senator from Massachusetts must not attempt to monopolize Americanism, for selfishness or partisanship in foreign affairs does not describe Americanism.

When Germany and Austria and Bulgaria and Turkey, the great military dynasties, were at the height of their power the Senator from Massachusetts argued in favor of nations uniting to prevent war. He was willing to admit military dynasties to a league of nations to prevent war, but now that the military dynasties have been humbled to the dust, now that brute force based on the doctrine that might makes right has been utterly overthrown by the honest peace-loving democracies of the world, the Senator rises up as the chief opponent of what he himself generously argued as a good American in 1915.

Mr. President, am I going too far if I appeal from "Philip drunk to Philip sober"?

The one great gigantic fact of all history has occurred to assure and make possible the future peace of the world and to make it comparatively easy to establish peace, and that is the overthrow of arbitrary power, the overthrow of the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, the Romanoff and their brood of princes, grand dukes, et id omne genus, and the establishment of the great doctrines of liberty, justice, and self-government and the establishment of the overwhelming power of the democracies of the world.

The Senator from Massachusetts fails to recognize the one great event which makes this war the most notable war of all history and which alone opens wide the door to permanent world peace.

The Senator from Massachusetts having argued that it was un-American to recognize this "mongrel" flag of the free nations of earth, proceeds, absurdly enough, to argue that he and his colleagues will accept the "mongrel" flag and all its evils provided reservations be inserted in the ratification, which do not really change the meaning of it, but would prevent any friendly ally in the future from changing the meaning of it.

The Senator does not recognize any difference between the *legal and moral* obligations of the league. He says treaty obligations are merely moral obligations, and with this view I am in entire accord. But, Mr. President, an interpretative resolution separate from the resolution of ratification of the treaty interpreting the meaning of the covenant would protect the United States from the possibility of any future charge of moral delinquency by any nation on earth, and prevent any nations, friendly or otherwise, from charging that the United States refused to do what it agreed to do. The only difference between the effect of a resolution separate and apart as an interpretation and an amendment or reservation in the face of the ratifying resolution is, that the latter would require the action of all other nations, might produce serious confusion, would certainly postpone final action for some months at a time when prompt action in declaring peace is of the highest importance, while a resolution of interpretation would avoid these obvious objections. There is one possible *partisan* advantage in putting amend-

ments and reservations on the proposed league. It might to that extent discredit with some of our own people and with those of foreign countries the President of the United States and the members of the peace conference who represented the United States at Paris.

Is it un-American if I should feel unwilling to discredit our representatives, either at home or abroad, unnecessarily? The delay in ratifying the peace treaty is paralyzing our export trade. Our favorable balance of trade fell off \$400,000,000 in the month of July in 31 days. Our foreign-exchange market has gone into complete demoralization awaiting the determination of the conditions of peace.

We hear no proposal from Great Britain or France or Italy or Belgium or Japan for putting amendments into this proposed league. They do not have any fear that the friendly nations of the earth, based on self-government, liberty, and justice will misinterpret the covenant to their disadvantage. None of them have imagined that they were relinquishing their rights of self-government or subjecting themselves to the coercion of a league of foreign nations. On the contrary, they wrote into the league section 10, for the protection of the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every nation. This covenant was drawn up by the ablest men in the world—if the Senator from Massachusetts will pardon the apparent neglect—chosen men representing all of the great nations. It was subjected to the closest scrutiny. It carries out and makes possible the aspirations of The Hague conventions with the addition of methods for conciliation and arbitration and disarmament and means for protecting the territorial integrity and existing political independence of nations by boycott, blockade, and even armed force, which will assuredly rarely, if by any possibility ever, be necessary.

This should not be made a partisan question. The Senator from Massachusetts taught me the sound doctrine in one of the great maxims of the United States Senate, which has been honored for a hundred years, and that is—

Party lines cease at tide water.

Is it un-American if I appeal to the honorable Senator to sustain this venerable and worthy maxim of the Senate? Why does he, before the treaty arrives, sign his round robin? Why does he marshal his political followers as far as he can in hostility to the aspirations of mankind? The world is weary, utterly weary, of war. The industries, the commerce of the whole world have been profoundly shaken by the gigantic destruction and waste of this war.

The cost of living because of this Great War has become painful and irksome to the people of the whole world. It is of the most urgent importance that we get back to the basis of peace, in order that we may address ourselves to solving the problem of the high cost of living in this country, which is greatly perplexing to the Congress as well as the people at home.

