

Proposed International Conference

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 19, 1923



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1923

39879—23665



SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. OWEN.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, this morning I sent to the desk a Senate resolution, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 445), as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to invite all the nations of earth, whether they have adhered to the covenant of the league or not, to attend, in the city of Washington, United States of America, a three months' international economic conference for the promotion of international trade and understanding, and a conference for the establishment throughout the world of the territorial integrity and political independence of every nation, great and small, and the abolition of war.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the time has come when the United States Senate should perform the duty of voicing throughout the world the doctrine of international justice, of international righteousness, and understanding, the doctrine upon which the peace of the world and the happiness of mankind must be based. If eventually, why not now?

The world is looking for the moral leadership of the one great disinterested, self-governing Nation.

The World War demonstrated the enormous physical power of the United States. It demonstrated its power to produce at high speed quantity and quality of munitions of war. It demonstrated the power of a peaceful democracy to organize for war. It demonstrated the power of our Republic financially, for without a quiver it raised forty thousand millions of dollars to finance the war and establish liberty and justice in the world. It demonstrated our unselfishness.

The statesmen of Europe are directly and indirectly appealing to America to point the path of peace and liberty. These appeals come from Great Britain, from Italy, from Belgium, from France, and from Germany.

From yesterday's press I clipped the following:

BRITISH LABORITES SEND APPEAL TO PRESIDENT—88 MEMBERS OF COMMONS ASK MR. HARDING TO SAVE EUROPE.

(By the Associated Press.)

LONDON, February 17.—Eighty-eight laborite members of the House of Commons have signed the following cablegram to President Harding: "America, with Great Britain, unwittingly has made France's present destructive action possible. We appeal for American cooperation to-day as the one hope of saving Europe."

President Baltasar Brum, of Montevideo, Uruguay, on February 10, made public a plan for an association of American nations which the delegation of Uruguay is to lay before the Pan American Congress at Santiago, Chile, next month, an abstract of which I hereto attach as Exhibit A.

The substance of President Brum's proposal is that the American nations should have a Western Hemisphere association to encourage the idea that international relations are

founded upon the principles of justice and solidarity, regardless of differences of race, customs, or religion, to intensify inter-American friendship and friendly relations with other countries of the world, and to solve by arbitration international conflicts and preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of every nation.

On Saturday, February 10, I submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Resolution No. 16 of the Legislature of Oklahoma, as follows:

Whereas it is made known by the American press that conditions in continental Europe grow daily worse; that nations, great and small, are tottering, unable to pay expenses; and

Whereas suffering among the people is increasing, famine threatens here and there, unemployment is growing, and a spirit of suicidal desperation has settled down over half the world; and

Whereas if step follows step and a new world war results this conflict by comparison will bleach the red horror of the last one, sweeping us along with the rest; and

Whereas the time to avert the European crisis is before it leads to a new conflict of nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Ninth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to give its sympathetic consideration to the following basic plan for a return to world sanity:

First. That the United States must assume the leadership;

Second. That at the first possible opening President Harding should call a conference of the leading World War powers;

Third. That the program at this conference should be in two sections, economic problems and limitation of armaments;

Fourth. That instantly the conference is called to order America's spokesman should lay before the assembly some specific plan of world rehabilitation which might involve an international moratorium on war debts and an international loan to the worst stricken nations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives this the 24th day of January, 1923.

CHAS. S. BRICE,

Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

This resolution from Oklahoma might be regarded as a motion in the assembly of nations and to all mankind calling for intelligent, concrete action, and a conference to promote commerce and end war. I ask the Senate of the United States to consider this proposal coming from the heart of America, from a legislature just elected by the people, a body of representatives who know and feel what the sentiment of the people is.

The proposal for action is timely. It is entitled to serious consideration and to a decision.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] on January 29 voiced from the State of Idaho in Senate Resolution 426 a conception similar to that which appeared in the Oklahoma Legislature. I am in accord with the Senator from Idaho, and would go still further concretely, directly, and simply. The time has come for action. The resolution of the Senator from Idaho represents the aspiration of the large majority of Americans.

