























Woodrow Wilson

# The Lake English Classics

---

REVISED EDITION WITH HELPS TO STUDY

---

## DEMOCRACY TODAY

AN AMERICAN INTERPRETATION

EDITED FOR SCHOOL USE

BY

CHRISTIAN GAUSS

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

---

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY  
CHICAGO NEW YORK

7619  
93  
1919

COPYRIGHT 1917, 1919 BY  
SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY



JUN 16 1919

©CL.A529043

201



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION .....	7
LINCOLN—GETTYSBURG ADDRESS.....	17
LOWELL—DEMOCRACY .....	19
CLEVELAND—THE MESSAGE OF WASHINGTON.....	49
ROOSEVELT—OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A NATION.....	59
WILSON—THE MEANING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPEND- ENCE .....	63
WILSON—THE AMERICAN OF FOREIGN BIRTH.....	75
WILSON—AMERICA FIRST.....	81
WILSON—THE SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP.....	90
WILSON—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	96
WILSON—A WORLD LEAGUE FOR PEACE.....	102
WILSON—MESSAGE TO CONGRESS.....	113
WILSON—REQUEST FOR A GRANT OF POWER.....	119
WILSON—WAR MESSAGE .....	126
WILSON—FLAG DAY ADDRESS.....	141
WILSON—REPLY TO THE POPE.....	151
LANE—WHY WE ARE AT WAR.....	156
ROOT—THE DUTIES OF THE CITIZEN.....	163
WILSON—WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS.....	182
WILSON—SECOND WAR MESSAGE.....	194
WILSON—PROGRAM OF THE WORLD'S PEACE.....	203

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
WILSON—ADDRESS TO CONGRESS.....	219
WILSON—THE END OF SELFISH DOMINION.....	229
WILSON—THE MOUNT VERNON ADDRESS.....	235
WILSON—PEACE WITH JUSTICE.....	240
WILSON—ATTITUDE OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARD MEXICO	250
WILSON—THE END OF THE WAR.....	257

## APPENDIX

LLOYD GEORGE—THE MEANING OF AMERICA'S ENTRANCE INTO THE WAR.....	1
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.....	9
BIOGRAPHICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES.....	29
LLOYD GEORGE—BRITAIN'S WAR AIMS NEWLY DEFINED...	107
INDEX .....	117
SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL	
Helps to Study.....	124
Theme Subjects.....	135
Selections for Class Reading.....	137

## INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this volume to provide certain important documents of abiding value which will help students in secondary schools and colleges to understand the situation in which the country finds itself today, and which will serve also to clarify their ideas on the purposes and significance of America.

The consciousness of any fixed, national purpose has never been strong in the minds and hearts of Americans. Our first impulse is angrily and emphatically to deny this, for we have never admitted that we were lacking in anything, even in ideals. What other nations possessed which was good, we too wished to have,—and on a “bigger” scale. Yet this deficiency in our national psychology has forcibly impressed foreigners. To them we are only too often a people of adventurers with no set goal, at best active and intrepid, making and breaking our own ideals. We impressed the stranger as Hannibal impressed the Roman historian. To us there is *nihil sancti*, nothing sacred: So Kipling found us:

We shake the iron hand of fate  
And match with destiny for beers.

Such an attitude as is attributed to us would pretty surely tend to make us overlook or minimize one main question that we, like all nations, must face. Of this question H. G. Wells in *The Future of America* writes: “The problem in America, save in its scale



and freedom, is no different from the problem of Great Britain, of Europe, of all humanity; it is one chiefly moral and intellectual; it is to resolve a confusion of purposes, traditions, habits, into a common, ordered intention."

That this problem should have received so little attention in America at large is due not to any absence of great leaders, or to any failure on the part of our leaders beginning with Washington to set before us such an "ordered intention." It has been due to the fact that we have been feverishly engaged in other problems; the exploitation of our natural resources, the development of industry, and the attempt to assimilate a vast immigrant population. It was due also to the further fact that living in a continent with no powerful or aggressive neighbors, we felt wrongly that we could, for the present at least, pursue a policy of isolation unmolested. We have lived in a provincialism of soul of which we were not conscious and which it has taken a world-catastrophe to shatter.

Yet around one fundamental ideal we have all and always rallied. No matter from what part of the earth we or our forefathers came, America is a democracy. Democracy and republicanism are often used interchangeably, though the latter refers rather to the form of government and the former to its spirit. That we are a republic is one of the fortunate accidents of history, for the men of '76 did not go to war for the purpose of electing a president of their own, but because they refused to

be governed by a body in which they were not represented. If then, the War of Independence was not waged primarily for the purpose of founding a republic, it was waged in the interest of democracy, in the interest of founding a government which on the one hand should be responsible to the people and for which on the other, the people should be responsible.

Any particular state is merely the expression of an ideal of society and when the Revolution had ended and the time had come to shape a constitution, it was natural that our forefathers should have chosen a republican form of government, in which not only are the policies to be pursued formulated by the citizens through their representatives, but the executives of these policies are also named by them.

In modern times and on so large a scale, the experiment was new and we have the distinction of having been the first of the great modern republics. The experiment, and such it was, was viewed abroad with interest and suspicion. During our early trials, and they were many and serious, few on the other side of the Atlantic believed that the new and struggling government could endure. For not only was our state a new departure, but the way of life of the colonists also; and the structure of their society differed in many respects from that of the great European powers. We had, to be sure, inherited the liberal traditions of the English law and the English constitution, but the great European states still maintained the social order known as feudal, developed in the Middle Ages and based upon the existence and official

recognition of privileged classes. Of such a class and such a feudal tradition we knew nothing, and the ignorance was a fortunate one.

If the little republic embarked upon an uncharted sea, it did so under the most favorable conditions ever vouchsafed to man. A people of pioneers, unhampered by constraining traditions, we were threatened by no fear of invasion by powerful and aggressive neighbors and we had been given as our inheritance what was to become the richest section of the habitable globe. Our past could not hamper us, and the future with untold wealth and an almost unlimited domain, lay before us "like a land of dreams." We were free as no European nation could possibly be free to carry out in relative peace and security the great democratic experiment. Before the world our rich endowment brought with it a corresponding responsibility never adequately recognized by the mass of our citizens. We have been justly regarded by others and should more frequently and seriously regard ourselves as the initiators of and the sponsors for the democratic idea; government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Lincoln put it in memorable words. It was such a state based on ideas of freedom and social and political equality that Washington sought to found, that Lincoln maintained against internal division, and that President Wilson is now defending against unwarranted foreign interference and the unprovoked aggression of an autocratic power. Our democracy today is for the first time in history called upon to

justify itself and to defend itself against autocracy. The aim of democracy is the liberty and welfare of the individual; the aim of autocracy is the power of the rulers and the state. The idea of conquest, of forcing an alien rule upon a strange people is foreign to the spirit of democracy. It is, however, of the essence of autocratic governments. It is well, therefore, that we now bethink ourselves and take counsel with our leaders.

---

It is a mistake to believe that democracy as we know it in America is a form of government sanctioned by classical examples reaching back to remote antiquity and with a long tradition behind it. Those who are tempted to believe otherwise should read carefully a passage written in 1901 by no less an authority than Woodrow Wilson.

“As a matter of fact democracy as we know it is no older than the end of the eighteenth century. The doctrines which sustain it can scarcely be said to derive any support at all from the practices of the classical states, or any countenance whatever from the principles of classical statesmen and philosophers. The citizens who constituted the people of the ancient republics were, when most numerous, a mere privileged class, a ruling minority of the population taken as a whole. Under their domination slaves abounded, and citizenship and even the privileges of the courts of justice were reserved for men of a particular blood and lineage. It never entered into the thought of any ancient republican to conceive of all men as equally entitled to take part in any government, or even in

the control of any government, by votes cast or lots drawn. Those who were in the ranks of privileged citizenship despised those who were not, guarded their ranks very jealously against intruders, and used their power as a right singular and exclusive, theirs, not as men, but as Athenians of authentic extraction, as Romans of old patrician blood.

“Modern democracy wears a very different aspect, and rests upon principles separated by the whole heaven from those of the Roman or Grecian democrat. Its theory is of equal rights without respect of blood or breeding. It knows nothing of a citizenship won by privilege or inherited through lines of descent which cannot be changed or broadened. Its thought is of a society without castes or classes, of an equality of political birthright which is without bound or limitation. Its foundations are set in a philosophy that would extend to all mankind an equal emancipation, make citizens of all men, and cut away everywhere exceptional privilege. ‘All men are born free and equal’ is the classical sentence of its creed, and its dream is always of a state in which no man shall have mastery over another without his willing acquiescence and consent. It speaks always of the sovereignty of the people, and the rulers as the peoples’ servants.

“Democracy is the antithesis of all government by privilege. It excludes all hereditary right to rule, whether in a single family or in a single class or in any combination of classes. It makes the general welfare of society the end and object of law, and declares that no class, no aristocratic minority, no single group of men, however numerous, however capable, however enlightened, can see broadly enough or sufficiently free itself from bias to perceive a nation’s needs in their entirety or guide its destinies



for the benefit of all. The consent of the governed must at every turn check and determine the action of those who make and execute the laws.”

Neither is our democracy the first and primitive form of government as is sometimes supposed. It is as a matter of fact the latest form of government, designed to give the individual the greatest degree of liberty and responsibility. We must not therefore regard it as something which will “run itself” or which has “always been so.” Indeed men of great authority like the English political historians, Lecky and Sir Henry Maine, have looked upon certain recent popular tendencies with grave misgiving. Maine admitted that the great tendency of recent decades has been to turn power more and more into the hands of the people, but felt that the movement was not intelligent, that the people did not know why they desired this power or what they would do once they had it in their possession. Lecky felt this same distrust. The quest for power in our democracy has only too often been selfish. If the people wish to exercise the great prerogatives of government, they must also assume the equally serious responsibility of molding “our confusion of purposes, traditions, habits, into a common ordered intention.”

The American people have come to us from every continent, they are of different races and diverging national traditions. They can only be united and welded into a truly great nation if we make these divergent traditions converge upon a definite and identical future. Though it must be a long task, it

will be the easier because from whatever lands Americans have come and with whatever antecedent customs and habits of mind, they have come in the expectation of finding a land of freedom. Difficult as it may seem, it should not therefore be impossible to polarize the hopes and aspirations of earnest men of many races and nations upon this central and unifying vision. In order to bring more clearly into our consciousness the meaning and bearing of these ideals, this volume was planned. It aims to present some of the most important pronouncements by recent American leaders and especially by President Wilson, which would help to make plain whence we come and whither we are tending.

These expressions of democracy's ideals may well claim a place in the English courses of our schools and colleges. For, in the words of the statesman already quoted: "These ideals have been very nobly expressed by some of the greatest thinkers of the race. The language in which they have been set for the thought of the world rings keen in the ear, as with a music of peace and good-will, and yet quick also with the energy of fine endeavor, lifting the thoughts to some of the highest conceptions of human progress."

In this presentation of the democratic idea as expounded by our leaders, it has been thought best to begin with Lincoln's famous *Gettysburg Address* and to follow this with some of the most notable pronouncements on democracy from his day to Wilson's. Lowell's *Democracy* is the more interesting as it

shows us still on the defensive; and with its annotations will help to make clearer the growth of the democratic idea. Beside the pronouncements by representative Americans, the address by Lloyd George on America's entrance into the war is reprinted as particularly significant. It was no part of the writer's intention to make of this volume a war book, but the issues of democracy were so deeply involved in the War of 1914 that the conflict and the developments which led to it could not be ignored. For this reason we have included the most important utterances made by President Wilson during the war in that period when we were forced to fight to "make the world safe for democracy"; and the *War Message* and the *Flag Day Address* are printed with very full annotations which detail the various intrusions of Germany upon our rights. These notes are reproduced from the editions of these speeches published by the Committee on Public Information at Washington. Though in some cases they have been abbreviated, the meaning has not been changed. The notes on the *War Message* were prepared for the Committee on Public Information by Professor William Stearns Davis of the University of Minnesota aided by Professor C. D. Allin and Dr. William Anderson, also of Minnesota; and those on the *Flag Day Address*, by Professors Wallace Notestein, Elmer Stoll, August C. Krey, and William Anderson of the University of Minnesota, and Professor Guernsey Jones of the University of Nebraska.

The editor has received considerable assistance from his friends and colleagues. He is especially

indebted for help and suggestions to Professor Lindsay Todd Damon of Brown University, General Editor of the Lake English Classics, and to Guy Stanton Ford, Director of the Division on Civic and Educational Co-operation of the Committee of Public Information at Washington.

# DEMOCRACY TODAY

---

## GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

[DELIVERED NOVEMBER 19, 1863, AT THE DEDICATION OF  
THE GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY]

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here<sup>1</sup> but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is

rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people,<sup>2</sup> shall not perish from the earth.

# DEMOCRACY

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

[INAUGURAL ADDRESS ON ASSUMING THE PRESIDENCY  
OF THE BIRMINGHAM AND MIDLAND INSTITUTE,  
BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND, OCTOBER 6, 1884]

He must be a born leader or misleader of men, or must have been sent into the world unfurnished with that modulating and restraining balance-wheel which we call a sense of humor, who, in old age, has as strong confidence in his opinions and in the necessity of bringing the universe into conformity with them as he had in youth. In a world the very condition of whose being is that it should be in perpetual flux, where all seems mirage, and the one abiding thing is the effort to distinguish realities from appearances, the elderly man must be indeed of a singularly tough and valid fiber who is certain that he has any clarified residuum of experience, any assured verdict of reflection, that deserves to be called an opinion, or who, even if he had, feels that he is justified in holding mankind by the button while he is expounding it. And in a world of daily—nay, almost hourly—journalism, where every clever man, every man who thinks himself clever, or whom anybody else thinks clever, is called upon to deliver his judgment point-blank and at the word of command on every conceivable subject of human thought, or, on what sometimes seems to him very much the same thing, on every inconceivable display of human want of thought, there



is such a spendthrift waste of all those commonplaces which furnish the permitted staple of public discourse that there is little chance of beguiling a new tune out of the one-stringed instrument on which we have been thrumming so long. In this desperate necessity one is often tempted to think that, if all the words of the dictionary were tumbled down in a heap and then all those fortuitous juxtapositions and combinations that made tolerable sense were picked out and pieced together, we might find among them some poignant suggestions towards novelty of thought or expression. But, alas! it is only the great poets who seem to have this unsolicited profusion of unexpected and incalculable phrase, this infinite variety of topic. For everybody else everything has been said before, and said over again after. He who has read his Aristotle will be apt to think that observation has on most points of general applicability said its last word, and he who has mounted the tower of Plato<sup>1</sup> to look abroad from it will never hope to climb another with so lofty a vantage of speculation. Where it is so simple if not so easy a thing to hold one's peace, why add to the general confusion of tongues? There is something disheartening, too, in being expected to fill up not less than a certain measure of time, as if the mind were an hour-glass, that need only be shaken and set on one end or the other, as the case may be, to run its allotted sixty minutes with decorous exactitude. I recollect being once told by the late eminent naturalist, Agassiz, that when he was to deliver his first lecture as professor (at Zürich, I believe) he had

grave doubts of his ability to occupy the prescribed three quarters of an hour. He was speaking without notes, and glancing anxiously from time to time at the watch that lay before him on the desk. "When I had spoken a half hour," he said, "I had told them everything I knew in the world, everything! Then I began to repeat myself," he added, roguishly, "and I have done nothing else ever since." Beneath the humorous exaggeration of the story I seemed to see the face of a very serious and improving moral. And yet if one were to say only what he had to say and then stopped, his audience would feel defrauded of their honest measure. Let us take courage by the example of the French, whose exportation of Bordeaux wines increases as the area of their land in vineyards is diminished.

To me, somewhat hopelessly revolving these things, the undelayable year has rolled round, and I find myself called upon to say something in this place, where so many wiser men have spoken before me. Precluded, in my quality of national guest, by motives of taste and discretion, from dealing with any question of immediate and domestic concern, it seemed to me wisest, or at any rate most prudent, to choose a topic of comparatively abstract interest, and to ask your indulgence for a few somewhat generalized remarks on a matter concerning which I had some experimental knowledge, derived from the use of such eyes and ears as Nature had been pleased to endow me withal, and such report as I had been able to win from them. The subject which most readily sug-

gested itself was the spirit and the working of those conceptions of life and polity which are lumped together, whether for reproach or commendation, under the name of Democracy. By temperament and education of a conservative turn, I saw the last years of that quaint Arcadia<sup>2</sup> which French travelers saw with delighted amazement a century ago, and have watched the change (to me a sad one) from an agricultural to a proletary population. The testimony of Balaam should carry some conviction. I have grown to manhood and am now growing old with the growth of this system of government in my native land, have watched its advances, or what some would call its encroachments, gradual and irresistible as those of a glacier, have been an ear-witness to the forebodings of wise and good and timid men, and have lived to see those forebodings belied by the course of events, which is apt to show itself humorously careless of the reputation of prophets. I recollect hearing a sagacious old gentleman say in 1840 that the doing away with the property qualification for suffrage twenty years before had been the ruin of the State of Massachusetts;<sup>3</sup> that it had put public credit and private estate alike at the mercy of demagogues. I lived to see that Commonwealth twenty odd years later paying the interest on her bonds in gold, though it cost her sometimes nearly three for one to keep her faith, and that while suffering an unparalleled drain of men and treasure in helping to sustain the unity and self-respect of the nation.<sup>4</sup>

If universal suffrage has worked ill in our larger

cities, as it certainly has, this has been mainly because the hands that wielded it were untrained to its use. There the election of a majority of the trustees of the public money is controlled by the most ignorant and vicious of a population which has come to us from abroad, wholly unpracticed in self-government and incapable of assimilation by American habits and methods. But the finances of our towns, where the native tradition is still dominant and whose affairs are discussed and settled in a public assembly of the people, have been in general honestly and prudently administered. Even in manufacturing towns, where a majority of the voters live by their daily wages, it is not so often the recklessness as the moderation of public expenditure that surprises an old-fashioned observer. "The beggar is in the saddle at last," cries Proverbial Wisdom. "Why, in the name of all former experience, doesn't he ride to the Devil?" Because in the very act of mounting he ceased to be a beggar and became part owner of the piece of property he bestrides. The last thing we need be anxious about is property. It always has friends or the means of making them. If riches have wings to fly away from their owner, they have wings also to escape danger.

I hear America sometimes playfully accused of sending you all your storms, and am in the habit of parrying the charge by alleging that we are enabled to do this because, in virtue of our protective system, we can afford to make better bad weather than anybody else. And what wiser use could we make of it than to export it in return for the paupers which

some European countries are good enough to send over to us who have not attained to the same skill in the manufacture of them? But bad weather is not the worst thing that is laid at our door. A French gentleman, not long ago, forgetting Burke's<sup>5</sup> monition of how unwise it is to draw an indictment against a whole people, has charged us with the responsibility of whatever he finds disagreeable in the morals or manners of his countrymen. If M. Zola<sup>6</sup> or some other competent witness would only go into the box and tell us what those morals and manners were before our example corrupted them! But I confess that I find little to interest and less to edify me in these international bandyings of "You're another."

I shall address myself to a single point only in the long list of offenses of which we are more or less gravely accused, because that really includes all the rest. It is that we are infecting the Old World with what seems to be thought the entirely new disease of Democracy.<sup>7</sup> It is generally people who are in what are called easy circumstances who can afford the leisure to treat themselves to a handsome complaint, and these experience an immediate alleviation when once they have found a sonorous Greek name to abuse it by. There is something consolatory also, something flattering to their sense of personal dignity, and to that conceit of singularity which is the natural recoil from our uneasy consciousness of being commonplace, in thinking ourselves victims of a malady by which no one had ever suffered before. Accordingly they find it simpler to class under one comprehensive heading



whatever they find offensive to their nerves, their tastes their interests, or what they suppose to be their opinions, and christen it Democracy, much as physicians label every obscure disease gout, or as cross-grained fellows lay their ill-temper to the weather. But is it really a new ailment, and, if it be, is America answerable for it? Even if she were, would it account for the phylloxera,<sup>8</sup> and hoof-and-mouth disease, and bad harvests, and bad English, and the German bands, and the Boers,<sup>8a</sup> and all the other discomforts with which these later days have vexed the souls of them that go in chariots? Yet I have seen the evil example of Democracy in America cited as the source and origin of things quite as heterogeneous and quite as little connected with it by any sequence of cause and effect. Surely this ferment is nothing new. It has been at work for centuries, and we are more conscious of it only because in this age of publicity, where the newspapers offer a rostrum to whoever has a grievance, or fancies that he has, the bubbles and scum thrown up by it are more noticeable on the surface than in those dumb ages when there was a cover of silence and suppression on the cauldron. Bernardo Navagero,<sup>9</sup> speaking of the Provinces of Lower Austria in 1546, tells us that “in them there are five sorts of persons, Clergy, Barons, Nobles, Burghers, and Peasants. Of these last no account is made, *because they have no voice in the Diet.*”

Nor was it among the people that subversive or mistaken doctrines had their rise. A Father of the

Church<sup>10</sup> said that property was theft many centuries before Proudhon<sup>11</sup> was born. Bourdaloue<sup>12</sup> reaffirmed it. Montesquieu<sup>13</sup> was the inventor of national workshops, and of the theory that the State owed every man a living. Nay, was not the Church herself the first organized Democracy?<sup>14</sup> A few centuries ago the chief end of man was to keep his soul alive, and then the little kernel of leaven that sets the gases at work was religious, and produced the Reformation. Even in that, far-sighted persons like the Emperor Charles V. saw the germ of political and social revolution.<sup>15</sup> Now that the chief end of man seems to have become the keeping of the body alive, and as comfortably alive as possible, the leaven also has become wholly political and social. But there had also been social upheavals before the Reformation and contemporaneously with it, especially among men of Teutonic race. The Reformation gave outlet and direction to an unrest already existing. Formerly the immense majority of men—our brothers—knew only their sufferings, their wants, and their desires. They are beginning now to know their opportunity and their power. All persons who see deeper than their plates are rather inclined to thank God for it than to bewail it, for the sores of Lazarus have a poison in them against which Dives has no antidote.<sup>16</sup>

There can be no doubt that the spectacle of a great and prosperous Democracy on the other side of the Atlantic must react powerfully on the aspirations and political theories of men in the Old World who do not find things to their mind; but, whether for good



or evil, it should not be overlooked that the acorn from which it sprang was ripened on the British oak. Every successive swarm that has gone out from this *officina gentium*<sup>17</sup> has, when left to its own instincts—may I not call them hereditary instincts?—assumed a more or less thoroughly democratic form. This would seem to show, what I believe to be the fact, that the British Constitution, under whatever disguises of prudence or decorum, is essentially democratic. England, indeed, may be called a monarchy with democratic tendencies, the United States a democracy with conservative instincts. People are continually saying that America is in the air, and I am glad to think it is, since this means only that a clearer conception of human claims and human duties is beginning to be prevalent. The discontent with the existing order of things, however, pervaded the atmosphere wherever the conditions were favorable, long before Columbus, seeking the back door of Asia, found himself knocking at the front door of America. I say wherever the conditions were favorable, for it is certain that the germs of disease do not stick or find a prosperous field for their development and noxious activity unless where the simplest sanitary precautions have been neglected. “For this effect defective comes by cause,” as Polonius said long ago.<sup>18</sup> It is only by instigation of the wrongs of men that what are called the Rights of Man<sup>19</sup> become turbulent and dangerous. It is then only that they syllogize unwelcome truths. It is not the insurrections of ignorance that are dangerous, but the revolts of intelligence :

The wicked and the weak rebel in vain,  
Slaves by their own compulsion.<sup>20</sup>

Had the governing classes in France during the last century paid as much heed to their proper business as to their pleasures or manners, the guillotine need never have severed that spinal marrow of orderly and secular tradition through which in a normally constituted state the brain sympathizes with the extremities and sends will and impulsion thither. It is only when the reasonable and practicable are denied that men demand the unreasonable and impracticable; only when the possible is made difficult that they fancy the impossible to be easy. Fairy tales are made out of the dreams of the poor. No; the sentiment which lies at the root of democracy is nothing new. I am speaking always of a sentiment, a spirit, and not of a form of government; for this was but the outgrowth of the other and not its cause. This sentiment is merely an expression of the natural wish of people to have a hand, if need be a controlling hand, in the management of their own affairs. What is new is that they are more and more gaining that control, and learning more and more how to be worthy of it. What we used to call the tendency or drift—what we are being taught to call more wisely the evolution of things—has for some time been setting steadily in this direction. There is no good in arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wind is to put on your overcoat. And in this case, also, the prudent will prepare themselves to encounter what they cannot prevent. Some people advise us to put

on the brakes, as if the movement of which we are conscious were that of a railway train running down an incline. But a metaphor is no argument, though it be sometimes the gunpowder to drive one home and imbed it in the memory. Our disquiet comes of what nurses and other experienced persons call growing-pains, and need not seriously alarm us. They are what every generation before us—certainly every generation since the invention of printing—has gone through with more or less good fortune. To the door of every generation there comes a knocking, and unless the household, like the Thane of Cawdor<sup>21</sup> and his wife, have been doing some deed without a name, they need not shudder. It turns out at worst to be a poor relation who wishes to come in out of the cold. The porter always grumbles and is slow to open. "Who's there, in the name of Beelzebub?" he mutters. Not a change for the better in our human housekeeping has ever taken place that wise and good men have not opposed it,—have not prophesied with the alderman that the world would wake up to find its throat cut in consequence of it. The world, on the contrary, wakes up, rubs its eyes, yawns, stretches itself, and goes about its business as if nothing had happened. Suppression of the slave trade, abolition of slavery, trade unions,—at all of these excellent people shook their heads despondingly, and murmured "Ichabod."<sup>22</sup> But the trade unions are now debating instead of conspiring, and we all read their discussions with comfort and hope, sure that they are learning the business of citizenship and the difficulties of practical legislation.

One of the most curious of these frenzies of exclusion was that against the emancipation of the Jews. All share in the government of the world was denied for centuries to perhaps the ablest, certainly the most tenacious, race that had ever lived in it—the race to whom we owed our religion and the purest spiritual stimulus and consolation to be found in all literature—a race in which ability seems as natural and hereditary as the curve of their noses, and whose blood, fur- tively mingling with the bluest bloods in Europe, has quickened them with its own indomitable impulsion. We drove them into a corner, but they had their revenge, as the wronged are always sure to have it sooner or later. They made their corner the counter- and banking-house of the world, and thence they rule it and us with their ignobler scepter of finance. Your grandfathers mobbed Priestley<sup>23</sup> only that you might set up his statue and make Birmingham the headquarters of English Unitarianism. We hear it said some- times that this is an age of transition, as if that made matters clearer; but can any one point us to an age that was not? If he could, he would show us an age of stagnation. The question for us, as it has been for all before us, is to make the transition gradual and easy, to see that our points are right so that the train may not come to grief. For we should remember that nothing is more natural for people whose education has been neglected than to spell evolution with an initial “r.” A great man struggling with the storms of fate has been called a sublime spectacle; but surely a great man wrestling with these new forces that have

come into the world, mastering them and controlling them to beneficent ends, would be a yet sublimer. Here is not a danger, and if there were it would be only a better school of manhood, a nobler scope for ambition. I have hinted that what people are afraid of in democracy is less the thing itself than what they conceive to be its necessary adjuncts and consequences. It is supposed to reduce all mankind to a dead level of mediocrity in character and culture, to vulgarize men's conceptions of life, and therefore their code of morals, manners, and conduct—to endanger the rights of property and possession.<sup>24</sup> But I believe that the real gravamen of the charges lies in the habit it has of making itself generally disagreeable by asking the Powers that Be at the most inconvenient moment whether they are the powers that ought to be. If the powers that be are in a condition to give a satisfactory answer to this inevitable question, they need feel in no way discomfited by it.

Few people take the trouble of trying to find out what democracy really is. Yet this would be a great help, for it is our lawless and uncertain thoughts, it is the indefiniteness of our impressions, that fill darkness, whether mental or physical, with specters and hobgoblins. Democracy is nothing more than an experiment in government, more likely to succeed in a new soil, but likely to be tried in all soils, which must stand or fall on its own merits as others have done before it. For there is no trick of perpetual motion in politics any more than in mechanics. President Lincoln defined democracy to be "the govern-



ment of the people by the people for the people." This is a sufficiently compact statement of it as a political arrangement. Theodore Parker<sup>25</sup> said that "Democracy meant not 'I'm as good as you are,' but 'You're as good as I am.'" And this is the ethical conception of it, necessary as a complement of the other; a conception which, could it be made actual and practical, would easily solve all the riddles that the old sphinx of political and social economy who sits by the roadside has been proposing to mankind from the beginning, and which mankind have shown such a singular talent for answering wrongly. In this sense Christ was the first true democrat that ever breathed, as the old dramatist Dekker said he was the first true gentleman.<sup>26</sup> The characters may be easily doubled so strong is the likeness between them. A beautiful and profound parable of the Persian poet Jellaladeen<sup>27</sup> tells us that "One knocked at the Beloved's door, and a voice asked from within 'Who is there?' and he answered 'It is I.' Then the voice said, 'This house will not hold me and thee'; and the door was not opened. Then went the lover into the desert and fasted and prayed in solitude, and after a year he returned and knocked again at the door; and again the voice asked 'Who is there?' and he said 'It is thyself'; and the door was opened to him." But that is idealism, you will say, and this is an only too practical world. I grant it; but I am one of those who believe that the real will never find an irremovable basis till it rests on the ideal.<sup>27a</sup> It used to be thought that a democracy was possible only in a small terri-

ory,<sup>28</sup> and this is doubtless true of a democracy strictly defined, for in such all the citizens decide directly upon every question of public concern in a general assembly. An example still survives in the tiny Swiss canton of Appenzell. But this immediate intervention of the people in their own affairs is not of the essence of democracy; it is not necessary, nor indeed, in most cases, practicable. Democracies to which Mr. Lincoln's definition would fairly enough apply have existed, and now exist, in which, though the supreme authority reside in the people, yet they can act only indirectly on the national policy. This generation has seen a democracy with an imperial figurehead,<sup>28a</sup> and in all that have ever existed the body politic has never embraced all the inhabitants included within its territory, the right to share in the direction of affairs has been confined to citizens, and citizenship has been further restricted by various limitations, sometimes of property, sometimes of nativity, and always of age and sex.

The framers of the American Constitution were far from wishing or intending to found a democracy in the strict sense of the word,<sup>29</sup> though, as was inevitable, every expansion of the scheme of government they elaborated has been in a democratical direction. But this has been generally the slow result of growth, and not the sudden innovation of theory; in fact, they had a profound disbelief in theory, and knew better than to commit the folly of breaking with the past. They were not seduced by the French fallacy that a new system of government could be ordered like a



new suit of clothes.<sup>30</sup> They would as soon have thought of ordering a new suit of flesh and skin. It is only on the roaring loom of time that the stuff is woven for such a vesture of their thought and experience as they were meditating. They recognized fully the value of tradition and habit as the great allies of permanence and stability. They all had that distaste for innovation which belonged to their race, and many of them a distrust of human nature derived from their creed. The day of sentiment was over, and no dithyrambic affirmations or fine-drawn analyses of the Rights of Man would serve their present turn. This was a practical question, and they addressed themselves to it as men of knowledge and judgment should. Their problem was how to adapt English principles and precedents to the new conditions of American life, and they solved it with singular discretion. They put as many obstacles as they could contrive, not in the way of the people's will, but of their whim. With few exceptions they probably admitted the logic of the then accepted syllogism,—democracy, anarchy, despotism.<sup>31</sup> But this formula was framed upon the experience of small cities shut up to stew within their narrow walls where the number of citizens made but an inconsiderable fraction of the inhabitants, where every passion was reverberated from house to house and from man to man with gathering rumor till every impulse became gregarious and therefore inconsiderate, and every popular assembly needed but an intrusion of eloquent sophistry to turn it into a mob, all the more dangerous because sanctified with the formality of law.

Fortunately their case was wholly different. They were to legislate for a widely scattered population and for States already practiced in the discipline of a partial independence. They had an unequaled opportunity and enormous advantages. The material they had to work upon was already democratical by instinct and habitude. It was tempered to their hands by more than a century's schooling in self-government. They had but to give permanent and conservative form to a ductile mass.<sup>32</sup> In giving impulse and direction to their new institutions, especially in supplying them with checks and balances, they had a great help and safeguard in their federal organization. The different, sometimes conflicting, interests and social systems of the several States made existence as a Union and coalescence into a nation conditional on a constant practice of moderation and compromise. The very elements of disintegration were the best guides in political training. Their children learned the lesson of compromise only too well, and it was the application of it to a question of fundamental morals that cost us our civil war.<sup>33</sup> We learned once for all that compromise makes a good umbrella but a poor roof; that it is a temporary expedient, often wise in party politics, almost sure to be unwise in statesmanship.

Has not the trial of democracy in America proved, on the whole, successful? If it had not, would the Old World be vexed with any fears of its proving contagious? This trial would have been less severe could it have been made with a people homogeneous in race,

language, and traditions, whereas the United States have been called on to absorb and assimilate enormous masses of foreign population heterogeneous in all these respects, and drawn mainly from that class which might fairly say that the world was not their friend, nor the world's law. The previous condition too often justified the traditional Irishman, who, landing in New York and asked what his politics were, inquired if there was a Government there, and on being told that there was, retorted, "Thin I'm agin it!" We have taken from Europe the poorest, the most ignorant, the most turbulent of her people, and have made them over into good citizens, who have added to our wealth, and who are ready to die in defence of a country and of institutions which they know to be worth dying for. The exceptions have been (and they are lamentable exceptions) where these hordes of ignorance and poverty have coagulated in great cities. But the social system is yet to seek which has not to look the same terrible wolf in the eyes. On the other hand, at this very moment Irish peasants are buying up the worn-out farms of Massachusetts, and making them productive again by the same virtues of industry and thrift that once made them profitable to the English ancestors of the men who are deserting them. To have achieved even these prosaic results (if you choose to call them so), and that out of materials the most discordant,—I might say the most recalcitrant,—argues a certain beneficent virtue in the system that could do it, and is not to be accounted for by mere luck. Carlyle said scorn-

fully that America meant only roast turkey every day for everybody.<sup>34</sup> He forgot that States, as Bacon<sup>35</sup> said of wars, go on their bellies. As for the security of property, it should be tolerably well secured in a country where every other man hopes to be rich, even though the only property qualification be the ownership of two hands that add to the general wealth. Is it not the best security for anything to interest the largest possible number of persons in its preservation and the smallest in its division? In point of fact, far-seeing<sup>36</sup> men count the increasing power of wealth and its combinations as one of the chief dangers with which the institutions of the United States are threatened in the not distant future. The right of individual property is no doubt the very corner-stone of civilization as hitherto understood, but I am a little impatient of being told that property is entitled to exceptional consideration because it bears all the burdens of the State. It bears those, indeed, which can most easily be borne, but poverty pays with its person the chief expenses of war, pestilence, and famine. Wealth should not forget this, for poverty is beginning to think of it now and then. Let me not be misunderstood. I see as clearly as any man possibly can, and rate as highly, the value of wealth, and of hereditary wealth, as the security of refinement, the feeder of all those arts that ennoble and beautify life, and as making a country worth living in. Many an ancestral hall here in England has been a nursery of that culture which has been of example and benefit to all. Old gold has a civilizing virtue which new gold must grow old to be capable of secreting.

I should not think of coming before you to defend or to criticize any form of government. All have their virtues, all their defects, and all have illustrated one period or another in the history of the race, with signal services to humanity and culture. There is not one that could stand a cynical cross-examination by an experienced criminal lawyer, except that of a perfectly wise and perfectly good despot, such as the world has never seen, except in that white-haired king of Browning's, who

Lived long ago  
In the morning of the world,  
When Earth was nearer Heaven than now.<sup>37</sup>

The English race, if they did not invent government by discussion, have at least carried it nearest to perfection in practice. It seems a very safe and reasonable contrivance for occupying the attention of the country, and is certainly a better way of settling questions than by push of pike. Yet, if one should ask it why it should not rather be called government by gabble, it would have to fumble in its pocket a good while before it found the change for a convincing reply. As matters stand, too, it is beginning to be doubtful whether Parliament and Congress sit at Westminster and Washington or in the editors' rooms of the leading journals, so thoroughly is everything debated before the authorized and responsible debaters get on their legs. And what shall we say of government by a majority of voices? To a person who in the last century would have called himself an Impartial Observer, a numerical preponderance seems,



on the whole, as clumsy a way of arriving at truth as could well be devised,<sup>38</sup> but experience has apparently shown it to be a convenient arrangement for determining what may be expedient or advisable or practicable at any given moment. Truth, after all, wears a different face to everybody, and it would be too tedious to wait till all were agreed. She is said to lie at the bottom of a well, for the very reason, perhaps, that whoever looks down in search of her sees his own image at the bottom, and is persuaded not only that he has seen the goddess, but that she is far better looking than he had imagined.

The arguments against universal suffrage are equally unanswerable. "What," we exclaim, "shall Tom, Dick, and Harry have as much weight in the scale as I?" Of course, nothing could be more absurd. And yet universal suffrage has not been the instrument of greater unwisdom than contrivances of a more select description. Assemblies could be mentioned composed entirely of Masters of Arts and Doctors in Divinity which have sometimes shown traces of human passion or prejudice in their votes. Have the Serene Highnesses and Enlightened Classes carried on the business of Mankind so well, then, that there is no use in trying a less costly method? The democratic theory is that those Constitutions are likely to prove steadiest which have the broadest base, that the right to vote makes a safety-valve of every voter, and that the best way of teaching a man how to vote is to give him the chance of practice. For the question is no longer the academic one, "Is it wise to give



every man the ballot?" but rather the practical one, "Is it prudent to deprive whole classes of it any longer?" It may be conjectured that it is cheaper in the long run to lift men up than to hold them down, and that the ballot in their hands is less dangerous to society than a sense of wrong in their heads. At any rate this is the dilemma to which the drift of opinion has been for some time sweeping us, and in politics a dilemma is a more unmanageable thing to hold by the horns than a wolf by the ears. It is said that the right of suffrage is not valued when it is indiscriminately bestowed, and there may be some truth in this, for I have observed that what men prize most is a privilege, even if it be that of chief mourner at a funeral. But is there not danger that it will be valued at more than its worth if denied, and that some illegitimate way will be sought to make up for the want of it? Men who have a voice in public affairs are at once affiliated with one or other of the great parties between which society is divided, merge their individual hopes and opinions in its safer, because more generalized, hopes and opinions, are disciplined by its tactics, and acquire, to a certain degree, the orderly qualities of an army. They no longer belong to a class, but to a body corporate. Of one thing, at least, we may be certain, that, under whatever method of helping things to go wrong man's wit can contrive, those who have the divine right to govern will be found to govern in the end, and that the highest privilege to which the majority of mankind can aspire is that of being governed by those

wiser than they. Universal suffrage has in the United States sometimes been made the instrument of inconsiderate changes, under the notion of reform, and this from a misconception of the true meaning of popular government. One of these has been the substitution in many of the states of popular election for official selection in the choice of judges. The same system applied to military officers was the source of much evil during our civil war, and, I believe, had to be abandoned.<sup>39</sup> But it has been also true that on all great questions of national policy a reserve of prudence and discretion has been brought out at the critical moment to turn the scale in favor of a wiser decision. An appeal to the reason of the people has never been known to fail in the long run. It is, perhaps, true that, by effacing the principle of passive obedience, democracy, ill understood, has slackened the spring of that ductility to discipline which is essential to "the unity and married calm of States." But I feel assured that experience and necessity will cure this evil, as they have shown their power to cure others. And under what frame of policy have evils ever been remedied till they became intolerable, and shook men out of their indolent indifference through their fears?