The unhappy people of Europe are struggling to reestablish themselves. Millions of men, women, and children have died in this great struggle to establish on earth human liberty and the right of the people of the earth to self-government. Side by side in the hills and in the valleys of France lie thousands of our beloved sons with the cherished youth of Great Britain,

Belgium, France, Italy, and of our other allies. They died in a war whose great purpose was to overthrow arbitrary power, to establish government upon a sound basis of the consent of the governed, to establish forever "Peace on earth, good will toward men." Surely it is not un-American that we should desire that their infinite sacrifice should not be in vain. Honest democracies do not want war, nor the cost of war, nor to have their children die in battle. The people who pay the cost of the war, who send their sons to die upon the battlefield, who pay the taxes of war, and control democracies will not permit war that can possibly be avoided.

Perhaps without a league the future peace of the world might be accomplished, but a league of free nations of the earth, established with the power to say to outlaw nations "You must not go to war," as the Senator from Massachusetts so finely argued in June, 1915, at Union College, will secure and make certain the ends for which the youth of the world was sent to the battle fields to die.

May I not be permitted to appeal to the better Americanism of the Senator from Massachusetts not to throw himself across the path of human progress and world peace? He is not (as he thinks) waging a war against Woodrow Wilson; he is waging a war against the desires and the hopes of all mankind.

We have joined the sons of France, Great Britain, and Italy and our other great allies in breaking down the military autocracies of Europe. Are we not in honor bound to stand by our allies until the new governments, the new democracies of Europe, are established and made stable by the stabilizing force of the organized powers of mankind that league to preserve peace?

Shall we scuttle like cowards and cravens from the wounded peoples of Europe before the nations born of this war can balance themselves and be at peace and a blessing to themselves and to the world when with the league of the great democracies we can easily assure them stability and peace?

Is it un-American to carry out our implied obligations to Europe?

Mr. President, the honorable Senator from Massachusetts interprets article 10 to mean that the council in *advising* the means to be employed to preserve the territorial integrity and the existing political independence of member nations will be authorized to send American troops to the ends of the earth in every petty quarrel that might arise anywhere in the world.

The Senator urges that we would have a "moral" obligation to take the advice, and the "moral" obligation being as strong as a legal obligation we would be obliged to obey or be guilty of a breach of our moral obligations, a thing absolutely inconceivable to the austere Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator greatly enlarges upon this great, unhappy thought and in his imagination he sees our soldiers sent into central Arabia to protect the Sultan of Hejaz under the irresistible advice of the council.

Mr. President, with the establishment of a league of nations, with the great democracies of the world in honest cooperation, there are many provisions which will prevent war or the need of soldiers.

For example:

Every means possible for conciliation.

13555—19825

Every means for arbitration, and at last if a nation be determined to be an outlaw nation in violation of the organized opinion of mankind, and then invades the territorial integrity of a member nation and its existing political independence, there is a penalty so gigantic that no nation would dare to face it. That is, a world boycott, a complete separation of that outlaw nation and of its nationals from any commercial, financial, postal, telegraphic, or any other means of communication with the citizens of other nations.

No nation could stand this. But this is not all. It is only on the extremely remote if not impossible contingency that this would not suffice to restore an outlaw nation to sanity, then and then only would it be necessary for the council to "advise" means of military and naval coercion.

It is to be assumed by men of common sense and common honesty that the council in such a remote contingency would give sensible and honest advice and that the great, honest, peace-loving democracies of the earth would act in good faith in regard to the advice.

If in the extremely remote contingency which might thus arise the still more unlikely occurrence should take place that the advice should prove foolish or tyrannical, no nation would be compelled as a "moral" obligation to observe idiotic advice.

The Senator from Massachusetts is unduly alarmed. He is seeing ghosts which do not exist.

Article 10, pledging every member nation its territorial integrity and existing political independence, is vital to the peace of the world, and under no circumstances should this assurance be removed from the treaty or modified.

The Senator finds an insuperable difficulty in article 15 because it provides that any dispute may be submitted to the council, and the council might submit it to the assembly, and the assembly might make a "report" unfavorable to the United States, and the dispute might be on the question of immigration with Japan. Terrible! The answer is, first, that no such dispute could arise, because it would be an invasion of our existing political independence and territorial integrity, and, second, if it did arise, in spite of the article 10, in spite of the preamble to the treaty, and the council did not throw it out of court because it was "solely within the domestic jurisdiction" of the United States, and, finally, if the entire assembly made a report against the United States, nothing would follow, because nothing could follow under article 15, except *that Japan might wage a war, and she can do that now*. Nothing would follow, because there is nothing in the treaty to compel the enforcement of the opinion or report of the assembly in that particular.

It is left to the parties unable to settle their controversy under the report then to resort to war, in which the world will take no part except conciliation, world opinion, and world influence. The report is not made enforceable by article 15. Such a report is only of the same force as a report by the council, wherein the members agree not to go to war against a member who complies with the recommendations of the report. If the council fails to reach a unanimous report the members reserve liberty of action.