On May 9, 1921, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] introduced Senate Resolution 74, protesting against the United States cooperating to carry into effect and enforce the terms of the treaty of Versailles, on the ground that the treaty of Versailles was influenced too largely by revenge; that it was a betrayal of the promises of the United States made to the world and formally accepted by the Allies as the basis of the

peace terms; that the Senate of the United States had refused to ratify it; that the people of the United States had indorsed the action of the Senate in objecting to the Versailles treaty.

The Senator from Wisconsin was reelected and renominated after this declaration by an overwhelming vote in Wisconsin. He represents also a very considerable element of public opinion in the United States.

Mr. President, the peoples of the world should no longer permit themselves to be put in danger of world war by the ambition, vanity, or self-sufficiency, or by the mere patriotism and physical courage of national leaders who demand the invasion of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other nations on any ground, real or fanciful.

The chief reason the invasion of Germany by French leaders is objectionable is because it is a denial of these fundamental international principles and because the remedy of French invasion is worse than the disease of German evasion. The Germans ought to be made to pay the reparations due, and the world ought to require it, but the French invasion of Germany by military force is building up hostilities so intense that it may again produce a world war without obtaining the justice to which the French people are undoubtedly entitled. Senators should not be deterred from expressing their honest opinions by the unthinking charge that they are taking sides with Germany against France. The principles of international justice must be declared without respecting persons or nations. It has been said that "God is no respecter of persons," and justice and liberty are the divine principles through which the peace and happiness of mankind must be secured, and these principles must not be twisted by either hate or love of any nation, whether French or German.

It is well to remember that there ought always to be made a broad distinction between the people and those who govern the people. The people can hardly be held morally responsible for things done against their will and without their consent by those who govern them without their consent, and this is why the subjects of the former Teutonic imperialists are entitled to some consideration because their consent was not asked. Their opinions were enslaved and the people were driven by a brute military force organized to the last degree which meant a summary death to any individual who dared refuse obedience.

How could the President of the United States have made clearer the distinction between the people who were subject and the rulers who subjected them without their consent in the Central Empires than he did in his address to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress January 8, 1918?

The President's address of January 8, 1918, was in answer to the desire of the spokesman of the Central Empires "to discuss the objects of the war and the possible bases of a general peace," and he spoke for the Entente Allies and all of them. He spoke expressly for the United States and for all the governments and peoples associated together against the imperialists.

The President said in regard to this:

We (the associated nations) can not be separated in interests or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end. For such arrangements and covenants (the 14 points) we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved.

39879-23665

The President said:

We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world—the new world in which we now live—instead of a place of mastery.

President Wilson said further in this address:

An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything that they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.

Who did the President speak for? He spoke for France, for Great Britain, for Italy—for the Allies as well as for the people of America—and the Allies adopted these principles, and on this declared basis the German leaders and the German people surrendered. Have we forgotten these 14 points? They are express covenants with Germany and the world. Can they ever be forgotten in international affairs? The 14 points were 14 explicit, contracted obligations. What are they?

1. Open covenants of peace. No private international understandings.
2. Freedom of the sea.
3. Removal of economic barriers. Equality of trade conditions.
4. Adequate guaranties to reduce national armaments to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.
5. Absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, recognizing of equal right the sovereignty of the populations concerned with the equitable claims of governments whose title is to be determined.
6. The treatment of the Russian people—political independence and welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing.
7. The evacuation and complete freedom of Belgium.
8. The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France.
9. The readjustment of the frontiers of Italy along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.
10. The freest opportunity of autonomous development of Austria-Hungary.
11. The evacuation of Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro. The political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States.
12. The sovereignty to the Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire, security to nationalities under Turkish rule, their autonomous development, and the opening of the Dardanelles.
13. The political and economic independence and territorial integrity of Poland inhabited by indisputably Polish populations.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike.

These are the covenants that the President of the United States declared "we (the Allies) are willing to fight for." Human liberty, international justice—this was the moral climax of the war. These were the objects put in concrete form for which we fought.