We are told that the inevitable result of democracy is to sap the foundations of personal independence, to weaken the principle of authority, to lessen the respect due to eminence, whether in station, virtue, or genius. If these things were so, society could not hold together. Perhaps the best forcing-house of robust

individuality would be where public opinion is inclined to be most overbearing, as he must be of heroic temper who should walk along Piccadilly<sup>40</sup> at the height of the season in a soft hat. As for authority, it is one of the symptoms of the time that the religious reverence for it is declining everywhere, but this is due partly to the fact that statecraft is no longer looked upon as a mystery, but as a business, and partly to the decay of superstition, by which I mean the habit of respecting what we are told to respect rather than what is respectable in itself. There is more rough and tumble in the American democracy than is altogether agreeable to people of sensitive nerves and refined habits, and the people take their political duties lightly and laughingly, as is, perhaps, neither unnatural nor unbecoming in a young giant. Democracies can no more jump away from their own shadows than the rest of us can. They no doubt sometimes make mistakes and pay honor to men who do not deserve it. But they do this because they believe them worthy of it, and though it be true that the idol is the measure of the worshipper, yet the worship has in it the germ of a nobler religion. But is it democracies alone that fall into these errors? I, who have seen it proposed to erect a statue to Hudson,<sup>41</sup> the railway king, and have heard Louis Napoleon<sup>42</sup> hailed as the savior of society by men who certainly had no democratic associations or leanings, am not ready to think so. But democracies have likewise their finer instincts. I have also seen the wisest statesman and most pregnant speaker of our genera-

tion, a man of humble birth and ungainly manners, of little culture beyond what his own genius supplied, become more absolute in power than any monarch of modern times through the reverence of his countrymen for his honesty, his wisdom, his sincerity, his faith in God and man, and the nobly humane simplicity of his character. And I remember another whom popular respect enveloped as with a halo, the least vulgar of men, the most austerely genial, and the most independent of opinion. Wherever he went he never met a stranger, but everywhere neighbors and friends proud of him as their ornament and decoration. Institutions which could bear and breed such men as Lincoln and Emerson had surely some energy for good. No, amid all the fruitless turmoil and miscarriage of the world, if there be one thing steadfast and of favorable omen, one thing to make optimism distrust its own obscure distrust, it is the rooted instinct in men to admire what is better and more beautiful than themselves. The touchstone of political and social institutions is their ability to supply them with worthy objects of this sentiment, which is the very tap-root of civilization and progress. There would seem to be no readier way of feeding it with the elements of growth and vigor than such an organization of society as will enable men to respect themselves, and so to justify them in respecting others.

Such a result is quite possible under other conditions than those of an avowedly democratical Constitution. For I take it that the real essence of democ-

racy was fairly enough defined by the First Napoleon when he said that the French Revolution meant "la carrière ouverte aux talents"—a clear pathway for merit of whatever kind.<sup>43</sup> I should be inclined to paraphrase this by calling democracy that form of society, no matter what its political classification, in which every man had a chance and knew that he had it. If a man can climb, and feels himself encouraged to climb, from a coalpit to the highest position for which he is fitted, he can well afford to be indifferent what name is given to the government under which he lives. The Bailli of Mirabeau, uncle of the more famous tribune of that name, wrote in 1771: "The English are, in my opinion, a hundred times more agitated and more unfortunate than the very Algerines themselves, because they do not know and will not know till the destruction of their overswollen power, which I believe very near, whether they are monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, and wish to play the part of all three." England has not been obliging enough to fulfill the Bailli's prophecy, and perhaps it was this very carelessness about the name, and concern about the substance of popular government, this skill in getting the best out of things as they are, in utilizing all the motives which influence men, and in giving one direction to many impulses, that has been a principal factor of her greatness and power. Perhaps it is fortunate to have an unwritten constitution,<sup>44</sup> for men are prone to be tinkering the work of their own hands, whereas they are more willing to let time and circumstance mend or modify what time and circum-



stances have made. All free governments, whatever their name, are in reality governments by public opinion, and it is on the quality of this public opinion that their prosperity depends. It is, therefore, their first duty to purify the element from which they draw the breath of life. With the growth of democracy grows also the fear, if not the danger, that this atmosphere may be corrupted with poisonous exhalations from lower and more malarious levels, and the question of sanitation becomes more instant and pressing. Democracy in its best sense is merely the letting in of light and air. Lord Sherbrooke,<sup>45</sup> with his usual epigrammatic terseness, bids you educate your future rulers. But would this alone be a sufficient safeguard? To educate the intelligence is to enlarge the horizon of its desires and wants. And it is well that this should be so. But the enterprise must go deeper and prepare the way for satisfying those desires and wants in so far as they are legitimate. What is really ominous of danger to the existing order of things is not democracy (which, properly understood, is a conservative force), but the Socialism, which may find a fulcrum in it. If we cannot equalize conditions and fortunes<sup>46</sup> any more than we can equalize the brains of men—and a very sagacious person has said that “where two men ride of a horse one must ride behind”—we can yet, perhaps, do something to correct those methods and influences that lead to enormous inequalities, and to prevent their growing more enormous. It is all very well to pooh-pooh Mr. George<sup>47</sup> and to prove him mistaken in his



political economy. I do not believe that land should be divided because the quantity of it is limited by nature. Of what may this not be said? *A fortiori*, we might on the same principle insist on a division of human wit, for I have observed that the quantity of this has been even more inconveniently limited. Mr. George himself has an inequitably large share of it. But he is right in his impelling motive; right, also, I am convinced, in insisting that humanity makes a part, by far the most important part, of political economy; and in thinking man to be of more concern and more convincing than the longest columns of figures in the world. For unless you include human nature in your addition, your total is sure to be wrong and your deductions from it fallacious. Communism means barbarism, but Socialism means, or wishes to mean, coöperation and community of interests, sympathy, the giving to the hands not so large a share as to the brains, but a larger share than hitherto in the wealth they must combine to produce—means, in short, the practical application of Christianity to life, and has in it the secret of an orderly and benign reconstruction. State Socialism would cut off the very roots in personal character—self-help, forethought, and frugality—which nourish and sustain the trunk and branches of every vigorous Commonwealth.

I do not believe in violent changes, nor do I expect them. Things in possession have a very firm grip.<sup>48</sup> One of the strongest cements of society is the conviction of mankind that the state of things into which

they are born is a part of the order of the universe, as natural, let us say, as that the sun should go round the earth. It is a conviction that they will not surrender except on compulsion, and a wise society should look to it that this compulsion be not put upon them. For the individual man there is no radical cure, outside of human nature itself, for the evils to which human nature is heir. The rule will always hold good that you must

Be your own palace or the world's your gaol.

But for artificial evils, for evils that spring from want of thought, thought must find a remedy somewhere. There has been no period of time in which wealth has been more sensible of its duties than now. It builds hospitals, it establishes missions among the poor, it endows schools. It is one of the advantages of accumulated wealth, and of the leisure it renders possible, that people have time to think of the wants and sorrows of their fellows. But all these remedies are partial and palliative merely. It is as if we should apply plasters to a single pustule of the smallpox with a view of driving out the disease. The true way is to discover and to extirpate the germs. As society is now constituted these are in the air it breathes, in the water it drinks, in things that seem, and which it has always believed, to be the most innocent and healthful. The evil elements it neglects corrupt these in their springs and pollute them in their courses. Let us be of good cheer, however, remembering that the misfortunes hardest to bear are those which never

come. The world has outlived much, and will outlive a great deal more, and men have contrived to be happy in it. It has shown the strength of its constitution in nothing more than in surviving the quack medicines it has tried. In the scales of the destinies brawn will never weigh so much as brain. Our healing is not in the storm or in the whirlwind, it is not in monarchies, or aristocracies, or democracies, but will be revealed by the still small voice that speaks to the conscience and the heart, prompting us to a wider and wiser humanity.

# THE MESSAGE OF WASHINGTON

GROVER CLEVELAND

[DELIVERED AT CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 22, 1907]

In furtherance of the high endeavor of your organization, it would have been impossible to select for observance any other civic holiday having as broad and fitting a significance as this. It memorizes the birth of one whose glorious deeds are transcendently above all others recorded in our national annals; and, in memorizing the birth of Washington, it commemorates the incarnation of all the virtues and all the ideals that made our nationality possible, and gave it promise of growth and strength. It is a holiday that belongs exclusively to the American people. All that Washington did was bound up in our national life, and became interwoven with the warp of our national destiny. The battles he fought were fought for American liberty, and the victories he won gave us national independence. His example of unselfish consecration,<sup>1</sup> and lofty patriotism made manifest, as in an open book, that those virtues were conditions not more vital to our nation's beginning than to its development and durability. His faith in God, and the fortitude of his faith, taught those for whom he wrought that the surest strength of nations comes from the support of God's almighty arm. His universal and unaffected sympathy with those in every sphere of American life, his thorough knowledge of

existing American conditions, and his wonderful foresight of conditions yet to be, coupled with his powerful influence in the councils of those who were to make or mar the fate of an infant nation, made him a tremendous factor in the construction and adoption of the constitutional chart by which the course of the newly launched republic could be safely sailed. And it was he who first took the helm, and demonstrated, for the guidance of all who might succeed him, how and in what spirit and intent the responsibilities of our chief magistracy should be discharged.

If your observance of this day were intended to make more secure the immortal fame of Washington, or to add to the strength and beauty of his imperishable monument built upon a nation's affectionate remembrance, your purpose would be useless. Washington has no need of you. But in every moment, from the time he drew his sword in the cause of American independence to this hour, living or dead, the American people have needed him. It is not important now, nor will it be in all the coming years, to remind our countrymen that Washington has lived, and that his achievements in his country's service are above all praise. But it is important—and more important now than ever before—that they should clearly apprehend and adequately value the virtues and ideals of which he was the embodiment, and that they should realize how essential to our safety and perpetuity are the consecration and patriotism which he exemplified. The American people need today the example and teachings of Washington no less than

those who fashioned our nation needed his labors and guidance; and only so far as we commemorate his birth with a sincere recognition of this need can our commemoration be useful to the present generation.

It is, therefore, above all things, absolutely essential to an appropriately commemorative condition of mind that there should be no toleration of even the shade of a thought that what Washington did and said and wrote, in aid of the young American republic have become in the least outworn, or that in these later days of material advance and development they may be merely pleasantly recalled with a sort of affectionate veneration, and with a kind of indulgent and loftily courteous concession of the value of Washington's example and precepts. These constitute the richest of all our crown jewels; and, if we disregard them or depreciate their value, we shall be no better than "the base Indian who threw a pearl away richer than all his tribe."<sup>2</sup>

They are full of stimulation to do grand and noble things, and full of lessons enjoining loyal adherence to public duty. But they teach nothing more impressive and nothing more needful by way of recalling our countrymen to a faith which has become somewhat faint and obscured than the necessity to national beneficence and the people's happiness of the homely, simple, personal virtues that grow and thrive in the hearts of men who, with high intent, illustrate the goodness there is in human nature.

Three months before his inauguration as first President of the republic which he had done so much



to create, Washington wrote a letter to Lafayette,<sup>5</sup> his warm friend and revolutionary ally, in which he expressed his unremitting desire to establish a general system of policy which, if pursued, would "ensure permanent felicity to the commonwealth"; and he added these words:

"I think I see a path as clear and as direct as a ray of light, which leads to the attainment of that object. Nothing but harmony, honesty, industry, and frugality is necessary to make us a great and happy people. Happily, the present posture of affairs, and the prevailing disposition of my countrymen promise to coöperate in establishing those four great and essential pillars of public felicity."

It is impossible for us to be in accord with the spirit which should pervade this occasion if we fail to realize the momentous import of this declaration, and if we doubt its conclusiveness or its application to any stage of our national life, we are not in sympathy with a proper and improving observance of the birthday of George Washington.

Such considerations as these suggest the thought that this is a time for honest self-examination. The question presses upon us with a demand for reply that will not be denied:

Who among us all, if our hearts are purged of misleading impulses and our minds freed from perverting pride, can be sure that today the posture of affairs and the prevailing disposition of our countrymen coöperate in the establishment and promotion of harmony, honesty, industry, and frugality?

When Washington wrote that nothing but these was necessary to make us a great and happy people, he had in mind the harmony of American brotherhood and unenvious good will, the honesty that insures against the betrayal of public trust and hates devious ways and conscienceless practices, the industry that recognizes in faithful work and intelligent endeavor abundant promise of well-earned competence and provident accumulation, and the frugality which outlaws waste and extravagant display as plunderers of thrift and promoters of covetous discontent.

The self-examination invited by this day's commemoration will be incomplete and superficial if we are not thereby forced to the confession that there are signs of the times which indicate a weakness and relaxation of our hold upon these saving virtues. When thus forewarned, it is the height of recreancy for us obstinately to close our eyes to the needs of the situation, and refuse admission to the thought that evil can overtake us. If we are to deserve security, and make good our claim to sensible, patriotic Americanism, we will carefully and dutifully take our bearings, and discover, if we can, how far wind and tide have carried us away from safe waters.

If we find that the wickedness of destructive agitators and the selfish depravity of demagogues have stirred up discontent and strife where there should be peace and harmony, and have arrayed against each other interests which should dwell together in hearty coöperation; if we find that the old standards of sturdy, uncompromising American honesty have

become so corroded and weakened by a sordid atmosphere that our people are hardly startled by crime in high places and shameful betrayals of trust everywhere; if we find a sadly prevalent disposition among us to turn from the highway of honorable industry into shorter crossroads leading to irresponsible and worthless ease; if we find that widespread wastefulness and extravagance have discredited the wholesome frugality which was once the pride of Americanism we should recall Washington's admonition that harmony, industry, and frugality are "essential pillars of public felicity," and forthwith endeavor to change our course.

To neglect this is not only to neglect the admonition of Washington, but to miss or neglect the conditions which our self-examination has made plain to us. These conditions demand something more from us than warmth and zest in the tribute we pay to Washington, and something more even than acceptance of his teachings, however reverent our acceptance may be.

The sooner we reach a state of mind which keeps constantly before us, as a living, active, impelling force, the truth that our people, good or bad, harmonious or with daggers drawn, honest or unscrupulous, industrious or idle, constitute the source of our nation's temperament and health, and that the traits and faults of our people must necessarily give quality and color to our national behavior, the sooner we shall appreciate the importance of protecting this source from unwholesome contamination. And the sooner

all of us honestly acknowledge this to be an individual duty that cannot be shifted or evaded, and the more thoroughly we purge ourselves from influences that hinder its conscientious performance, the sooner will our country be regenerated and made secure by the saving power of good citizenship.

It is our habit to affiliate with political parties. Happily, the strength and solidity of our institutions can safely withstand the utmost freedom and activity of political discussion so far as it involves the adoption of governmental policies or the enforcement of good administration. But they cannot withstand the frenzy of hate which seeks, under the guise of political earnestness, to blot out American brotherhood, and cunningly to persuade our people that a crusade of envy and malice is no more than a zealous insistence upon their manhood rights.

Political parties are exceedingly human; and they more easily fall before temptation than individuals, by so much as partisan success is the law of their life, and because their responsibility is impersonal. It is easily recalled that political organizations have been quite willing to utilize gusts of popular prejudice and resentment; and I believe they have been known, as a matter of shrewd management, to encourage voters to hope for some measure of relief from economic abuses, and yet to "stand pat" on the day appointed for realization.

We have fallen upon a time when it behooves every thoughtful citizen, whose political beliefs are based on reason and who cares enough for his manliness

and duty to save them from barter, to realize that the organization of the party of his choice needs watching, and that at times it is not amiss critically to observe its direction and tendency. This certainly ought to result in our country's gain; and it is only partisan impudence that condemns a member of a political party who, on proper occasion, submits its conduct and the loyalty to principle of its leaders to a Court of Review, over which his conscience, his reason and his political understanding preside.

I protest that I have not spoken in a spirit of pessimism. I have and enjoy my full share of the pride and exultation which our country's material advancement so fully justifies. Its limitless resources, its astonishing growth, its unapproachable industrial development, and its irrepressible inventive genius have made it the wonder of the centuries. Nevertheless, these things do not complete the story of a people truly great. Our country is infinitely more than a domain affording to those who dwell upon it immense material advantages and opportunities. In such a country we live. But I love to think of a glorious nation built upon the will of free men, set apart for the propagation and cultivation of humanity's best ideal of a free government, and made ready for the growth and fruitage of the highest aspirations of patriotism. This is the country that lives in us. I indulge in no mere figure of speech when I say that our nation, the immortal spirit of our domain, lives in us—in our hearts and minds and consciences. There it must find its nutriment or die. This thought



more than any other presents to our minds the impressiveness and responsibility of American citizenship. The land we live in seems to be strong and active. But how fares the land that lives in us? Are we sure that we are doing all we ought to keep it in vigor and health? Are we keeping its roots well surrounded by the fertile soil of loving allegiance, and are we furnishing them the invigorating moisture of unselfish fidelity? Are we as diligent as we ought to be to protect this precious growth against the poison that must arise from the decay of harmony and honesty and industry and frugality; and are we sufficiently watchful against the deadly, burrowing pests of consuming greed and cankerous cupidity? Our answers to these questions make up the account of our stewardship as keepers of a sacred trust.

The land we live in is safe as long as we are dutifully careful of the land that lives in us. But good intentions and fine sentiments will not meet the emergency. If we would bestow upon the land that lives in us the care it needs, it is indispensable that we should recognize the weakness of our human nature, and our susceptibility to temptations and influences that interfere with a full conception of our obligations; and thereupon we should see to it that cupidity and selfishness do not blind our consciences or dull our efforts.

From different points of view I have invited you to consider with me what obligations and responsibilities rest upon those who in this country of ours are entitled to be called good citizens. The things I



pointed out may be trite. I know I have spoken in the way of exhortation rather than with an attempt to say something new and striking. Perhaps you have suspected, what I am quite willing to confess, that, behind all that I have said, there is in my mind a sober conviction that we all can and ought to do more for the country that lives in us than it has been our habit to do; and that no better means to this end are at hand than a revival of pure patriotic affection for our country for its own sake, and the acceptance, as permanent occupants in our hearts and minds, of the virtues which Washington regarded as all that was necessary to make us a great and happy people, and which he declared to be "the great and essential pillars of public felicity"—harmony, honesty, industry, and frugality.

# OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A NATION

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

[INAUGURAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT WASHINGTON,  
MARCH 4, 1905]

No people on earth have more cause to be thankful than ours, and this is said reverently, in no spirit of boastfulness in our own strength, but with gratitude to the Giver of Good, who has blessed us with the conditions which have enabled us to achieve so large a measure of well-being and of happiness. To us as a people it has been granted to lay the foundations of our national life in a new continent. We are the heirs of the ages, and yet we have had to pay few of the penalties which in old countries are exacted by the dead hand of a bygone civilization. We have not been obliged to fight for our existence against any alien race; and yet our life has called for the vigor and effort without which the manlier and hardier virtues wither away. Under such conditions it would be our own fault if we failed; and the success which we have had in the past, the success which we confidently believe the future will bring, should cause in us no feeling of vainglory, but rather a deep and abiding realization of all which life has offered us; a full acknowledgment of the responsibility which is ours; and a fixed determination to show that under a free government a mighty people can thrive best,

alike as regards the things of the body and the things of the soul.

Much has been given to us, and much will rightfully be expected from us. We have duties to others and duties to ourselves; and we can shirk neither. We have become a great nation, forced by the fact of its greatness into relations with the other nations of the earth; and we must behave as beseems a people with such responsibilities. Toward all other nations, large and small, our attitude must be one of cordial and sincere friendship. We must show not only in our words but in our deeds that we are earnestly desirous of securing their good will by acting toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights. But justice and generosity in a nation, as in an individual, count most when shown not by the weak but by the strong. While ever careful to refrain from wronging others, we must be no less insistent that we are not wronged ourselves. We wish peace; but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression.

Our relations with the other Powers of the world are important; but still more important are our relations among ourselves. Such growth in wealth, in population, and in power as this nation has seen during the century and a quarter of its national life

is inevitably accompanied by a like growth in the problems which are ever before every nation that rises to greatness. Power invariably means both responsibility and danger. Our forefathers faced certain perils which we have outgrown. We now face other perils, the very existence of which it was impossible that they should foresee. Modern life is both complex and intense, and the tremendous changes wrought by the extraordinary industrial development of the last half century are felt in every fiber of our social and political being. Never before have men tried so vast and formidable an experiment as that of administering the affairs of a continent under the form of a democratic republic. The conditions which have told for our marvelous material well-being, which have developed to a very high degree our energy, self-reliance, and individual initiative, have also brought the care and anxiety inseparable from the accumulation of great wealth in industrial centers. Upon the success of our experiment much depends; not only as regards our own welfare, but as regards the welfare of mankind. If we fail, the cause of free self-government throughout the world will rock to its foundations; and therefore our responsibility is heavy, to ourselves, to the world as it is today, and to the generations yet unborn. There is no good reason why we should fear the future but there is every reason why we should face it seriously, neither hiding from ourselves the gravity of the problems before us nor fearing to approach these problems with the unbending, unflinching purpose to solve them aright.

Yet, after all, though the problems are new, though the tasks set before us differ from the tasks set before our fathers who founded and preserved this Republic, the spirit in which these tasks must be undertaken and these problems faced, if our duty is to be well done, remains essentially unchanged. We know that self-government is difficult. We know that no people needs such high traits of character as that people which seeks to govern its affairs aright through the freely expressed will of the freemen who compose it. But we have faith that we shall not prove false to the memories of the men of the mighty past. They did their work, they left us the splendid heritage we now enjoy. We in our turn have an assured confidence that we shall be able to leave this heritage unwasted and enlarged to our children and our children's children. To do so we must show, not merely in great crises, but in the everyday affairs of life, the qualities of practical intelligence, of courage, of hardihood and endurance, and above all the power of devotion to a lofty ideal, which made great the men who founded this Republic in the days of Washington, which made great the men who preserved this Republic in the days of Abraham Lincoln.

# THE MEANING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

WOODROW WILSON

[DELIVERED AT INDEPENDENCE HALL, JULY 4, 1914]

We are assembled to celebrate the one hundred and thirty-eighth anniversary of the birth of the United States. I suppose that we can more vividly realize the circumstances of that birth standing on this historic spot than it would be possible to realize them anywhere else. The Declaration of Independence was written in Philadelphia; it was adopted in this historic building by which we stand. I have just had the privilege of sitting in the chair of the great man who presided over the deliberations of those who gave the declaration to the world.<sup>1</sup> My hand rests at this moment upon the table upon which the declaration was signed. We can feel that we are almost in the visible and tangible presence of a great historic transaction.

Have you ever read the Declaration of Independence or attended with close comprehension to the real character of it when you have heard it read? If you have, you will know that it is not a Fourth of July oration. The Declaration of Independence was a document preliminary to war. It was a vital piece of practical business, not a piece of rhetoric; and if you will pass beyond those preliminary passages which we are accustomed to quote about the rights of men



and read into the heart of the document you will see that it is very express and detailed, that it consists of a series of definite specifications concerning actual public business of the day. Not the business of our day, for the matter with which it deals is past, but the business of that first revolution by which the Nation was set up, the business of 1776. Its general statements, its general declarations can not mean anything to us unless we append to it a similar specific body of particulars as to what we consider the essential business of our own day.

Liberty does not consist, my fellow citizens, in mere general declarations of the rights of man. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action. Therefore, standing here where the declaration was adopted, reading its businesslike sentences, we ought to ask ourselves what there is in it for us. There is nothing in it for us unless we can translate it into the terms of our own conditions and of our own lives. We must reduce it to what the lawyers call a bill of particulars. It contains a bill of particulars, but the bill of particulars of 1776. If we would keep it alive, we must fill it with a bill of particulars of the year 1914.

The task to which we have constantly to readdress ourselves is the task of proving that we are worthy of the men who drew this great declaration<sup>2</sup> and know what they would have done in our circumstances. Patriotism consists in some very practical things—practical in that they belong to the life of every day, that they wear no extraordinary distinction about them, that they are connected with commonplace duty.

The way to be patriotic in America is not only to love America but to love the duty that lies nearest to our hand and know that in performing it we are serving our country. There are some gentlemen in Washington, for example, at this very moment who are showing themselves very patriotic in a way which does not attract wide attention but seems to belong to mere everyday obligations. The Members of the House and Senate who stay in hot Washington to maintain a quorum of the Houses and transact the all-important business of the Nation are doing an act of patriotism. I honor them for it, and I am glad to stay there and stick by them until the work is done.

It is patriotic, also, to learn what the facts of our national life are and to face them with candor. I have heard a great many facts stated about the present business condition<sup>3</sup> of this country, for example—a great many allegations of fact, at any rate, but the allegations do not tally with one another. And yet I know that truth always matches with truth; and when I find some insisting that everything is going wrong and others insisting that everything is going right, and when I know from a wide observation of the general circumstances of the country taken as a whole that things are going extremely well, I wonder what those who are crying out that things are wrong are trying to do. Are they trying to serve the country, or are they trying to serve something smaller than the country? Are they trying to put hope into the hearts of the men who work and toil every day, or are they trying to plant discouragement and despair in those

hearts? And why do they cry that everything is wrong and yet do nothing to set it right? If they love America and anything is wrong amongst us, it is their business to put their hand with ours to the task of setting it right. When the facts are known and acknowledged, the duty of all patriotic men is to accept them in candor and to address themselves hopefully and confidently to the common counsel which is necessary to act upon them wisely and in universal concert.

I have had some experiences in the last fourteen months which have not been entirely reassuring. It was universally admitted, for example, my fellow citizens, that the banking system of this country needed reorganization. We set the best minds that we could find to the task of discovering the best method of reorganization.<sup>4</sup> But we met with hardly anything but criticism from the bankers of the country; we met with hardly anything but resistance from the majority of those at least who spoke at all concerning the matter. And yet so soon as that act was passed there was a universal chorus of applause, and the very men who had opposed the measure joined in that applause. If it was wrong the day before it was passed, why was it right the day after it was passed? Where had been the candor of criticism not only, but the concert of counsel which makes legislative action vigorous and safe and successful?

It is not patriotic to concert measures against one another; it is patriotic to concert measures for one another.

In one sense the Declaration of Independence has lost its significance. It has lost its significance as a declaration of national independence. Nobody outside of America believed when it was uttered that we could make good our independence; now nobody anywhere would dare to doubt that we are independent and can maintain our independence. As a declaration of independence, therefore, it is a mere historic document. Our independence is a fact so stupendous that it can be measured only by the size and energy and variety and wealth and power of one of the greatest nations in the world. But it is one thing to be independent and it is another thing to know what to do with your independence. It is one thing to come to your majority and another thing to know what you are going to do with your life and your energies; and one of the most serious questions for sober-minded men to address themselves to in the United States is this: What are we going to do with the influence and power of this great Nation? Are we going to play the old rôle of using that power for our aggrandizement and material benefit only? You know what that may mean. It may upon occasion mean that we shall use it to make the people of other nations suffer in the way in which we said it was intolerable to suffer when we uttered our Declaration of Independence.

The Department of State at Washington is constantly called upon to back up the commercial enterprises and the industrial enterprises of the United States in foreign countries, and it at one time went

so far in that direction that all its diplomacy came to be designated as "dollar diplomacy." It was called upon to support every man who wanted to earn anything anywhere if he was an American. But there ought to be a limit to that. There is no man who is more interested than I am in carrying the enterprise of American business men to every quarter of the globe. I was interested in it long before I was suspected of being a politician. I have been preaching it year after year as the great thing that lay in the future for the United States, to show her wit and skill and enterprise and influence in every country in the world. But observe the limit to all that which is laid upon us perhaps more than upon any other nation in the world. We set this Nation up, at any rate we professed to set it up, to vindicate the rights of men. We did not name any differences between one race and another. We did not set up any barriers against any particular people. We opened our gates to all the world and said, "Let all men who wish to be free come to us and they will be welcome." We said, "This independence of ours is not a selfish thing for our own exclusive private use. It is for everybody to whom we can find the means of extending it." We can not with that oath taken in our youth, we can not with that great ideal set before us when we were a young people and numbered only a scant 3,000,000, take upon ourselves, now that we are 100,000,000 strong, any other conception of duty than we then entertained. If American enterprise in foreign countries, particularly in those foreign countries which



are not strong enough to resist us, takes the shape of imposing upon and exploiting the mass of the people of that country it ought to be checked and not encouraged. I am willing to get anything for an American that money and enterprise can obtain except the suppression of the rights of other men. I will not help any man buy a power which he ought not to exercise over his fellow beings.<sup>5</sup>

You know, my fellow countrymen, what a big question there is in Mexico. Eighty-five per cent of the Mexican people have never been allowed to have any genuine participation in their own Government or to exercise any substantial rights with regard to the very land they live upon. All the rights that men most desire have been exercised by the other fifteen per cent. Do you suppose that that circumstance is not sometimes in my thought? I know that the American people have a heart that will beat just as strong for those millions in Mexico as it will beat, or has beaten, for any other millions elsewhere in the world, and that when once they conceive what is at stake in Mexico they will know what ought to be done in Mexico. I hear a great deal said about the loss of property in Mexico and the loss of the lives of foreigners, and I deplore these things with all my heart. Undoubtedly, upon the conclusion of the present disturbed conditions in Mexico those who have been unjustly deprived of their property or in any wise unjustly put upon ought to be compensated. Men's individual rights have no doubt been invaded, and the invasion of those rights has been attended by many deplorable circum-



stances which ought sometime, in the proper way, to be accounted for. But back of it all is the struggle of a people to come into its own, and while we look upon the incidents in the foreground let us not forget the great tragic reality in the background which towers above the whole picture.

A patriotic American is a man who is not niggardly and selfish in the things that he enjoys that make for human liberty and the rights of man. He wants to share them with the whole world, and he is never so proud of the great flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to other people as well as to himself a symbol of hope and liberty. I would be ashamed of this flag if it did anything outside America that we would not permit it to do inside of America.

The world is becoming more complicated every day, my fellow citizens. No man ought to be foolish enough to think that he understands it all. And, therefore, I am glad that there are some simple things in the world. One of the simple things is principle. Honesty is a perfectly simple thing. It is hard for me to believe that in most circumstances when a man has a choice of ways he does not know which is the right way and which is the wrong way. No man who has chosen the wrong way ought even to come into Independence Square; it is holy ground which he ought not to tread upon. He ought not to come where immortal voices have uttered the great sentences of such a document as this Declaration of Independence upon which rests the liberty of a whole nation.

And so I say that it is patriotic sometimes to prefer the honor of the country to its material interest. Would you rather be deemed by all the nations of the world incapable of keeping your treaty obligations in order that you might have free tolls for American ships?<sup>6</sup> The treaty under which we gave up that right may have been a mistaken treaty, but there was no mistake about its meaning.

When I have made a promise as a man I try to keep it, and I know of no other rule permissible to a nation. The most distinguished nation in the world is the nation that can and will keep its promises even to its own hurt. And I want to say parenthetically that I do not think anybody was hurt. I cannot be enthusiastic for subsidies to a monopoly, but let those who are enthusiastic for subsidies ask themselves whether they prefer subsidies to unsullied honor.

The most patriotic man, ladies and gentlemen, is sometimes the man who goes in the direction that he thinks right even when he sees half the world against him. It is the dictate of patriotism to sacrifice yourself if you think that that is the path of honor and of duty. Do not blame others if they do not agree with you. Do not die with bitterness in your heart because you did not convince the rest of the world, but die happy because you believe that you tried to serve your country by not selling your soul. Those were grim days, the days of 1776. Those gentlemen did not attach their names to the Declaration of Independence on this table expecting a holiday on the next day, and that 4th of July was not itself a holiday. They at-

tached their signatures to that significant document knowing that if they failed it was certain that every one of them would hang for the failure. They were committing treason in the interest of the liberty of 3,000,000 people in America. All the rest of the world was against them and smiled with cynical incredulity at the audacious undertaking. Do you think that if they could see this great Nation now they would regret anything that they then did to draw the gaze of a hostile world upon them? Every idea must be started by somebody, and it is a lonely thing to start anything. Yet if it is in you, you must start it if you have a man's blood in you and if you love the country that you profess to be working for.

I am sometimes very much interested when I see gentlemen supposing that popularity is the way to success in America. The way to success in this great country, with its fair judgments, is to show that you are not afraid of anybody except God and His final verdict. If I did not believe that, I would not believe in democracy. If I did not believe that, I would not believe that people can govern themselves. If I did not believe that the moral judgment would be the last judgment, the final judgment, in the minds of men as well as the tribunal of God, I could not believe in popular government. But I do believe these things, and, therefore, I earnestly believe in the democracy not only of America but of every awakened people that wishes and intends to govern and control its own affairs.

It is very inspiring, my friends, to come to this

that may be called the original fountain of independence and liberty in America and here drink draughts of patriotic feeling which seem to renew the very blood in one's veins. Down in Washington sometimes when the days are hot and the business presses intolerably and there are so many things to do that it does not seem possible to do anything in the way it ought to be done, it is always possible to lift one's thought above the task of the moment and, as it were, to realize that great thing of which we are all parts, the great body of American feeling and American principle. No man could do the work that has to be done in Washington if he allowed himself to be separated from that body of principle. He must make himself feel that he is a part of the people of the United States, that he is trying to think not only for them, but with them, and then he can not feel lonely. He not only can not feel lonely but he can not feel afraid of anything.

My dream is that as the years go on and the world knows more and more of America it will also drink at these fountains of youth and renewal; that it also will turn to America for those moral inspirations which lie at the basis of all freedom; that the world will never fear America unless it feels that it is engaged in some enterprise which is inconsistent with the rights of humanity; and that America will come into the full light of the day when all shall know that she puts human rights above all other rights and that her flag is the flag not only of America but of humanity.

What other great people has devoted itself to this

exalted ideal? To what other nation in the world can all eyes look for an instant sympathy that thrills the whole body politic when men anywhere are fighting for their rights? I do not know that there will ever be a declaration of independence and of grievances for mankind, but I believe that if any such document is ever drawn it will be drawn in the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence, and that America has lifted high the light which will shine unto all generations and guide the feet of mankind to the goal of justice and liberty and peace.

# THE AMERICAN OF FOREIGN BIRTH

## WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE A GATHERING OF RECENTLY  
NATURALIZED CITIZENS AT CONVENTION HALL,  
PHILADELPHIA, MAY 10, 1915]

MR. MAYOR, FELLOW CITIZENS: It warms my heart that you should give me such a reception; but it is not of myself that I wish to think tonight, but of those who have just become citizens of the United States.

This is the only country in the world which experiences this constant and repeated rebirth. Other countries depend upon the multiplication of their own native people. This country is constantly drinking strength out of new sources by the voluntary association with it of great bodies of strong men and forward-looking women out of other lands. And so by the gift of the free will of independent people it is being constantly renewed from generation to generation by the same process by which it was originally created. It is as if humanity had determined to see to it that this great Nation, founded for the benefit of humanity, should not lack for the allegiance of the people of the world.

You have just taken an oath of allegiance to the United States. Of allegiance to whom? Of allegiance to no one, unless it be God—certainly not of allegiance to those who temporarily represent this great



Government. You have taken an oath of allegiance to a great ideal, to a great body of principles, to a great hope of the human race. You have said, "We are going to America not only to earn a living, not only to seek the things which it was more difficult to obtain where we were born, but to help forward the great enterprises of the human spirit—to let men know that everywhere in the world there are men who will cross strange oceans and go where a speech is spoken which is alien to them if they can but satisfy their quest for what their spirits crave; knowing that whatever the speech there is but one longing and utterance of the human heart, and that is for liberty and justice." And while you bring all countries with you, you come with a purpose of leaving all other countries behind you—bringing what is best of their spirit, but not looking over your shoulders and seeking to perpetuate what you intended to leave behind in them. I certainly would not be one even to suggest that a man cease to love the home of his birth and the nation of his origin—these things are very sacred and ought not to be put out of our hearts—but it is one thing to love the place where you were born and it is another thing to dedicate yourself to the place to which you go. You can not dedicate yourself to America unless you become in every respect and with every purpose of your will thorough Americans. You can not become thorough Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America

has not yet become an American, and the man who goes among you to trade upon your nationality is no worthy son to live under the Stars and Stripes.

My urgent advice to you would be, not only always to think first of America, but always, also, to think first of humanity. You do not love humanity if you seek to divide humanity into jealous camps. Humanity can be welded together only by love, by sympathy, by justice, not by jealousy and hatred. I am sorry for the man who seeks to make personal capital out of the passions of his fellow-men. He has lost the touch and ideal of America, for America was created to unite mankind by those passions which lift and not by the passions which separate and debase. We came to America, either ourselves or in the persons of our ancestors, to better the ideals of men, to make them see finer things than they had seen before, to get rid of the things that divide and to make sure of the things that unite. It was but an historical accident no doubt that this great country was called the "United States"; yet I am very thankful that it has that word "United" in its title, and the man who seeks to divide man from man, group from group, interest from interest in this great Union is striking at its very heart.

It is a very interesting circumstance to me, in thinking of those of you who have just sworn allegiance to this great Government, that you were drawn across the ocean by some beckoning finger of hope, by some belief, by some vision of a new kind of justice, by some expectation of a better kind of life. No doubt

you have been disappointed in some of us. Some of us are very disappointing. No doubt you have found that justice in the United States goes only with a pure heart and a right purpose as it does everywhere else in the world. No doubt what you found here did not seem touched for you, after all, with the complete beauty of the ideal which you had conceived beforehand. But remember this: If we had grown at all poor in the ideal, you had brought some of it with you. A man does not go out to seek the thing that is not in him. A man does not hope for the thing that he does not believe in, and if some of us have forgotten what America believed in, you, at any rate, imported in your own hearts a renewal of the belief. That is the reason that I, for one, make you welcome. If I have in any degree forgotten what America was intended for, I will thank God if you will remind me. I was born in America. You dreamed dreams of what America was to be, and I hope you brought the dreams with you. No man that does not see visions will ever realize any high hope or undertake any high enterprise. Just because you brought dreams with you, America is more likely to realize dreams such as you brought. You are enriching us if you came expecting us to be better than we are.

See, my friends, what that means. It means that Americans must have a consciousness different from the consciousness of every other nation in the world. I am not saying this with even the slightest thought of criticism of other nations. You know how it is with a family. A family gets centered on itself if it is not

careful and is less interested in the neighbors than it is in its own members. So a nation that is not constantly renewed out of new sources is apt to have the narrowness and prejudice of a family; whereas, America must have this consciousness, that on all sides it touches elbows and touches hearts with all the nations of mankind. The example of America must be a special example. The example of America must be the example not merely of peace because it will not fight, but of peace because peace is the healing and elevating influence of the world and strife is not. There is such a thing as a man being too proud to fight. There is such a thing as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right.

You have come into this great Nation voluntarily seeking something that we have to give, and all that we have to give is this: We can not exempt you from work. No man is exempt from work anywhere in the world. We can not exempt you from the strife and the heartbreaking burden of the struggle of the day—that is common to mankind everywhere; we can not exempt you from the loads that you must carry. We can only make them light by the spirit in which they are carried. That is the spirit of hope. it is the spirit of liberty, it is the spirit of justice.