We would not be any worse off if the three times impossible should happen, as imagined by the Senator, for Japan could

make war on us now if Japan wished to do so. Besides that, we could withdraw from the league of nations if we did not like the administration of it. There is not the slightest possibility, however, that any nation will ever withdraw from this league once it has entered into it, because this league will work to perfection, giving a forum, a meeting place, where the nations of the world can come together and use there the common sense and common honesty of the human race, and that will be found sufficient.

The Senator is seeing ghosts, which were not visible at Union College. The Senator declares that if other nations are willing to subject themselves to the *domination* of a league, he will never, never consent for the United States to be *dominated* by the league.

The Senator need not trouble himself. Other nations are not willing to subject themselves to the *domination* of a league, but enter into the league for the purpose of protecting themselves against the *domination* of outlaw military tribes or nations who are not yet sufficiently advanced in civilization to appreciate the blessings of liberty and justice and self-government.

The Senator is very much frightened about the Monroe doctrine, and it is extremely difficult for me to believe in the sincerity of those who argue the Monroe doctrine will be weakened by the proposed covenant which explicitly recognizes it and implicitly confirms it by every principle of the proposed covenant.

The Senator is terribly afraid that we can not withdraw, because he thinks that we could not withdraw *except by unanimous vote*, that all our international obligations and all obligations under the covenant had been fulfilled. It never crossed the mind of any honest man who had part in framing this league covenant that any member could be refused the right to withdraw on any such ground. Such an interpretation is not only contradicted by the President of the United States but is absurd. Of course, a nation in withdrawing should withdraw and discharge its obligations at the same time. But the Senator proves too much. He discovers that it requires *unanimous* action to withdraw.

If it were an *affirmative action of the league* (which it is not) it might be true—for an affirmative action of the league does require *unanimous* consent—but this discovery entirely destroys the long argument which the Senator makes about the league dominating the United States, interfering with immigration, tariffs, and so forth, as no one is stupid enough to contend a *unanimous* vote of the assembly to deal unjustly with any nation is possible.

The Senator greatly enlarges upon the United States meddling in the internal affairs of the nations of Europe. There is nothing in the league of nations which justifies this notion of the Senator from Massachusetts. On the contrary, the 10th article prevents any interference with the existing political independence of the nations. It was necessary, in setting up the new Governments of Europe, made up out of the heretofore subject peoples of Austria and Germany, to provide the means by which they should be established, including Turkey and Bulgaria; but beyond this the treaty does not go, and in this the covenant of the league takes no part.

Mr. President, I favor the liberty and freedom of all peoples sufficiently advanced to govern themselves or under mandatories where backward and not yet qualified. I wish to see Ireland free and the Philippines. I wish to see Egypt and Porto Rico free; I wish to see India and Korea free to govern themselves, and given honest, faithful help to accomplish this end in safety and peace.

The members of the league, article 23 (b), "undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control."

What is the just treatment referred to? It can be nothing less than liberty, freedom, and self-government, such as was involved in the proposals of President Wilson as a basis of the armistice, and which was accepted by all our great allies.

We set the example in Cuba, we are following it in the Philippines, we must perfect it in Porto Rico, and we must use our influence in having this element of justice carried out throughout the world undeterred by commercial or industrial selfishness.

Mr. President, the league of nations in this covenant is a league between the great, honest, peace-loving democracies and free nations of the whole earth.

Its moral influence for peace and good will toward men is the greatest power ever invoked for the peace, the happiness, the prosperity of mankind. It not only proposes peace; it provides the most abundant means and mechanism by which to accomplish it. It provides the completest means for the conciliation of disputes and the settlement of controversies by arbitration.

It provides for disarmament and the reduction of the military and naval forces of mankind down to police purposes.

It puts an end to military dynasties. It establishes the great principles of liberty, justice, and the self-government of the people of the whole world.

On such principles it safeguards the backward peoples of the world and provides a means for leading them forward to civilization without exploitation.

It provides for the protection and preservation of the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every nation.

It provides the means to enforce the rights of member nations against aggression.

It establishes in the council and in the assembly a meeting place where all the nations of the world may in one chamber communicate with each other freely and openly.

It puts an end to secret treaties and political intrigue and military dynasties and the doctrine of divine right and the doctrine that might makes right and establishes on earth the rule of conscience, the rule of morality, the rule of international decency and justice and good neighborhood. It is not a mere peace of idealism based on a rosy dream. It is a real living, vital force, born on the battle field out of the blood of all of the nations of earth. The world will not go back. It is moving forward under the leadership of God and the everlasting doctrines of Christ. Let the Senator from Massachusetts beware of throwing himself across the path of the righteous judgment of mankind.