The authorities of the British Empire, the leaders of France, of Italy, of Japan accepted the doctrine laid down by Woodrow Wilson. These are the things for which America sacrificed. These are the things for which our American soldiers died. They did not lay down their lives to establish the principles of injustice, of territorial aggrandizement, of military ambition, or to support the petty vanities of any human leadership.

These are the pledges on which as a solemn contract the Germans laid down their arms and the Prussian military dynasty forever.

Mr. President, it is said that all legislation is a matter of compromise, and the treaty of Versailles was a matter of compromise. It has been, however, demonstrated that Woodrow Wilson used every ounce of his energy—social, physical, and moral—to get these 14 contracted terms and points recognized. If he did not succeed absolutely and completely, it was not because he did not go to the utmost limit of his powers. Perhaps he might have succeeded if he had had the whole-hearted support and understanding of all the American leaders. Unhappily, party divisions, party ambitions, party prejudices, perhaps, seriously weakened his efforts and did the world great injury.

I am sure that he believed that time would correct the failure of the Versailles treaty to fully meet the obligations to the world under the 14 points, such as self-government to the people of Shantung, to the people of Ireland, to the people of Egypt, and the matter of reparations. The Shantung controversy has settled itself. The Irish people have been given self-government. Large concessions have already been made to the people of Egypt, and various concessions have been made in the reparations matter; so that his foresight and hope have not been entirely disappointed nor without reason.

The doctrine of the right to rule without the consent of the governed has been almost entirely abandoned throughout the world. The doctrine of democracy, the right of the people to govern themselves, the doctrine of liberty, of the sovereignty of the people, their right to political independence and territorial integrity, is now a generally accepted doctrine throughout the world. The military autocracies have been annihilated.

Woodrow Wilson made a gigantic effort to convince the American people of the importance of accepting the Versailles treaty and the covenant of the league. He pointed out in many speeches throughout the country how the entry of the United States into this treaty, into the league, would give stability to the nations of the world; would bring disarmament, international peace, and a rapid restoration of the productive powers of mankind under the happy influence of complete international peace. Unhappily, his very great effort resulted in his very

serious and prolonged illness, for he was not physically strong when he entered upon the duties of the Chief Executive, and only by the most careful daily effort had he been able to keep himself equal to his task. In the fall of 1919 he was no longer physically able to carry on this contest. He was as much a martyr to the public service as any soldier that ever fell in battle, and history will in due time accord him the high place which his very great services justify.

Mr. President, America owes a duty to the world and to its own future to take the invited initiative in organizing the world to recognize the principles of international justice, liberty, and good understanding, and of the right of every nation, great or small, to territorial integrity and political independence.

WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIONS?

Certainly, Mr. President, there can be no objection to the United States giving voice to these principles in which we all unanimously believe, and a formal declaration would go far to strengthen these political doctrines throughout the world.

Certainly our entry into the League of Nations with such reservations as Congress might see fit, would wonderfully stimulate the great doctrines of liberty and international justice set forth in the covenant of the league.

THE ELECTION OF 1920.

Mr. President, there are those who imagine that the election of 1920, and there are those who have carried on a propaganda to the effect that the election of 1920, was a mandate from the American people not to enter the League of Nations. Nothing could be more absurd or so injurious to the world's interest as this pretension. If this grotesque notion that the American people voted against the League of Nations in the election of 1920 prevails it would mean the abandonment by America of the moral leadership of mankind.

The election of 1920 meant nothing of the kind. Both parties were committed to the covenant of the League of Nations. The Democrats voted for it without reservations and with reservations. The Republican Senators voted for it with reservations and some without reservations, and only a negligible number voted against it. The Democratic Party made it an issue in the campaign of 1920 and made the following declaration:

The Democratic Party favors the League of Nations as the surest, if not the only, practicable means of maintaining the peace of the world and terminating the insufferable burden of great military and naval establishments.