When I was asked, therefore, by the Mayor and the committee that accompanied him to come up from Washington to meet this great company of newly admitted citizens, I could not decline the invitation. I ought not to be away from Washington, and yet I feel

that it has renewed my spirit as an American to be here. In Washington men tell you so many things every day that are not so, and I like to come and stand in the presence of a great body of my fellow-citizens, whether they have been my fellow-citizens a long time or a short time, and drink, as it were, out of the common fountains with them and go back feeling what you have so generously given me—the sense of your support and of the living vitality in your hearts of the great ideals which have made America the hope of the world.

# AMERICA FIRST

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE DAUGHTERS OF THE  
AMERICAN REVOLUTION, WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
OCTOBER 11, 1915]

Again it is my very great privilege to welcome you to the City of Washington and to the hospitalities of the Capital. May I admit a point of ignorance? I was surprised to learn that this association is so young, and that an association so young should devote itself wholly to memory I can not believe. For to me the duties to which you are consecrated are more than the duties and the pride of memory.

There is a very great thrill to be had from the memories of the American Revolution, but the American Revolution was a beginning, not a consummation, and the duty laid upon us by that beginning is the duty of bringing the things then begun to a noble triumph of completion. For it seems to me that the peculiarity of patriotism in America is that it is not a mere sentiment. It is an active principle of conduct. It is something that was born into the world, not to please it but to regenerate it. It is something that was born into the world to replace systems that had preceded it and to bring men out upon a new plane of privilege. The glory of the men whose memories you honor and perpetuate is that they saw this vision, and it was a vision of the future. It was a vision of



great days to come when a little handful of three million people upon the borders of a single sea should have become a great multitude of free men and women spreading across a great continent, dominating the shores of two oceans, and sending West as well as East the influences of individual freedom. These things were consciously in their minds as they framed the great Government which was born out of the American Revolution; and every time we gather to perpetuate their memories it is incumbent upon us that we should be worthy of recalling them and that we should endeavor by every means in our power to emulate their example.

The American Revolution was the birth of a nation; it was the creation of a great free republic based upon traditions of personal liberty which theretofore had been confined to a single little island, but which it was purposed should spread to all mankind. And the singular fascination of American history is that it has been a process of constant re-creation, of making over again in each generation the thing which was conceived at first. You know how peculiarly necessary that has been in our case, because America has not grown by the mere multiplication of the original stock. It is easy to preserve tradition with continuity of blood; it is easy in a single family to remember the origins of the race and the purposes of its organization; but it is not so easy when that race is constantly being renewed and augmented from other sources, from stocks that did not carry or originate the same principles.

So from generation to generation strangers have had to be indoctrinated with the principles of the American family, and the wonder and the beauty of it all has been that the infection has been so generously easy. For the principles of liberty are united with the principles of hope. Every individual, as well as every Nation, wishes to realize the best thing that is in him, the best thing that can be conceived out of the materials of which his spirit is constructed. It has happened in a way that fascinates the imagination that we have not only been augmented by additions from outside, but that we have been greatly stimulated by those additions. Living in the easy prosperity of a free people, knowing that the sun had always been free to shine upon us and prosper our undertakings, we did not realize how hard the task of liberty is and how rare the privilege of liberty is; but men were drawn out of every climate and out of every race because of an irresistible attraction of their spirits to the American ideal. They thought of America as lifting, like that great statue in the harbor of New York, a torch to light the pathway of men to the things that they desire, and men of all sorts and conditions struggled toward that light and came to our shores with an eager desire to realize it, and a hunger for it such as some of us no longer felt, for we were as if satiated and satisfied and were indulging ourselves after a fashion that did not belong to the ascetic devotion of the early devotees of those great principles. Strangers came to remind us of what we had promised ourselves and through ourselves had promised man-

kind. All men came to us and said, "Where is the bread of life with which you promised to feed us, and have you partaken of it yourselves?" For my part, I believe that the constant renewal of this people out of foreign stocks has been a constant source of reminder to this people of what the inducement was that was offered to men who would come and be of our number.

Now we have come to a time of special stress and test. There never was a time when we needed more clearly to conserve the principles of our own patriotism than this present time. The rest of the world from which our politics were drawn seems for the time in the crucible and no man can predict what will come out of that crucible. We stand apart, unembroiled, conscious of our own principles, conscious of what we hope and purpose, so far as our powers permit, for the world at large, and it is necessary that we should consolidate the American principle. Every political action, every social action, should have for its object in America at this time to challenge the spirit of America; to ask that every man and woman who thinks first of America should rally to the standards of our life. There have been some among us who have not thought first of America, who have thought to use the might of America in some matter not of America's origination. They have forgotten that the first duty of a nation is to express its own individual principles in the action of the family of nations and not to seek to aid and abet any rival or contrary ideal.

Neutrality is a negative word. It is a word that

does not express what America ought to feel. America has a heart and that heart throbs with all sorts of intense sympathies, but America has schooled its heart to love the things that America believes in and it ought to devote itself only to the things that America believes in; and, believing that America stands apart in its ideals, it ought not to allow itself to be drawn, so far as its heart is concerned, into anybody's quarrel.<sup>1</sup> Not because it does not understand the quarrel, not because it does not in its head assess the merits of the controversy, but because America has promised the world to stand apart and maintain certain principles of action which are grounded in law and in justice. We are not trying to keep out of trouble; we are trying to preserve the foundations upon which peace can be rebuilt. Peace can be rebuilt only upon the ancient and accepted principles of international law, only upon those things which remind nations of their duties to each other, and, deeper than that, of their duties to mankind and to humanity.

America has a great cause which is not confined to the American continent. It is the cause of humanity itself. I do not mean in anything that I say even to imply a judgment upon any nation or upon any policy, for my object here this afternoon is not to sit in judgment upon anybody but ourselves and to challenge you to assist all of us who are trying to make America more than ever conscious of her own principles and her own duty. I look forward to the necessity in every political agitation in the years which

are immediately at hand of calling upon every man to declare himself, where he stands. Is it America first or is it not?

We ought to be very careful about some of the impressions that we are forming just now. There is too general an impression, I fear, that very large numbers of our fellow-citizens born in other lands have not entertained with sufficient intensity and affection the American ideal. But the number of such is, I am sure, not large. Those who would seek to represent them are very vocal, but they are not very influential. Some of the best stuff of America has come out of foreign lands, and some of the best stuff in America is in the men who are naturalized citizens of the United States. I would not be afraid upon the test of "America first" to take a census of all the foreign-born citizens of the United States, for I know that the vast majority of them came here because they believed in America; and their belief in America has made them better citizens than some people who were born in America. They can say that they have bought this privilege with a great price. They have left their homes, they have left their kindred, they have broken all the nearest and dearest ties of human life in order to come to a new land, take a new rootage, begin a new life, and so by self-sacrifice express their confidence in a new principle; whereas, it cost us none of these things. We were born into this privilege; we were rocked and cradled in it; we did nothing to create it; and it is, therefore, the greater duty on our part to do a great deal to enhance it and preserve it.



I am not deceived as to the balance of opinion among the foreign-born citizens of the United States, but I am in a hurry for an opportunity to have a line-up and let the men who are thinking first of other countries stand on one side and all those that are for America first, last, and all the time on the other side.

Now, you can do a great deal in this direction. When I was a college officer I used to be very much opposed to hazing; not because hazing is not wholesome, but because sophomores are poor judges. I remember a very dear friend of mine, a professor of ethics on the other side of the water, was asked if he thought it was ever justifiable to tell a lie. He said Yes, he thought it was sometimes justifiable to lie; "but," he said, "it is so difficult to judge of the justification that I usually tell the truth." I think that ought to be the motto of the sophomore. There are freshmen who need to be hazed, but the need is to be judged by such nice tests that a sophomore is hardly old enough to determine them. But the world can determine them. We are not freshmen at college, but we are constantly hazed. I would a great deal rather be obliged to draw pepper up my nose than to observe the hostile glances of my neighbors. I would a great deal rather be beaten than ostracized. I would a great deal rather endure any sort of physical hardship if I might have the affection of my fellow-men. We constantly discipline our fellow-citizens by having an opinion about them. That is the sort of discipline we ought now to administer to everybody who is not to the very core of his heart an American. Just have



an opinion about him and let him experience the atmospheric effects of that opinion! And I know of no body of persons comparable to a body of ladies for creating an atmosphere of opinion! I have myself in part yielded to the influences of that atmosphere, though it took me a long time to determine how I was going to vote in New Jersey.<sup>2</sup>

So it has seemed to me that my privilege this afternoon was not merely a privilege of courtesy, but the real privilege of reminding you—for I am sure I am doing nothing more—of the great principles which we stand associated to promote. I for my part rejoice that we belong to a country in which the whole business of government is so difficult. We do not take orders from anybody; it is a universal communication of conviction, the most subtle, delicate, and difficult of processes. There is not a single individual's opinion that is not of some consequence in making up the grand total, and to be in this great coöperative effort is the most stimulating thing in the world. A man standing alone may well misdoubt his own judgment. He may mistrust his own intellectual processes; he may even wonder if his own heart leads him right in matters of public conduct; but if he finds his heart part of the great throb of national life, there can be no doubt about it. If that is his happy circumstance, then he may know that he is part of one of the great forces of the world.

I would not feel any exhilaration in belonging to America if I did not feel that she was something more than a rich and powerful nation. I should not

feel proud to be in some respects and for a little while her spokesman if I did not believe that there was something else than physical force behind her. I believe that the glory of America is that she is a great spiritual conception and that in the spirit of her institutions dwells not only her distinction but her power. The one thing that the world cannot permanently resist is the moral force of great and triumphant convictions.

# THE SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE CITIZENSHIP CONVENTION, WILSON NORMAL SCHOOL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 13, 1916.]

I have come here for the simple purpose of expressing my very deep interest in what these conferences are intended to attain. It is not fair to the great multitudes of hopeful men and women who press into this country from other countries that we should leave them without that friendly and intimate instruction which will enable them very soon after they come to find out what America is like at heart and what America is intended for among the nations of the world.

I believe that the chief school that these people must attend after they get here is the school which all of us attend, which is furnished by the life of the communities in which we live and the nation to which we belong. It has been a very touching thought to me sometimes to think of the hopes which have drawn these people to America. I have no doubt that many a simple soul has been thrilled by that great statue standing in the harbor of New York and seeming to lift the light of liberty for the guidance of the feet of men; and I can imagine that they have expected here something ideal in the treatment that they will receive, something ideal in the laws which they would

have to live under, and it has caused me many a time to turn upon myself the eye of examination to see whether there burned in me the true light of the American spirit which they expected to find here. It is easy, my fellow-citizens, to communicate physical lessons, but it is very difficult to communicate spiritual lessons. America was intended to be a spirit among the nations of the world, and it is the purpose of conferences like this to find out the best way to introduce the newcomers to this spirit, and by that very interest in them to enhance and purify in ourselves the thing that ought to make America great and not only ought to make her great, but ought to make her exhibit a spirit unlike any other nation in the world.

I have never been among those who felt comfortable in boasting of the superiority of America over other countries. The way to cure yourself of that is to travel in other countries and find out how much of nobility and character and fine enterprise there is everywhere in the world. The most that America can hope to do is to show, it may be, the finest example, not the only example, of the things that ought to benefit and promote the progress of the world.

So my interest in this movement is as much an interest in ourselves as in those whom we are trying to Americanize, because if we are genuine Americans they cannot avoid the infection; whereas, if we are not genuine Americans, there will be nothing to infect them with, and no amount of teaching, no amount of exposition of the Constitution,—which I find very few persons understand,—no amount of dwelling upon the

idea of liberty and of justice will accomplish the object we have in view, unless we ourselves illustrate the idea of justice and of liberty. My interest in this movement is, therefore, a two-fold interest. I believe it will assist us to become self-conscious in respect of the fundamental ideas of American life. When you ask a man to be loyal to a government, if he comes from some foreign countries, his idea is that he is expected to be loyal to a certain set of persons like a ruler or a body set in authority over him, but that is not the American idea. Our idea is that he is to be loyal to certain objects in life, and that the only reason he has a President and a Congress and a Governor and a State Legislature and courts is that the community shall have instrumentalities by which to promote those objects. It is a coöperative organization expressing itself in this Constitution, expressing itself in these laws, intending to express itself in the exposition of those laws by the courts; and the idea of America is not so much that men are to be restrained and punished by the law as instructed and guided by the law. That is the reason so many hopeful reforms come to grief. A law cannot work until it expresses the spirit of the community for which it is enacted, and if you try to enact into law what expresses only the spirit of a small coterie or of a small minority, you know, or at any rate you ought to know, beforehand that it is not going to work. The object of the law is that there, written upon these pages, the citizen should read the record of the experience of this state and nation; what they have concluded it is necessary for

them to do because of the life they have lived and the things that they have discovered to be elements in that life. So that we ought to be careful to maintain a government at which the immigrant can look with the closest scrutiny and to which he should be at liberty to address this question: "You declare this to be a land of liberty and of equality and of justice; have you made it so by your law?" We ought to be able in our schools, in our night schools, and in every other method of instructing these people, to show them that that has been our endeavor. We cannot conceal from them long the fact that we are just as human as any other nation, that we are just as selfish, that there are just as many mean people amongst us as anywhere else, that there are just as many people here who want to take advantage of other people as you can find in other countries, just as many cruel people, just as many people heartless when it comes to maintaining and promoting their own interest; but you can show that our object is to get these people in harness and see to it that they do not do any damage and are not allowed to indulge the passions which would bring injustice and calamity at last upon a nation whose object is spiritual and not material.

America has built up a great body of wealth. America has become, from the physical point of view, one of the most powerful nations in the world, a nation which if it took the pains to do so, could build that power up into one of the most formidable instruments in the world, one of the most formidable instruments of force, but which has no other idea than to use its



force for ideal objects and not for self-aggrandizement.

We have been disturbed recently, my fellow-citizens, by certain symptoms which have showed themselves in our body politic. Certain men,—I have never believed a great number,—born in other lands, have in recent months thought more of those lands than they have of the honor and interest of the government under which they are now living. They have even gone so far as to draw apart in spirit and in organization from the rest of us to accomplish some special object of their own.<sup>1</sup> I am not here going to utter any criticism of these people, but I want to say this, that such a thing as that is absolutely incompatible with the fundamental idea of loyalty, and that loyalty is not a self-pleasing virtue. I am not bound to be loyal to the United States to please myself. I am bound to be loyal to the United States because I live under its laws and am its citizen, and whether it hurts me or whether it benefits me, I am obliged to be loyal. Loyalty means nothing unless it has at its heart the absolute principle of self-sacrifice. Loyalty means that you ought to be ready to sacrifice every interest that you have, and your life itself, if your country calls upon you to do so, and that is the sort of loyalty which ought to be inculcated into these newcomers, that they are not to be loyal only so long as they are pleased, but that, having once entered into this sacred relationship, they are bound to be loyal whether they are pleased or not; and that loyalty which is merely self-pleasing is only self-indulgence and selfishness.

No man has ever risen to the real stature of spiritual manhood until he has found that it is finer to serve somebody else than it is to serve himself.

These are the conceptions which we ought to teach the newcomers into our midst, and we ought to realize that the life of every one of us is part of the schooling, and that we cannot preach loyalty unless we set the example, that we cannot profess things with any influence upon others unless we practice them also. This process of Americanization is going to be a process of self-examination, a process of purification, a process of rededication to the things which America represents and is proud to represent. And it takes a great deal more courage and steadfastness, my fellow-citizens, to represent ideal things than to represent anything else. It is easy to lose your temper, and hard to keep it. It is easy to strike and sometimes very difficult to refrain from striking, and I think you will agree with me that we are most justified in being proud of doing the things that are hard to do and not the things that are easy. You do not settle things quickly by taking what seems to be the quickest way to settle them. You may make the complication just that much the more profound and inextricable, and, therefore, what I believe America should exalt above everything else is the sovereignty of thoughtfulness and sympathy and vision as against the grosser impulses of mankind. No nation can live without vision, and no vision will exalt a nation except the vision of real liberty and real justice and purity of conduct.

# ABRAHAM LINCOLN

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE ACCEPTANCE BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT OF THE GIFT TO THE NATION OF THE LINCOLN BIRTHPLACE FARM AT HODGENVILLE, KENTUCKY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1916.]

No more significant memorial could have been presented to the nation than this. It expresses so much of what is singular and noteworthy in the history of the country; it suggests so many of the things that we prize most highly in our life and in our system of government. How eloquent this little house within this shrine is of the vigor of democracy! There is nowhere in the land any home so remote, so humble, that it may not contain the power of mind and heart and conscience to which nations yield and history submits its processes. Nature pays no tribute to aristocracy, subscribes to no creed of caste, renders fealty to no monarch or master of any name or kind. Genius is no snob. It does not run after titles or seek by preference the high circles of society. It affects humble company as well as great. It pays no special tribute to universities or learned societies or conventional standards of greatness, but serenely chooses its own comrades, its own haunts, its own cradle even, and its own life of adventure and of training. Here

is proof of it. This little hut was the cradle of one of the great sons of men, a man of singular, delightful, vital genius who presently emerged upon the great stage of the nation's history, gaunt, shy, ungainly, but dominant and majestic, a natural ruler of men, himself inevitably the central figure of the great plot. No man can explain this, but every man can see how it demonstrates the vigor of democracy, where every door is open, in every hamlet and countryside, in city and wilderness alike, for the ruler to emerge when he will and claim his leadership in the free life. Such are the authentic proofs of the validity and vitality of democracy.

Here, no less, hides the mystery of democracy. Who shall guess this secret of nature and providence and a free polity? Whatever the vigor and vitality of the stock from which he sprang, its mere vigor and soundness do not explain where this man got his great heart that seemed to comprehend all mankind in its catholic and benignant sympathy, the mind that sat enthroned behind those brooding, melancholy eyes, whose vision swept many an horizon which those about him dreamed not of,—that mind that comprehended what it had never seen, and understood the language of affairs with the ready ease of one to the manner born,—or that nature which seemed in its varied richness to be the familiar of men of every way of life. This is the sacred mystery of democracy; that its richest fruits spring up out of soils which no man has prepared and in circumstances amidst which they are the least expected. This is a place alike of mystery and of reassurance.

It is likely that in a society ordered otherwise than our own Lincoln could not have found himself or the path of fame and power upon which he walked serenely to his death. In this place it is right that we should remind ourselves of the solid and striking facts upon which our faith in democracy is founded. Many another man besides Lincoln has served the nation in its highest places of counsel and of action whose origins were as humble as his. Though the greatest example of the universal energy, richness, stimulation, and force of democracy, he is only one example among many. The permeating and all-pervasive virtue of the freedom which challenges us in America to make the most of every gift and power we possess every page of our history serves to emphasize and illustrate. Standing here in this place, it seems almost the whole of the stirring story.

Here Lincoln had his beginnings. Here the end and consummation of that great life seem remote and a bit incredible. And yet there was no break anywhere between beginning and end, no lack of natural sequence anywhere. Nothing really incredible happened. Lincoln was unaffectedly as much at home in the White House as he was here. Do you share with me the feeling, I wonder, that he was permanently at home nowhere? It seems to me that in the case of a man,—I would rather say of a spirit,—like Lincoln the question *where* he was is of little significance, that it is always *what* he was that really arrests our thought and takes hold of our imagination. It is the spirit always that is sovereign. Lincoln, like the



rest of us, was put through the discipline of the world,—a very rough and exacting discipline for him, an indispensable discipline for every man who would know what he is about in the midst of the world's affairs; but his spirit got only its schooling there. It did not derive its character or its vision from the experiences which brought it to its full revelation. The test of every American must always be, not where he is, but what he is. That, also, is of the essence of democracy, and is the moral of which this place is most gravely expressive.

We would like to think of men like Lincoln and Washington as typical Americans, but no man can be typical who is so unusual as these great men were. It was typical of American life that it should produce such men with supreme indifference as to the manner in which it produced them, and as readily here in this hut as amidst the little circle of cultivated gentlemen to whom Virginia owed so much in leadership and example. And Lincoln and Washington were typical Americans in the use they made of their genius. But there will be few such men at best, and we will not look into the mystery of how and why they come. We will only keep the door open for them always, and a hearty welcome,—after we have recognized them.

I have read many biographies of Lincoln; I have sought out with the greatest interest the many intimate stories that are told of him, the narratives of nearby friends, the sketches at close quarters, in which those who had the privilege of being associated



with him have tried to depict for us the very man himself "in his habit as he lived"<sup>1</sup>; but I have nowhere found a real intimate of Lincoln's. I nowhere get the impression in any narrative or reminiscence that the writer had in fact penetrated to the heart of his mystery, or that any man could penetrate to the heart of it. That brooding spirit had no real familiars. I get the impression that it never spoke out in complete self-revelation, and that it could not reveal itself completely to anyone. It was a very lonely spirit that looked out from underneath those shaggy brows and comprehended men without fully communing with them, as if, in spite of all its genial efforts at comradeship, it dwelt apart, saw its visions of duty where no man looked on. There is a very holy and very terrible isolation for the conscience of every man who seeks to read the destiny in affairs for others as well as for himself, for a nation as well as for individuals. That privacy no man can intrude upon. That lonely search of the spirit for the right perhaps no man can assist. This strange child of the cabin kept company with invisible things, was born into no intimacy but that of its own silently assembling and deploying thoughts.

I have come here today, not to utter a eulogy on Lincoln; he stands in need of none, but to endeavor to interpret the meaning of this gift to the nation of the place of his birth and origin. Is not this an altar upon which we may forever keep alive the vestal fire of democracy as upon a shrine at which some of the deepest and most sacred hopes of mankind may from

age to age be rekindled? For these hopes must constantly be rekindled, and only those who live can rekindle them. The only stuff that can retain the life-giving heat is the stuff of living hearts. And the hopes of mankind cannot be kept alive by words merely, by constitutions and doctrines of right and codes of liberty. The object of democracy is to transmute these into the life and action of society, the self-denial and self-sacrifice of heroic men and women willing to make their lives an embodiment of right and service and enlightened purpose. The commands of democracy are as imperative as its privileges and opportunities are wide and generous. Its compulsion is upon us. It will be great and lift a great light for the guidance of the nations only if we are great and carry that light high for the guidance of our own feet. We are not worthy to stand here unless we ourselves be in deed and in truth real democrats and servants of mankind, ready to give our very lives for the freedom and justice and spiritual exaltation of the great nation which shelters and nurtures us.

# A WORLD LEAGUE FOR PEACE<sup>1</sup>

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 22, 1917.]

On the 18th of December last I addressed an identic note to the Governments of the nations now at war, requesting them to state, more definitely than they had yet been stated by either group of belligerents, the terms upon which they would deem it possible to make peace. I spoke on behalf of humanity and of the rights of all neutral nations like our own, many of whose most vital interests the war puts in constant jeopardy.

The Central Powers united in a reply which stated merely that they were ready to meet their antagonists in conference to discuss terms of peace.

The Entente Powers have replied much more definitely and have stated, in general terms, indeed, but with sufficient definiteness to imply details, the arrangements, guarantees, and acts of reparation which they deem to be the indispensable conditions of a satisfactory settlement.

We are that much nearer a definite discussion of the peace which shall end the present war. We are that much nearer the discussion of the international concert which must thereafter hold the world at peace.

In every discussion of the peace that must end this war it is taken for granted that that peace must be followed by some definite concert of power which will make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe should ever overwhelm us again. Every lover of mankind, every sane and thoughtful man, must take that for granted.

I have sought this opportunity to address you because I thought that I owed it to you, as the council associated with me in the final determination of our international obligations, to disclose to you, without reserve, the thought and purpose that have been taking form in my mind in regard to the duty of our Government in these days to come when it will be necessary to lay afresh and upon a new plan the foundations of peace among the nations.

It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in that great enterprise. To take part in such a service will be the opportunity for which they have sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their polity and the approved practices of their Government, ever since the days when they set up a new nation in the high and honorable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty.

They cannot, in honor, withhold the service to which they are now about to be challenged. They do not wish to withhold it. But they owe it to themselves and to the other nations of the world to state the conditions under which they will feel free to render it.

That service is nothing less than this—to add their

authority and their power to the authority and force of other nations to guarantee peace and justice throughout the world. Such a settlement cannot now be long postponed. It is right that before it comes this Government should frankly formulate the conditions upon which it would feel justified in asking our people to approve its formal and solemn adherence to a league for peace. I am here to attempt to state those conditions.

The present war must first be ended ; but we owe it to candor and to a just regard for the opinion of mankind to say that so far as our participation in guarantees of future peace is concerned it makes a great deal of difference in what way and upon what terms it is ended.

The treaties and agreements which bring it to an end must embody terms which will create a peace that is worth guaranteeing and preserving, a peace that will win the approval of mankind ; not merely a peace that will serve the several interests and immediate aims of the nations engaged.

We shall have no voice in determining what those terms shall be, but we shall, I feel sure, have a voice in determining whether they shall be made lasting or not by the guarantees of a universal covenant, and our judgment upon what is fundamental and essential as a condition precedent to permanency should be spoken now, not afterward, when it may be too late.

No covenant of coöperative peace that does not include the peoples of the New World can suffice to keep the future safe against war, and yet there is only

one sort of peace that the peoples of America could join in guaranteeing.

The elements of that peace must be elements that engage the confidence and satisfy the principles of the American Governments, elements consistent with their political faith and the practical convictions which the peoples of America have once for all embraced and undertaken to defend.

I do not mean to say that any American Government would throw any obstacle in the way of any terms of peace the Governments now at war might agree upon, or seek to upset them when made, whatever they might be. I only take it for granted that mere terms of peace between the belligerents will not satisfy even the belligerents themselves.<sup>2</sup>

Mere agreements may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged in any alliance hitherto formed or projected that no nation, no probable combination of nations, could face or withstand it.

If the peace presently to be made is to endure it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind.

The terms of the immediate peace agreed upon will determine whether it is a peace for which such a guarantee can be secured. The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this:



Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace or only for a new balance of power? If it be only a struggle for a new balance of power,<sup>3</sup> who will guarantee, who can guarantee, the stable equilibrium of the new arrangement?

Only a tranquil Europe can be a stable Europe. There must be not only a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace.

Fortunately, we have received very explicit assurances on this point. The statesmen of both of the groups of nations now arrayed against one another have said, in terms that could not be misinterpreted, that it was no part of the purpose they had in mind to crush their antagonists. But the implications of these assurances may not be equally clear to all—may not be the same on both sides of the water. I think it will be serviceable if I attempt to set forth what we understand them to be.

They imply, first of all, that it must be a peace without victory. It is not pleasant to say this. I beg that I may be permitted to put my own interpretation upon it and that it may be understood that no other interpretation was in my thought.<sup>4</sup>

I am seeking only to face realities and to face them without soft concealments. Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory,

upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand.

Only a peace between equals can last; only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit. The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of questions of territory or of racial and national allegiance.

The equality of nations upon which peace must be founded, if it is to last, must be an equality of rights; the guarantees exchanged must neither recognize nor imply a difference between big nations and small, between those that are powerful and those that are weak.<sup>5</sup>

Right must be based upon the common strength, not upon the individual strength, of the nations upon whose concert peace will depend.

Equality of territory or of resources there, of course, cannot be; nor any other sort of equality not gained in the ordinary peaceful and legitimate development of the peoples themselves. But no one asks or expects any thing more than an equality of rights. Mankind is looking now for freedom of life, not for equipoises of power.

And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of rights among organized nations. No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that Governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed,<sup>6</sup> and that no right anywhere exists to hand

people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

I take it for granted, for instance, if I may venture upon a single example, that statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland, and that henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship, and of industrial and social development should be guaranteed to all peoples who have lived hitherto under the power of Governments devoted to a faith and purpose hostile to their own.

I speak of this, not because of any desire to exalt an abstract political principle which has always been held very dear by those who have sought to build up liberty in America, but for the same reason that I have spoken of the other conditions of peace which seem to me clearly indispensable—because I wish frankly to uncover realities.

Any peace which does not recognize and accept this principle will inevitably be upset. It will not rest upon the affections or the convictions of mankind. The ferment of spirit of whole populations will fight subtly and constantly against it, and all the world will sympathize. The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right.

So far as practicable, moreover, every great people now struggling toward a full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct

outlet to the great highways of the sea. Where this cannot be done by the cession of territory, it can no doubt be done by the neutralization of direct rights of way under the general guarantee which will assure the peace itself. With a right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.

And the paths of the sea must alike in law and in fact be free. The freedom of the seas is the *sine qua non* of peace, equality, and coöperation.<sup>7</sup>

No doubt a somewhat radical reconsideration of many of the rules of international practice hitherto sought to be established may be necessary in order to make the seas indeed free and common in practically all circumstances for the use of mankind, but the motive for such changes is convincing and compelling. There can be no trust or intimacy between the peoples of the world without them.

The free, constant, unthreatened intercourse of nations is an essential part of the process of peace and of development. It need not be difficult to define or to secure the freedom of the seas if the Governments of the world sincerely desire to come to an agreement concerning it.

It is a problem closely connected with the limitation of naval armaments and the coöperation of the navies of the world in keeping the seas at once free and safe. And the question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of armies and of all programs of military preparation.

Difficult and delicate as these questions are, they must be faced with the utmost candor and decided in a spirit of real accommodation if peace is to come with healing in its wings and come to stay. Peace cannot be had without concession and sacrifice. There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armies are henceforth to continue here and there to be built up and maintained.

The statesmen of the world must plan for peace, and nations must adjust and accommodate their policy to it as they have planned for war and made ready for pitiless contest and rivalry. The question of armaments, whether on land or sea, is the most immediately and intensely practical question connected with the future fortunes of nations and of mankind.

I have spoken upon these great matters without reserve and with the utmost explicitness because it has seemed to me to be necessary if the world's yearning desire for peace was anywhere to find free voice and utterance. Perhaps I am the only person in high authority among all the peoples of the world who is at liberty to speak and hold nothing back.

I am speaking as an individual, and yet I am speaking also, of course, as the responsible head of a great Government, and I feel confident that I have said what the people of the United States would wish me to say. May I not add that I hope and believe that I am in effect speaking for liberals and friends of humanity in every nation and of every program of liberty?

I would fain believe that I am speaking for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who have as yet had no place or opportunity to speak their real hearts out concerning the death and ruin they see to have come already upon the persons and the homes they hold most dear.

And in holding out the expectation that the people and Government of the United States will join the other civilized nations of the world in guaranteeing the permanence of peace upon such terms as I have named, I speak with the greater boldness and confidence because it is clear to every man who can think that there is in this promise no breach in either our traditions or our policy as a nation, but a fulfilment; rather, of all that we have professed or striven for.

I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world;<sup>8</sup> that no nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful.

I am proposing that all nations henceforth avoid entangling alliances which would draw them into competitions of power, catch them in a net of intrigue and selfish rivalry, and disturb their own affairs with influences intruded from without. There is no entangling alliance in a concert of power. When all unite to act in the same sense and with the same purpose, all act in the common interest and are free to



live their own lives under a common protection.

I am proposing government by the consent of the governed; that freedom of the seas which in international conference after conference representatives of the United States have urged with the eloquence of those who are the convinced disciples of liberty; and that moderation of armaments which makes of armies and navies a power for order merely, not an instrument of aggression or of selfish violence.

These are American principles, American policies. We can stand for no others. And they are also the principles and policies of forward-looking men and women everywhere, of every modern nation, of every enlightened community. They are the principles of mankind, and must prevail.<sup>9</sup>

# MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

WOODROW WILSON

[DELIVERED BEFORE CONGRESS FEBRUARY 3, 1917, ON THE  
OCCASION OF SEVERING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS  
WITH GERMANY.]

The Imperial German Government, on the 31st of January, announced to this Government and to the Governments of the other neutral nations that on and after the first day of February, the present month, it would adopt a policy with regard to the use of submarines against all shipping seeking to pass through certain designated areas of the high seas to which it is clearly my duty to call your attention.

Let me remind the Congress that on the 18th of April last, in view of the sinking on the 24th of March of the cross-Channel passenger-steamer *Sussex* by a German submarine, without summons or warning, and the consequent loss of the lives of several citizens of the United States who were passengers aboard her, this Government addressed a note to the Imperial German Government in which it made the following declaration:

If it is still the purpose of the Imperial German Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the uni-

versally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the German Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight-carrying vessels the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether.

In reply to this declaration the German Government gave this Government the following assurances:

The German Government is prepared to do its utmost to confine the operations of war for the rest of its duration to the fighting forces of the belligerents, thereby insuring the freedom of the seas, a principle upon which the German Government believes, now as before, to be in agreement with the Government of the United States.

The German Government, guided by this idea, notifies the Government of the United States that the German naval forces have received the following orders:

In accordance with the general principles of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law, such vessels, both within and without the area declared as naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, unless these ships attempt to escape or offer resistance.

But neutrals cannot expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall, for the sake of neutral interest, restrict the use of an effective weapon if her enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of international law. Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality, and the German Government is convinced that the Government of the United States does not think of making such a demand, knowing that the Government of the United States has repeatedly declared that it is determined to restore the principle of the freedom of the seas from whatever quarter it has been violated.

To this the Government of the United States replied on the 8th of May, accepting, of course, the assurances given, but adding:

The Government of the United States feels it necessary to state that it takes it for granted that the Imperial German Government does not intend to imply that the maintenance of its newly announced policy is in any way contingent upon the course or result of diplomatic negotiations between the Government of the United States and any other belligerent Government, notwithstanding the fact that certain passages in the Imperial Government's note of the 10th instant might appear to be susceptible to that construction. In order, however, to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the Government of the United States notifies the Imperial Government that it cannot for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect by German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals and non-combatants. Responsibility in such matters is single, not joint; absolute, not relative.

To this note of the 8th of May the Imperial German Government made no reply.

On the 31st of January, the Wednesday of the present week, the German Ambassador handed to the Secretary of State, along with a formal note, a memorandum which contains the following statement:

The Imperial Government, therefore, does not doubt that the Government of the United States will understand the situation thus forced upon Germany by the Entente Allies' brutal methods of war and by their determination to destroy the Central Powers, and that the Government of the United States will further realize that the now openly disclosed intentions of the Entente Allies give back to Germany the freedom of action which she

reserved in her note addressed to the Government of the United States on May 4, 1916.

Under these circumstances Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to France, etc. All ships met within the zone will be sunk.

I think that you will agree with me that, in view of this declaration, which suddenly and without prior intimation of any kind deliberately withdraws the solemn assurance given in the Imperial Government's note of the 4th of May, 1916, this Government has no alternative consistent with the dignity and honor of the United States but to take the course which, in its note of the 18th of April, 1916, it announced that it would take in the event that the German Government did not declare and effect an abandonment of the methods of submarine warfare which it was then employing and to which it now purposes again to resort.

I have, therefore, directed the Secretary of State to announce to his Excellency the German ambassador that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire are severed, and that the American ambassador at Berlin will immediately be withdrawn, and, in accordance with this decision, to hand to his Excellency his passports.

Notwithstanding this unexpected action of the German Government, this sudden and deeply deplorable renunciation of its assurances, given this Government at one of the most critical moments of tension in the relations of the two Governments, I refuse to believe

that it is the intention of the German authorities to do in fact what they have warned us they will feel at liberty to do. I cannot bring myself to believe that they will indeed pay no regard to the ancient friendship between their people and our own or to the solemn obligations which have been exchanged between them and destroy American ships and take the lives of American citizens in the wilful prosecution of the ruthless naval program they have announced their intention to adopt.

Only actual overt acts on their part can make me believe it even now.

If this inveterate confidence on my part in the sobriety and prudent foresight of their purpose should unhappily prove unfounded, if American ships and American lives should, in fact, be sacrificed by their naval commanders in heedless contravention of the just and reasonable understandings of international law and the obvious dictates of humanity, I shall take the liberty of coming again before the Congress to ask that authority be given me to use any means that may be necessary for the protection of our seamen and our people in the prosecution of their peaceful and legitimate errands on the high seas. I can do nothing less. I take it for granted that all neutral Governments will take the same course.

I do not desire any hostile conflict with the Imperial German Government. We are the sincere friends of the German people and earnestly desire to remain at peace with the Government which speaks for them. We shall not believe that they are hostile to us until



we are obliged to believe it; and we purpose nothing more than the reasonable defense of the undoubted rights of our people. We wish to serve no selfish ends. We seek merely to stand true alike in thought and in action to the immemorial principles of our people which I sought to express in my address to the Senate only two weeks ago—seek merely to vindicate our right to liberty and justice and an unmolested life. These are bases of peace, not war. God grant we may not be challenged to defend them by acts of wilful injustice on the part of the Government of Germany.

# REQUEST FOR A GRANT OF POWER

WOODROW WILSON

[MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 26, 1917.]

I have again asked the privilege of addressing you because we are moving through critical times, during which it seems to me to be my duty to keep in close touch with the Houses of Congress so that neither counsel nor action shall run at cross-purposes between us.

On the 3d of February I officially informed you of the sudden and unexpected action of the Imperial German Government in declaring its intention to disregard the promises it had made to this Government in April last and undertake immediate submarine operations against all commerce, whether of belligerents or of neutrals, that should seek to approach Great Britain and Ireland, the Atlantic coasts of Europe, or the harbors of the eastern Mediterranean, and to conduct those operations without regard to the established restrictions of international practice, without regard to any considerations of humanity, even, which might interfere with their object.

That policy was forthwith put into practice. It has now been in active exhibition for nearly four weeks. Its practical results are not fully disclosed. The commerce of other neutral nations is suffering severely, but not, perhaps, very much more severely

than it was already suffering before the 1st of February, when the new policy of the Imperial Government was put into operation.

We have asked the coöperation of the other neutral Governments to prevent these depredations, but I fear none of them has thought it wise to join us in any common course of action. Our own commerce has suffered, is suffering, rather in apprehension than in fact, rather because so many of our ships are timidly keeping to their home ports than because American ships have been sunk.

Two American vessels have been sunk, the *Housatonic* and the *Lyman M. Law*. The case of the *Housatonic*, which was carrying foodstuffs consigned to a London firm, was essentially like the case of the *Frye*, in which, it will be recalled, the German Government admitted its liability for damages, and the lives of the crew, as in the case of the *Frye*, were safeguarded with reasonable care.

The case of the *Law*, which was carrying lemon-box staves to Palermo, disclosed a ruthlessness of method which deserves grave condemnation, but was accompanied by no circumstances which might not have been expected at any time in connection with the use of the submarine against merchantmen as the German Government has used it.

In sum, therefore, the situation we find ourselves in with regard to the actual conduct of the German submarine warfare against commerce and its effects upon our own ships and people is substantially the same that it was when I addressed you on the 3d of

February, except for the tying up of our shipping in our own ports because of the unwillingness of our ship-owners to risk their vessels at sea without insurance or adequate protection, and the very serious congestion of our commerce which has resulted, a congestion which is growing rapidly more and more serious every day.

This in itself might presently accomplish, in effect, what the new German submarine orders were meant to accomplish, so far as we are concerned. We can only say, therefore, that the overt act which I have ventured to hope the German commanders would in fact avoid has not occurred.

But while this is happily true, it must be admitted that there have been certain additional indications and expressions of purpose on the part of the German press and the German authorities which have increased rather than lessened the impression that if our ships and our people are spared it will be because of fortunate circumstances or because the commanders of the German submarines which they may happen to encounter exercise an unexpected discretion and restraint, rather than because of the instructions under which those commanders are acting.

It would be foolish to deny that the situation is fraught with the gravest possibilities and dangers. No thoughtful man can fail to see that the necessity for definite action may come at any time, if we are in fact, and not in word merely, to defend our elementary rights as a neutral nation. It would be most imprudent to be unprepared.

I cannot in such circumstances be unmindful of the fact that the expiration of the term of the present Congress is immediately at hand by constitutional limitation, and that it would in all likelihood require an unusual length of time to assemble and organize the Congress which is to succeed it.

I feel that I ought, in view of that fact, to obtain from you full and immediate assurance of the authority which I may need at any moment to exercise. No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers, but I prefer in the present circumstances not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do. We are jointly the servants of the people and must act together and in their spirit, so far as we can divine and interpret it.

No one doubts what it is our duty to do. We must defend our commerce and the lives of our people in the midst of the present trying circumstances with discretion, but with clear and steadfast purpose. Only the method and the extent remain to be chosen upon the occasion, if occasion should indeed arise.

Since it has unhappily proved impossible to safeguard our neutral rights by diplomatic means against the unwarranted infringements they are suffering at the hands of Germany, there may be no recourse but to armed neutrality, which we shall know how to maintain and for which there is abundant American precedent.

It is devoutly to be hoped that it will not be necessary to put armed forces anywhere into action. The American people do not desire it, and our desire is not different from theirs. I am sure that they will understand the spirit in which I am now acting, the purpose I hold nearest my heart, and would wish to exhibit in everything I do. I am anxious that the people of the nations at war also should understand and not mistrust us.

I hope that I need give no further proofs and assurances than I have already given throughout nearly three years of anxious patience that I am the friend of peace, and mean to preserve it for America so long as I am able.

I am not now proposing or contemplating war, or any steps that lead to it. I merely request that you will accord me by your own vote and definite bestowal the means and the authority to safeguard in practice the right of a great people, who are at peace and who are desirous of exercising none but the rights of peace, to follow the pursuit of peace in quietness and good-will—rights recognized time out of mind by all the civilized nations of the world.

No course of my choosing or of theirs will lead to war. War can come only by the wilful acts and aggressions of others.

You will understand why I can make no definite proposals or forecasts of action now, and must ask for your supporting authority in the most general terms. The form in which action may become necessary cannot yet be foreseen. I believe that the



people will be willing to trust me to act with restraint, with prudence, and in the true spirit of amity and good faith that they have themselves displayed throughout these trying months; and it is in that belief that I request that you will authorize me to supply our merchant-ships with defensive arms should that become necessary, and with the means of using them, and to employ any other instrumentalities or methods that may be necessary and adequate to protect our ships and our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits of the seas.

I request also that you will grant me at the same time, along with the powers I ask, a sufficient credit to enable me to provide adequate means of protection where they are lacking, including adequate insurance against the present war risks.

I have spoken of our commerce and of the legitimate errands of our people on the seas, but you will not be misled as to my main thought, the thought that lies beneath these phrases and gives them dignity and weight.

It is not of material interest merely that we are thinking. It is, rather, of fundamental human rights, chief of all the right of life itself. I am thinking not only of the rights of Americans to go and come about their proper business by way of the sea, but also of something much deeper, much more fundamental than that. I am thinking of those rights of humanity without which there is no civilization. My theme is of those great principles of compassion and of protection which mankind has sought to throw

about human lives—the lives of non-combatants, the lives of men who are peacefully at work keeping the industrial processes of the world quick and vital, the lives of women and children, and of those who supply the labor which ministers to their sustenance.

We are speaking of no selfish material rights, but of rights which our hearts support, and whose foundation is that righteous passion for justice upon which all law, all structures alike of family, of state, and of mankind must rest, and upon the ultimate base of our existence and our liberty. I cannot imagine any man with American principles at his heart hesitating to defend these things.

## WAR MESSAGE

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE CONGRESS, APRIL 2, 1917.]

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible<sup>1</sup> that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the 3d of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean.<sup>2</sup> That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us<sup>3</sup> that passenger-boats should not be sunk, and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy where no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews

were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats.

The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed.<sup>4</sup>

The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning, and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital-ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium,<sup>5</sup> though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle.

I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would, in fact, be done by any Government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion, and where lay the free highways of the world. By painful stage after stage has that law been built up with meager enough results, indeed, after all was accomplished that could be accomplished, but always with a clear view at least of

what the heart and conscience of mankind demanded.

This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity, and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these, which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world.

I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of non-combatants, men, women, and children engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history,<sup>6</sup> been deemed innocent and legitimate.

Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be.

The present German warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind. It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk,<sup>7</sup> American lives taken,<sup>8</sup> in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it.<sup>9</sup> The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a Nation. We must put excited feeling away.

Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the 26th of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea.

It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity, indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all.

The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant-ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be.

Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pre-



tensions it is worse than ineffectual; it is likely to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents.

There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our nation and our people to be ignored or violated.<sup>10</sup> The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are not common wrongs; they reach out to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States.<sup>11</sup> That it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense, but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable coöperation in counsel and action with the Governments now at war with Germany, and as incident to that the extension to those Governments of the most liberal financial credits in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs.

It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible.

It will involve the immediate full equipment of the navy in all respects, but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines.

It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training.

It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well-conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed.

It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation, which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.<sup>12</sup>

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the nation has been altered or clouded by them.

I have exactly the same thing in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the 22d of January last; the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the 3d of February and on the 26th of February.

Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and the justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles.

Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic Governments<sup>13</sup> backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances.

We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their Governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war.<sup>14</sup> It was not with their previous knowledge or approval.<sup>15</sup>

It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties<sup>16</sup> or little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow-men as pawns and tools.

Self-governed nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest.<sup>17</sup> Such designs can be successfully worked only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions.

Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs.

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic Government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away, the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.<sup>18</sup>

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia?

Russia was known by those who know it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude toward life.

Autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, in character or purpose;<sup>19</sup> and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added, in all their native majesty and might, to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

One of the things that have served to convince us that the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of Government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of council, our peace within and without, our industries and our commerce.<sup>20</sup>

Indeed, it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began, and it is, unhappily, not a matter of conjecture, but a fact proved in our courts of justice, that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction, of official



agents of the Imperial German Government accredited to the Government of the United States.

Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people toward us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience.<sup>21</sup> That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.<sup>22</sup>

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world.<sup>23</sup>

We are now about to accept the gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty, and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the

German people included; for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the trusted foundations of political liberty.

We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish objects, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.<sup>24</sup>

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor.

The Austro-Hungarian Government has indeed avowed its unqualified indorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare<sup>25</sup> adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the

Imperial and Royal Government of Austro-Hungary, but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna.

We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity toward a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible Government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck.

We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early re-establishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us, however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship,—exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible.<sup>26</sup>

We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and

share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it toward all who are, in fact, loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression;<sup>27</sup> but, if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great, peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts<sup>28</sup>—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her

blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.<sup>29</sup>

## FLAG DAY ADDRESS

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT WASHINGTON, D. C., ON FLAG DAY, JUNE 14, 1917.]

We meet to celebrate Flag Day because this flag which we honor and under which we serve is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us,—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us and of the records they wrote upon it. We celebrate the day of its birth; and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbol of great events, of a great plan of life worked out by a great people. We are about to carry it into battle, to lift it where it will draw the fire of our enemies. We are about to bid thousands, hundreds of thousands, it may be millions, of our men, the young, the strong, the capable men of the nation, to go forth and die beneath it on fields of blood far away,—for what? For some unaccustomed thing? For something for which it has never sought the fire before? American armies were never before sent across the seas



Why are they sent now? For some new purpose, for which this great flag has never been carried before, or for some old, familiar, heroic purpose for which it has seen men, its own men, die on every battlefield upon which Americans have borne arms since the Revolution?

These are questions which must be answered. We are Americans. We in our turn serve America, and can serve her with no private purpose. We must use her flag as she has always used it. We are accountable at the bar of history and must plead in utter frankness what purpose it is we seek to serve.

It is plain enough how we were forced into the war. The extraordinary insults and aggressions of the Imperial German Government left us no self-respecting choice but to take up arms in defense of our rights as a free people and of our honor as a sovereign government. The military masters of Germany denied us the right to be neutral. They filled our unsuspecting communities with vicious spies and conspirators and sought to corrupt the opinion of our people in their own behalf. When they found that they could not do that, their agents diligently spread sedition amongst us and sought to draw our own citizens from their allegiance,—and some of those agents were men connected with the official Embassy of the German Government itself here in our own Capital.<sup>1</sup> They sought by violence to destroy our industries and arrest our commerce.<sup>2</sup> They tried to incite Mexico to take up arms against us and to draw Japan into a hostile alliance with

her,—and that, not by indirection, but by direct suggestion from the Foreign Office in Berlin.<sup>3</sup> They impudently denied us the use of the high seas and repeatedly executed their threat that they would send to their death any of our people who ventured to approach the coasts of Europe.<sup>4</sup> And many of our own people were corrupted.<sup>5</sup> Men began to look upon their own neighbors with suspicion and to wonder in their hot resentment and surprise whether there was any community in which hostile intrigue did not lurk. What great nation in such circumstances would not have taken up arms? Much as we had desired peace, it was denied us, and not of our own choice. This flag under which we serve would have been dishonored had we withheld our hand.

But that is only part of the story. We know now as clearly as we knew before we were ourselves engaged that we are not the enemies of the German people and that they are not our enemies. They did not originate or desire this hideous war or wish that we should be drawn into it; and we are vaguely conscious that we are fighting their cause, as they will some day see it, as well as our own.<sup>6</sup> They are themselves in the grip of the same sinister power that has now at last stretched its ugly talons out and drawn blood from us.<sup>7</sup> The whole world is at war because the whole world is in the grip of that power and is trying out the great battle which shall determine whether it is to be brought under its mastery or fling itself free.

The war was begun by the military masters of Germany, who proved to be also the masters of Austria-Hungary. These men have never regarded nations as peoples, men, women, and children of like blood and frame as themselves, for whom governments existed and in whom governments had their life. They have regarded them merely as serviceable organizations which they could by force or intrigue bend or corrupt to their own purpose. They have regarded the smaller states, in particular, and the peoples who could be overwhelmed by force, as their natural tools and instruments of domination.<sup>8</sup> Their purpose has long been avowed. The statesmen of other nations, to whom that purpose was incredible,<sup>9</sup> paid little attention; regarded what German professors expounded in their classrooms and German writers set forth to the world as the goal of German policy as rather the dream of minds detached from practical affairs, as preposterous private conceptions of German destiny, than as the actual plans of responsible rulers; but the rulers of Germany themselves knew all the while what concrete plans, what well advanced intrigues lay back of what the professors and the writers were saying, and were glad to go forward unmolested,<sup>10</sup> filling the thrones of Balkan states with German princes,<sup>11</sup> putting German officers at the service of Turkey to drill her armies<sup>12</sup> and make interest with her government, developing plans of sedition and rebellion in India and Egypt, setting their fires in Persia.<sup>13</sup> The demands made by Austria upon Servia were a mere

single step<sup>14</sup> in a plan which compassed Europe and Asia, from Berlin to Bagdad.<sup>15</sup> They hoped those demands might not arouse Europe, but they meant to press them whether they did or not, for they thought themselves ready for the final issue of arms.

Their plan was to throw a broad belt of German military power and political control across the very center of Europe and beyond the Mediterranean into the heart of Asia; and Austria-Hungary was to be as much their tool and pawn as Servia or Bulgaria or Turkey or the ponderous states of the East. Austria-Hungary, indeed, was to become part of the central German Empire, absorbed and dominated by the same forces and influences that had originally cemented the German states themselves. The dream had its heart at Berlin. It could have had a heart nowhere else!<sup>16</sup> It rejected the idea of solidarity of race entirely. The choice of peoples played no part in it at all. It contemplated binding together racial and political units which could be kept together only by force,—Czechs, Magyars, Croats, Serbs, Roumanians, Turks, Armenians,—the proud states of Bohemia and Hungary, the stout little commonwealths of the Balkans, the indomitable Turks, the subtle peoples of the East.<sup>17</sup> These peoples did not wish to be united. They ardently desired to direct their own affairs, would be satisfied only by undisputed independence. They could be kept quiet only by the presence or the constant threat of armed men. They would live under a common power only by sheer compulsion and await the day of revolution.<sup>18</sup>

But the German military statesmen had reckoned with all that and were ready to deal with it in their own way.

And they have actually carried the greater part of that amazing plan into execution! Look how things stand. Austria is at their mercy. It has acted, not upon its own initiative or upon the choice of its own people, but at Berlin's dictation ever since the war began. Its people now desire peace, but cannot have it until leave is granted from Berlin. The so-called Central Powers are in fact but a single Power. Serbia is at its mercy, should its hands be but for a moment freed. Bulgaria has consented to its will, and Roumania is overrun. The Turkish armies, which Germans trained, are serving Germany, certainly not themselves, and the guns of German warships lying in the harbor at Constantinople remind Turkish statesmen every day that they have no choice but to take their orders from Berlin.<sup>19</sup> From Hamburg to the Persian Gulf the net is spread.

Is it not easy to understand the eagerness for peace that has been manifested from Berlin ever since the snare was set and sprung? Peace, peace, peace has been the talk of her Foreign Office for now a year and more; not peace upon her own initiative, but upon the initiative of the nations over which she now deems herself to hold the advantage. A little of the talk has been public, but most of it has been private. Through all sorts of channels it has come to me, and in all sorts of guises, but never with the terms disclosed which the German Government would be willing to accept.<sup>20</sup>



That government has other valuable pawns in its hands besides those I have mentioned. It still holds a valuable part of France, though with slowly relaxing grasp, and practically the whole of Belgium. Its armies press close upon Russia and overrun Poland at their will. It cannot go further; it dare not go back. It wishes to close its bargain before it is too late and it has little left to offer for the pound of flesh it will demand.<sup>21</sup>

The military masters under whom Germany is bleeding see very clearly to what point Fate has brought them. If they fall back or are forced back an inch, their power both abroad and at home will fall to pieces like a house of cards. It is their power at home they are thinking about now more than their power abroad. It is that power which is trembling under their very feet; and deep fear has entered their hearts. They have but one chance to perpetuate their military power or even their controlling political influence. If they can secure peace now with the immense advantages still in their hands which they have up to this point apparently gained, they will have justified themselves before the German people: they will have gained by force what they promised to gain by it: an immense expansion of German power, an immense enlargement of German industrial and commercial opportunities. Their prestige will be secure, and with their prestige their political power. If they fail, their people will thrust them aside; a government accountable to the people themselves will be set up in Germany as it



has been in England, in the United States, in France, and in all the great countries of the modern time except Germany. If they succeed they are safe and Germany and the world are undone; if they fail Germany is saved and the world will be at peace. If they succeed, America will fall within the menace. We and all the rest of the world must remain armed, as they will remain, and must make ready for the next step in their aggression; if they fail, the world may unite for peace and Germany may be of the union.<sup>22</sup>

Do you not now understand the new intrigue,<sup>23</sup> the intrigue for peace, and why the masters of Germany do not hesitate to use any agency that promises to effect their purpose, the deceit of the nations? Their present particular aim is to deceive all those who throughout the world stand for the rights of peoples and the self-government of nations; for they see what immense strength the forces of justice and of liberalism are gathering out of this war. They are employing liberals in their enterprise. They are using men, in Germany and without, as their spokesmen whom they have hitherto despised and oppressed, using them for their own destruction,—Socialists,<sup>24</sup> the leaders of labor, the thinkers they have hitherto sought to silence. Let them once succeed and these men, now their tools, will be ground to powder beneath the weight of the great military empire they will have set up; the revolutionists in Russia will be cut off from all succor or coöperation in western Europe and a counter revolution fostered

and supported; Germany herself will lose her chance of freedom; and all Europe will arm for the next, the final struggle.

The sinister intrigue is being no less actively conducted in this country than in Russia and in every country in Europe to which the agents and dupes of the Imperial German Government can get access. That government has many spokesmen here, in places high and low. They have learned discretion. They keep within the law. It is opinion they utter now, not sedition. They proclaim the liberal purposes of their masters; declare this a foreign war which can touch America with no danger to either her lands or her institutions; set England at the center of the stage and talk of her ambition to assert economic dominion throughout the world; appeal to our ancient tradition of isolation in the politics of the nations; and seek to undermine the government with false professions of loyalty to its principles.

But they will make no headway. The false betray themselves always in every accent. It is only friends and partisans of the German Government whom we have already identified who utter these thinly disguised disloyalties. The facts are patent to all the world, and nowhere are they more plainly seen than in the United States, where we are accustomed to deal with facts and not with sophistries; and the great fact that stands out above all the rest is that this is a People's War, a war for freedom and justice and self-government amongst all the nations of the world, a war to make the world safe

for the peoples who live upon it and have made it their own, the German people themselves included; and that with us rests the choice to break through all these hypocrisies and patent cheats and masks of brute force and help set the world free, or else stand aside and let it be dominated a long age through by sheer weight of arms and the arbitrary choices of self-constituted masters, by the nation which can maintain the biggest armies and the most irresistible armaments,—a power to which the world has afforded no parallel and in the face of which political freedom must wither and perish.

For us there is but one choice. We have made it. Woe be to the man or group of men that seeks to stand in our way in this day of high resolution when every principle we hold dearest is to be vindicated and made secure for the salvation of the nations. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born, and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people.

# REPLY TO THE POPE

WOODROW WILSON

WASHINGTON, D. C., AUGUST, 27, 1917.

TO HIS HOLINESS BENEDICTUS XV., POPE:

In acknowledgment of the communication of your Holiness to the belligerent peoples, dated Aug. 1, 1917, the President of the United States requests me to transmit the following reply:

Every heart that has not been blinded and hardened by this terrible war must be touched by this moving appeal of his Holiness the Pope, must feel the dignity and force of the humane and generous motives which prompted it, and must fervently wish that we might take the path of peace he so persuasively points out. But it would be folly to take it if it does not in fact lead to the goal he proposes. Our response must be based upon the stern facts and upon nothing else. It is not a mere cessation of arms he desires; it is a stable and enduring peace. The agony must not be gone through with again, and it must be a matter of very sober judgment what will insure us against it.

His Holiness in substance proposes that we return to the status quo ante bellum, and that then there be a general condonation, disarmament, and a concert of nations based upon an acceptance of the principle of arbitration; that by a similar concert freedom of the seas be established; and that the

territorial claims of France and Italy, the perplexing problems of the Balkan States, and the restitution of Poland be left to such conciliatory adjustments as may be possible in the new temper of such a peace, due regard being paid to the aspirations of the peoples whose political fortunes and affiliations will be involved.

It is manifest that no part of this program can be successfully carried out unless the restitution of the status quo ante furnishes a firm and satisfactory basis for it. The object of this war is to deliver the free peoples of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible Government which, having secretly planned to dominate the world, proceeded to carry the plan out without regard either to the sacred obligations of treaty or the long-established practices and long-cherished principles of international action and honor; which chose its own time for the war; delivered its blow fiercely and suddenly; stopped at no barrier either of law or of mercy; swept a whole continent within the tide of blood—not the blood of soldiers only, but the blood of innocent women and children also and of the helpless poor; and now stands balked but not defeated, the enemy of four-fifths of the world. This power is not the German people. It is the ruthless master of the German people. It is no business of ours how that great people came under its control or submitted with temporary zest to the domination of its purpose; but it is our business to see to it

that the history of the rest of the world is no longer left to its handling.

To deal with such a power by way of peace upon the plan proposed by his Holiness the Pope would, so far as we can see, involve a recuperation of its strength and a renewal of its policy; would make it necessary to create a permanent hostile combination of nations against the German people, who are its instruments; and would result in abandoning the new-born Russia to the intrigue, the manifold subtle interference, and the certain counter-revolution which would be attempted by all the malign influences to which the German Government has of late accustomed the world. Can peace be based upon a restitution of its power or upon any word of honor it could pledge in a treaty of settlement and accommodation?

Responsible statesmen must now everywhere see, if they never saw before, that no peace can rest securely upon political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and cripple or embarrass others, upon vindictive action of any sort, or any kind of revenge or deliberate injury. The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German Government, but they desire no reprisals upon the German people, who have themselves suffered all things in this war, which they did not choose. They believe that peace should rest upon the rights of peoples, not the rights of Governments—the rights of peoples great or small, weak or powerful—their equal right to free-



dom and security and self-government and to a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world, the German people of course included if they will accept equality and not seek domination.

The test, therefore, of every plan of peace is this: Is it based upon the faith of all the peoples involved or merely upon the word of an ambitious and intriguing Government, on the one hand, and of a group of free peoples on the other? This is the test which goes to the root of the matter; and it is the test which must be applied.

The purposes of the United States in this war are known to the whole world, to every people to whom the truth has been permitted to come. They do not need to be stated again. We seek no material advantage of any kind. We believe that the intolerable wrongs done in this war by the furious and brutal power of the Imperial German Government ought to be repaired, but not at the expense of the sovereignty of any people—rather a vindication of the sovereignty both of those that are weak and of those that are strong. Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace. That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind.

We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything that is to

endure, unless explicitly supported by such conclusive evidence of the will and purpose of the German people themselves as the other peoples of the world would be justified in accepting. Without such guarantees treaties of settlement, agreements for disarmament, covenants to set up arbitration in the place of force, territorial adjustments, reconstitutions of small nations, if made with the German Government, no man, no nation could now depend on. We must await some new evidence of the purposes of the great peoples of the Central Powers. God grant it may be given soon and in a way to restore the confidence of all peoples everywhere in the faith of nations and the possibility of a covenanted peace.

ROBERT LANSING,

Secretary of State of the United States of America

## WHY WE ARE AT WAR

FRANKLIN K. LANE

Why are we fighting Germany? The brief answer is that ours is a war of self-defense. We did not wish to fight Germany. She made the attack upon us; not on our shores, but on our ships, our lives, our rights, our future. For two years and more we held to a neutrality that made us apologists for things which outraged man's common sense of fair play and humanity. At each new offense—the invasion of Belgium, the killing of civilian Belgians, the attacks on Scarborough and other defenseless towns, the laying of mines in neutral waters, the fencing off of the seas—and on and on through the months we said: "This is war—archaic, uncivilized war, but war! All rules have been thrown away: all nobility; man has come down to the primitive brute. And while we can not justify we will not intervene. It is not our war."

Then why are we in? Because we could not keep out. The invasion of Belgium, which opened the war, led to the invasion of the United States by slow, steady, logical steps. Our sympathies evolved into a conviction of self-interest. Our love of fair play ripened into alarm at our own peril.

We talked in the language and in the spirit of good faith and sincerity, as honest men should talk, until we discovered that our talk was construed as

cowardice. And Mexico was called upon to invade us. We talked as men would talk who cared alone for peace and the advancement of their own material interests, until we discovered that we were thought to be a nation of mere money makers, devoid of all character—until, indeed, we were told that we could not walk the highways of the world without permission of a Prussian soldier; that our ships might not sail without wearing a striped uniform<sup>1</sup> of humiliation upon a narrow path of national subservience. We talked as men talk who hope for honest agreement, not for war, until we found that the treaty torn to pieces at Liège was but the symbol of a policy that made agreements worthless against a purpose that knew no word but success.

And so we came into this war for ourselves. It is a war to save America—to preserve self-respect, to justify our right to live as we have lived, not as some one else wishes us to live. In the name of freedom we challenge with ships and men, money, and an undaunted spirit, that word “*Verboten*” which Germany has written upon the sea and upon the land. For America is not the name of so much territory. It is a living spirit, born in travail, grown in the rough school of bitter experiences, a living spirit which has purpose and pride, and conscience—knows why it wishes to live and to what end, knows how it comes to be respected of the world, and hopes to retain that respect by living on with the light of Lincoln’s love of man as its Old and New Testament. It is more precious that this

America should live than that we Americans should live. And this America, as we now see, has been challenged from the first of this war by the strong arm of a power that has no sympathy with our purpose and will not hesitate to destroy us if the law that we respect, the rights that are to us sacred, or the spirit that we have, stand across her set will to make this world bow before her policies, backed by her organized and scientific military system. The world of Christ—a neglected but not a rejected Christ—has come again face to face with the world of Mahomet, who willed to win by force.

With this background of history and in this sense, then, we fight Germany—

Because of Belgium—invaded, outraged, enslaved, impoverished Belgium. We can not forget Liège, Louvain, and Cardinal Mercier. Translated into terms of American history, these names stand for Bunker Hill, Lexington, and Patrick Henry.

Because of France—invaded, desecrated France, a million of whose heroic sons have died to save the land of Lafayette. Glorious golden France, the preserver of the arts, the land of noble spirit—the first land to follow our lead into republican liberty.

Because of England—from whom came the laws, traditions, standards of life, and inherent love of liberty which we call Anglo-Saxon civilization. We defeated her once upon the land and once upon the sea.<sup>2</sup> But Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and Canada are free because of what we did. And they are with us in the fight for the freedom of the seas.

Because of Russia—New Russia. She must not be overwhelmed now. Not now, surely, when she is just born into freedom. Her peasants must have their chance; they must go to school to Washington, to Jefferson, and to Lincoln until they know their way about in this new, strange world of government by the popular will.

Because of other peoples, with their rising hope that the world may be freed from government by the soldier.

We are fighting Germany because she sought to terrorize us and then to fool us. We could not believe that Germany would do what she said she would do upon the seas.

We still hear the piteous cries of children coming up out of the sea where the *Lusitania* went down. And Germany has never asked forgiveness of the world.

We saw the *Sussex* sunk, crowded with the sons and daughters of neutral nations.

We saw ship after ship sent to the bottom—ships of mercy bound out of America for the Belgian starving; ships carrying the Red Cross and laden with the wounded of all nations; ships carrying food and clothing to friendly, harmless, terrorized peoples; ships flying the Stars and Stripes—sent to the bottom hundreds of miles from shore, manned by American seamen, murdered against all law, without warning.

We believed Germany's promise that she would respect the neutral flag and the rights of neutrals,



and we held our anger and outrage in check. But now we see that she was holding us off with fair promises until she could build her huge fleet of submarines.<sup>3</sup> For when spring came she blew her promise into the air, just as at the beginning she had torn up that "scrap of paper."<sup>4</sup> Then we saw clearly that there was but one law for Germany—her will to rule.

We are fighting Germany because she violated our confidence. Paid German spies filled our cities. Officials of her Government, received as the guests of this Nation, lived with us to bribe and terrorize, defying our law and the law of nations.

We are fighting Germany because while we were yet her friends—the only great power that still held hands off—she sent the Zimmermann note,<sup>5</sup> calling to her aid Mexico, our southern neighbor, and hoping to lure Japan, our western neighbor, into war against this Nation of peace.

The nation that would do these things proclaims the gospel that government has no conscience. And this doctrine can not live, or else democracy must die. For the nations of the world must keep faith. There can be no living for us in a world where the state has no conscience, no reverence for the things of the spirit, no respect for international law, no mercy for those who fall before its force. What an unordered world! Anarchy! The anarchy of rival wolf packs!

We are fighting Germany because in this war feudalism<sup>6</sup> is making its last stand against on-coming

democracy. We see it now. This is a war against an old spirit, an ancient, outworn spirit. It is a war against feudalism—the right of the castle on the hill to rule the village below. It is a war for democracy—the right of all to be their own masters. Let Germany be feudal if she will, but she must not spread her system over the world that has outgrown it. Feudalism plus science, thirteenth century plus twentieth—this is the religion of the mistaken Germany that has linked itself with the Turk; that has, too, adopted the method of Mahomet. “The state has no conscience.” “The state can do no wrong.” With the spirit of the fanatic she believes this gospel and that it is her duty to spread it by force. With poison gas that makes living a hell, with submarines that sneak through the seas to slyly murder noncombatants, with dirigibles that bombard men and women while they sleep, with a perfected system of terrorization that the modern world first heard of when German troops entered China,<sup>8</sup> German feudalism is making war upon mankind. Let this old spirit of evil have its way and no man will live in America without paying toll to it in manhood and in money. This spirit might demand Canada from a defeated, navyless England, and then our dream of peace on the north would be at an end. We would live, as France has lived for forty years, in haunting terror.

America speaks for the world in fighting Germany. Mark on a map those countries which are Germany's allies and you will mark but four, run-

ning from the Baltic through Austria and Bulgaria to Turkey. All the other nations the whole globe around are in arms against her or are unable to move. There is deep meaning in this. We fight with the world for an honest world in which nations keep their word, for a world in which nations do not live by swagger or by threat, for a world in which men think of the ways in which they can conquer the common cruelties of nature instead of inventing more horrible cruelties to inflict upon the spirit and body of man, for a world in which the ambition or the philosophy of a few shall not make miserable all mankind, for a world in which the man is held more precious than the machine, the system, or the state.

# THE DUTIES OF THE CITIZEN

ELIHU ROOT

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, SEPTEMBER  
14, 1917]

The declaration of war between the United States and Germany completely changed the relations of all the inhabitants of this country to the subject of peace and war.

Before the declaration everybody had a right to discuss in private and in public the question whether the United States should carry on war against Germany. Everybody had a right to argue that there was no sufficient cause for war, that the consequences of war would be worse than the consequences of continued peace, that it would be wiser to submit to the aggressions of Germany against American rights, that it would be better to have Germany succeed than to have the allies succeed in the great conflict.

Everybody holding these views had a right by expressing them to seek to influence public opinion and to affect the action of the President and the Congress, to whom the people of the country by their constitution have entrusted the power to determine whether the United States shall or shall not make war.

But the question of peace or war has now been decided by the President and Congress, the sole

authorities which had the right to decide, the lawful authorities upon whom rested the duty to decide. The question no longer remains open. It has been determined and the United States is at war with Germany.

The power to make such a decision is the most essential, vital, and momentous of all the powers of government. No nation can maintain its independence or protect its citizens against oppression or continue to be free which does not vest the power to make that decision in some designated authority, or which does not recognize the special and imperative duties of citizenship in time of war following upon such a decision lawfully made.

One of the cardinal objects of the Union which formed this nation was to create a lawful authority whose decision and action upon this momentous question should bind all the states and all the people of every state.

The constitution under which we have lived for one hundred and thirty years declares: "We, the people of the United States, in order to . . . provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution."<sup>1</sup>

The constitution so ordained vests in Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy,<sup>2</sup> and it vests in the President the power to command the army and navy.<sup>3</sup>

The power in this instance was exercised not suddenly or rashly, but advisedly, after a long delay and discussion, and patience under provocation, after

repeated diplomatic warnings to Germany known to the whole country, after clear notice by breach of diplomatic relations with Germany that the question was imminent, after long opportunity for reflection and discussion following that notice, and after a formal and deliberate presentation by the President to Congress of the reasons for action in an address which compelled the attention not of Congress alone but of all Americans and of all the world and which must forever stand as one of the great state papers of modern times.

The decision was made by overwhelming majorities of both houses of Congress.<sup>4</sup> When such a decision has been made the duties—and therefore the rights—of all the people of the country immediately change.

It becomes their duty to stop discussion upon the question decided, and to act, to proceed immediately to do everything in their power to enable the government of their country to succeed in the war upon which the country has entered. It is a fundamental necessity of government that it shall have the power to decide great questions of policy and to act upon its decision.

In order that there shall be action following a decision once made, the decision must be accepted. Discussion upon the question must be deemed closed.

A nation which declares war and goes on discussing whether it ought to have declared war or not is impotent, paralyzed, imbecile, and earns the contempt of mankind and the certainty of humiliating defeat and subjection to foreign control.



A democracy which cannot accept its own decisions, made in accordance with its own laws, but must keep on endlessly discussing the questions already decided, has failed in the fundamental requirements of self-government; and, if the decision is to make war, the failure to exhibit capacity for self-government by action will inevitably result in the loss of the right of self-government.

Before the decision of a proposal to make war, men may range themselves upon one side or the other of the question; but after the decision in favor of war, the country has ranged itself, and the only issue left for the individual citizen is whether he is for or against his country. From that time on arguments against the war in which the country is engaged are enemy arguments.

Their spirit is the spirit of rebellion against the government and laws of the United States. Their effect is to hinder and lessen that popular support of the government in carrying on the war which is necessary to success. Their manifest purpose is to prevent action by continuing discussion.

They encourage the enemy. They tend to introduce delay and irresolution into our own councils. The men who are speaking and writing and printing arguments against the war now, and against everything which is being done to carry on the war, are rendering more effective service to Germany than they ever could render in the field with arms in their hands.

The purpose and effect of what they are doing is so plain that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that

the greater part of them are at heart traitors to the United States and wilfully seeking to bring about the triumph of Germany and the humiliation and defeat of their own country.

Somebody has to decide where armies are to fight, whether our territory is to be defended by waiting here until we are attacked or by going out and attacking the enemy before they get here. The power to make that decision and the duty to make it rest under the constitution of this country with the President as commander-in-chief.

When the President has decided that the best way to beat Germany is to send our troops to France and Belgium, that is the way the war must be carried on, if at all.

I think the decision was wise. Others may think it unwise. But, when the decision has been made, what we think is immaterial. The commander-in-chief, with all the advice and all the wisdom he can command, has decided when and where the American army is to move. The army must obey, and all loyal citizens of the country will do their utmost to make that movement a success.

Anybody who seeks by argument or otherwise to stop the execution of the order sending troops to France and Belgium is simply trying to prevent the American government from carrying on the war successfully. He is aiding the enemies of his country, and if he understands what he is really doing, he is a traitor at heart.

It is beyond doubt that many of the professed pacifists, the opponents of the war after the war has been entered upon, the men who are trying to stir up resistance to the draft, the men who are inciting strikes in the particular branches of production which are necessary for the supply of arms and munitions of war, are intentionally seeking to aid Germany and defeat the United States.

As time goes on and the character of these acts becomes more and more clearly manifest, all who continue to associate with them must come under the same condemnation as traitors to their country.

There are doubtless some who do not understand what this struggle really is. Some who were born here resent interference with their comfort and prosperity, and the demands for sacrifice which seem to them unnecessary, and they fail to see that the time has come when, if Americans are to keep the independence and liberty which their fathers won by suffering and sacrifice, they in their turn must fight again for the preservation of that independence and liberty.

There are some born abroad who have come to this land for a greater freedom and broader opportunities, and have sought and received the privileges of American citizenship, who are swayed by dislike for some ally or by the sympathies of German kinship, and fail to see that the time has come for them to make good the obligations of their sworn oaths of naturalization.

This is the oath that the applicant for citizenship makes:

“That he will support the constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty; that he will support and defend the constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to the same.”

All these naturalized citizens who are taking part in this obstruction to our government in the conduct of the war are false to their oaths, are forfeiting their rights of citizenship, are repudiating their honorable obligations, are requiting by evil the good that has been done them in the generous and unstinted hospitality with which the people of the United States have welcomed them to the liberty and the opportunities of this free land. We must believe that in many cases this is done because of failure to understand what this war really is.

This is a war of defense. It is perfectly described in the words of the constitution which established this nation: “To provide for the common defense” and “To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”

The national defense demands not merely force, but intelligence. It requires foresight, consideration of the policies and purposes of other nations, understanding of the inevitable or probable consequences of the acts of other nations, judgment as to the time when successful defense may be made, and when it will be too late, and prompt action before it is too late.

By entering this war in April, the United States availed itself of the very last opportunity to defend itself against subjection to German power before it was too late to defend itself successfully.

For many years we have pursued our peaceful course of internal development protected in a variety of ways. We were protected by the law of nations to which all civilized governments have professed their allegiance. So long as we committed no injustice ourselves we could not be attacked without a violation of that law.

We were protected by a series of treaties under which all the principal nations of the earth agreed to respect our rights and to maintain friendship with us. We were protected by an extensive system of arbitration created by or consequent upon the peace conferences at The Hague, and under which all controversies arising under the law and under treaties were to be settled peaceably by arbitration and not by force.

We were protected by the broad expanse of ocean separating us from all great military powers, and by the bold assertion of the Monroe Doctrine that if any of those powers undertook to overpass the ocean and establish itself upon these western continents that would be regarded as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, and would call upon her to act in her defense.

We were protected by the fact that the policy and the fleet of Great Britain were well known to support the Monroe Doctrine. We were protected by the deli-

cate balance of power in Europe which made it seem not worth while for any power to engage in a conflict here at the risk of suffering from its rivals there.

All these protections were swept away by the war which began in Europe in 1914. The war was begun by the concerted action of Germany and Austria—the invasion of Serbia on the east by Austria and the invasion of Luxembourg and Belgium on the west by Germany. Both invasions were in violation of the law of nations, and in violation of the faith of treaties.

Everybody knew that Russia was bound in good faith to come to the relief of Serbia, that France was bound by treaty to come to the aid of Russia, that England was bound by treaty to come to the aid of Belgium, so that the invasion of these two small states was the beginning of a general European war.

These acts, which have drenched the world with blood, were defended and justified in the bold avowal of the German government that the interests of the German state were superior to the obligations of law and the faith of treaties,<sup>5</sup> that no law or treaty was binding upon Germany which it was for the interest of Germany to violate.

All pretense of obedience to the law of nations and of respect for solemn promises was thrown off; and, in lieu of that system of lawful and moral restraint upon power which Christian civilization has been building up for a century was reinstated the cynical philosophy of Frederick the Great, the greatest of the Hohenzollerns, who declares:



“Statesmanship can be reduced to three principles: First, to maintain your power, and, according to circumstances, to extend it. Second, to form an alliance only for your own advantage. Third, to command fear and respect, even in the most disastrous times.

“Do not be ashamed of making interested alliances from which you yourself can derive the whole advantage. Do not make the foolish mistake of not breaking them when you believe your interests require it.

“Above all, uphold the following maxim: To despoil your neighbors is to deprive them of the means of injuring you.

“When he is about to conclude a treaty with some foreign power, if a sovereign remembers he is a Christian, he is lost.”

From 1914 until the present, in a war waged by Germany with a revolting barbarity unequaled since the conquests of Genghis Khan,<sup>6</sup> Germany has violated every rule agreed upon by civilized nations in modern times to mitigate the barbarities of war or to protect the rights of noncombatants and neutrals. She had no grievance against Belgium except that Belgium stood upon her admitted rights and refused to break the faith of her treaties by consenting that the neutrality of her territory should be violated to give Germany an avenue for the attack upon France.

She has taken possession of the territory of Belgium and subjected her people to the hard yoke of a brutal soldiery. She has extorted vast sums from her peaceful cities. She has burned her towns and battered down her noble churches. She has stripped the Bel-

gian factories of their machinery and deprived them of the raw material of manufacture.

She has carried away her workmen by tens of thousands into slavery, and her women into worse than slavery. She has slain peaceful noncombatants by the hundred, undeterred by the helplessness of age, of infancy, or of womanhood. She has done the same in northern France, in Poland, in Serbia, in Roumania.

In all of these countries women have been outraged by the thousand, by tens of thousand, and who ever heard of a German soldier being punished for rape, or robbery, or murder? These revolting outrages upon humanity and law are not the casual incidents of war, but are the results of a settled policy of frightfulness answering to the maxim of the Great Frederick to "command respect through fear."

Why were these things done by Germany? The answer rests upon the accumulated evidence of German acts and German words so conclusive that no pretense can cover it, no sophistry can disguise it. The answer is that this war was begun and these crimes against humanity were done because Germany was pursuing the hereditary policy of the Hohenzollerns and following the instincts of the arrogant military caste which rules Prussia, to grasp the over-lordship of the civilized world and establish an empire in which she should play the rôle of ancient Rome.

They were done because Prussian militarism still pursues the policy of power through conquest, of aggrandizement through force and fear, which in little more than two centuries has brought the puny mark

of Brandenburg<sup>7</sup>—with its million and a half of people to the control of a vast empire—the greatest armed force of the modern world.

It now appears beyond the possibility of doubt that this war was made by Germany pursuing a long and settled purpose. For many years she has been preparing to do exactly what she has done with a thoroughness, a perfection of plans, and a vastness of provision in men, munitions, and supplies never before equaled or approached in human history.