It was upon this basis that the President of the United States, in prearrangement with our allies, consented to a suspension of hostilities against the Imperial German Government; the armistice was granted and a treaty of peace negotiated upon the definite assurance to Germany, as well as to the powers pitted against Germany, that "a general association of nations must be formed, under specific covenants, for the purpose of affording mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike."

Upon this platform the Democratic candidate received 9,147,350 votes.

The Republican Party platform of 1920 made the following declaration with regard to the League of Nations:

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts and which

shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

We believe that all this can be done without the compromise of national independence, without depriving the people of the United States in advance of the right to determine for themselves what is just and fair when the occasion arises, and without involving them as participants and not as peacemakers in a multitude of quarrels the merits of which they are unable to judge.

It criticizes the covenant of the league as drawn and the insistence of the President in favor of the covenant without amendment; and in regard to the Republican Senate which had voted to adopt the covenant of the league with reservations the Republican platform said:

We approve their conduct and honor their courage and fidelity, and we pledge the coming Republican administration to such agreements with the other nations of the world as shall meet the full duty of America to civilization and humanity in accordance with American ideals and without surrendering the right of the American people to exercise its judgment and its power in favor of justice and peace.

As far as the public was concerned there was little or no difference between the attitude of this Republican platform and the Democratic platform, because the Democratic platform had no intention whatever to deprive the people of the United States "to determine for themselves what is just and fair" or to involve them in a multitude of quarrels, as stated in the Republican platform. The Democratic platform stated in terms, with regard to the League of Nations, that—

The President repeatedly has declared, and this convention reaffirms, that all our duties and obligations as a member of the league must be fulfilled in strict conformity with the Constitution of the United States, embodied in which is the fundamental requirement of declaratory action by the Congress before this Nation may become a participant in any war.

When on November 19, 1919 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8802), Mr. LODGE submitted the question of ratifying the covenant of the league with certain reservations, 41 Senators, including myself, voted for it, including nearly all the Republican Senators—

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Spencer
Calder	Hale	McLean	Sterling
Capper	Harding	McNary	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Newberry	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Warren
Dillingham	Keyes	Penrose	Watson
Edge	Lenroot	Phipps	
Elkins	Lodge	Smoot	

and five Democrats. The following Republicans voted against the treaty with the reservations:

Borah	Gronna	McCumber	Sherman
Brandegee	Johnson	Moses	
Fernald	Knox	Norris	
France	La Follette	Polindexter	

Some of these Republicans voted against it because they were opposed to the treaty on any ground whatever, such as Senators BORAH and JOHNSON of California, while others, including nearly all the Democrats, favored the treaty without these reservations, including all of the Democrats except five, and these Democrats were in favor of the treaty notwithstanding the reservations, so that the vote in the Senate of the United States was overwhelmingly in favor of the covenant of the league, with or without reservations.

Senator Harding, who was at that time a candidate for the Presidency, voted twice for the covenant of the league with reservations.

Nearly all the great Republican leaders were strenuously for the covenant of the League of Nations with or without reservations, for example:

Hon. William Howard Taft, formerly President, who was the president of the League to Enforce Peace, and now, by President Harding's appointment, Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. Taft, in signed articles in the Public Ledger and in interviews and addresses, strongly advised the friends of the League of Nations to vote for Senator Harding as the best, if not the only hope, for our entry into the league, and in an article in the Public Ledger immediately following the election Mr. Chief Justice Taft said:

The enemies of the league will maintain that the general verdict is one completely adverse to any league, but this will not be the reasonable judgment of those who have followed Mr. Harding's promises in his speech of acceptance, in his speech of August 28, in his Des Moines speech, and in his Indianapolis speech.

Hon. Elihu Root, former member of the Cabinet, Secretary of State, stood for the league with the Lodge reservations.

Charles Evans Hughes, twice Governor of the State of New York and Justice of the Supreme Court, nominee for President, and at the present time Secretary of State under President Harding—the same.

Gen. Leonard Wood, who was a leading candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, declared his—

Approval of the League of Nations with the Senate reservations—reservations which thoroughly Americanize it and leave America absolutely free and untrammelled to follow the only mandate she will ever accept—the mandate of American public opinion, the will of the American people.

Frank O. Lowden, twice Governor of Illinois, another leading candidate for the Republican nomination, stated in his primary campaign—

Another question is that of the League of Nations. I believe in the passage of the League of Nations covenant with reservations. I defend the action of Senators who insisted upon reservations to the charter submitted to them. * * * When the Republican Party is in power we shall, I hope, proceed to establish this machinery for adjusting international differences.

Herbert Hoover, whose friends were urging him for the Presidency, in the Public Ledger and the Chicago Daily News, said—

I stand earnestly for a League of Nations to minimize war, and, moreover, I stand for the league with alterations in the direction pointed by the Republican reservations.

And Herbert Hoover went so far as to say that—

The gravest peril to the cause of peace seems to me to be this, that JOHNSON and BORAH believe and are making the party and the country believe that they have made the issues and are dominating the campaign. If that false impression is allowed to go unchallenged, when they return to the Senate they will be able to draw to their side such Senate support as will enable them to block completely Senator Harding when, as President, he invites approval either of the existing league with reservations or—

And so forth. Vice President Coolidge on October 28 at Carnegie Hall, New York, said:

If the security of Europe is so intertwined with the Versailles treaty and the existing League of Nations that we can make the best progress

39879—23665

by taking the good in that treaty and in that covenant and by excising or amending those things which are not consonant with American traditions and habits, surely the Republican platform permits of such a course; surely the public declarations of Senator Harding permit such a course.

And so, many other of the Republican leaders, such as W. Murray Crane, of Massachusetts; William Allen White, of Kansas; Judge Nathan L. Miller, ex-Governor of New York; Lyman J. Gage, ex-Secretary of the Treasury; George W. Wickersham, ex-Attorney General; Charles D. Hilles, president of the National Republican Club; Oscar Straus, and so forth. It is perfectly notorious that the Republicans went before the people in 1920 with the assurance that Senator Harding was the best means by which to get effective favorable action on the League of Nations.

The Republican Party platform was framed in such a way as to prevent Senator JOHNSON, of California, or his supporters bringing about a party split, but the friends of the league believed in Harding and voted for him; and to say that the 7,000,000 plurality which he received was because President Harding was opposed to the League of Nations, for which he twice voted, is false and utterly preposterous.

There are other reasons which fully explain the 7,000,000 plurality which Harding received without the pretense that hostility to the league was the reason.

In the first place, the number of votes had been increased 50 per cent by the woman's vote; and, therefore, whatever the plurality, it would be largely increased by this new vote.

In 1916 the voters in America were exceedingly opposed to the entry of the United States into the war. The Democrats had made the campaign on the slogan "He kept us out of war," and on that slogan Woodrow Wilson received 9,129,606 votes against 6,286,214 in 1912, a gain of nearly 3,000,000 votes. This included the people who by descent or affiliation were sympathetic with the German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish people, the pacifists, and many of the socialists, and all those who wanted to keep out of war.

When Woodrow Wilson led us into war, as he was compelled to do by public opinion, these citizens turned from the support of the Democratic ticket like a shoal of herring, and the Republicans carried both the House and Senate in 1918.

The preelection letter of Woodrow Wilson in 1918 alienated many progressive Republicans, energized the Republican Party, and laid the foundation for the solidarity of all Republicans in 1920.

Many independents and Democrats, as well as progressive Republicans and people of no particular party activity, were incensed by the unavoidable annoyances of war activities, for example:

(a) The selective draft act called 10,000,000 men of all political complexions on June 5, 1917, and left hundreds of thousands of grievances.

(b) The Council of National Defense, necessary as it was, was organized down to the crossroads and offended hundreds of thousands.

(c) The antisedition act, with its spies, and so forth, a necessary act, nevertheless laid the foundation for a number of grievances against the party in power—the Democratic Party.