She brought the war on when she chose, because she chose, in the belief that she could conquer the earth, nation by nation.

All nations are egotistical, all peoples think most highly of their own qualities, and regard other peoples as inferior; but the egotism of the ruling class of Prussia is beyond all example and it is active and aggressive. They believe that Germany is entitled to rule the world by virtue of her superiority in all these qualities which they include under the term “kultur,” and by reason of her power to compel submission by the sword.

That belief does not evaporate in theory. It is translated into action, and this war is the action which results. This belief of national superiority and the right to assert it everywhere is a tradition from the Great Frederick.<sup>8</sup> It has been instilled into the minds of the German people through all the universities and schools. It has been preached from her pulpits and taught by her philosophers and historians. It has been maintained by her government and it will never

cease to furnish the motive for the people of Prussia so long as German power enables the military autocracy of Prussia to act upon it with success.

Plainly, if the power of the German government is to continue, America can no longer look for protection to the law of nations or the faith of treaties or the instincts of humanity or the restraints of modern civilization.

Plainly, also, if we had stayed out of the war and Germany had won there would no longer have been a balance of power in Europe or a British fleet to support the Monroe Doctrine and protect America.

Does any one indulge in the foolish assumption that Germany would not then have extended her lust for power by conquest to the American continent? Let him consider what it is for which the nations of Europe have been chiefly contending for centuries past.

It has been for colonies. It has been to bring the unoccupied or weakly held spaces of the earth under their flags and their political control, in order to increase their trade and their power.

Spain, Holland, Portugal, England, France, have all had their turn, and have covered the earth with their possessions. For thirty years Germany, the last comer, has been pressing forward with feverish activity the acquisition of stations for her power on every coast and every sea, restive and resentful because she has been obliged to take what others have left.

Europe, Asia, and Africa have been taken up. The Americas alone remain. Here in the vast and unde-

fended spaces of the new world, fraught with potential wealth incalculable, Germany could "find a place in the sun," to use her emperor's phrase; Germany could find her "liberty of national evolution," to use his phrase again. Every traditional policy, every instinct of predatory Prussia, would urge her into this new field of aggrandizement.

What would prevent? The Monroe doctrine? Yes. But what is the Monroe doctrine as against a nation which respects only force unless it can be maintained by force? We already know how the German government feels about the Monroe doctrine.

Bismarck declared it to be a piece of colossal impudence; and, when President Roosevelt interfered to assert the doctrine for the protection of Venezuela, the present kaiser declared that if he then had a larger navy he would have taken America by the scruff of the neck.<sup>9</sup>

If we had stayed out of the war, and Germany had won, we should have had to defend the Monroe doctrine by force or abandon it; and if we abandoned it there would have been a German naval base in the Caribbean commanding the Panama canal, depriving us of that strategic line which unites our eastern and western coasts, and depriving us of the protection the expanse of ocean once gave, and an America unable or unwilling to protect herself against the establishment of a German naval base in the Caribbean would lie at the mercy of Germany, and subject to Germany's orders.

America's independence would be gone unless she was ready to fight for it, and her security would thenceforth be not a security of freedom, but only a security purchased by submission.

But if America had stayed out of the war and Germany had won, could we have defended the Monroe doctrine? Could we have maintained our independence? For an answer to that question consider what we have been doing since the 2d of April last, when war was declared.

Congress has been in continuous session passing with unprecedented rapidity laws containing grants of power and of money unexampled in our history. The executive establishment has been straining every nerve to prepare for war. The ablest and strongest leaders of industrial activity have been called from all parts of the country to aid the government.

The people of the country have generously responded with noble loyalty and enthusiasm to the call for the surrender of money and of customary rights, and the supply of men to the service of the country.

Nearly half a year has passed, and still we are not ready to fight. I am not blaming the government. It was inevitable. Preparation for modern war cannot be made briefly or speedily. It requires time—long periods of time; and the more peaceful and unprepared for war a democracy is the longer is the time required.

It would have required just as long for America to prepare for war if we had stayed out of this war and



Germany had won and we had undertaken to defend the Monroe doctrine or to defend our coasts when we had lost the protection of the Monroe doctrine. Month after month would have passed with no adequate army ready to fight, just as these recent months have passed.

But what would Germany have been doing in the meantime? How long would it have been before our attempts at preparation would have been stopped by German arms? A country that is forced to defend itself against the aggression of a military autocracy always prepared for war must herself be prepared for war beforehand or she never will have the opportunity to prepare.

The history, the character, the avowed principles of action, the manifest and undisguised purposes of the German autocracy made it clear and certain that if America stayed out of the great war, and Germany won, America would forthwith be required to defend herself and would be unable to defend herself against the same lust for conquest, the same will to dominate the world, which has made Europe a bloody shambles.

When Germany did actually apply her principles of action to us, and by the invasion of Belgium she violated the solemn covenant she has made with us<sup>10</sup> to observe the law of neutrality established for the protection of peaceful states, when she had arrogantly demanded that American commerce should surrender its lawful right of passage upon the high seas under penalty of destruction, when she had sunk American ships and sent to their death hundreds of American citizens, peaceful men, women, and children, when the

*Gulflight* and the *Falaba* and the *Persia* and the *Arabic* and the *Sussex* and the *Lusitania* had been torpedoed without warning in contempt of law and of humanity, when the German embassy at Washington had been found to be the headquarters of a vast conspiracy of corruption within our country inciting sedition and concealing infernal machines in the cargoes of our ships and blowing up our factories with the workmen laboring in them, and when the government of Germany had been discovered attempting to incite Mexico and Japan to form a league with her to attack us and to bring about a dismemberment of our territory, then the question presented to the American people was not what shall be done regarding each of these specific aggressions taken by itself, but what shall be done by America to defend her commerce, her territory, her citizens, her independence, her liberty, her life as a nation against the continuance of assaults already begun by that mighty and conscienceless power which had swept aside every restraint and every principle of Christian civilization and was seeking to force upon a subjugated world the dark and cruel rule of a barbarous past.

The question was how shall peaceful and unprepared and liberty loving America save herself from subjection to the military power of Germany. There was but one possible answer. There was but one chance for rescue and that was to act at once while the other democracies of the world were still maintaining their liberty against the oppressor, to prepare at once while the armies and the navies of England

and France and Italy and Russia and Roumania were holding down Germany so that she could not attack us while our preparation was but half accomplished, to strike while there were allies loving freedom like ourselves to strike with us, to do our share to prevent the German kaiser from acquiring that domination over the world which would have left us without friends to aid us, without preparation, and without the possibility of successful defense.

The instinct of the American democracy which led it to act when it did arose from a long delayed and reluctant consciousness still vague and half expressed, that this is no ordinary war which the world is waging. It is no contest for petty policies and profits. It is a mighty and all-embracing struggle between two conflicting principles of human right and human duty.

It is a conflict between the divine right of kings to govern mankind through armies and nobles and the right of the peoples of the earth to toil and endure and aspire to govern themselves by law in the freedom of individual manhood.

It is the climax of the supreme struggle between autocracy and democracy. No nation can stand aside and be free from its effects. The two systems cannot endure together in the same world.

If autocracy triumphs, military power lustful of dominion, supreme in strength, intolerant of human rights, holding itself superior to law, to morals, to faith, to compassion, will crush out the free democracies of the world. If autocracy is defeated and

nations are compelled to recognize the rules of law and of morals, then and then only will democracy be safe.

To this great conflict for human rights and human liberty America has committed herself. There can be no backward step. There must be either humiliating and degrading submission or terrible defeat or glorious victory. It was no human will that brought us to this pass. It was not the President. It was not Congress. It was not the press. It was not any political party. It was not any section or part of our people.

It was that in the providence of God the mighty forces that determine the destinies of mankind beyond the control of human purpose have brought to us the time, the occasion, the necessity, that this peaceful people so long enjoying the blessings of liberty and justice for which their fathers fought and sacrificed shall again gird themselves for conflict, and with all the forces of manhood nurtured and strengthened by liberty offer again the sacrifice of possessions and of life itself, that this nation may still be free, that the mission of American democracy shall not have failed, that the world shall be free.

# WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR  
DELIVERED AT BUFFALO, NEW YORK, NOV. 12, 1917]

I esteem it a great privilege and a real honor to be thus admitted to your public councils. When your executive committee paid me the compliment of inviting me here I gladly accepted the invitation because it seems to me that this above all other times in our history is the time for common counsel, for the drawing not only of the energies but of the minds of the nation together.

I thought that it was a welcome opportunity for disclosing to you some of the thoughts that have been gathering in my mind during the last momentous months.

I am introduced to you as the president of the United States, and yet I would be pleased if you would put the thought of the office into the background and regard me as one of your fellow citizens who has come here to speak not the words of authority but the words of counsel, the words which men should speak to one another who wish to be frank in a moment more critical perhaps than the history of the world has ever yet known, a moment when it is every man's duty to forget himself, to forget his own interests, to fill himself with the nobility of a great national and

world conception and act upon a new platform elevated above the ordinary affairs of life, elevated to where men have views of the long destiny of mankind.

I think that in order to realize just what this moment of counsel is, it is very desirable that we should remind ourselves just how this war came about and just what it is for. You can explain most wars very simply, but the explanation of this is not so simple. Its roots run deep into all the obscure soils of history, and in my view this is the last decisive issue between the old principles of power and the new principles of freedom.

The war was started by Germany. Her authorities deny that they started it. But I am willing to let the statement I have just made await the verdict of history. And the thing that needs to be explained is why Germany started the war.

Remember what the position of Germany in the world was—as enviable a position as any nation has ever occupied. The whole world stood at admiration of her wonderful intellectual and material achievements, and all the intellectual men of the world went to school to her. As a university man I have been surrounded by men trained in Germany, men who had resorted to Germany because nowhere else could they get such thorough and searching training, particularly in the principles of science and the principles that underlie modern material achievements.

Her men of science had made her industries perhaps the most competent industries in the world, and



the label, "Made in Germany," was a guarantee of good workmanship and of sound material. She had access to all the markets of the world, and every other man who traded in those markets feared Germany because of her effective and almost irresistible competition.

She had a place in the sun. Why was she not satisfied? What more did she want? There was nothing in the world of peace that she did not already have and have in abundance.

We boast of the extraordinary pace of American advancement. We show with pride the statistics of the increase of our industries and of the population of our cities. Well, those statistics did not match the recent statistics of Germany. Her old cities took on youth, grew faster than any American city ever grew; her old industries opened their eyes and saw a new world and went out for its conquest; and yet the authorities of Germany were not satisfied.

You have one part of the answer to the question why she was not satisfied in her methods of competition. There is no important industry in Germany upon which the government has not laid its hands to direct it, and when necessity arise, control it.

You have only to ask any man whom you meet, who is familiar with the conditions that prevailed before the war in the matter of international competition, to find out the methods of competition which the German manufacturers and exporters used under the patronage and support of the government of Germany.<sup>1</sup> You will find that they were the same sorts of

competition that we have tried to prevent by law within our own borders.

If they could not sell their goods cheaper than we could sell ours at a profit to themselves, they could get a subsidy from the government which made it possible to sell them cheaper anyhow, and the conditions of competition were thus controlled in large measure by the German government itself. But that did not satisfy the German government.

All the while there was lying behind its thought, in its dreams of the future, a political control which would enable it in the long run to dominate the labor and the industry of the world. They were not content with success by superior achievement; they wanted success by authority.

I suppose few of you have thought much about the Berlin to Bagdad railway.<sup>2</sup> The Berlin to Bagdad railway was constructed in order to run the threat of force down the flank of the industrial undertakings of half a dozen other countries, so that when German competition came in it would not be resisted too far—because there was always the possibility of getting German armies into the heart of that country quicker than any other armies could be got there.

Look at the map of Europe now. Germany, in thrusting upon us again and again the discussion of peace talks about what? Talks about Belgium, talks about northern France, talks about Alsace-Lorraine. Those are deeply interesting subjects to us and to them, but they are not talking about the heart of the matter.

Take the map and look at it. Germany has absolute control of Austria-Hungary, practical control of the Balkan states, control of Turkey, control of Asia Minor. I saw a map in which the whole thing was printed in appropriate black the other day and the black stretched all the way from Hamburg to Bagdad—the bulk of German power inserted into the heart of the world.

If it can keep that she has kept all that her dreams contemplated when the war began. If she can keep that, her power can disturb the world as long as she keeps it, always provided, for I feel bound to put this proviso in, always provided the present influences that control the German government continue to control it.

I believe that the spirit of freedom can get into the hearts of Germans and find as fine a welcome there as it can find in any other hearts. But the spirit of freedom does not suit the plans of the Pan-Germans.<sup>3</sup> Power cannot be used with concentrated force against free peoples if it is used by free people.

You know how many intimations come to us from one of the central powers that it is more anxious for peace than the chief central power; and you know that it means that the people in that central power know that if the war ends as it stands, they will in effect themselves be vassals of Germany, notwithstanding that their populations are compounded with all the people of that part of the world, and notwithstanding the fact that they do not wish in their pride

and proper spirit of nationality to be so absorbed and dominated.

Germany is determined that the political power of the world shall belong to her. There have been such ambitions before. They have been in part realized. But never before have those ambitions been based upon so exact and precise and scientific a plan of domination.

May I not say that it is amazing to me that any group of people should be so ill-informed as to suppose, as some groups in Russia apparently suppose, that any reforms planned in the interest of the people can live in the presence of a Germany powerful enough to undermine or overthrow them by intrigue or force? Any body of free men that compounds with the present German government is compounding for its own destruction. But that is not the whole of the story. Any man in America, or anywhere else, who supposes that the free industry and enterprise of the world can continue if the Pan-German plan is achieved and German power fastened upon the world is as fatuous as the dreamers of Russia.

What I am opposed to is not the feeling of the pacifists, but their stupidity. My heart is with them, but my mind has a contempt for them. I want peace, but I know how to get it, and they do not.

You will notice that I sent a friend of mine, Colonel House, to Europe,<sup>4</sup> who is as great a lover of peace as any man in the world; but I did not send him on a peace mission; I sent him to take part in a conference as to how the war was to be won; and he knows, as I

know, that this is the way to get peace, if you want it for more than a few minutes.

All of this is a preface to the conference that I referred to with regard to what we are going to do. If we are true friends of freedom—our own or anybody else's—we will see that the power of this country and the productivity of this country is raised to its absolute maximum and that absolutely nobody is allowed to stand in the way of it.

When I say that nobody is allowed to stand in the way, I don't mean that they shall be prevented by the power of the government, but by the power of the American spirit. Our duty, if we are to do this great thing and show America to be what we believe her to be, the greatest hope and energy of the world, then we must stand together night and day until the job is finished.

While we are fighting for freedom we must see, among other things, that labor is free; and that means a number of interesting things. It means not only that we must do what we have declared our purpose to do—see that the conditions of labor are not rendered more onerous by the war—but also that we shall see to it that the instrumentalities by which the conditions of labor are improved are not blocked or checked.

That we must do. That has been the matter about which I have taken pleasure in conferring from time to time with your president, Mr. Gompers. And, if I may be permitted to do so, I want to express my admiration of his patriotic courage, his large vision,

and his statesmanlike sense of what is to be done. I like to lay my mind alongside of a mind that knows how to pull in harness. The horses that kick over the traces will have to be put in a corral.

Now, to "stand the ground" means that nobody must interrupt the processes of our energy, if the interruption can possibly be avoided without the absolute invasion of freedom. To put it concretely that means this: Nobody has a right to stop the processes of labor until all the methods of conciliation and settlement have been exhausted; and I might as well say right here that I am not talking to you alone.

You sometimes stop the courses of labor, but there are others who do the same. And I believe that I am speaking of my own experience not only but of the experience of others, when I say that you are reasonable in a larger number of cases than the capitalists.

I am not saying these things to them personally yet, because I haven't had a chance. But in order to clear the atmosphere and come down to business everybody on both sides has got to transact business, and the settlement is never impossible when both sides want to do the square and right thing. Moreover, a settlement is always hard to avoid when the parties can be brought face to face.

I can differ with a man much more radically when he isn't in the room than I can when he is in the room, because then the awkward thing is that he can come back at me and answer what I say. It is always dangerous for a man to have the floor entirely to himself. And, therefore, we must insist in every instance that



the parties come into each other's presence and there discuss the issues between them, and not separately in places which have no communication with each other.

I always like to remind myself of a delightful saying of an Englishman of a past generation, Charles Lamb. He was with a group of friends and he spoke very harshly of some man who was not present. I ought to say that Lamb stuttered a little. And one of his friends said, "Why, Charles, I didn't know that you knew so and so?"

"O," he said, "I don't. I can't hate a man I know."

There is a great deal of human nature, of very pleasant human nature, in that saying. It is hard to hate a man you know. I must admit, parenthetically, that there are some politicians whose methods I do not believe in, but they are jolly good fellows, and if they only would not talk the wrong kind of politics with me I would love to be with them. And so it is all along the line in serious matters and things less serious.

We are all of the same clay and spirit and we can get together if we desire to get together.

Therefore, my counsel to you is this:

Let us show ourselves Americans by showing that we do not want to go off in separate camps or groups by ourselves, but that we want to coöperate with all other classes and all other groups in a common enterprise which is to release the spirits of the world from bondage.

I would be willing to set that up as the final test of an American. That is the meaning of democracy.

I have been very much distressed, my fellow citizens, by some of the things that have happened recently. The mob spirit is displaying itself here and there in this country.<sup>5</sup> I have sympathy with what some men are saying, but I have no sympathy with the men that take their punishment into their own hands; and I want to say to every man who does join such a mob that I do not recognize him as worthy of the free institutions of the United States.

There are some organizations<sup>6</sup> in this country whose object is anarchy and the destruction of law, but I would not meet their efforts by making myself a partner in destroying the law. I despise and hate their purposes as much as any man, but I respect the ancient processes of justice and I would be too proud not to see them done justice, however wrong they are. And so I want to utter my earnest protest against any manifestation of the spirit of lawlessness anywhere or in any cause.

Why, gentlemen, look what it means. We claim to be the greatest democratic people in the world, and democracy means first of all that we can govern ourselves. If our men have not self-control, then they are not capable of that great thing which we call democratic government. A man who takes the law into his own hands is not the right man to coöperate in any form of orderly development of law and institutions. And some of the processes by which the struggle between capital and labor is carried on are processes that come very near to taking the law into your own hands.

I do not mean for a moment to compare them with what I have just been speaking of, but I want you to see that they are mere gradations of the manifestations of the unwillingness to coöperate, and the fundamental lesson of the whole situation is that we must not only take common counsel but that we must yield to and obey common counsel. Not all of the instrumentalities for this are at hand. I am hopeful that in the very near future new instrumentalities may be organized by which we can see to it that various things that are now going on shall not go on.

There are various processes of the dilution of labor and the unnecessary substitution of labor and bidding in distant markets and unfairly upsetting the whole competition of labor which ought not to go on—I mean now on the part of employers—and we must interject into this some instrumentality of coöperation by which the fair thing will be done all around. I am hopeful that some such instrumentalities may be devised, but whether they are or not, we must use those that we have and upon every occasion where it is necessary to have such an instrumentality originated upon that occasion, if necessary.

And so, my fellow citizens, the reason that I came away from Washington is that I sometimes get lonely down there. There are so many people in Washington who know things that are not so, and there are so few people in Washington who know anything about what the people of the United States are thinking, I have to come away to get reminded of the rest of the country; I have to come away and talk to men who

are up against the real thing and say to them, "I am with you if you are with me." And the only test of being with me is not to think about me personally at all, but merely to think of me as the expression for the time being of the power and dignity and hope of the United States.

## SECOND WAR MESSAGE

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE CONGRESS, DECEMBER 4,  
1917.]

Eight months have elapsed since I last had the honor of addressing you. They have been months crowded with events of immense and grave significance for us. I shall not undertake to retail or even to summarize those events. The practical particulars of the part we have played in them will be laid before you in the reports of the executive departments. I shall discuss only our present outlook upon these vast affairs, our present duties, and the immediate means of accomplishing the objects we shall hold always in view.

I shall not go back to debate the causes of the war. The intolerable wrongs done and planned against us by the sinister masters of Germany have long since become too grossly obvious and odious to every true American to need to be rehearsed. But I shall ask you to consider again and with very grave scrutiny our objectives and the measures by which we mean to attain them; for the purpose of discussion here in this place is action and our action must move straight toward definite ends. Our object is, of course, to win the war, and we shall not slacken or suffer ourselves to be diverted until it is won. But it is worth while

asking and answering the question, When shall we consider the war won?

From one point of view it is not necessary to broach this fundamental matter. I do not doubt that the American people know what the war is about and what sort of an outcome they will regard as a realization of their purpose in it. As a nation we are united in spirit and intention.

I pay little heed to those who tell me otherwise. I hear the voices of dissent—who does not? I hear the criticism and the clamor of the noisily thoughtless and troublesome. I also see men here and there fling themselves in impotent disloyalty against the calm, indomitable power of the nation. I hear men debate peace who understand neither its nature nor the way in which we may attain it, with uplifted eyes and unbroken spirits. But I know that none of these speaks for the nation. They do not touch the heart of anything. They may safely be left to strut their uneasy hour and be forgotten.<sup>1</sup>

But from another point of view I believe that it is necessary to say plainly what we here at the seat of action consider the war to be for and what part we mean to play in the settlement of its searching issues. We are the spokesmen of the American people and they have a right to know whether their purpose is ours. They desire peace by the overcoming of evil, by the defeat once and for all of the sinister forces that interrupt peace and render it impossible, and they wish to know how closely our thought runs with theirs and what action we propose. They are impa-



tient with those who desire peace by any sort of compromise—deeply and indignantly impatient—but they will be equally impatient with us if we do not make it plain to them what our objectives are and what we are planning for in seeking to make conquest of peace by arms.

I believe that I speak for them when I say two things: First, that this intolerable Thing of which the masters of Germany have shown us the ugly face, this menace of combined intrigue and force,<sup>2</sup> which we now see so clearly as the German power, a Thing without conscience or honor or capacity for covenanted peace, must be crushed, and if it be not utterly brought to an end, at least shut out from the friendly intercourse of the nations; and, second, that when this Thing and its power are indeed defeated and the time comes that we can discuss peace—when the German people have spokesmen whose word we can believe, and when those spokesmen are ready in the name of their people to accept the common judgment of the nations as to what shall henceforth be the bases of law and of covenant for the life of the world—we shall be willing and glad to pay the full price for peace and pay it ungrudgingly. We know what that price will be. It will be full, impartial justice—justice done at every point and to every nation that the final settlement must affect, our enemies as well as our friends.

You catch, with me, the voices of humanity that are in the air. They grow daily more audible, more articulate, more persuasive, and they come from the

hearts of men every where. They insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong. It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula, "No annexations, no contributions, no punitive indemnities."<sup>3</sup>

Just because this crude formula expresses the instinctive judgment as to the right of plain men everywhere it has been made diligent use of by the masters of German intrigue to lead the people of Russia astray, and the people of every other country their agents could reach, in order that a premature peace might be brought about before autocracy has been taught its final and convincing lesson and the people of the world put in control of their own destinies.

But the fact that a wrong use has been made of a just idea is no reason why a right use should not be made of it. It ought to be brought under the patronage of its real friends. Let it be said again that autocracy must first be shown the utter futility of its claims to power or leadership in the modern world. It is impossible to apply any standard of justice so long as such forces are unchecked and undefeated as the present masters of Germany command. Not until that has been done can right be set up as arbiter and peacemaker among the nations. But when that has been done—as, God willing, it assuredly will be—we shall at last be free to do an unprecedented thing, and this is the time to avow our purpose to

do it. We shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice, to the exclusion of all selfish claims to advantage even on the part of the victors.

Let there be no misunderstanding. Our present and immediate task is to win the war, and nothing shall turn us aside from it until it is accomplished. Every power and resource we possess, whether of men, of money, or of materials, is being devoted and will continue to be devoted, to that purpose until it is achieved. Those who desire to bring peace about before that purpose is achieved, I counsel to carry their advice elsewhere. We will not entertain it.

We shall regard the war as won only when the German people say to us, through properly accredited representatives, that they are ready to agree to a settlement based upon justice and the reparation of the wrongs their rulers have done. They have done a wrong to Belgium<sup>4</sup> which must be repaired. They have established a power over other lands and peoples than their own—over the great empire of Austria-Hungary, over hitherto free Balkan states, over Turkey, and within Asia—which must be relinquished.<sup>5</sup>

Germany's success by skill, by industry, by knowledge, by enterprise we did not grudge or oppose, but admired rather. She had built up for herself a real empire of trade and influence, secured by the peace of the world. We were content to abide the rivalries of manufacture, science, and commerce that were involved for us in her success and stand or fall as we had or did not have the brains and the initiative to surpass her.

But at the moment when she had conspicuously won her triumphs of peace she threw them away to establish in their stead what the world will no longer permit to be established, military and political domination by arms, by which to oust where she could not excel the rivals she most feared and hated.

The peace we make must remedy that wrong. It must deliver the once fair lands and happy peoples of Belgium and northern France<sup>6</sup> from the Prussian conquest and the Prussian menace, but it must also deliver the peoples of Austria-Hungary, the peoples of the Balkans, and the peoples of Turkey, alike in Europe and in Asia, from the impudent and alien domination of the Prussian military and commercial autocracy.

We owe it, however, to ourselves to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the Austro-Hungarian empire. It is no affair of ours what they do with their own life, either industrially or politically. We do not purpose nor desire to dictate to them in any way. We only desire to see that their affairs are left in their own hands, in all matters, great or small. We shall hope to secure for the peoples of the Balkan peninsula and for the people of the Turkish empire the right and opportunity to make their own lives safe, their own fortunes secure against oppression or injustice and from the dictation of foreign courts or parties, and our attitude and purpose with regard to Germany herself are of a like kind.

We intend no wrong against the German empire,

no interference with her internal affairs. We should deem either the one or the other absolutely unjustifiable, absolutely contrary to the principles we have professed to live by and to hold most sacred throughout our life as a nation.

The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their empire, a war of desperate self-defense against deliberate aggression.<sup>7</sup> Nothing could be more grossly or wantonly false, and we must seek by the utmost openness and candor as to our real aims to convince them of its falseness. We are, in fact, fighting for their emancipation from fear, along with our own, from the fear as well as from the fact of unjust attack by neighbors or rivals or schemers after world empire. No one is threatening the existence or the independence or the peaceful enterprise of the German empire.

The worst that can happen to the detriment of the German people is this, that if they should still, after the war is over, continue to be obliged to live under ambitious and intriguing masters interested to disturb the peace of the world, men or classes of men whom the other peoples of the world could not trust, it might be impossible to admit them to the partnership of nations which must henceforth guarantee the world's peace. That partnership must be a partnership of peoples, not a mere partnership of governments.

It might be impossible, also, in such untoward circumstances, to admit Germany to the free economic



intercourse which must inevitably spring out of the other partnerships of a real peace. But there would be no aggression in that; and such a situation, inevitable because of distrust, would in the very nature of things sooner or later cure itself, by processes which would assuredly set in.

The wrongs, the very deep wrongs,<sup>8</sup> committed in this war will have to be righted. That of course. But they cannot and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies. The world will not permit the commission of similar wrongs as a means of reparation and settlement. Statesmen must by this time have learned that the opinion of the world is everywhere wide-awake and fully comprehends the issues involved. No representative of any self-governed nation will dare disregard it by attempting any such covenants of selfishness and compromise as were entered into at the congress of Vienna.<sup>9</sup>

The thought of the plain people here and everywhere throughout the world, the people who enjoy no privilege and have very simple and unsophisticated standards of right and wrong, is the air all governments must henceforth breathe if they would live. It is in the full disclosing light of that thought that all policies must be conceived and executed in this midday hour of the world's life.

German rulers have been able to upset the peace of the world only because the German people were not suffered under their tutelage, to share the comradeship of the other peoples of the world either in thought



or in purpose. They were allowed to have no opinion of their own which might be set up as a rule of conduct for those who exercised authority over them.<sup>10</sup> But the congress that concludes this war will feel the full strength of the tides that run now in the hearts and consciences of free men everywhere. Its conclusions will run with those tides.

All these things have been true from the very beginning of this stupendous war; and I cannot help thinking that if they had been made plain at the very outset the sympathy and enthusiasm of the Russian people might have been once for all enlisted on the side of the allies, suspicion and distrust swept away, and a real and lasting union of purpose effected.<sup>11</sup> Had they believed these things at the very moment of their revolution and had they been confirmed in that belief since, the sad reverses which have recently marked the progress of their affairs toward an ordered and stable government of free men might have been avoided.

The Russian people have been poisoned by the very same falsehoods that have kept the German people in the dark, and the poison has been administered by the very same hands.<sup>12</sup> The only possible antidote is the truth. It cannot be uttered too plainly or too often.

From every point of view, therefore, it has seemed to be my duty to speak these declarations of purpose, to add these specific interpretations to what I took the liberty of saying to the senate in January. Our entrance into the war has not altered our attitude

toward the settlement that must come when it is over. When I said in January<sup>13</sup> that the nations of the world were entitled not only to free pathways upon the sea, but also to assured and unmolested access to those pathways I was thinking, and I am thinking now, not of the smaller and weaker nations alone, which need our countenance and support, but also of the great and powerful nations, and of our present enemies as well as our present associates in the war. I was thinking, and am thinking now, of Austria herself, among the rest, as well as of Serbia and of Poland. Justice and equality of rights can be had only at a great price. We are seeking permanent, not temporary, foundations for the peace of the world, and must seek them candidly and fearlessly. As always, the right will prove to be the expedient.

What shall we do, then, to push this great war of freedom and justice to its righteous conclusion? We must clear away with a thorough hand all impediments to success, and we must make every adjustment of law that will facilitate the full and free use of our whole capacity and force as a fighting unit.

One very embarrassing obstacle that stands in our way is that we are at war with Germany, but not with her allies.<sup>14</sup> I therefore very earnestly recommend that the congress immediately declare the United States in a state of war with Austria-Hungary.<sup>15</sup> Does it seem strange to you that this should be the conclusion of the argument I have just addressed to you? It is not. It is in fact the inevitable logic of what I have said. Austria-Hungary is for the time being not her

own mistress, but simply the vassal of the German government.<sup>16</sup> We must face the facts as they are and act upon them without sentiment in this stern business.

The government of Austria-Hungary is not acting upon its own initiative or in response to the wishes and feelings of its own peoples, but as the instrument of another nation. We must meet its force with our own and regard the central powers as but one. The war can be successfully conducted in no other way. The same logic would lead also to a declaration of war against Turkey and Bulgaria. They also are the tools of Germany. But they are mere tools and do not yet stand in the direct path of our necessary action. We shall go wherever the necessities of this war carry us, but it seems to me that we should go only where immediate and practical considerations lead us and not heed any others.

The financial and military measures which must be adopted will suggest themselves as the war and its undertakings develop, but I will take the liberty of proposing to you certain other acts of legislation which seem to me to be needed for the support of the war and for the release of our whole force and energy.

It will be necessary to extend in certain particulars the legislation of the last session with regard to alien enemies; and also necessary, I believe, to create a very definite and particular control over the entrance and departure of all persons into and from the United States.

Legislation should be enacted defining as a criminal

offense every willful violation of the Presidential proclamations relating to enemy aliens promulgated under Section 4,067 of the Revised Statutes<sup>17</sup> and providing appropriate punishments; and women as well as men should be included under the terms of the acts placing restraints upon alien enemies. It is likely that as time goes on many alien enemies will be willing to be fed and housed at the expense of the government in the detention camps, and it would be the purpose of the legislation I have suggested to confine offenders among them in penitentiaries and other similar institutions where they could be made to work as other criminals do.

Recent experience has convinced me that the Congress must go further in authorizing the Government to set limits to prices. The law of supply and demand, I am sorry to say, has been replaced by the law of unrestrained selfishness.<sup>18</sup> While we have eliminated profiteering in several branches of industry it still runs impudently rampant in others. The farmers, for example, complain with a great deal of justice that, while the regulation of food prices restricts their incomes, no restraints are placed upon the prices of most of the things they must themselves purchase, and similar iniquities obtain on all sides.

It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country and also the consideration of the systematic and yet economical development of such of the natural resources of the country as are still under the control of the Federal Government should be resumed and affirma-

tively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The pressing need of such legislation is daily becoming more obvious.

The Legislation proposed at the last session<sup>19</sup> with regard to regulated combinations among our exporters, in order to provide for our foreign trade a more effective organization and method of coöperation, ought by all means to be completed at this session.

And I beg that the members of the House of Representatives will permit me to express the opinion that it will be impossible to deal in any way but a very wasteful and extravagant fashion with the enormous appropriations of the public moneys which must continue to be made, if the war is to be properly sustained, unless the House will consent to return to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication as much as possible avoided.<sup>20</sup>

Additional legislation may also become necessary before the present Congress adjourns in order to effect the most efficient coördination and operation of the railway and other transportation systems of the country;<sup>21</sup> but to that I shall, if circumstances should demand, call the attention of Congress upon another occasion.

If I have overlooked anything that ought to be done for the more effective conduct of the war, your own counsels will supply the omission. What I am perfectly clear about is that in the present session of



the Congress our whole attention and energy should be concentrated on the vigorous and rapid and successful prosecution of the great task of winning the war.

We can do this with all the greater zeal and enthusiasm because we know that for us this is a war of high principle, debased by no selfish ambition of conquest or spoliation; because we know, and all the world knows, that we have been forced into it to save the very institutions we live under from corruption and destruction. The purposes of the central powers strike straight at the very heart of everything we believe in; their methods of warfare outrage every principle of humanity and of knightly honor;<sup>22</sup> their intrigue has corrupted the very thought and spirit of many of our people; their sinister and secret diplomacy has sought to take our very territory away from us and disrupt the union of the States.<sup>23</sup> Our safety would be at an end, our honor forever sullied and brought into contempt were we to permit their triumph. They are striking at the very existence of democracy and liberty.

It is because it is for us a war of high, disinterested purpose, in which all the free peoples of the world are banded together for the vindication of right, a war for the preservation of our nation and of all that it has held dear of principle and of purpose, that we feel ourselves doubly constrained to propose for its outcome only that which is righteous and of irreproachable intention, for our foes as well as for our friends.

The cause being just and holy, the settlement must



be of like motive and quality. For this we can fight, but for nothing less noble or less worthy of our traditions. For this cause we entered the war and for this cause will we battle until the last gun is fired.

I have spoken plainly because this seems to me the time when it is most necessary to speak plainly, in order that all the world may know that even in the heat and ardor of the struggle and when our whole thought is of carrying the war through to its end we have not forgotten any ideal or principle for which the name of America has been held in honor among the nations and for which it has been our glory to contend in the great generations that went before us.

A supreme moment of history has come. The eyes of the people have been opened and they see. The hand of God is laid upon the nations. He will show them favor, I devoutly believe, only if they rise to the clear heights of His own justice and mercy.

# PROGRAM OF THE WORLD'S PEACE\*

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE CONGRESS JANUARY 8,  
1918.]

Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the central empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible bases of a general peace.<sup>1</sup> Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk<sup>2</sup> between Russian representatives and representatives of the central powers to which the attention of all the belligerents has been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement.

The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace, but also an equally definite program of the concrete application of those principles.<sup>3</sup>

The representatives of the central powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific program of practical terms was added.

That program proposed no concessions at all, either to sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the population with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the central empires were to keep every

\* Lloyd George—App., p. 107. 209

foot of territory their armed forces had occupied—every province, every city, every point of vantage—as a permanent addition to their territories and their power.

It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own people's thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders, who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significance. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the central empires speaking?<sup>4</sup> Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties—that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and the Balkan states, which have felt obliged to become their associates in this war?

The Russian representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of democracy, that the conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open, not closed, doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired.

To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the resolutions of the German reichstag of the 19th of July last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening in fact to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world.

But whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the central empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory.

There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candor. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again,<sup>5</sup> we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definitive terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them.

Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George<sup>6</sup> has spoken with admirable candor and in admirable spirit for the people and government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the central powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail.

The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war lies with Germany and her allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of the very life of society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless,<sup>7</sup> it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power apparently is shattered, and yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. The conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe.

They call to us to say what it is that we desire, in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ

from theirs ; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond with utter simplicity and frankness.

Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open, and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by ; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments, and likely at some unlooked for moment to upset the peace of the world.

It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view

We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible<sup>s</sup> unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves.

It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in ; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its



own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression.

All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us.

The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program, and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas,<sup>8</sup> outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV. Adequate guaranties given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.<sup>10</sup>

V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interest of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the

equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest coöperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

VII. Belgium,<sup>11</sup> the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine,<sup>12</sup> which has unsettled the peace of the world

for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy<sup>13</sup> should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.<sup>14</sup>

XI. Roumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia<sup>15</sup> accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guaranties of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guaranties.

XIII. An independent Polish state<sup>16</sup> should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should

be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

XIV. 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.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the imperialists. We can not be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does remove.

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.

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question.

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 strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity, and devotion to the test.

# ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

WOODROW WILSON

[SPEECH DELIVERED BEFORE CONGRESS  
FEBRUARY 11, 1918]

On the 8th of January I had the honor of addressing you on the objects of the war as our people conceive them. The prime minister of Great Britain had spoken in similar terms on the 5th of January.

To these addresses the German chancellor replied on the 24th, and Count Czernin for Austria on the same day. It is gratifying to have our desire so promptly realized that all exchanges of view on this great matter should be made in the hearing of all the world.

Count Czernin's reply, which is directed chiefly to my own address on the 8th of January, is uttered in a very friendly tone.<sup>1</sup> He finds in my statement a sufficiently encouraging approach to the views of his own government to justify him in believing that it furnishes a basis for a more detailed discussion of purposes by the two governments.

He is represented to have intimated that the views he was expressing had been communicated to me beforehand and that I was aware of them at the time he was uttering them; but in this I am sure he was misunderstood. I had received no intimation of what he intended to say. There was, of course, no reason



why he should communicate privately with me.<sup>2</sup> I am content to be one of his public audience.

Count von Hertling's reply is, I must say, very vague and very confusing. It is full of equivocal phrases and leads it is not clear where. But it is certainly in a very different tone from that of Count Czernin and apparently of an opposite purpose. It confirms, I am sorry to say, rather than removes, the unfortunate impression made by what we had learned of the conferences at Brest-Litovsk.<sup>3</sup>

His discussion and acceptance of our general principles lead him to no practical conclusions. He refuses to apply them to the substantive items which must constitute the body of any final settlement. He is jealous of international action and of international counsel.

He accepts, he says, the principle of public diplomacy, but he appears to insist that it be confined, at any rate in this case, to generalities and that the several particular questions of territory and sovereignty, the several questions upon whose settlement must depend the acceptance of peace by the twenty-three states now engaged in the war, must be discussed and settled, not in general council, but severally by the nations most immediately concerned by interest or neighborhood.

He agrees that the seas should be free, but looks askance at any limitation to that freedom by international action in the interest of the common order. He would without reserve be glad to see economic barriers removed between nation and nation, for that could in

no way impede the ambitions of the military party with whom he seems constrained to keep on terms.

Neither does he raise objection to a limitation of armaments. That matter will be settled of itself, he thinks, by the economic conditions which must follow the war.

But the German colonies, he demands, must be returned without debate. He will discuss with no one but the representatives of Russia what dispositions shall be made of the peoples and the lands of the Baltic provinces; with no one but the government of France the "conditions" under which French territory shall be evacuated, and only with Austria what shall be done with Poland.