(d) The suppression of free speech, necessary in war to prevent the foolish from demoralizing our war activities, nevertheless offended thousands.

(e) The War Trade Board interfered with trade and commerce in innumerable ways and left hundreds of thousands of offended.

(f) The War Industries Board interfered in all sorts of ways with the industrial life of America—very necessary in time of war and commendable in the highest degree. Unnumbered grievances nevertheless were incited by the action of the War Industries Board.

(g) The food control under Hoover and fuel control under Garfield offended millions of the people. It mattered not if Hoover and Garfield were Republicans. The offense was committed by the Democratic administration and the grievance was against the Democratic Party.

(h) Priority orders on the railroads and embargoes on goods and gold offended hundreds of thousands of people.

(i) The Government control of railroads, the Government control of the telegraph and cable, the Government control of the telephones, the preferential treatment of military and naval business in men, materials, and transports over civilian business offended thousands.

(j) The commandeering of men and materials and outbidding civilians for labor and goods required for war broke up peacetime commercial standards and offended thousands.

(k) The high taxes of war, the excess taxes, the surplus taxes, and the methods of revenue collection and administration annoyed and incensed many.

(l) Necessarily the administration of war is autocratic even in a democracy and thousands were offended by this cause.

On top of all these things there was a resolute and tremendous propaganda carried on against Woodrow Wilson and his administration, due, of course, in part to these causes which are enumerated.

Then followed Wilson's physical illness and more or less Democratic demoralization and a serious discontent within the ranks of the Democratic leadership.

It was all of these things combined that led to Harding's very great plurality, not because of American hostility to the League of Nations.

The campaign of 1920 was carried on on the Republican slogan of so-called "anti-Wilsonism" and "we want a change." The American people wanted to get a change from the autocratic bureaucracy of war to the usual and more democratic processes of peace, and the election of 1920 reflected this sentiment.

But the American people, the overwhelming majority of the American people, believed in the principles of progressive democracy. Nearly all the Democrats are progressive and over half of the Republican citizens are progressive and have been for years, as was shown in the election of 1912 when Roosevelt received 4,126,020 votes and the lovable, genial Taft only 3,483,922. The American people are progressive, and they wish to have a progressive Government. This was most clearly indicated in the election of 1922 when so many stand-pat, conservative Republicans were defeated and progressive Republicans and

Democrats sent to the House of Representatives and the Senate by that election.

In Oklahoma not less than 75,000 Republicans voted the Democratic ticket in 1922.

The people of America are not altogether blind party followers, but to a large extent the people regard political parties as a means by which to make effective their will. The time has come when Congress and the Senate should voice the aspirations of America and of mankind for international liberty, international justice, international righteousness. If it did nothing more than express its opinion in an intelligible form it would probably suffice.

But, Mr. President, America should discharge its full responsibility before God and before man and call the leaders of the world together in Washington for an economic and political conference to complete the work of overthrowing militarism already so largely accomplished. It was a splendid thing, in pursuance of this great advance, which President Harding and Secretary of State Charles Evan Hughes accomplished in bringing about the four treaties limiting naval armament. It had my heartfelt approval because it was a fine step forward.

It is time to take another step forward.

It is time for President Harding to fulfill his promises to America.

It is time for the Republican Party to meet its promises of 1920 to America with regard to international peace.

Let us not be content to be silent and allow the days to pass by while another world war is being bred in Europe. It is our duty to Europe, as well as to our own people, to speak and to give the world a forum in which to speak, and the nations of the earth, when assembled in Washington City, in a favorable atmosphere, comparatively free from intrigue, will be able to give voice to the aspirations of the human heart, to the aspirations implanted in the soul of man by the Master Maker of men. It would be another Pentecost.

America will then be able to fulfill the high destiny for which she has through the last century been slowly and surely prepared.

Mr. President, our responsibility in this matter demands action.

America already has the financial and commercial leadership of the world and by equipment is the only great Nation capable of assuming the moral leadership of mankind and leading peacefully the way to international liberty, international understanding, international justice, international prosperity, and happiness.

39870-23665