In the determination of all questions affecting the Balkan states he defers, as I understand him, to Austria and Turkey; and with regard to the agreements to be entered into concerning the non-Turkish peoples of the present Ottoman empire to the Turkish authorities themselves.

After a settlement all around, effected in this fashion by individual barter and concession, he would have no objection, if I correctly interpret his statement, to a league of nations which would undertake to hold the new balance of power steady against external disturbances.

It must be evident to every one who understands what this war has wrought in the opinion and temper of the world that no general peace, no peace worth the infinite sacrifices of these years of tragical suffering, can possibly be arrived at in any such fashion.

The method the German chancellor proposes is the method of the congress of Vienna.<sup>4</sup> We cannot and will not return to that. What is at stake now is the peace of the world. What we are striving for is a new international order based upon broad and universal principles of right and justice—no mere peace of shreds and patches.

Is it possible that Count von Hertling does not see that, does not grasp it, is in fact living in his thought in a world dead and gone? Has he utterly forgotten the reichstag resolutions of the 19th of July,<sup>5</sup> or does he deliberately ignore them? They spoke of the conditions of a general peace, not of national aggrandizement or of arrangements between state and state.

The peace of the world depends upon the just settlement of each of the several problems to which I adverted in my recent address to the congress. I, of course, do not mean that the peace of the world depends upon the acceptance of any particular set of suggestions as to the way in which those problems are to be dealt with. I mean only that those problems each and all affect the whole world; that unless they are dealt with in a spirit of unselfish and unbiased justice, with a view to the wishes, the natural connections, the racial aspirations, the security and peace of mind of the peoples involved, no permanent peace will have been attained.

They cannot be discussed separately or in corners. None of them constitutes a private or separate interest from which the opinion of the world may be shut

out. Whatever affects the peace affects mankind, and nothing settled by military force, if settled wrong, is settled at all. It will presently have to be reopened.

Is Count von Hertling not aware that he is speaking in the court of mankind, that all the awakened nations of the world now sit in judgment on what every public man, of whatever nation, may say on the issues of a conflict which has spread to every region of the world?

The reichstag resolutions of July themselves frankly accepted the decisions of that court. There shall be no annexations, no contributions, no punitive damages. Peoples are not to be handed about from one sovereignty to another by an international conference or an understanding between rivals and antagonists.

National aspirations must be respected, peoples may now be dominated and governed only by their own consent. "Self determination" is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action, which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril.

We cannot have general peace for the asking, or by the mere arrangements of a peace conference. It cannot be pieced together out of individual understandings between powerful states. All the parties to this war must join in the settlement of every issue anywhere involved in it because what we are seeking is a peace that we can all unite to guarantee and maintain and every item of it must be submitted to the common judgment whether it be right and fair, an act of justice, rather than a bargain between sovereigns.

The United States has no desire to interfere in Eu-

ropean affairs or to act as arbiter in European territorial disputes.<sup>6</sup> We would disdain to take advantage of any internal weakness or disorder to impose our own will upon another people. She is quite ready to be shown that the settlements she has suggested are not the best or the most enduring. They are only her own provisional sketch of principles, and of the way in which they should be applied.

But she entered this war because she was made a partner, whether she would or not, in the sufferings and indignities inflicted by the military masters of Germany against the peace and security of mankind; and the conditions of peace will touch her as nearly as they will touch any other nation to which is intrusted a leading part in the maintenance of civilization.

She cannot see her way to peace until the causes of this war are removed, its renewal rendered as nearly as may be impossible.

This war had its roots in the disregard of the rights of small nations and of nationalities which lacked the union and the force to make good their claim to determine their own allegiances and their own forms of political life. Covenants must now be entered into which will render such things impossible for the future; and those covenants must be backed by the united force of all the nations that love justice and are willing to maintain it at any cost.

If territorial settlements and the political relations of great populations which have not the organized power to resist are to be determined by the contracts

of the powerful governments which consider themselves most directly affected, as Count von Hertling proposes, why may not economic questions also?

It has come about in the altered world in which we now find ourselves that justice and the rights of peoples affect the whole field of international dealing as much as access to raw materials and fair and equal conditions of trade.

Count von Hertling wants the essential bases of commercial and industrial life to be safeguarded by common agreement and guarantee, but he cannot expect that to be conceded him if the other matters to be determined by the articles of peace are not handled in the same way as items in the final accounting. He cannot ask the benefit of common agreement in the one field without according it in the other.

I take it for granted that he sees that separate and selfish compacts with regard to trade and the essential materials of manufacture would afford no foundation for peace. Neither, he may rest assured, will separate and selfish compacts with regard to provinces and peoples.

Count Czernin seems to see the fundamental elements of peace with clear eyes and does not seek to obscure them. He sees that an independent Poland,<sup>7</sup> made up of all the indisputably Polish peoples who lie contiguous to one another, is a matter of European concern and must, of course, be conceded; that Belgium must be evacuated and restored, no matter what sacrifices and concessions that may involve; and that national aspirations must be satisfied, even within his



own empire, in the common interest of Europe and mankind.

If he is silent about questions which touch the interest and purpose of his allies more nearly than they touch those of Austria only, it must of course be because he feels constrained, I suppose, to defer to Germany and Turkey in the circumstances.

Seeing and conceding, as he does, the essential principles involved and the necessity of candidly applying them, he naturally feels that Austria can respond to the purpose of peace as expressed by the United States with less embarrassment than could Germany. He probably would have gone much further had it not been for the embarrassments of Austria's alliances and of her dependence upon Germany.

After all, the test of whether it is possible for either government to go any further in this comparison of views is simple and obvious. The principles to be applied are these:

*First*—That each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular cause and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent.

*Second*—That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power; but that,

*Third*—Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part

of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival states; and.

*Fourth*—That all well defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe and consequently of the world.

A general peace erected on such foundations can be discussed. Until such a peace can be secured we have no choice but to go on.\* So far as we can judge, these principles that we regard as fundamental are already everywhere accepted as imperative, except among the spokesmen of the military and annexationist party in Germany. If they have anywhere else been rejected the objectors have not been sufficiently numerous or influential to make their voices audible.

The tragical circumstance is that this one party in Germany is apparently willing and able to send millions of men to their death to prevent what all the world now sees to be just.

I would not be a true spokesman of the people of the United States if I did not say once more that we entered this war upon no small occasion and that we never can turn back from a course chosen upon principle.

Our resources are in part mobilized now and we shall not pause until they are mobilized in their entirety. Our armies are rapidly going to the fighting front and will go more and more rapidly. Our whole strength will be put into this war of emancipation—

emancipation from the threat and attempted mastery of selfish groups of autocratic rulers—whatever the difficulties and present partial delays.

We are indomitable in our power of independent action and can in no circumstances consent to live in a world governed by intrigue and force. We believe that our own desire for a new international order under which reason and justice and the common interests of mankind shall prevail is the desire of enlightened men everywhere. Without that new order the world will be without peace, and human life will lack tolerable conditions of existence and development. Having set our hand to the task of achieving it we shall not turn back.

I hope that it is not necessary for me to add that no word of what I have said is intended as a threat. That is not the temper of our people. I have spoken thus only that the whole world may know the true spirit of America—that men everywhere may know that our passion for justice and for self-government is no mere passion of words, but a passion which, once set in action, must be satisfied. The power of the United States is a menace to no nation or people. It will never be used in aggression or for the aggrandizement of any selfish interest of our own. It springs out of freedom and is for the service of freedom.

# THE END OF SELFISH DOMINION

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT BALTIMORE, APRIL 6, 1918]

This is the anniversary of our acceptance of Germany's challenge to fight for our right to live and be free, and for the sacred rights of freemen everywhere.<sup>1</sup> The nation is awake. There is no need to call to it. We know what the war must cost, our utmost sacrifice, the lives of our fittest men and, if need be, all that we possess.

The loan<sup>2</sup> we are met to discuss is one of the least parts of what we are called upon to give and to do, though in itself imperative. The people of the whole country are alive to the necessity of it, and are ready to lend to the utmost, even where it involves a sharp skimping and daily sacrifice to lend out of meager earnings. They will look with reprobation and contempt upon those who can and will not, upon those who demand a higher rate of interest, upon those who think of it as a mere commercial transaction. I have not come, therefore, to urge the loan. I have come only to give you, if I can, a more vivid conception of what it is for.

The reason for this great war, the reason why it had to come, the need to fight it through, and the issues that hang upon its outcome, are more clearly disclosed now than ever before. It is easy to see just what this particular loan means, because the cause we are fighting for stands more sharply revealed than at any previous crisis of the momentous struggle. The man who knows least

can now see plainly how the cause of justice stands, and what the imperishable thing he is asked to invest in is. Men in America may be more sure than they ever were before that the cause is their own, and that, if it should be lost, their own great nation's place and mission in the world would be lost with it.

I call you to witness, my fellow-countrymen, that at no stage of this terrible business have I judged the purposes of Germany intemperately. I would be ashamed in the presence of affairs so grave, so fraught with the destinies of mankind throughout all the world, to speak with truculence, to use the weak language of hatred or vindictive purpose. We must judge as we would be judged. I have sought to learn the objects Germany has in this war from the mouths of her own spokesmen, and to deal frankly with them as I wished them to deal with me. I have laid bare our own ideals, our own purposes, without reserve or doubtful phrase, and have asked them to say as plainly what it is that they seek.

We have ourselves proposed no injustice, no aggression. We are ready, whenever the final reckoning is made, to be just to the German people, deal fairly with the German power, as with all others. There can be no difference between the peoples in the final judgment, if it is indeed to be a righteous judgment. To propose anything but justice, even-handed and dispassionate justice, to Germany at any time, whatever the outcome of the war, would be to renounce and dishonor our cause, for we ask nothing that we are not willing to accord.

It has been with this thought that I have sought to learn from those who spoke for Germany whether it was

justice or dominion and the execution of their own will upon the other nations of the world that the German leaders were seeking. They have answered—answered in unmistakable terms. They have avowed that it was not justice, but dominion and the unhindered execution of their own will. The avowal has not come from Germany's statesmen. It has come from her military leaders, who are her real rulers. Her statesmen have said that they wished peace, and were ready to discuss its terms whenever their opponents were willing to sit down at the conference table with them.<sup>3</sup> Her present Chancellor has said—in indefinite and uncertain terms, indeed, and in phrases that often seem to deny their own meaning, but with as much plainness as he thought prudent—that he believed that peace should be based upon the principles which we had declared would be our own in the final settlement.<sup>4</sup>

At Brest-Litovsk her civilian delegates spoke in similar terms; professed their desire to conclude a fair peace and accord to the peoples with whose fortunes they were dealing the right to choose their own allegiances. But action accompanied and followed the profession. Their military masters, the men who act for Germany and exhibit her purpose in execution, proclaimed a very different conclusion. We cannot mistake what they have done—in Russia, in Finland, in the Ukraine, in Roumania.<sup>5</sup> The real test of their justice and fair play has come. From this we may judge the rest.

They are enjoying in Russia a cheap triumph in which no brave or gallant nation can long take pride. A great people, helpless by their own act, lies for the time at their



mercy. Their fair professions are forgotten. They nowhere set up justice, but everywhere impose their power and exploit everything for their own use and aggrandizement, and the peoples of conquered provinces are invited to be free under their dominion!

Are we not justified in believing that they would do the same things at their western front if they were not there face to face with armies whom even their countless divisions cannot overcome? If, when they have felt their check to be final, they should propose favorable and equitable terms with regard to Belgium and France and Italy, could they blame us if we concluded that they did so only to assure themselves of a free hand in Russia and the East?

Their purpose is, undoubtedly, to make all the Slavic peoples, all the free and ambitious nations of the Balkan Peninsula, all the lands that Turkey has dominated and misruled, subject to their will and ambition, and build upon that dominion an empire of force upon which they fancy that they can then erect an empire of gain and commercial supremacy—an empire as hostile to the Americas as to the Europe which it will overawe—an empire which will ultimately master Persia, India, and the peoples of the Far East.

In such a program our ideals, the ideals of justice and humanity and liberty, the principle of the free self-determination of nations, upon which all the modern world insists, can play no part. They are rejected for the ideals of power, for the principle that the strong must rule the weak, that trade must follow the flag, whether those to whom it is taken welcome it or not, that the

peoples of the world are to be made subject to the patronage and overlordship of those who have the power to enforce it.

That program once carried out, America and all who care or dare to stand with her must arm and prepare themselves to contest the mastery of the world—a mastery in which the rights of common men, the rights of women and of all who are weak, must for the time being be trodden underfoot and disregarded and the old, age-long struggle for freedom and right begin again at its beginning. Everything that America has lived for and loved and grown great to vindicate and bring to a glorious realization will have fallen in utter ruin and the gates of mercy once more pitilessly shut upon mankind!

The thing is preposterous and impossible; and yet is not that what the whole course and action of the German armies has meant wherever they have moved? I do not wish, even in this moment of utter disillusionment, to judge harshly or unrighteously. I judge only what the German arms have accomplished with unpitying thoroughness throughout every fair region they have touched.

What, then, are we to do? For myself, I am ready, ready still, ready even now, to discuss a fair and just and honest peace at any time that it is sincerely proposed—a peace in which the strong and the weak shall fare alike. But the answer, when I proposed such a peace,<sup>6</sup> came from the German commanders in Russia<sup>7</sup> and I cannot mistake the meaning of the answer.

I accept the challenge. I know that you accept it. All the world shall know that you accept it. It shall appear in the utter sacrifice and self-forgetfulness with

which we shall give all that we love and all that we have to redeem the world and make it fit for free men like ourselves to live in. This now is the meaning of all that we do. Let everything that we say, my fellow countrymen, everything that we henceforth plan and accomplish, ring true to this response till the majesty and might of our concerted power shall fill the thought and utterly defeat the force of those who flout and misprize what we honor and hold dear.

Germany has once more said that force, and force alone, shall decide whether justice and peace shall reign in the affairs of men, whether right as America conceives it or dominion as she conceives it shall determine the destinies of mankind. There is, therefore, but one response possible from us: Force, force to the utmost, force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant force which shall make right the law of the world and cast every selfish dominion down in the dust.

## THE MOUNT VERNON ADDRESS

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE GRAVE OF WASHINGTON,  
JULY 4, 1918]

I am happy to draw apart with you to this quiet place of old counsel in order to speak a little of the meaning of this day of our nation's independence. The place seems very still and remote. It is as serene and untouched by the hurry of the world as it was in those great days long ago when General Washington was here and held leisurely conference with the men who were to be associated with him in the creation of a nation. From these gentle slopes they looked out upon the world and saw it whole, saw it with the light of the future upon it, saw it with modern eyes that turned away from a past which men of liberated spirits could no longer endure. It is for that reason that we cannot feel, even here, in the immediate presence of this sacred tomb, that this is a place of death. It was a place of achievement. A great promise that was meant for all mankind was here given plan and reality. The associations by which we are here surrounded are the inspiring associations of that noble death which is only a glorious consummation. From this green hillside we also ought to be able to see with comprehending eyes the world that lies around us and conceive anew the purpose that must set men free.

It is significant—significant of their own character and purpose and of the influences they were setting afoot

—that Washington and his associates, like the Barons at Runnymede,<sup>1</sup> spoke and acted, not for a class, but for a people. It has been left for us to see to it that it shall be understood that they spoke and acted, not for a single people only, but for all mankind. They were thinking not of themselves and of the material interests which centered in the little groups of landholders and merchants and men of affairs with whom they were accustomed to act, in Virginia and the colonies to the north and south of her, but of a people which wished to be done with classes and special interests and the authority of men whom they had not themselves chosen to rule over them. They entertained no private purpose, desired no peculiar privilege. They were consciously planning that men of every class should be free and America a place to which men out of every nation might resort who wished to share with them the rights and privileges of free men. And we take our cue from them—do we not? We intend what they intended. We here in America believe our participation in the present war to be only the fruitage of what they planted. Our case differs from theirs only in this, that it is our inestimable privilege to concert with men out of every nation who shall make not only the liberties of America secure but the liberties of every other people as well. We are happy in the thought that we are permitted to do what they would have done had they been in our place. There must now be settled, once for all, what was settled for America in the great age upon whose inspiration we draw today. This is surely a fitting place from which calmly to look out upon our task,

that we may fortify our spirits for its accomplishment. And this is the appropriate place from which to avow, alike to the friends who look on<sup>2</sup> and to the friends with whom we have the happiness to be associated in action, the faith and purpose with which we act.

This, then, is our conception of the great struggle in which we are engaged. The plot is written plain upon every scene and every act of the supreme tragedy. On the one hand stand the peoples of the world—not only the peoples actually engaged, but many others, also, who suffer under mastery but cannot act; peoples of many races and in every part of the world—the people of stricken Russia still among the rest, though they are for the moment unorganized and helpless. Opposed to them, masters of many armies, stand an isolated, friendless group of Governments, who speak no common purpose, but only selfish ambitions of their own, by which none can profit but themselves, and whose peoples are fuel in their hands; Governments which fear their people, and yet are for the time being sovereign lords, making every choice for them and disposing of their lives and fortunes as they will, as well as of the lives and fortunes of every people who fall under their power—Governments clothed with the strange trappings and the primitive authority of an age that is altogether alien and hostile to our own. The Past and the Present are in deadly grapple, and the peoples of the world are being done to death between them.

There can be but one issue. The settlement must be final. There can be no compromise. No halfway decision would be tolerable. No halfway decision is con-



ceivable. These are the ends for which the associated peoples of the world are fighting and which must be conceded them before there can be peace:

I. The destruction of every arbitrary power anywhere that can separately, secretly, and of its single choice disturb the peace of the world; or, if it cannot be presently destroyed, at the least its reduction to virtual impotence.<sup>3</sup>

II. The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.

III. The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct toward each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern the individual citizens of all modern States in their relations with one another; to the end that all promises and covenants may be sacredly observed, no private plots or conspiracies hatched, no selfish injuries wrought with impunity, and a mutual trust established upon the handsome foundation of a mutual respect for right.

IV. The establishment of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of free nations will check every invasion of right and serve to make peace and justice the more secure by affording a definite tribunal of opinion to which all must submit

and by which every international readjustment that cannot be amicably agreed upon by the peoples directly concerned shall be sanctioned.<sup>4</sup>

These great objects can be put into a single sentence. What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.

These great ends cannot be achieved by debating and seeking to reconcile and accommodate what statesmen may wish with their projects for balances of power and of national opportunity. They can be realized only by the determination of what the thinking peoples of the world desire, with their longing hope for justice and for social freedom and opportunity.

I can fancy that the air of this place carries the accents of such principles with a peculiar kindness. Here were started forces which the great nation against which they were primarily directed at first regarded as a revolt against its rightful authority, but which it has long since seen to have been a step in the liberation of its own people as well as of the people of the United States; and I stand here now to speak—speak proudly and with confident hope—of the spread of this revolt, this liberation, to the great stage of the world itself! The blinded rulers of Prussia have roused forces they know little of—forces which, once roused, can never be crushed to earth again; for they have at their heart an inspiration and a purpose which are deathless and of the very stuff of triumph!

## PEACE WITH JUSTICE

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE FOURTH LIBERTY LOAN AT THE METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1918.]

I am not here to promote the loan. That will be done—ably and enthusiastically done—by the hundreds of thousands of loyal and tireless men and women who have undertaken to present it to you and to our fellow citizens throughout the country; and I have not the least doubt of their complete success; for I know their spirit and the spirit of the country. My confidence is confirmed, too, by the thoughtful and experienced co-operation of the bankers here and everywhere, who are lending their invaluable aid and guidance.<sup>1</sup> I have come, rather, to seek an opportunity to present to you some thoughts which I trust will serve to give you, in perhaps fuller measure than before, a vivid sense of the great issues involved, in order that you may appreciate and accept with added enthusiasm the grave significance of the duty of supporting the Government by your men and your means to the utmost point of sacrifice and self-denial. No man or woman who has really taken in what this war means can hesitate to give to the very limit of what they have; and it is my mission here to-night to try to make it clear once more what the war really means. You will need no other stimulation or reminder of your duty.

At every turn of the war we gain a fresh consciousness of what we mean to accomplish by it. When our hope and expectation are most excited we think more definitely than before of the issues that hang upon it and of the purposes which must be realized by means of it. For it has positive and well-defined purposes which we did not determine and which we cannot alter. No statesman or assembly created them; no statesman or assembly can alter them. They have arisen out of the very nature and circumstances of the war. The most that statesmen or assemblies can do is to carry them out or be false to them. They were perhaps not clear at the outset; but they are clear now. The war has lasted more than four years and the whole world has been drawn into it. The common will of mankind has been substituted for the particular purposes of individual States. Individual statesmen may have started the conflict, but neither they nor their opponents can stop it as they please. It has become a people's war, and peoples of all sorts and races, of every degree of power and variety of fortune, are involved in its sweeping processes of change and settlement. We came into it when its character had become fully defined and it was plain that no action could stand apart or be indifferent to its outcome. Its challenge drove to the heart of everything we cared for and lived for. The voice of the war had become clear and gripped our hearts. Our brothers from many lands, as well as our own murdered dead under the sea, were calling to us, and we responded, fiercely and of course.

The air was clear about us. We saw things in their full, convincing proportions as they were; and we have

seen them with steady eyes and unchanging comprehension ever since. We accepted the issues of the war as facts, not as any group of men either here or elsewhere had defined them, and we can accept no outcome which does not squarely meet and settle them. Those issues are these:

Shall the military power of any nation or group of nations be suffered to determine the fortunes of peoples over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force?

Shall strong nations be free to wrong weak nations and make them subject to their purpose and interest?

Shall peoples be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible force or by their own will and choice?

Shall there be a common standard of right and privilege for all peoples and nations, or shall the strong do as they will and the weak suffer without redress?

Shall the assertion of right be haphazard and by casual alliance or shall there be a common concert to oblige the observance of common rights?

No man, no group of men, chose these to be the issues of the struggle. They *are* the issues of it; and they must be settled—by no arrangement or compromise or adjustment of interests, but definitely and once for all and with a full and unequivocal acceptance of the principle that the interest of the weakest is as sacred as the interest of the strongest.

This is what we mean when we speak of a permanent peace, if we speak sincerely, intelligently, and with a

real knowledge and comprehension of the matter we deal with.

We are all agreed that there can be no peace obtained by any kind of bargain or compromise with the Governments of the Central Empires, because we have dealt with them already and have seen them deal with other Governments that were parties to this struggle, at Brest-Litovsk<sup>2</sup> and Bucharest.<sup>3</sup> They have convinced us that they are without honor and do not intend justice. They observe no covenants, accept no principle but force and their own interest. We cannot "come to terms" with them.<sup>4</sup> They have made it impossible. The German people must by this time be fully aware that we cannot accept the word of those who forced this war upon us. We do not think the same thoughts or speak the same language of agreement.

It is of capital importance that we should also be explicitly agreed that no peace shall be obtained by any kind of compromise or abatement of the principles we have avowed as the principles for which we are fighting. There should exist no doubt about that. I am, therefore, going to take the liberty of speaking with the utmost frankness about the practical implications that are involved in it.

If it be in deed and in truth the common object of the Governments associated against Germany and of the nations whom they govern, as I believe it to be, to achieve by the coming settlements a secure and lasting peace, it will be necessary that all who sit down at the peace table shall come ready and willing to pay the price, the only price, that will procure it; and ready and willing,



also, to create in some virile fashion the only instrumentality by which it can be made certain that the agreements of the peace will be honored and fulfilled.

That price is impartial justice in every item of the settlement, no matter whose interest is crossed; and not only impartial justice, but also the satisfaction of the several peoples whose fortunes are dealt with. That indispensable instrumentality is a League of Nations,<sup>5</sup> formed under covenants that will be efficacious. Without such an instrumentality, by which the peace of the world can be guaranteed, peace will rest in part upon the word of outlaws, and only upon that word. For Germany will have to redeem her character, not by what happens at the peace table, but by what follows.

And, as I see it, the constitution of that League of Nations and the clear definition of its objects must be a part, is in a sense the most essential part, of the peace settlement itself. It cannot be formed now. If formed now, it would be merely a new alliance confined to the nations associated against a common enemy. It is not likely that it could be formed after the settlement. It is necessary to guarantee the peace; and the peace cannot be guaranteed as an afterthought. The reason, to speak in plain terms again, why it must be guaranteed is that there will be parties to the peace whose promises have proved untrustworthy, and means must be found in connection with the peace settlement itself to remove that source of insecurity. It would be folly to leave the guarantee to the subsequent voluntary action of the Governments we have seen destroy Roumania and deceive Roumania.

But these general terms do not disclose the whole matter. Some details are needed to make them sound less like a thesis and more like a practical program. These, then, are some of the particulars, and I state them with the greater confidence because I can state them authoritatively as representing this Government's interpretation of its own duty with regard to peace:

1. The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

2. No special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

3. There can be no league or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

4. And more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the league and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

5. All international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities

have been the prolific source in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding terms.

The confidence with which I venture to speak for our people in these matters does not spring from our traditions merely, and the well-known principles of international action which we have always professed and followed. In the same sentence in which I say that the United States will enter into no special arrangements or understandings with particular nations let me say also that the United States is prepared to assume its full share of responsibility for the maintenance of the common covenants and understandings upon which peace must henceforth rest. We still read Washington's immortal warning against "entangling alliances" with full comprehension and an unswerving purpose. But only special and limited alliances entangle; and we recognize and accept the duty of a new day in which we are permitted to hope for a general alliance which will avoid entanglements and clear the air of the world for common understandings and the maintenance of common rights.

I have made this analysis of the international situation which the war has created, not, of course, because I doubted whether the leaders of the great nations and peoples with whom we are associated were of the same mind and entertained a like purpose, but because the air every now and again gets darkened by mists and groundless doubtings and mischievous perversions of counsel, and it is necessary once and again to sweep all

the irresponsible talk about peace intrigues and weakening morale and doubtful purpose on the part of those in authority utterly, and if need be unceremoniously, aside and say things in the plainest words that can be found, even when it is only to say over again what has been said before, quite as plainly if in less unvarnished terms.

As I have said, neither I nor any other man in governmental authority created or gave form to the issues of this war. I have simply responded to them with such vision as I could command. But I have responded gladly and with a resolution that has grown warmer and more confident as the issues have grown clearer and clearer. It is now plain that they are issues which no man can pervert unless it be wilfully. I am bound to fight for them, and happy to fight for them as time and circumstance have revealed them to me as to all the world. Our enthusiasm for them grows more and more irresistible as they stand out in more and more vivid and unmistakable outline.

And the forces that fight for them draw into closer and closer array, organize their millions into more and more unconquerable might, as they become more and more distinct to the thought and purpose of the peoples engaged. It is the peculiarity of this great war that while statesmen have seemed to cast about for definitions of their purpose, and have sometimes seemed to shift their ground and their point of view, the thought of the mass of men, whom statesmen are supposed to instruct and lead, has grown more and more unclouded, more and **more** certain of what it is that they are fighting for.

National purposes have fallen more and more into the background and the common purpose of enlightened mankind has taken their place. The counsels of plain men have become on all hands more simple and straightforward and more unified than the counsels of sophisticated men of affairs, who still retain the impression that they are playing a game of power and playing for high stakes. That is why I have said that this is a peoples' war, not a statesmen's. Statesmen must follow the clarified common thought or be broken.<sup>6</sup>

I take that to be the significance of the fact that assemblies and associations of many kinds made up of plain workaday people have demanded, almost every time they came together, and are still demanding,<sup>7</sup> that the leaders of their Governments declare to them plainly what it is, exactly what it is, that they are seeking in this war, and what they think the items of the final settlement should be. They are not yet satisfied with what they have been told. They still seem to fear that they are getting what they ask for only in statesmen's terms—only in the terms of territorial arrangements and divisions of power, and not in terms of broad-voiced justice and mercy and peace and the satisfaction of those deep-seated longings of oppressed and distracted men and women and enslaved peoples that seem to them the only things worth fighting a war for that engulfs the world. Perhaps statesmen have not always recognized this changed aspect of the whole world of policy and action. Perhaps they have not always spoken in direct reply to the questions asked because they did not know how searching those questions were and what sort of answers they demanded.

But I, for one, am glad to attempt the answer again and again, in the hope that I may make it clearer and clearer that my one thought is to satisfy those who struggle in the ranks and are, perhaps above all others, entitled to a reply whose meaning no one can have any excuse for misunderstanding, if he understands the language in which it is spoken or can get someone to translate it correctly into his own. And I believe that the leaders of the Governments with which we are associated will speak, as they have occasion, as plainly as I have tried to speak. I hope that they will feel free to say whether they think that I am in any degree mistaken in my interpretation of the issues involved or in my purpose with regard to the means by which a satisfactory settlement of those issues may be obtained. Unity of purpose and of counsel are as imperatively necessary in this war as was unity of command in the battlefield; and with perfect unity of purpose and counsel will come assurance of complete victory. It can be had in no other way. "Peace drives" can be effectively neutralized and silenced only by showing that every victory of the nations associated against Germany brings the nations nearer the sort of peace which will bring security and reassurance to all peoples and make the recurrence of another such struggle of pitiless force and bloodshed forever impossible, and that nothing else can. Germany is constantly intimating the "terms" she will accept; and always finds that the world does not want terms. It wishes the final triumph of justice and fair dealing.



# ATTITUDE OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARD MEXICO

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE WHITE HOUSE TO THE  
MEXICAN EDITORS, JUNE 7, 1918]

Gentlemen, I have never received a group of men who were more welcome than you are, because it has been one of my distresses during the period of my Presidency that the Mexican people did not more thoroughly understand the attitude of the United States toward Mexico.<sup>1</sup> I think I can assure you, and I hope you have had every evidence of the truth of my assurance, that that attitude is one of sincere friendship. And not merely the sort of friendship which prompts one not to do his neighbor any harm, but the sort of friendship which earnestly desires to do his neighbor service.

My own policy, the policy of my own administration, toward Mexico was at every point based upon this principle, that the internal settlement of the affairs of Mexico was none of our business; that we had no right to interfere with or to dictate to Mexico in any particular with regard to her own affairs. Take one aspect of our relations which at one time may have been difficult for you to understand: When we sent troops into Mexico,<sup>2</sup> our sincere desire was nothing else than to assist you to get rid of a man who was making the settlement of your affairs for the time being impossible. We had no desire to use our troops for any other purpose, and I was in

hopes that by assisting in that way and then immediately withdrawing I might give substantial proof of the truth of the assurances that I had given your Government through President Carranza.

And at the present time it distresses me to learn that certain influences, which I assume to be German in their origin,<sup>3</sup> are trying to make a wrong impression throughout Mexico as to the purposes of the United States, and not only a wrong impression, but to give an absolutely untrue account of things that happen. You know the distressing things that have been happening just off our coasts. You know of the vessels that have been sunk. I yesterday received a quotation from a paper in Guadalajara which stated that thirteen of our battleships had been sunk off the capes of the Chesapeake. You see how dreadful it is to have people so radically misinformed. It was added that our Navy Department was withholding the truth with regard to these sinkings. I have no doubt that the publisher of the paper published that in perfect innocence without intending to convey wrong impressions, but it is evident that allegations of that sort proceed from those who wish to make trouble between Mexico and the United States.

Now, gentlemen, for the time being, at any rate—and I hope it will not be a short time—the influence of the United States is somewhat pervasive in the affairs of the world, and I believe that it is pervasive because the nations of the world which are less powerful than some of the greatest nations are coming to believe that our sincere desire is to do disinterested service. We are the champions of those nations which have not had a military

standing which would enable them to compete with the strongest nations in the world, and I look forward with pride to the time, which I hope will soon come, when we can give substantial evidence, not only that we do not want anything out of this war, but that we would not accept anything out of it, that it is absolutely a case of disinterested action. And if you will watch the attitude of our people, you will see that nothing stirs them so deeply as assurances that this war, so far as we are concerned, is for idealistic objects. One of the difficulties that I experienced during the first three years of the war—the years when the United States was not in the war—was in getting the foreign offices of European nations to believe that the United States was seeking nothing for herself, that her neutrality was not selfish, and that if she came in she would not come in to get anything substantial out of the war, any material object, any territory, or trade, or anything else of that sort. In some of the foreign offices there were men who personally knew me and they believed, I hope, that I was sincere in assuring them that our purposes were disinterested, but they thought that these assurances came from an academic gentleman removed from the ordinary sources of information and speaking the idealistic purposes of the cloister. They did not believe that I was speaking the real heart of the American people, and I knew all along that I was. Now I believe that everybody who comes into contact with the American people knows that I am speaking their purposes.

The other night in New York,<sup>4</sup> at the opening of the campaign for funds for our Red Cross, I made an

address. I had not intended to refer to Russia, but I was speaking without notes, and in the course of what I said my own thought was led to Russia, and I said that we meant to stand by Russia just as firmly as we would stand by France or England or any other of the allies. The audience to which I was speaking was not an audience from which I would have expected an enthusiastic response to that. It was rather too well dressed. It was not an audience, in other words, made of the class of people whom you would suppose to have the most intimate feeling for the sufferings of the ordinary man in Russia, but that audience jumped into the aisles, the whole audience rose to its feet, and nothing that I had said on that occasion aroused anything like the enthusiasm that that single sentence aroused. Now, there is a sample, gentlemen. We can not make anything out of Russia. We can not make anything out of standing by Russia at this time—the most remote of the European nations, so far as we are concerned, the one with which we have had the least connections in trade and advantage—and yet the people of the United States rose to that suggestion as to no other that I made in that address. That is the heart of America, and we are ready to show you by any act of friendship that you may propose our real feelings toward Mexico.

Some of us, if I may say so privately, look back with regret upon some of the more ancient relations that we have had with Mexico long before our generation: and America, if I may so express it, would now feel ashamed to take advantage of a neighbor. So I hope that you can carry back to your homes something better than the

assurances of words. You have had contact with our people. You know your own personal reception. You know how gladly we have opened to you the doors of every establishment that you wanted to see and have shown you just what we were doing, and I hope you have gained the right impression as to why we were doing it. We are doing it, gentlemen, so that the world may never hereafter have to fear the only thing that any nation has to dread—the unjust and selfish aggression of another nation. Some time ago, as you probably all know, I proposed a sort of Pan-American agreement. I had perceived that one of the difficulties of our relationship with Latin America was this: The famous Monroe doctrine was adopted<sup>5</sup> without your consent, without the consent of any of the Central or South American States.

If I may express it in the terms that we so often use in this country, we said, “We are going to be your big brother, whether you want us to be or not.” We did not ask whether it was agreeable to you that we should be your big brother. We said we were going to be. Now, that was all very well so far as protecting you from aggression from the other side of the water was concerned, but there was nothing in it that protected you from aggression from us, and I have repeatedly seen the uneasy feeling on the part of representatives of the States of Central and South America that our self-appointed protection might be for our own benefit and our own interests and not for the interest of our neighbors. So I said, “Very well, let us make an arrangement by which we will give bond. Let us have a common guarantee, that all of us will sign, of political independ-



ence and territorial integrity. Let us agree that if any one of us, the United States included, violates the political independence or the territorial integrity of any of the others, all the others will jump on her. I pointed out to some of the gentlemen who were less inclined to enter into this arrangement than others that that was in effect giving bonds on the part of the United States that we would enter into an arrangement by which you would be protected from us.

Now, that is the kind of agreement that will have to be the foundation of the future life of the nations of the world, gentlemen. The whole family of nations will have to guarantee to each nation that no nation shall violate its political independence or its territorial integrity. That is the basis, the only conceivable basis, for the future peace of the world, and I must admit that I was ambitious to have the States of the two continents of America show the way to the rest of the world as to how to make a basis of peace. Peace can come only by trust. As long as there is suspicion there is going to be misunderstanding, and as long as there is misunderstanding there is going to be trouble. If you can once get a situation of trust, then you have got a situation of permanent peace. Therefore, everyone of us, it seems to me, owes it as a patriotic duty to his own country to plant the seeds of trust and of confidence instead of the seeds of suspicion and variety of interest. That is the reason that I began by saying to you that I have not had the pleasure of meeting a group of men who were more welcome than you are, because you are our near neighbors. Suspicion on your part or misunderstanding on



your part distresses us more than we would be distressed by similar feelings on the part of those less near by.

When you reflect how wonderful a storehouse of treasure Mexico is, you can see how her future must depend upon peace and honor, so that nobody shall exploit her. It must depend upon every nation that has any relations with her, and the citizens of any nation that has relations with her, keeping within the bounds of honor and fair dealing and justice, because so soon as you can admit your own capital and the capital of the world to the free use of the resources of Mexico, it will be one of the most wonderfully rich and prosperous countries in the world. And when you have the foundations of established order, and the world has come to its senses again, we shall, I hope, have the very best connections that will assure us all a permanent cordiality and friendship.

# THE END OF THE WAR

WOODROW WILSON

[ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE CONGRESS,  
NOVEMBER 11, 1918]

Gentlemen of the Congress: In these anxious times of rapid and stupendous change it will in some degree lighten my sense of responsibility to perform in person the duty of communicating to you some of the larger circumstances of the situation with which it is necessary to deal.

The German authorities, who have, at the invitation of the supreme war council, been in communication with Marshal Foch, have accepted and signed the terms of armistice<sup>1</sup> which he was authorized and instructed to communicate to them.<sup>2</sup>

The war thus comes to an end; for, having accepted these terms of armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it.

It is not now possible to assess the consequences of this great consummation. We know only that this tragical war, whose consuming flames swept from one nation to another until all the world was on fire, is at an end and that it was the privilege of our own people to enter it at its most critical juncture in such fashion and in such force as to contribute, in a way of which we are all deeply proud, to the great result.

We know, too, that the object of the war is attained;

the object upon which all free men had set their hearts; and attained with a sweeping completeness which even now we do not realize.

Armed imperialism, such as the men conceived who were but yesterday the masters of Germany, is at an end, its illicit ambitions engulfed in black disaster. Who will now seek to revive it? The arbitrary power of the military caste of Germany, which once could secretly and of its own single choice disturb the peace of the world, is discredited and destroyed.

And more than that—much more than that—has been accomplished. The great nations which associated themselves to destroy it had now definitely united in the common purpose to set up such a peace as will satisfy the longing of the whole world for disinterested justice, embodied in settlements which are based upon something much better and much more lasting than the selfish competitive interests of powerful States.

There is no longer conjecture as to the objects the victors have in mind. They have a mind in the matter, not only, but a heart also. Their avowed and concerted purpose is to satisfy and protect the weak as well as to accord their just rights to the strong.

The humane temper and intention of the victorious Governments has already been manifested in a very practical way. Their representatives in the Supreme War Council at Versailles have by unanimous resolution assured the people of the Central Empires that everything that is possible in the circumstances will be done to supply them with food<sup>3</sup> and relieve the distressing want that is in so many places threatening their very lives; and

steps are to be taken immediately to organize these efforts at relief in the same systematic manner that they were organized in the case of Belgium.

By the use of the idle tonnage of the Central Empires it ought presently to be possible to lift the fear of utter misery from their oppressed populations and set their minds and energies free for the great and hazardous tasks of political reconstruction which now face them on every hand. Hunger does not breed reform; it breeds madness and all the ugly distempers that make an ordered life impossible.

For, with the fall of the ancient Governments<sup>4</sup> which rested like an incubus on the people of the Central Empires, has come political change not merely, but revolution; and revolution which seems as yet to assume no final and ordered form, but to run from one fluid change to another, until thoughtful men are forced to ask themselves with what governments, and of what sort, are we about to deal in the making of the covenants of peace.

With what authority will they meet us and with what assurance that their authority will abide and sustain securely the international arrangements into which we are about to enter? There is here matter for no small anxiety and misgiving. When peace is made, upon whose promises and engagements besides our own is it to rest?

Let us be perfectly frank with ourselves and admit that these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered now or at once. But the moral is not that there is little hope of an early answer that will suffice. It is only that we must be patient and helpful and mindful above all

of the great hope and confidence that lie at the heart of what is taking place.

Excesses accomplish nothing. Unhappy Russia has furnished abundant recent proof of that. Disorder immediately defeats itself. If excesses should occur, if disorder should for a time raise its head, a sober second thought will follow and a day of constructive action, if we help and do not hinder.

The present and all that it holds belongs to the nations and the peoples who preserve their self-control and the orderly processes of their Governments; the future to those who prove themselves the true friends of mankind.

To conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest; to conquer the world by earning its esteem is to make permanent conquest. I am confident that the nations that have learned the discipline of freedom and that have settled with self-possession to its ordered practice are now about to make conquest of the world by the sheer power of example and of friendly helpfulness.

The peoples who have but just come out from under the yoke of arbitrary government and who are now coming at last into their freedom will never find the treasures of liberty they are in search of if they look for them by the light of the torch. They will find that every pathway that is stained with the blood of their own brothers leads to the wilderness, not to the seat of their hope.

They are now face to face with their initial tests. We must hold the light steady until they find themselves. And in the meantime, if it be possible, we must establish a peace that will justly define their place among

the nations, remove all fear of their neighbors and of their former masters, and enable them to live in security and contentment when they have set their own affairs in order.

I for one do not doubt their purpose or their capacity. There are some happy signs that they know and will choose the way of self-control and peaceful accommodation. If they do, we shall put our aid at their disposal in every way that we can. If they do not, we must await with patience and sympathy the awakening and recovery that will assuredly come at last.





## APPENDIX

---

### THE MEANING OF AMERICA'S ENTRANCE INTO THE WAR

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE AMERICAN CLUB IN LONDON,  
APRIL 12, 1917.]

I am in the happy position of being, I think, the first British Minister of the Crown who, speaking on behalf of the people of this country, can salute the American Nation as comrades in arms. I am glad; I am proud. I am glad not merely because of the stupendous resources which this great nation will bring to the succor of the alliance, but I rejoice as a democrat that the advent of the United States into this war gives the final stamp and seal to the character of the conflict as a struggle against military autocracy throughout the world.

That was the note that ran through the great deliverance of President Wilson.<sup>1</sup> It was echoed, Sir, in your resounding words today. The United States of America have the noble tradition, never broken, of having never engaged in war except for liberty. And this is the greatest struggle for liberty that they have ever embarked upon. I am not at all surprised, when one recalls the wars of the past, that America took its time to make up its mind about the character of this struggle. In Europe most of the great wars of the past were waged for dynastic aggrandizement and conquest. No wonder when this great war started that there were some elements of suspicion still lurking in the minds of the people

of the United States of America. There were those who thought perhaps that Kings were at their old tricks—and although they saw the gallant Republic of France fighting, they some of them perhaps regarded it as the poor victim of a conspiracy of monarchial swashbucklers. The fact that the United States of America has made up its mind finally makes it abundantly clear to the world that this is no struggle of that character, but a great fight for human liberty.

They naturally did not know at first what we had endured in Europe for years from this military caste in Prussia. It never has reached the United States of America. Prussia was not a democracy. The Kaiser promises that it will be a democracy after the war. I think he is right. But Prussia not merely was not a democracy. Prussia was not a State; Prussia was an army. It had great industries that had been highly developed; a great educational system; it had its universities, it had developed its science.

All these were subordinate to the one great predominant purpose, the purpose of all—a conquering army which was to intimidate the world. The army was the spear-point of Prussia; the rest was merely the haft. That was what we had to deal with in these old countries. It got on the nerves of Europe. They knew what it all meant. It was an army that in recent times had waged three wars,<sup>2</sup> all of conquest, and the unceasing tramp of its legions through the streets of Prussia, on the parade grounds of Prussia, had got into the Prussian head. The Kaiser, when he witnessed on a grand scale his reviews, got drunk with the sound of it.<sup>3</sup> He delivered the law to the world as if Potsdam was another Sinai, and he was uttering the law from the thunder clouds.

But make no mistake. Europe was uneasy. Europe was half intimidated. Europe was anxious. Europe was apprehensive. We knew the whole time what it meant. What we did not know was the moment it would come.

This is the menace, this is the apprehension from which Europe has suffered for over fifty years.<sup>4</sup> It paralyzed the beneficent activity of all States, which ought to be devoted

to concentrating on the well-being of their peoples. They had to think about this menace, which was there constantly as a cloud ready to burst over the land. No one can tell except Frenchmen what they endured from this tyranny, patiently, gallantly, with dignity, till the hour of deliverance came.<sup>5</sup> The best energies of domestic science had been devoted to defending itself against the impending blow. France was like a nation which put up its right arm to ward off a blow, and could not give the whole of her strength to the great things which she was capable of. That great, bold, imaginative, fertile mind, which would otherwise have been clearing new paths for progress, was paralyzed.

That is the state of things we had to encounter. The most characteristic of Prussian institutions is the Hindenburg line. What is the Hindenburg line? The Hindenburg line is a line drawn in the territories of other people, with a warning that the inhabitants of those territories shall not cross it at the peril of their lives. That line has been drawn in Europe for fifty years.

You recollect what happened some years ago in France, when the French Foreign Minister<sup>6</sup> was practically driven out of office by Prussian interference. Why? What had he done? He had done nothing which a Minister of an independent State had not the most absolute right to do. He had crossed the imaginary line drawn in French territory by Prussian despotism, and he had to leave. Europe, after enduring this for generations, made up its mind at last that the Hindenburg line must be drawn along the legitimate frontiers of Germany herself. There could be no other attitude than that for the emancipation of Europe and the world.

It was hard at first for the people of America quite to appreciate that Germany had not interfered to the same extent with their freedom, if at all. But at last they endured the same experience as Europe had been subjected to. Americans were told that they were not to be allowed to cross and recross the Atlantic except at their peril. American ships were sunk without warning. American citizens were

drowned, hardly with an apology—in fact, as a matter of German right. At first America could hardly believe it. They could not think it possible that any sane people should behave in that manner. And they tolerated it once, and they tolerated it twice, until it became clear that the Germans really meant it. Then America acted, and acted promptly.

The Hindenburg line was drawn along the shores of America, and the Americans were told they must not cross it. America said, "What is this?" Germany said, "This is our line, beyond which you must not go," and America said, "The place for that line is not the Atlantic, but on the Rhine—and we mean to help you roll it up."

There are two great facts which clinch the argument that this is a great struggle for freedom. The first is the fact that America has come in. She would not have come in otherwise. The second is the Russian revolution. When France in the eighteenth century sent her soldiers to America to fight for the freedom and independence of that land, France also was an autocracy in those days. But Frenchmen in America, once they were there—their aim was freedom, their atmosphere was freedom, their inspiration was freedom. They acquired a taste for freedom, and they took it home, and France became free. That is the story of Russia. Russia engaged in this great war for the freedom of Serbia, of Montenegro, of Bulgaria, and has fought for the freedom of Europe. They wanted to make their own country free, and they have done it. The Russian revolution is not merely the outcome of the struggle for freedom. It is a proof of the character of the struggle for liberty, and if the Russian people realize, as there is every evidence they are doing, that national discipline is not incompatible with national freedom—nay, that national discipline is essential to the security of national freedom—they will, indeed, become a free people.

I have been asking myself the question, Why did Germany, deliberately, in the third year of the war, provoke America

to this declaration and to this action—deliberately, resolutely? It has been suggested that the reason was that there were certain elements in American life, and they were under the impression that they would make it impossible for the United States to declare war. That I can hardly believe. But the answer has been afforded by Marshal von Hindenburg himself, in the very remarkable interview which appeared in the press, I think, only this morning.

He depended clearly on one of two things. First, that the submarine campaign would have destroyed international shipping to such an extent that England would have been put out of business before America was ready. According to his computation, America cannot be ready for twelve months. He does not know America. In the alternative, that when America is ready, at the end of twelve months, with her army, she will have no ships to transport that army to the field of battle. In von Hindenburg's words, "America carries no weight," I suppose he means she has no ships to carry weight. On that, undoubtedly, they are reckoning.

Well, it is not wise always to assume that even when the German General Staff, which has miscalculated so often, makes a calculation it has no ground for it. It therefore behooves the whole of the Allies, Great Britain and America in particular, to see that that reckoning of von Hindenburg is as false as the one he made about his famous line, which we have broken already.

The road to victory, the guarantee of victory, the absolute assurance of victory is to be found in one word—ships; and a second word—ships; and a third word—ships. And with that quickness of apprehension which characterizes your nation, Mr. Chairman, I see that they fully realize that, and today I observe that they have already made arrangements to build one thousand 3000-tonners for the Atlantic. I think that the German military advisers must already begin to realize that this is another of the tragic miscalculations which are going to lead them to disaster and to ruin. But you will pardon me for emphasizing that. We are a slow



people in these islands—slow and blundering—but we get there. You get there sooner, and that is why I am glad to see you in.

But may I say that we have been in this business for three years? We have, as we generally do, tried every blunder. In golfing phraseology, we have got into every bunker. But we have got a good niblick. We are right out on the course. But may I respectfully suggest that it is worth America's while to study our blunders, so as to begin just where we are now and not where we were three years ago? That is an advantage. In war, time has as tragic a significance as it has in sickness. A step which, taken today, may lead to assured victory, taken tomorrow may barely avert disaster. All the Allies have discovered that. It was a new country for us all. It was trackless, mapless. We had to go by instinct. But we found the way, and I am so glad that you are sending your great naval and military experts here, just to exchange experiences with men who have been through all the dreary, anxious crises of the last three years.

America has helped us even to win the battle of Arras. Do you know that these guns which destroyed the German trenches, shattered the barbed wire—I remember, with some friends of mine whom I see here, arranging to order the machines to make those guns from America. Not all of them—you got your share, but only a share, a glorious share. So that America has also had her training. She has been making guns, making ammunition, giving us machinery to prepare both; she has supplied us with steel, and she has got all that organization and she has got that wonderful facility, adaptability, and resourcefulness of the great people which inhabits that great continent. Ah! It was a bad day for military autocracy in Prussia when it challenged the great Republic of the West. We know what America can do, and we also know that now she is in it she will do it. She will wage an effective and successful war.

There is something more important. She will insure a beneficent peace. I attach great importance—and I am the

last man in the world, knowing for three years what our difficulties have been, what our anxieties have been, and what our fears have been—I am the last man to say that the succor which is given to us from America is not something in itself to rejoice in, and to rejoice in greatly. But I don't mind saying that I rejoice even more in the knowledge that America is going to win the right to be at the conference table when the terms of peace are being discussed. That conference will settle the destiny of nations—the course of human life—for God knows how many ages. It would have been tragic for mankind if America had not been there, and there with all the influence, all the power, and the right which she has now won by flinging herself into this great struggle.

I can see peace coming now—not a peace which will be the beginning of war; not a peace which will be an endless preparation for strife and bloodshed; but a real peace. The world is an old world. It has never had peace. It has been rocking and swaying like an ocean, and Europe—poor Europe!—has always lived under the menace of the sword. When this war began two-thirds of Europe were under autocratic rule. It is the other way about now, and democracy means peace. The democracy of France did not want war; the democracy of Italy hesitated long before they entered the war; the democracy of this country shrank from it—shrank and shuddered—and never would have entered the caldron had it not been for the invasion of Belgium. The democracies sought peace; strove for peace. If Prussia had been a democracy there would have been no war. Strange things have happened in this war. There are stranger things to come, and they are coming rapidly.

There are times in history when this world spins so leisurely along its destined course that it seems for centuries to be at a standstill; but there are also times when it rushes along at a giddy pace, covering the track of centuries in a year. Those are the times we are living in now. Six weeks ago Russia was an autocracy; she now is one of the most

advanced democracies in the world. Today we are waging the most devastating war that the world has ever seen; tomorrow—perhaps not a distant tomorrow—war may be abolished forever from the category of human crimes. This may be something like the fierce outburst of Winter which we are now witnessing before the complete triumph of the sun. It is written of those gallant men who won that victory on Monday<sup>7</sup>—men from Canada, from Australia, and from this old country, which has proved that in spite of its age it is not decrepit—it is written of those gallant men that they attacked with the dawn—fit work for the dawn!—to drive out of forty miles of French soil those miscreants who had defiled it for three years. “They attacked with the dawn.” Significant phrase!

The breaking up of the dark rule of the Turk, which for centuries has clouded the sunniest land in the world, the freeing of Russia from an oppression which has covered it like a shroud for so long, the great declaration of President Wilson coming with the might of the great nation which he represents into the struggle for liberty are heralds of the dawn. “They attacked with the dawn,” and these men are marching forward in the full radiance of that dawn, and soon Frenchmen and Americans, British, Italians, Russians, yea, and Serbians, Belgians, Montenegrins, will march into the full light of a perfect day.

# THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

## PREAMBLE

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

## ARTICLE I

### THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

#### *The Congress: Its Divisions and Powers*

Section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

#### *The House: Its Composition and Powers*

Sec. 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states, and the electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature.

No person shall be a representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that state in which he shall be chosen.

(Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons.\*) The actual enumera-

---

\*Partly superseded by the Fourteenth Amendment.

tion shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand, but each state shall have at least one representative; and until such enumeration shall be made the state of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three; Massachusetts, eight; Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, one; Connecticut, five; New York, six; New Jersey, four; Pennsylvania, eight; Delaware, one; Maryland, six; Virginia, ten; North Carolina, five; South Carolina, five; and Georgia, three.

When vacancies happen in the representation from any state, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers, and shall have the sole power of impeachment.

#### *The Senate: Its Composition and Powers*

Sec. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each state, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years; and each senator shall have one vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class, at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class, at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year; and if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any state, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall fill such vacancies.

No person shall be a senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that state for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice-president of the United States shall be president of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a president pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice-president, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments; when sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law.

#### *Congressional Elections and Date of Assembly*

Sec. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

#### *Rules of Procedure of Senate and House*

Sec. 5. Each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as each house may provide.

Each house may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member.

Each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members of either house on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.



Neither house, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two houses shall be sitting.

#### *Compensation and Privileges of Members*

Sec. 6. The senators and representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house, they shall not be questioned in any other place.

No senator or representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased, during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office.

#### *Methods of Legislation*

Sec. 7. All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve, he shall sign it, but if not, he shall return it, with his objections, to that house in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration two-thirds of that house shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that house, it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on

the journal of each house respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

#### *Powers Vested in Congress*

Sec. 8. The Congress shall have power:

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defenses and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

To establish post offices and post roads;

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing, for limited times, to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the states, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings; and—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

#### *Limits to Powers of the Federal Government*

Sec. 9. The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.

The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended, unless when in case of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law shall be passed.

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state.

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one state over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one state, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

No money shall be drawn from the treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States. And no person holding any office of profit or trust under them shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

#### *Limits to Powers of the States*

Sec. 10. No state shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.

No state shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any state on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress.

No state shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another state, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

## ARTICLE II

## THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

*The Executive Officers; the Electoral College*

Section 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice-President, chosen for the same term, be elected, as follows:

Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of senators and representatives to which the state may be entitled in the Congress; but no senator or representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

(The electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves. And they shall make a list of all the persons voted for, and of the number of votes for each; which list they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the president of the Senate. The president of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such majority, and have an equal number of votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by ballot one of them for President; and if no person have a majority, then from the five highest on the list the said House shall, in like manner, choose the President. But in choosing the President the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. In every case, after the choice of the President, the person having the greatest number of votes of the electors shall



be the Vice-President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal votes, the Senate shall choose from them by ballot the Vice-president.\*)

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.

In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-president, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what officer shall then act as President; and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The president shall, at stated times, receive for his services a compensation which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

#### *Powers Granted to the President*

SEC. 2. The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several states, when called into the actual service of the United

---

\*This paragraph was in force only from 1788 to 1803.



States; he may acquire the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices; and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint, ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior offices as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The President shall have power to fill up vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which will expire at the end of their next session.

#### *The President's Duties*

SEC. 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.

#### *Impeachment of Executive and Civil Officers*

Sec. 4. The President, Vice-president, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE III

THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

*The Federal Courts—Supreme and Inferior*

Section 1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

*Powers and Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts*

Sec. 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more states; (between a state and citizens of another state\*); between citizens of different states; between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects.

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the state where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any state, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

---

\*Cancelled by the Eleventh Amendment.

*Treason: Its Nature and Punishment*

Sec. 3. Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attained.

## ARTICLE IV

## RELATION OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS

*Recognition of State Authority*

Section 1. Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. And the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

*Laws Regarding Citizens of the States*

Sec. 2. The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.

A person charged in any state with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another state, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the state from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the state having jurisdiction of the crime.

No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

*Admission of States and Regulation of United States Territories*

Sec. 3. New states may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new state shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other state; nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states, or parts of states, without the

consent of the legislature of the states concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.

*Protection Guaranteed by the Federal Government*

Sec. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.

ARTICLE V

POWER AND METHOD OF AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION

The Congress whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislature of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislature of three-fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ARTICLE VI

PUBLIC DEBTS; THE SUPREME LAW; OATH OF OFFICE; RELIGIOUS TEST PROHIBITED

All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the confederation.

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.

The senators and representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

#### ARTICLE VII

##### RATIFICATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION

The ratification of the conventions of nine states shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the states so ratifying the same.

Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the states present, the seventeenth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven, and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto subscribed our names,  
GEO. WASHINGTON, Deputy from Virginia.

##### NEW HAMPSHIRE:

John Langdon  
Nicholas Gilman

##### MASSACHUSETTS:

Nathaniel Gorham  
Rufus King

##### CONNECTICUT:

William Samuel Johnson  
Roger Sherman

##### NEW YORK:

Alexander Hamilton

##### NEW JERSEY:

William Livingston  
David Brearley  
William Paterson  
Jonathan Dayton

##### PENNSYLVANIA:

Benjamin Franklin  
Thomas Mifflin  
Robert Morris  
George Clymer  
Thomas Fitzsimmons  
James Wilson  
Gouverneur Morris

DELAWARE:

George Reed  
Gunning Bedford, Jr.  
John Dickinson  
Richard Bassett  
Jacob Broom

MARYLAND:

James McHenry  
Daniel of St. Thomas  
Jenifer  
Daniel Carroll

VIRGINIA:

John Blair  
James Madison, Jr.

NORTH CAROLINA:

William Blount  
Richard Dobbs Spaight  
Hugh Williamson

SOUTH CAROLINA:

John Rutledge  
Charles Pinckney  
Charles Cotesworth  
Pinckney  
Pierce Butler .

GEORGIA:

William Few  
Abraham Baldwin

Attest: WILLIAM JACKSON, Secretary.

AMENDMENTS

Articles in addition to, and amendments of, the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the legislatures of the several states pursuant to the fifth article of the original Constitution.

ARTICLE I

FREEDOM OF RELIGION AND SPEECH; RIGHT OF ASSEMBLY

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

ARTICLE II

RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

ARTICLE III

QUARTERING OF TROOPS

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.



## ARTICLE IV

## RIGHT OF SEARCH PROHIBITED

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

## ARTICLE V

## RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war and public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life and limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

## ARTICLE VI

## RIGHTS OF ACCUSED IN CRIMINAL CASES

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

## ARTICLE VII

## SUITS AT COMMON LAW

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of common law.

ARTICLE VIII

BAIL AND FINES

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

ARTICLE IX

MODIFICATION OF ENUMERATED RIGHTS

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

ARTICLE X

POWERS RESERVED TO STATES AND THE PEOPLE

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

ARTICLE XI

LIMITATION TO POWER OF THE FEDERAL COURTS

The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another state, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

ARTICLE XII

NEW ELECTORAL LAW

The electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-president, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-president; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-president, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the

persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the vote shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-president shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President. The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-president shall be the Vice-president, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list the Senate shall choose the Vice-president. A quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

### ARTICLE XIII

#### ABOLITION OF SLAVERY

##### *Slavery and Involuntary Servitude Prohibited*

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

### ARTICLE XIV

#### NEW LAWS MADE NECESSARY BY THE CIVIL WAR

##### *Qualifications for Citizenship*

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No

state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

*Apportionment of Representatives*

Sec. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, representatives in Congress, the executive or judicial officers of a state, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such state, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such state.

*Disability for Breaking Oath of Office*

Sec. 3. No person shall be a senator, or representative in Congress, or elector of President or Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who, having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each house, remove such disability.

*The Public Debt*

Sec. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United

States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Sec. 5. Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

#### ARTICLE XV

##### RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE

##### *Right Guaranteed to All Citizens*

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any state, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

#### ARTICLE XVI

##### INCOME TAX

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

#### ARTICLE XVII

##### ELECTION OF SENATORS

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

# BIOGRAPHICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES

ABRAHAM LINCOLN (1809-1865)

The circumstances of the writing and delivery of Lincoln's address at Gettysburg are so well known as scarcely to need recounting. The battle had been fought July 1-2-3 of 1863 and the check there sustained by the Confederacy marked the turning point in the Civil War. Lincoln's address, delivered Nov. 19, 1863, at the Dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery, has remained one of the most important and striking documents in the history of American Democracy. His definition of our system of rule "as government of the people, by the people, for the people" has become a touchstone of one's Americanism.

The reading of this famous passage, almost universally adopted in our time, which places the emphasis on the prepositions *of*, *by*, and *for* is incorrect in the sense that it is not that used by Lincoln himself. President John Grier Hibben of Princeton University informs the editor that one of the audience on that memorable day has assured him that the emphasis was placed by Lincoln unmistakably on the word *people*, which he made stronger with each repetition, "government of the *people*, by the PEOPLE, for the PEOPLE." It is natural that Lincoln should have done this, for to him one of the greatest advantages in our system of government was the importance and the opportunity it gave to the young citizen poor in purse and social station. This was one of the reasons why he believed slavery hostile to the spirit of democracy. He was proud to count himself one of the people. The point was brought out sharply in his speech delivered at New Haven, March 6, 1860, before his election to the Presidency.

"One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just this: what is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more



Page

harm than good. So while we do not propose any war on capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. When one starts poor, as most of us do in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor for his whole life. I am not ashamed to confess that twenty-five years ago I was a hired laborer, mauling rails, at work on a flatboat—just what might happen to any poor man's son. I want every man to have a chance—and I believe a black man is entitled to it—in which he can better his condition—where he may look forward and hope to be a hired laborer this year and the next, work for himself afterward, and finally to hire men to work for him. That is the true system.”

Further light on the character of Lincoln will be found in President Wilson's address on Abraham Lincoln, pages 96-101.

#### LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

*(Bold face figures refer to pages; plain figures to note numbers in text.)*

17. 1. Lincoln with characteristic modesty little thought that his address would go down to posterity. Before its delivery he told a friend: “It is a flat failure. The people won't like it.”
18. 2. This definition of our government may possibly have been suggested to Lincoln by a phrase of the abolitionist preacher, Theodore Parker, in a speech delivered in 1858. Parker's statement ran “Democracy is direct self-government, over all the people, by all the people, for all the people.” Lincoln's simpler statement is in any case more effective.

#### JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

James Russell Lowell, 1819-1891, added to his fame as poet and essayist, the distinction of having served his country as ambassador to Spain 1876-1880, and to Great Britain, 1880-1885. He performed a particularly useful service in interpreting England and the United States to each other. The address on Democracy, which shows his optimistic faith and native Americanism, was delivered during this period of his stay in England. It should be remembered that as late as 1884, American democracy was still in European eyes on the defensive.

## DEMOCRACY

10. 1. Plato is more idealistic than Aristotle; hence "the tower of Plato." His works, with those of Aristotle, constitute the most important body of ancient philosophy.
2. 2. Lowell, born in 1819 at Cambridge, Mass., on the edge of the open country, had seen the transformation of his section from a rural to an industrial population. The French travelers had brought back glowing accounts of the simple life of the American settlers and even of the American Indians. Though Lowell did not like the change he would not willingly testify against it; hence the reference to Balaam. See *Numbers*, xxii, xxiii.
3. The property qualification for suffrage, general in the early years of our government, had been abolished in Massachusetts at the Constitutional Convention in 1820.
4. In the period of the Civil War Massachusetts paid out in bounties and bounty loans \$26,000,000 and the war debt of the state at the close of the war was \$15,000,000.
24. 5. In the speech on Moving his Resolution for Conciliation with the Colonies, March 22, 1775, Burke says, "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." *Select Works*, Clarendon Press, 1892, Vol. I, p. 192. It is impossible to identify exactly the "French gentleman" referred to. Lowell may have been thinking of the well-known critic and historian, Taine, who satirized certain American tendencies in his *Life and Opinions of F. T. Graindorge*.
6. Zola (1840-1902) was at this time (1884) the most discussed novelist in France. His novels include "naturalistic" pictures of the worst and most depraved elements in French life.
7. Democracy was not nearly so popular in Europe in 1884 as it is at present. The excesses of the Paris Commune in 1871 had dealt a severe blow to the idea that the people can govern themselves. The great Civil War through which we ourselves had passed had likewise discouraged enthusiasm for democracy.

Page

25. 8. A species of grape louse which at this time was ruining the vineyards of France.

8a. The Boers had started a revolt in 1880 and in 1881 routed the small British force at Majuba Hill.

9. A distinguished Venetian ambassador (1507-1565).

26. 10. Not one but many of the fathers of the church contested the rights of property. The medieval church held that the taking of interest was sinful and it was this condemnation that threw money-lending as a business into the hands of the Jews. It made no distinction between usury and interest.

11. Proudhon (1809-1865), a French radical and socialist who summarily defined property as a theft in his famous volume *What Is Property?* published in 1840.

12. Bourdaloue (1632-1704), a famous French pulpit orator, not at all revolutionary in his general conceptions.

13. Montesquieu (1689-1755), author of *The Spirit of the Laws* and historically the most important of the modern political writers. His work influenced the framers of our Constitution and he is frequently referred to by Jefferson.

National workshops (*ateliers nationaux*) were established in France just before the French Revolution, but Lowell is doubtless thinking about the national workshops which were founded after the Revolution of 1848 in France and which were a failure. Lowell strains his point when he attributes them to Montesquieu. He is trying to prove in this passage that most of the "heresies" attributed to American Democracy were in existence before we had declared our independence.

14. Like all the above statements, true in a measure. In the Church of the Middle Ages a career was open to young men of ability, whatever their station, far more readily than at the court or in the army from which persons not of noble birth were in most cases excluded.

15. Charles V. (1500-1555), Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in the time of Luther. More clearly than most of his contemporaries he saw the leaven of "democracy" working in the reforms demanded of the church. The Reformation was a protest against outside authority in religious matters; the

age

American and French Revolutions were protests against submission to authority in political matters. The refusal to submit to the rule of any power outside ourselves is the first step in democracy. The idea of "government by the consent of the governed" is fundamental to it and is frequently emphasized by President Wilson, as in the close of his *A World League for Peace*. Contrast this with Emperor William's attitude in Note 15 to Wilson's *War Message*.

16. That is, extreme poverty (Lazarus) and what it entails, slums, unsanitary conditions, criminality, are plague-spots in a state, which the existence of a very wealthy class (Dives) does not cure or compensate for.

17. 17. "Forge of the races or mother of peoples." The British have of course been recognized as the colonizing people par excellence.

18. *Hamlet*, Act II, Scene 2.

19. The "rights of man," a phrase frequently used by radical thinkers in France in the 18th century, became a shibboleth of the French Revolutionists. Thomas Paine adopted it as the title of his famous reply to Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. These natural rights of men are emphasized in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. Many modern political thinkers disagree with this doctrine of "natural rights."

28. 20. Lowell was evidently quoting from memory the opening lines of Coleridge's *Ode to France*. His memory tricked him for the first line should read—

"The Sensual and the Dark rebel in vain."

29. 21. See *Macbeth*, Act II, Scenes 2 and 3.

22. An expression of despair. See I *Samuel*, iv, 21.

30. 23. Joseph Priestly (1733-1804), a nonconformist minister of liberal tendencies, famous in the history of science as well as of religion. He was mobbed in Birmingham in 1791 but not so much for his religious opinions as for his sympathies with the French Revolution. He spent his last years in America.

31. 24. The fear that democracy will reduce all to a "dead

level'' has frequently been entertained. In his volume on *Walt Whitman*, J. A. Symonds discusses the question whether there can be any great poetry of democracy, seeing that democracies must lack the contrasts of older civilizations. The fear is groundless.

32. 25. Theodore Parker, 1810-1860, an advanced New England theologian and social reformer and a courageous abolitionist. See Note 2 to Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address*.

26. Dekker's beautiful lines deserve quotation.

"The best of men  
That e'er wore earth about him, was a sufferer,  
A soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit,  
The first true gentleman that ever breathed."

See *Thomas Dekker*, edited by Ernest Rhys. The Mermaid Series, London, 1887, page 190.

27. Perhaps more correctly Jelal-ed-din-Rumi, 1207-1273, a Persian mystic poet, author of *Mathnawi*.

27a. The idea that any real democracy must rest on a basis of ideals is one frequently encountered in President Wilson's speeches and admirably characterizes the American attitude.

33. 28. The belief that a democracy could only exist in a small or city-state where all citizens could assemble for deliberation, was frequently held and supported by arguments drawn from history. The Greek republics as well as the Italian republics of the late Middle Age and Renaissance and the northern Free Cities or Communes had all been small. The Swiss republics, like Geneva, were often cited and indeed Geneva was the state Rousseau had most in mind in writing his *Social Contract*. We must not forget that our immensely larger democracy with its universal manhood suffrage and representative government had no precedent in antiquity or indeed in modern times.

28a. The reference is vague, but Lowell is probably referring to England. Queen Victoria was also Empress of India.

29. This is an extreme statement but true in the sense that the framers of the Constitution did not wish to extend suffrage to all citizens regardless of qualifications and that they dis-



Page

trusted unreasoning popular movements. It was for this reason that they "put as many obstacles as they could contrive, not in the way of the people's will, but of their whim." It was for this reason that they divided the functions of government into legislative, judicial, and executive. In adopting this system of "checks and balances" they were following Montesquieu. On all this see the Constitution, Appendix.

34. 30. The French Revolution had tried to throw overboard all previous French tradition. They were to begin with the Year One, a new calendar, a new religion, an entirely new system of government based, so they thought, on reason alone and made to order. Of all these radical innovations the metric system alone survived.

31. It was quite generally held that democracy leads to anarchy since the people are unwilling to curb themselves. Anarchy in its turn disappears before the power of some ambitious despot. This in rough outline was the history of the French nation from the overthrow of the monarchy to the Terror, this anarchy giving way in its turn to the supremacy of Napoleon. The same process had frequently occurred in the Greek republics and in the Italian Cities of the Renaissance.

35. 32. This paragraph makes the task of the founders of the Republic and the Framers of the Constitution seem far easier than it really was. The local state governments were very unwilling to surrender any of their rights or property and the smaller ones were jealous of the larger. Maryland had signed the Articles of Confederation only in 1781 and this first Federation was altogether unsatisfactory. State legislated against state, especially in commercial matters, and there was no central authority to which all would yield. Yet it was impossible to frame a Constitution until 1787 and the difficulties encountered were serious indeed. See Madison's *Journal of the Constitutional Convention*, edited by E. H. Scott, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1892.

33. The Missouri Compromise (1821) admitted Missouri as a slave state and forbade slavery in territory west of Missouri and north of 36° 30'. It perpetuated the situation in which



Page

Lincoln said the union could not exist. It made us half slave and half free. Lowell was bitterly opposed to slavery.

37. 34. Lowell's memory is again at fault, though what Carlyle said was "just as bad." In *Latter Day Pamphlets I*, "The Present Time," Carlyle pays his compliments to America as follows: "Roast-geese with apple-sauce, she (America) is not much. Roast-geese with apple sauce for the poorest working man."

35. Lowell probably had in mind the Essay, *Of Seditious and Troubles*, though Bacon does not say this in so many words. He does say that "the rebellions of the belly are the worst."

36. In this matter Lowell himself was far-sighted. At the time of this address there was relatively little fear of trusts. The agitation and legislation against them became important in the next decade.

38. 37. From *Pippa Passes III*. The last line should read, "When earth was nigher heaven than now."

39. 38. This was the objection of the English historian and political thinker, Lecky, who says, "One of the great divisions of politics in our day is coming to be whether, at the last resort, the world should be governed by its ignorance or by its intelligence. According to the one party, the preponderating power should be with education and property. According to the other, the ultimate source of power, the supreme right of appeal and control, belongs legitimately to the majority of the nation told by the head—or in other words, to the poorest, the most ignorant, the most incapable, who are necessarily the most numerous." In opposition to this, see Whitman's *Democratic Vistas* where he holds that the object of democracy is not better government, but a better people, and that universal suffrage tends to raise the level of intelligence and self-respect. Lowell's answer, slightly different, follows in the next paragraph.

41. 39. In volunteer regiments at the outset of the Civil War the command was often given to him who raised them; or officers, often with no or insufficient training, were elected. The system was a poor one.

Page

42. 40. Piccadilly, the thoroughfare for the promenades of the elegant and fashionable in London, so called from the piccadill, a small stiff collar, affected by the gallants of the time of James I.

41. George Hudson, 1800-1871, one of the first "promoters" of English railways. Risen to a position of undeserved wealth and prominence, he was ruined by the discovery of frauds in his procedure. The English public turned on him; Carlyle frequently held him up to scorn and called him "the big swollen gambler." See *Latter Day Pamphlets*. The project to erect a statue to him, never carried through, called forth Carlyle's fiercest denunciations.

42. Napoleon III, 1808-1873. Elected president of France in 1848 he made himself emperor in 1852, and retained this title until captured in the Franco-Prussian War, for the unfortunate outcome of which his lack of political foresight was largely responsible. He was a man of more ambition than character.

44. 43. This phrase is still used by French radicals and socialists. See also Lincoln's speech at New Haven in Introduction to Lincoln, page 247.

44. The English have no written constitution.

45. 45. Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke, 1811-1892, was a British liberal statesman and at one time Chancellor of the Exchequer. He is perhaps best known for his brilliant speeches. Though the phrase quoted has always been credited to Lowe, what he really said in the famous address in Edinburgh in 1867 was that it is necessary "to induce our masters to learn their letters."

46. It is hardly necessary to say that Lowell is speaking of the socialism of an earlier day and that his idea is imperfect. Modern socialism does not insist on equalizing all fortunes or incomes. Advanced socialists today claim that they are working to overthrow the capitalistic régime and create a "coöperative commonwealth" in which the state is employer and in which unnecessary competition is eliminated. Communism, mentioned later (p. 46), would have all property held in common.

Page

47. Henry George, 1839-1897, author of *Progress and Poverty*, in which he advocated the theory of taxing land exclusively. George did not wish land to be "divided" primarily, but to destroy private property in land, which he held should no more exist than private property in light or air. Under his system each user of property would pay to the government a tax on his land. This land tax or "single tax" would be sufficient to cover all governmental expenses.

46. 48. Compare this with Balzac's statement in *The Country Doctor*: "There is something in the nature of power which makes it tend to conserve itself."

#### STEPHEN GROVER CLEVELAND (1837-1908)

Stephen Grover Cleveland was President of the United States 1885-1889 and 1893-1897. By the death of his father he was forced as a lad to make his own way in the world without the benefit of a college education. A man of simple habits, he never sought to attract attention. The quality of forceful leadership which he possessed and ever exercised in the interest of good citizenship forced him upon the attention of the country and brought him to the Presidency.

His career as President was marked by independence in forming his judgments and intrepidity in the execution of judgments once formed. He never sought favor and had the high courage to follow the unpopular course. Time justified him and has proved the wisdom of his decisions.

The address delivered before the Union League Club of Chicago has as its subject *Patriotism and Holiday Observance*. The introductory paragraphs deal with the observance of holidays generally and have no immediate bearing on our subject, and are therefore omitted. The second and larger part of the speech, dealing with *Washington and Patriotism*, is given without change.

#### THE MESSAGE OF WASHINGTON

49. 1. Washington served during the seven years of the Revolution with no expectation or hope of compensation. He was later reimbursed only for the expenditures which as com-

Page

mander-in-chief he had made out of his private purse. He loved his home but in this long period could visit it but twice. Fond of retirement as he was, he prepared his *Farewell Address* at the end of his first term (1793) and was prevailed upon to accept a second only because of the very threatening condition of our relations with France and England. Yet after his retirement when war seemed imminent with France he again, in 1798, accepted the heavy responsibility of commander-in-chief of the provisional army that was being raised.

51. 2. From *Othello*, Act V, scene 2.

52. 3. The letter was written at Mount Vernon January 29, 1789. In the same letter he says, in reply to Lafayette's congratulations on his election, "I shall assume the task with the most unfeigned reluctance, and with a real diffidence."

#### THEODORE ROOSEVELT (1858-1919)

Theodore Roosevelt, born 1858, was graduated from Harvard University in 1880. Distinguished sportsman, soldier, and man of letters, he was twenty-sixth President of the United States, 1901-1909. His earlier policy was an advocacy of the "Square Deal" between capital and labor with hands off except in case of unfairness on the part of either contestant. His later policy has been strongly for legislation in the interest of the wage-earner and the economically unfortunate. He was leader of the Progressive Party, 1912. He was an ardent advocate of universal military training and was recognized abroad as the type of American man of action. He died January 6, 1919.

#### WOODROW WILSON (1856- —)

Woodrow Wilson, born in Virginia in 1856, is the twenty-eighth President of the United States. After graduation from Princeton University, he studied and practiced law, then turned to teaching. After serving eight years as President of Princeton University, he was elected Governor of New Jersey 1911, and President of the United States 1913. The leader of the nation in the third great crisis in its history, he has won the confidence of the people by his patience, earnestness, and high sense of our national destiny. One of the greatest masters of

Page

style in our time, his addresses are regarded both here and in Europe, as among the most important documents in the history of the world war. The earlier addresses given in this volume deal with problems of citizenship, patriotism, and democracy. The later ones are landmarks in our struggle against Germany and autocracy.

#### THE MEANING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

63. 1. John Hancock of Massachusetts (1737-1793) was chosen president of the Continental Congress in 1775 and his name stands at the head of the signers of the Declaration.
64. 2. On the 10th of June, 1776, a committee of five was appointed to draw up the Declaration. It consisted of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston. This committee assigned the composition to Jefferson. The draft which he brought in was modified by omitting certain passages and articles which it was thought might weaken the force of the Colonies' case. The phraseology is very largely Jefferson's.
65. 3. Before the outbreak of the war in Europe and for some time thereafter, there was a financial depression in the country, of which the President's opponents took advantage in order to criticize the legislative program which he was carrying into execution.
66. 4. The banking and currency law, known as the Federal Reserve Act, was approved after much opposition and discussion, December 23, 1913. It was a constructive measure based on the work of financiers, bankers, statesmen, and economists. Under it the United States is divided into twelve districts, each with a Reserve Bank which is the center of the banking system of that district. In operation it has proved itself successful and a decided advance upon its predecessor, the National Banking System.
69. 5. At this time the President was being severely criticized for his refusal to declare war or intervene in Mexico to protect the property rights of American citizens.
71. 6. The Panama Canal Act of 1912, providing for the permanent government of the Canal Zone and other regulations, was



Page

amended in a bill signed by the President June 15, 1914, known as the "Panama Tolls Exemption Repeal Bill." In this bill the clause which exempted American coastwise vessels from paying tolls was repealed because it was in contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain. The repeal of the Tolls Exemption for American coastwise vessels gave the same advantages to English and foreign vessels that our own possessed. It meant sacrificing undoubted economic advantages in the interest of maintaining good faith.

## AMERICA FIRST

85. 1. This paragraph, and indeed this whole address, illustrates President Wilson's attitude in the early period of the war. He felt at that time that America was out of and above the conflict. The reasons for the change will be plain after reading the *War Message*, April 2nd, 1917, page 126, and the *Flag Day Address*, June 14, 1917, page 141, with their notes.
88. 2. Woman Suffrage was voted upon and defeated in New Jersey October 19, 1915.

## THE SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP

94. 1. How serious this movement was, and how it was started and fomented by agents of the German government will be plainer after reading the *Flag Day Address*, June 14, 1917, and the notes to its opening paragraphs.

## ABRAHAM LINCOLN

100. 1. *Hamlet*, Act III. scene 4.

## A WORLD LEAGUE FOR PEACE

102. 1. This address, which attracted much attention throughout the world, marks the culmination of President Wilson's earlier policy and of his efforts to establish peace between the belligerents without direct intervention. Even at the time of its delivery, Germany, unknown to the President, was planning acts of aggression against the United States (see the Zimmermann Note, *War Message*, note 22). Her failure to make any satisfactory reply to the President's Note of December 18th, in which he asked the belligerents to state their peace terms,



Page

showed only too plainly that her rulers were more interested in carrying out their plans for the extension of German dominion and the creation of Mittel-Europa (see *Flag Day Address*, notes 12-16) than they were in the establishment of any permanent peace based upon principles of right and justice.

This address was directed not to the belligerents but to the American people, and its main interest lay in the fact that it presented the program for peace which the President was then willing to sanction. Its main thesis lay in its insistence that the time for a new "balance of power" (see Note 3) was past and that the peace to which we aspired must be based upon a concert of the powers acting to guarantee liberty and justice and ready to check and curb any outlaw nation. The many Declarations of War upon Germany which followed upon her promulgation of ruthless submarine warfare seemed to foreshadow the formation of such a concert of powers.

105. 2. See *Flag Day Address*.

106. 3. "Balance of power" is an old phrase in political history and international law. The idea goes back to the ancients and is in principle as follows: No nation or group of nations must be allowed to become so strong as to be able to enforce their will upon the others. In order to prevent this, members of the family of nations are justified in combining against another nation or group of nations. This idea of reestablishing the "balance of power" lay behind the formation of many of the coalitions in modern history,—those for instance against Louis XIV and Napoleon. The theory was complicated in the last hundred years by wars waged to establish national independence. In the later period of the nineteenth century the theory was illustrated in the attempted balance between the Dual Alliance of France and Russia and the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy.

4. It is plain from the *War Message* that the President made a distinction between the German people and their rulers. It is no less plain from the *Flag Day Address* that he felt that the rulers of Germany, her military caste, her policy of inhumanity, and her plans of conquest must be defeated.

Page

107. 5. The principles set forth in this and the following paragraphs were wholly at variance with the desires and purposes of Germany as they became plain at the end of 1917. Her contempt for the rights of small nations was only too evident in her treatment of Belgium and in her plans with respect to the smaller states of Europe as revealed in the *Flag Day Address* and its notes.
6. The German autocracy was never willing to recognize this principle, of government by the consent of the governed. Prussia and the German Empire themselves were not governed in this way. (See *Flag Day Address*, Note 7.) Only a few years before the war the Emperor threatened to make Alsace-Lorraine, which was still governed like a conquered province, "a Prussian province." The Poles, who had been under German rule for over a century and a quarter, were still discriminated against; and it is unthinkable that Germany would ever willingly have founded a really autonomous Poland as suggested in the next paragraph. (See *Flag Day Address*, Note 18.) Carrying the principles here stated by Wilson into effect would have meant not only the complete nullification of Germany's plans in the war, but a reversal of her fundamental idea of social and national organization.
109. 7. Germany, the originator of submarine warfare on neutrals, had claimed that she was fighting "for the freedom of the seas." With no color of right she had already sunk, to mention but one neutral, over six hundred Norwegian vessels, and her policy had brought forth from many previously friendly nations declarations of war against her. (See *War Message*, Note 9.) The German conception of freedom of the seas was clearly exhibited in her note to us of February 1, 1917. (Quoted in *Flag Day Address*, Note 4.)
111. 8. The Monroe Doctrine, proclaimed in 1823, insisted that no foreign power should colonize further or attempt "to extend the European system" to the Western Hemisphere.
112. 9. How useless it was to propose peace to Germany on these terms will be only too evident when we read President Wilson's message to Congress, delivered less than two weeks later, severing relations with Germany for the reasons there given.

## WAR MESSAGE

*These notes on the War Message are taken by special permission from the text of the President's Message officially annotated by the Committee on Public Information. (See Introduction, page 15.)*

126. 1. President Wilson had the sworn duty to lay the facts before Congress and recommended to it the needful action. The Constitution prescribes his duties in such emergencies.

It is worthy of note that the Constitution lays the duty and power of declaring war directly upon Congress, and that it can not be evaded by Congressmen by any referendum to the voters, for which not the slightest constitutional provision is made.

Congress performed this duty by voting on the war question, as requested. The vote of the Senate was 82 to 6 for war; of the House 373 to 50. Such comparative unanimity upon so momentous a question is almost unparalleled in the history of free nations.

2. The German Chancellor in announcing this repudiation of all his solemn pledges in the Imperial Parliament (Reichstag), on January 31, frankly admitted that this policy involved "ruthlessness" toward neutrals. "When the most ruthless methods are considered the best calculated to lead us to victory and to a swift victory . . . they must be employed. . . ."

3. The broken *Sussex* pledge. On May 4, 1916, the German government, in reply to the protest and warning of the United States following the sinking of the *Sussex*, gave this promise: That "merchant vessels both within and without the area declared a naval war zone shall not be sunk without warning, and without saving human lives, unless the ship attempt to escape or offer resistance."

Germany added, indeed, that if Great Britain continued her blockade policy, she would have to consider "a new situation."

On May 8, 1916, the United States replied that it could not admit that the pledge of Germany was "in the slightest degree contingent upon the conduct of any other Government" (*i. e.*, on any question of the English blockade). To this Germany made no reply at all, and under general diplomatic usage, when one nation makes a statement to another, the latest statement

Page

of the case stands as final unless there is a protest made. The promise made by Germany thus became a binding pledge.

127. 4. As to the proper usages in dealing with merchant vessels in war, here are the rules laid down some time ago for the American Navy (a fighting navy, surely), and these rules hardly differed in other navies, including the Russian and Japanese:

“The personnel of a merchant vessel captured as a prize . . . are entitled to their personal effects.

“All passengers not in the service of the enemy, and all women and children on board such vessels should be released and landed at a convenient port at the first opportunity.

“Any person in the naval service of the United States who pillages or maltreats in any manner, any person found on board a merchant vessel captured as a prize, shall be severely punished.”

“The destruction of a vessel which has surrendered without first removing its officers and crew would be an act contrary to the sense of right which prevails even between enemies in time of war.”

5. The British hospital ships *Asturias* sunk March 20, and the *Gloucester Castle*. These vessels had been sunk although protected by the most solemn possible of international compacts. Somewhat earlier in the war the great liner *Britannic* had been sunk while in service as a hospital ship, probably torpedoed by a U-boat. Until the end of the war the Germans continued their policy of murdering more wounded soldiers and their nurses by sinking more hospital ships.

The Belgian relief ships referred to were probably the *Camilla*, *Trevier*, and the *Feistein*, but most particularly the large Norwegian steamer *Storstad*, sunk with 10,000 tons of grain for the starving Belgians.

128. 6. Mr. Wilson could have gone further back than “modern history.”

Even in the most troubled period of the Middle Ages there was consistent effort to spare the lives of nonbelligerents. Thus in the eleventh century not merely did the church enjoin the “truce of God” which ordered all warfare to cease on four days

Page

of the week, but it especially pronounced its curse upon those who outraged or injured not merely clergymen and monks, but all classes of women. We also have ordinances from this "dark period" of history forbidding the interference with shepherds and their flocks, the damaging of olive trees, or the carrying off or destruction of farming implements. All this at a period when feudal barons are alleged to have been waging their wars with unusual ferocity.

7. The following American vessels were sunk by submarines after Germany's decree of ruthless submarine policy, January 31, 1917:

February 3, 1917, *Housatonic*; February 13, 1917, *Lyman M. Law*; March 2, 1917, *Algonquin*; March 16, 1917, *Vigilancia*; March 17, 1917, *City of Memphis*; March 17, 1917, *Illinois*; March 21, 1917, *Healdton* (claimed to have been sunk off Dutch coast, and far from the so-called "prohibited zone"); April 1, 1917, *Aztec*.

8. In all, up to the declaration of war by us, 226 American citizens, many of them women and children, had lost their lives by the action of German submarines, and in most instances without the faintest color of international right. The most flagrant and horrible case was that of the *Lusitania*, sunk May 7, 1915, with loss of 114 American lives.

9. Practically all the civilized neutral countries of the earth protested against the German policy.

130. 10. Right of American citizens to protection in their doings abroad and on the seas no less than at home. Decided by Supreme Court of United States. (Slaughter House Cases, 16 Wall., 36.)

"Every citizen . . . may demand the care and protection of the United States when on the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign Government."

See Cooley's *Principles of Constitutional Law*, third edition, page 273 (standard authority).

Obviously a Government which can not or will not protect its citizens against a policy of lawless murder is unworthy of respect abroad or obedience at home. The protection of the



Page

lives of the innocent and law-abiding is clearly the very first duty of a civilized state.

130. 11. Wars do not have to be declared in order to exist. The mere commission of warlike or unfriendly acts commences them. Thus the first serious clash in the Mexican war took place April 24, 1846. Congress "recognized" the state of war only on May 11 of that year. Already Gen. Taylor had fought two serious battles at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma.

Many other like cases could be cited; the most recent was the outbreak of the war between Japan and Russia. In 1904 the Japanese attacked the Russian fleet before Port Arthur, and only several days after this battle was war "recognized."

If the acts of Germany were unfriendly, war in the strictest sense existed when the President addressed Congress.

132. 12. So obvious was the military necessity of giving every possible help to the present enemies of Germany that those who tried to thwart this were almost open to the very grave criminal charge of giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

133. 13. Contrast these two standards: Bethmann-Hollweg addressing the Reichstag, August 4, 1914:

"We are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied (neutral) Luxemburg and perhaps already have entered Belgium territory. Gentlemen, this is a breach of international law. The wrong—I speak openly—the wrong we hereby commit we will try to make good as soon as our military aims have been attained.

"He who is menaced as we are, and is fighting for his highest possession, can only consider how he is to hack his way through."

Or Frederick the Great again, the arch prophet of Prussianism, speaking in 1740 and giving the keynote to all his successors, "The question of right is an affair of ministers. . . . It is time to consider it in secret, for the orders to my troops have been given," and still, again, "Take what you can; you are never wrong unless you are obliged to give back." (Perkins, *France under Louis XV*, volume 1, pages 169-170.)

Against this set the words of the first President of the Young American Republic, speaking at a time when the Nation was so



## Page

weak that surely any kind of shifts could have been justified on the score of necessity.

133. Said George Washington in his first inaugural address (1789):

“ . . . the foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality, and the preëminence of free government be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens and command the respect of the world. I dwell on this prospect with every satisfaction which an ardent love for my country can inspire, since there is no truth more thoroughly established than that there exists in the economy and course of nature an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness; between duty and advantage; between the genuine maxims of an honest and magnanimous policy and the solid rewards of public prosperity and felicity; since we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained; and since the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people.”

The great war was for a large part being waged to settle whether the American or the Prussian standard of morality was valid.

The constitution of Prussia remained practically unchanged and the electoral districts and three class voting system of nearly 70 years ago still existed in 1918. Liberal industrial and socialistic elements in the great modern cities and manufacturing areas were without adequate representation in the Prussian Diet, and the old country districts were practically “rotten boroughs” where the peasant who voted by voice, not written ballot, was at the mercy of his feudal noble landlord. It was the latter who backed the throne and its autocratic power so long as the policy suited his narrow provincial militaristic views formed in the days of Frederick the Great and his despotic father and revived and glorified by Bismarck.

Page

133. 14. When the crisis was precipitated late in July, 1914, there was a strong peace-party in Germany, and earnest protests were made against letting Austrian aggression against Serbia start a world conflagration. In Berlin on July 29, twenty-eight mass meetings were held to denounce the proposed war, and one of them is said to have been attended by 70,000 men. The *Vorwaerts* (the great organ of the socialists) declared on that day, "the indications proved beyond a doubt that the camarilla of war lords is working with absolutely unscrupulous means to carry out their fearful designs to precipitate an international war and to start a world-wide fire to devastate Europe." On the 31st this same paper asserted that the policy of the German Government was "utterly without conscience." Then came the declaration of "war emergency" (*Kriegsgefahr*), mobilization, martial law, and any expression of public opinion was stilled in Germany.

15. The German people had not the slightest share in shaping the events which led up to the declaration of war. The German Emperor was clothed by the imperial constitution with practically autocratic power in all matters of foreign policy. The Reichstag had not even a consultative voice in such matters. The German constitution (Article 11) gave to the Emperor specific power to "declare war, conclude peace, and enter into alliances." The provision that only defensive wars might be declared by the Emperor alone put the power in his hands to declare the late war without consulting any but the military group, for no power in modern times has ever admitted that it waged aggressive warfare. William II declared this war without taking his people into the slightest confidence until the final deed was done.

As for William II, speeches without number can be cited to show his sense of his own autocratic authority—*e. g.*, speaking at Königsberg, in 1910—"Looking upon myself as the instrument of the Lord, regardless of the views and the opinions of the hour, I go on my way." And another time: "There is but one master in this country; it is I, and I will bear no other." He has also been very fond of transforming an old Latin adage, making it read: "The will of the king is the highest law."

Page

16. President Wilson probably had in mind such wars as those of Louis XIV, waged by that King almost solely for his own glory and interest and with extremely little heed to the small benefit and great suffering they brought to France. The War of the Spanish Succession (begun in 1701) was particularly such a war. History, of course, contains a great many others begun from no worthier motive, including several conducted by Prussia and earlier by Philip II of Spain.

134. 17. There is abundant evidence that the situation in Europe in July, 1914, was regarded by the German "jingo" party—Von Tirpitz, Bernhardi, et al.—as peculiarly favorable. Russia was busy rearming her army, and her railway system had not yet been properly developed for strategic purposes. France was vexed with labor troubles, a murder trial was heaping scandal upon one of her well known politicians, and her army was reported by her own statesmen as sadly unready. England seemed on the point of being plunged into a civil war by the revolt of a large fraction of Ireland.

Such a convenient crippling of all the three great rivals of Germany might never come again. The murder of the archduke of Austria at Serajevo came, therefore, as a most convenient occasion for a stroke which would either result in a great increase of Teutonic prestige or enable Germany to fight with every possible advantage.

18. The great humanitarian aims of The Hague peace conferences of 1899 and 1907 were the limitation of armaments and the compulsory arbitration of international disputes. Unanimity among the world powers was essential to the success of both. None dared disarm unless all would do so. The great democracies, Great Britain, France, and the United States, favored both propositions, but Germany, leading the opposition, prevented their adoption. She agreed with reluctance to a convention for optional arbitration, but refused at the second conference even to discuss disarmament. [See Scott, James Brown, *The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907*, I, index "Armaments" and "Arbitration."']

135. 19. The whole autocratic régime has been imposed on a people whose instincts and institutions are fundamentally democratic.

**Page**

The deposed Romanoff dynasty began in an election among the nobles. Peter the Great and the more despotic of his successors created largely by imitation and adaptation of German bureaucracy the machinery with which they ruled. Underneath this un-Russian machinery of despotism Russian communal and local life has preserved itself with wonderful vitality.

135. 20. Besides undoubtedly many matters which from reasons of public policy the Government could not publish, the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, when it presented the war resolution following the President's message, went on formal record as listing at least twenty-one crimes or unfriendly acts committed upon our soil with the connivance of the German Government after the European war began. Among these were:

Inciting Hindoos within the United States to stir up revolts in India, and supplying them with funds for that end, contrary to our neutrality laws.

Running a fraudulent passport office for German reservists. This was supervised by Capt. von Papen of the German Embassy.

Sending German agents to England to act as spies, equipped with American passports.

Outfitting steamers to supply German raiders, and sending them out of American ports in defiance of our laws.

Sending an agent from the United States to try to blow up the International Bridge at Vanceboro, Me.

Furnishing funds to agents to blow up factories in Canada.

Five different conspiracies, some partly successful, to manufacture and place bombs on ships leaving United States ports. For these crimes a number of persons have been convicted; also Consul-General Bopp, of San Francisco (a very high German official accredited to the United States Government), has been convicted of plotting to cause bridges and tunnels to be destroyed in Canada.

Financing newspapers in this country to conduct a propaganda serviceable to the ends of the German Government.

Stirring up anti-American sentiment in Mexico and disorders generally in that country, to make it impossible for the United States to mix in European affairs.

Page

German military usage had been quite in this spirit, however, and approved of such doings. (See *German War Code*, standard translation, page 85.)

“Bribery of enemies’ subjects, acceptance of offers of treachery, utilization of discontented elements in the population, support of pretenders and the like, are permissible; indeed, international law is in no way opposed to the exploitation of crimes of third parties.”

136. 21. A Prussianized Germany, triumphant in Europe and dominant on the seas, would have found occasion to strike down America in its isolation and make of us the over-seas tributary of a new Roman Empire. There can be no question that the future of democracy and of independent national life was hanging in the balance in this struggle.

22. The famous “Zimmermann note,” exposed by our Government March 1, is a document that should stick in the memories of all Americans. It was composed on *January 19, 1917*, at a time when Germany and America were officially very good friends, and the date was just three days before Mr. Wilson appeared in the Senate with his scheme for a league to assure peace and justice to the world.

Zimmermann admitted the authenticity of the note, and only deplored that it had been discovered. The significant parts were these:

“BERLIN, *January 19, 1917*.

“On February 1 we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. In spite of this, it is our intention to keep neutral the United States of America.

“If this attempt is not successful, we propose an alliance on the following basis with Mexico: That we shall make war together and together make peace. We shall give general financial support, and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The details are left to you for settlement.”

The whole dispatch was so gross a revelation of international immorality that German-American papers immediately denounced it as a forgery, only to have its genuineness brazenly acknowledged and defended by Berlin.



23. It is worthy of note that although nearly all the nations opposed to Germany concluded the so-called "cooling off" arbitration treaties with the United States, negotiated by Mr. Bryan, Germany, although indulging in certain meaningless talk about "approving of the principle" of arbitration, declined to join in the compacts.

There was no arbitration treaty that could be invoked when trouble arose with Germany.

27. 24. "Fair play" had small part in the Prussian military usage, however. (See *German War Code*, authorized translation, pages 1-3 and 52.) J. Murray, London, 1915.

"A war conducted with energy can not be directed merely against the combatants of the enemy State and the positions they occupy, but will and must in like manner seek to destroy the total intellectual and material resources of the latter. Humanitarian claims, such as the protection of men and their goods, can only be taken into consideration in so far as the nature and object of the war permit."

See also Clausewitz (the Prussian military authority and oft-quoted oracle). Treatise "On War" (*Vom Kriege*) V: Kap. 14 (3).

Speaking of the desirability of crushing down a hostile country by requisitions, etc., he commends it because of "the fear of responsibility, punishment, and ill-treatment, which in such cases presses on the whole population like a general weight." This recourse (of requisitions) has "no limits except those of the exhaustion, impoverishment, and devastation of the country."

25. Austria had a serious clash with the United States in the *Ancona* case late in 1915, when Americans perished, thanks to the ruthless action of an Austrian submarine. In reply to American protests Austria promised to order her commanders to behave with humanity, and (compared, at least, to her German allies) she kept her word with reasonable exactness.

On April 8, 1917, however, Austria, probably acting under German pressure, broke off diplomatic relations with the United States without waiting for action by our Government, and the



Page

same was done a little later by Germany's other obedient vassal, the Sultan of Turkey.

138. 26. No one can accuse Mr. Wilson of the least precipitancy in bringing matters to an issue. Of course, on the contrary, his persistent attempts to bring the German Government to recognize the claims of reason and humanity caused him to be bitterly criticized. Despite this criticism he patiently and steadily held to the policy "to wait until facts became unmistakable and were susceptible of only one interpretation." (*Sussex* note, April 18, 1916.)

**Here is a partial list of the stages in the U-boat campaign:**

(1) December 24, 1914. Admiral von Tirpitz throws out hints in a newspaper interview of a wholesale torpedoing policy. He directly asks, "What will America say?" This was considerably before the so-called English blockade was causing Germany any serious food problem.

(2) February 4, 1915. German Government proclaims a war zone within which any ship may be sunk unwarned.

(3) February 10, 1915. Mr. Wilson tells German Government it will be held to "strict accountability" if any American rights are violated in this way.

(4) May 1, (dated April 22), 1915. German Embassy publishes in New York morning papers warning against taking passage on ships which our Government had told the people they had a perfect right to take.

The *Lusitania* sailed at 12:20 noon, May 1.

(5) May 7, 1915. Sinking of *Lusitania*.

(6) May 13, 1915. Mr. Wilson's "first *Lusitania*" note.

(7) May 28, 1915. Germany's reply defending the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

(8) June 9, 1915. Mr. Wilson's "second *Lusitania*" note.

(9) July 21, 1915. Mr. Wilson's "third *Lusitania*" note (following more unsatisfactory German rejoinders.)

(10) August 19, 1915. Sinking of the *Arabic*, whereupon von Bernstorff gave an oral pledge for his Government that hereafter German submarines would not sink "liners" without warning.

(11) February, 1916. (After still more debatable sinkings) Germany makes proposals looking toward "assuming liability" for the *Lusitania* victims, but the whole case is soon complicated again by the "armed ship" issue.

(12) March 24, 1916. Sinking of the *Sussex* passenger vessel with Americans on board.

page

(13) April 10, 1916. Germany cynically tells United States she can not be sure whether she sunk the *Sussex* or not, although admitting one of her submarines was active close to the place of disaster.

(14) April 18, 1916. President Wilson threatens Germany with breach of diplomatic relations if *Sussex* and similar incidents are repeated.

(15) May 4, 1916. Germany grudgingly makes the promise that ships will not be sunk without warning.

(16) October 8, 1916. German submarine appears off American coast and sinks British passenger steamer *Stephano* with many American passengers (vacationists returning from Newfoundland) on board. Loss of life almost certain had not American men-of-war been on hand to pick up the refugees.

[From this time until final break several other vessels sunk under circumstances which made it at least doubtful whether Germany was living up to her pledges.]

(17) January 31, 1917. Germany tears up her promises and notifies Mr. Wilson she will begin "unrestricted submarine war."

(18) February 3, 1917. Mr. Wilson gives Count Bernstorff his passports and recalls Ambassador Gerard from Berlin.

In all modern history it may be doubted if there is another chapter displaying such prolonged patience, forbearance, and conciliatoriness as that shown by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lansing in the face of a long course of deliberate evasion and prevarication to them personally, as well as outrage after outrage upon the property, and still more, upon the lives of very many American citizens.

39. 27. The treason statutes of the United States have seldom been invoked, but they exist and possess teeth.

It is treason to "levy war against the United States, adhere to their enemies, or give them aid or comfort." (Chapter 1, section 1, Revised Statutes.) The penalty is death, or imprisonment for at least five years, and a fine of at least \$10,000.

It is "misprision of treason" to know of any treasonable plots or doings and fail to report the same to the authorities. The penalty is seven years' imprisonment. The penalty for inciting a rebellion or insurrection is ten years, and the crime of entering into any correspondence with a foreign government to influence it in any dispute with the United States, or to

Page

defeat any measures taken by our Government, calls for three years' imprisonment. (Chapter 1, section 5.) There is also a penalty of six years' imprisonment for any seditious conspiracy to oppose the authority of the United States.

139. These laws President Wilson had, by proclamation (April 6, 1917), declared to be in full force.

"Giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States" has been defined in the courts (30 Federal Cases, No. 18272), as—

"In general, any act clearly indicating a want of loyalty to the Government and sympathy with its enemies, and which by fair construction is directly in furtherance of their hostile designs." Such deeds are, of course, liable to all the penalty of treason.

In extreme cases also, of "rebellion and invasion" the Constitution specifically gives the Government power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus (Constitution, Article I, section 9, paragraph 2); in other words, to arrest and imprison on mere suspicion without trial, and this was actually done in the Civil War.

28. Abraham Lincoln (second inaugural address, 1865).

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in—to bind up one another's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphans; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Friedrich von Bernhardi (German lieutenant general, and acceptable mouthpiece, not of the whole German nation, but of the Prussian military caste which holds the German nation in its grip):

"Might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war" (page 23).

"The inevitableness, the idealism, and the blessedness of war as the indispensable and stimulating law of development must be repeatedly emphasized (page 37).

"Our people must learn to feel that the maintenance of peace

age

never can or may be the goal of a policy" (page 37, "*Germany and the Next War*").

0. 29. The last sentence is an adaptation of the close of Luther's defense at the Diet of Worms in 1521, "I can not do otherwise. God help me."

#### FLAG DAY ADDRESS

*All the following notes on the Flag Day Address are taken by special permission from the text of the President's Address officially annotated by the Committee on Public Information. (See Introduction, page 15.)*

12. 1. As for espionage, König, the head of the Hamburg-American secret service, who was active in passport frauds, who induced Gustave Stahl to perjure himself and declare the *Lusitania* armed, and who plotted the destruction of the Welland Canal, in his work as a spy, passed under thirteen aliases in this country and Canada. As for the corruption of public opinion, it proceeded both openly and under cover. Dr. Dernburg was the official missionary, and he and others went up and down the land. Newspapers were started with German money and others received secret subsidies from the German Government. The accounts of large sums given in this way to buy up newspapers or individuals have been published. Most important of all, in a telegram, dated January 22, 1917, but not made public until later by the Secretary of State, von Bernstorff asked his Government for authority to expend \$50,000 "in order, as on former occasions, to influence Congress through the organization you know of."

As for conspiracy in our midst, it took various forms under Capts. Boy-Ed, von Papen, von Rintelen, Tauscher, and von Igel, all directly connected with the German Government. For what unlawful and seditious purposes their money was spent—for bombs to blow up our merchant vessels and their crews, for evading our laws and supplying German raiders at sea, or for organizing disguised pro-German societies, is plain from the von Igel papers seized by our Government.

Page

In others there is the implication that the German diplomatists in America were involved in the Separatist movement in the Province of Quebec. The German agents spent \$600,000 on Huerta's abortive attempt in this country to start a revolution in Mexico (1915). For the whole subject see files of *New York World* and *New York Times Index* under "German and Austro-Hungarian conspirators," "German plots, etc., for 1914-1917," *Congressional Record*, April 5, 1917, pp. 192, 193, and *German Intrigue* by the Committee on Public Information.

142. 2. They sought to destroy our industries by bringing about strikes and inducing men to quit work. Labor's National Peace Council attempted to bring about a strike among 23,000 longshoremen (Gomper's statement, *New York Times*, Sept. 14, 1915), and that was not the only attempt. Ambassador Dumba and Consul General von Nuber ran advertisements in various papers calling upon all loyal Austrians to quit work in munition factories. German official documents, seized in Capt. von Igel's office, present as an argument against Austria-Hungary's cutting off the subsidy to a pretended employment bureau, which was in reality a branch of the German Secret Service, that this "Liebau Bureau" had been highly successful in fomenting strikes and disturbances at munition factories. (Cf. letter of Mar. 24, 1916, to Ambassador von Bernstorff.) Dumba's letter, reporting his plans to bring about disturbances in the Bethlehem Steel Works, was seized by the British among the belongings of Mr. Archibald, a subsidized American correspondent, and Dumba's recall was thereupon demanded by our Department of State.

The Germans sought to arrest our commerce, not by submarines alone, but by blowing up ships in harbor and at sea. They put bombs in coal bunkers and tied them to rudder posts. Models of Robert Fay's contrivances for this latter purpose were exhibited at his trial, and he spared passenger ships only because twin screws baffled him. By Fay's own confession and that of his partner the money for this treachery and murder came from the German secret police.

143. 3. The reference is to the note sent by Dr. Alfred Zimmer-



mann, foreign secretary, to von Eckhart, German minister to Mexico, requesting him to seek an alliance against us with Mexico and Japan. See Note 22 to the *War Message*. The note was intercepted, and when in March its contents were made known it set popular feeling aflame and more than any other act of aggression on the part of Germany aroused the American public.

143. 4. Possibly the most glaring instance of German official effrontery was the *permission* to regular American passenger steamers to continue their sailings undisturbed after February 1, 1917, if—

“(a) The port of destination is Falmouth.

“(b) Sailing to or coming from that port course is taken via the Scilly Islands and a point 50° N. 20° W.

“(c) The steamers are marked in the following way, which must not be allowed to other vessels in American ports: On ship's hull and superstructure three vertical stripes, 1 meter wide, each to be painted alternately white and red. Each mast should show a large flag checkered white and red and the stern the American national flag. Care should be taken that, during dark, national flag and painted marks are easily recognizable from a distance, and that the boats are well lighted throughout.

“(d) One steamer a week sails in each direction with arrival at Falmouth on Sunday and departure from Falmouth on Wednesday.

“(e) The United States Government guarantees that no contraband (according to German contraband list) is carried by those steamers.”

The German ambassador to the Secretary of State, January 31, 1917.

5. A check for \$5,000 to J. F. J. Archibald for “propaganda work,” and a receipt from Edwin Emerson, the war correspondent, for \$1,000 “traveling expenses” were among the documents found in von Igel's possession. Many persons in places of influence and authority were approached.

Others likewise bearing English names were persuaded to take leading places in similar organizations which concealed



## Page

their origin and real purpose. The American Embargo Conference arose out of the ashes of Labor's Peace Council, and its president was American, though the funds were not. Still others tampered with were journalists who lent themselves to the German propaganda, and who went so far as to serve as couriers between the Teutonic embassies and Vienna and Berlin.

143. 6. At 5 p. m., Aug. 1, the German Army was formally mobilized, although there is much evidence that it had been mobilized for days, and at 7 p. m., war was declared against Russia. On Aug. 4 the Reichstag, the representative body of the German Nation, met, and for the first time learned officially what had been done. Between July 23 and August 4 the German Government had put itself in the posture of war against Russia, France, Great Britain, and Belgium, and had violated Luxemburg, and yet had asked no advice or consent of the German people. That is why it is proper to say that the German people did not begin the war, or the mass of the people originate it. Perhaps the most conclusive proof of this lies in the efforts made by the Government to convince the people that the war was strictly a defensive one. "Envious people everywhere are compelling us to our just defense," said the Kaiser on July 31; and again, "The sword is being forced into our hand." By such speeches and by the circulation of a report (since acknowledged by high German officials to be false) that France had already attacked Germany, the German people were aroused. Even the invasion of Belgium was represented to be a defensive measure, and it was declared by the Chancellor in the Reichstag and by everybody else in authority to have been due to certain knowledge that France herself was about to invade Belgium. Lieut. Gen. Freytag-Loringhoven, Chief of the Supplementary Staff, later made it clear that this was not true. He admitted that the initial success of the German arms was largely owing to the French expecting the German advance elsewhere. (*N. Y. Times*, Aug. 12, 1917.)

7. The German Empire and its constitution was formed not by the people but by the twenty-five kings and princes of Germany, headed by the King of Prussia. Bismarck

Page

wrote the constitution and regarded it as adopted when the German princes and kings approved it. It was never submitted to a vote of the people. It is clear at once how perfect this constitution was. It was perfect from the standpoint of the kings and princes, especially of the Kaiser, who, as King of Prussia, controlled two-thirds of the people and two-thirds of the land of Germany.

43. Bismarck did not choose to leave the people out entirely; thus the German constitution provided for an elected house, called the Reichstag. It was chosen by manhood suffrage of those over twenty-five years of age. The districts established in 1871 were unchanged up to 1918. This meant that the large cities which had grown up since 1871 and contained the laboring vote were but partially represented, and the German Government dared not change these districts, because it would mean an increased vote for the laboring classes and the Socialist Party. It need not have been so fearful, for, under the constitution, the popular house was merely a great debating club, which might talk and go through the forms of considering legislation, but was not a real factor in the German Government. It was little more than a convenient piece of political scene-painting, and the room where it met was well called by one of the members the "Hall of Echoes."

The real power in the German Parliament lay with the *Bundesrat*, a body of 61 members, which met in secret. It was composed of diplomats appointed by the kings and princes of Germany, Prussia having the largest number. These ambassadors voted at the direction of their sovereigns, and as the King of Prussia was the most powerful and appointed the chancellor, who presided over the *Bundesrat*, he had enough votes to veto any measure. The *Bundesrat* was not only safe from democracy but it was the body through which the Emperor, as King of Prussia, could really control Germany. Here were originated almost all bills, and all legislation had to be approved by the *Bundesrat*; this meant, in other words, by Prussia and its King, the Emperor. It is thus that Germany became Prussianized in its government and filled with the political ambitions and military ideals of a State whose best models of a

## Page

ruler were still, in the twentieth century, Frederick the Great and his brutal father.

143. It was this Government, comprised of a group of kings and princes, led by the King of Prussia, that the pro-Germans praised as the most democratic in the world. What they meant was that for the sake of keeping the people quiet and submissive to their military aims the autocracy granted them old-age pensions and clean streets, and in return expected them to send their sons to any war and to commit any act for the sake of a State where irresponsible medieval-minded sovereigns still believed in the twentieth century that they ruled by divine grace and were accountable only to God. But the god that they had in mind was a war god whom they created in their own image.

This pictures but half of what we mean by autocracy, for it leaves out of account the government of the most powerful State in Germany, that of Prussia itself. When one knows that in Prussia the voters were divided into three classes according to their wealth, and one nobleman's or rich man's vote might be equal to that of 10,000 laborers, and that actually 4 per cent of the wealthy people counted for as much as 82 per cent of the laboring and poor class, some may think that this is efficient government; but the only people they could get to agree with them were the Prussian nobles, landowners, and capitalists. See Hazen, *The German Government*, published and distributed by the Committee on Public Information.

The militaristic group which started the war without consulting the people's representatives were equally contemptuous of public opinion in conducting it. In England there were two sweeping changes in the cabinet in response to popular demand, and in France both cabinet ministers and army leaders were changed; but in Germany even when, after three years of war, popular discontent led to the fall of Bethmann-Hollweg, the first secret conferences concerning his successor were evidently with the army generals and then with the crown council at which the Crown Prince was present. The new chancellor, Michaelis, was so far from being the choice of the people that even the most hostile groups in the Reichstag

age

did not know what to make of him. Michaelis was soon displaced by another puppet of the Emperor's, von Hertling. He was succeeded by Prince Maxmilian of Baden shortly before the signing of the armistice.

14. 8. Revelations from Petrograd brought new evidence from the secret Russian archives of the Kaiser's intrigues against small states. In telegrams signed "Nicky" and "Willy," the Czar and the German Emperor are shown to have been arranging in 1905 for a secret alliance endangering Denmark. In case of war with England, Denmark was to be treated as Belgium was in the great war, except that a preliminary effort was to be made to make the Danes see and accept the inevitable. The German Emperor telegraphed on August 2, 1905, from Copenhagen, where he had gone to break ground for the nefarious scheme:

"Considering great number of channels leading from Copenhagen to London and proverbial want of discretion of the Danish court, I was afraid to let anything be known about our alliance, as it would immediately have been communicated to London, a most impossible thing so long as treaty is to remain secret for the present.

"By long conversation with Isvolsky, however, I was able to gather that actual Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Raben, and a number of persons of influence have already come to the conviction that in case of war and impending attack on Baltic from foreign power Danes expect—their inability and helplessness to uphold even shadow of neutrality against invasion being evident—that Russia and Germany will immediately take steps to safeguard their interests by laying hands on Denmark and occupying it during the war.

"As this would at the same time guarantee territory and future existence of dynasty and country, the Danes are slowly resigning themselves to this alternative and making up their minds accordingly. This being exactly what you wished and hoped for, I thought it better not to touch on the subject with Danes and refrained from making any allusions.

"It is better to let the idea develop and ripen in their heads

Page

and let them draw final conclusions themselves, so that they will of their own accord be moved to lean upon us and fall in line with our two countries. *Tout vient a qui sait attendre.* [‘All things come to him who waits.’]

. . . .

“WILLY.”

144. 9. Some of the German conceptions and plans are indicated in the quotations that follow. These quotations are necessarily brief, and for that reason they may seem somewhat sharp, but they are none the less typical of the spirit that is to be found in scores of German pamphlets and books, in a wide range of newspapers, and, indeed, in the conversation of a large number of intelligent Germans. Unfortunately a powerful and increasing party were in favor of the policy of military aggression.

“Room—they must make room. The western and southern Slavs—or we. Since we are the stronger, the choice will not be difficult. We must quit our modest waiting at the door. Only by growth can a people save itself.” (Otto R. Tannenberg, *Gross-Deutschland: die Arbeit des 20ten Jahrhunderts* [Greater Germany: the Work of the 20th Century], 1911, pp. 74-75.)

“We are of the race of the Thunderer;  
We will possess the earth.  
That is the old right of the Germans—  
To win land with the hammer.

“This right of the Germans arises, let it be said once more, out of German civilization, the best on earth . . . forward, then, into the fight for German aims, and ‘far as the hammer is hurled, let the earth be ours.’” (Bley, *Die Weltstellung des Deutschtums* [Germany’s Position in the World], 1897, pp. 27-29.)

“Our fathers have left us much to do. The German people is so situated in Europe that it need only run and take whatever it requires. . . . Today . . . it is for Ger-



many to rise from a European to a world power. . . . Humanitarian dreams are imbecility. Diplomatic charity begins at home. Statesmanship is business. Right and wrong are notions indispensable in private life. The German people are right because they number 87,000,000 souls. Our fathers have left us much to do." (O. R. Tannenberg, *Gross-Deutschland: die Arbeit des 20ten Jahrhunderts*, 1911, pp. 230-31.)

14. "It is our sacred duty to sharpen the sword that has been put into our hands and to hold it ready for defense as well as for offense. We must allow the idea to sink into the minds of our people that our armaments are an answer to the armaments and policy of the French. We must accustom them to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity, in order to combat the provocations of our adversaries. We must act with prudence so as not to arouse suspicion and to avoid the crises which might injure our economic existence. We must so manage matters that under the heavy weight of powerful armaments, considerable sacrifices, and strained political relations the precipitation of war (*Losschlagen*) should be considered as a relief, because after it would come decades of peace and prosperity, as after 1870." (Memorandum of the German Government on the strengthening of the German Army, Berlin, Mar. 19, 1913; *French Yellow Book*, Carnegie edition, 1915, I, p. 542.)

"Do not let us forget the civilizing task which the decrees of Providence have assigned to us. Just as Prussia was destined to be the nucleus of Germany, so the regenerated Germany shall be the nucleus of a future empire of the west. And in order that no one shall be left in doubt, we proclaim from henceforth that our continental nation has a right to the sea, not only to the North Sea but to the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. Hence we intend to absorb one after another all the provinces which neighbor on Prussia. We will successively annex Denmark, Holland, Belgium, northern Switzerland, then Trieste and Venice, finally northern France, from the Sambre to the Loire. This programme we fearlessly pronounce. It is not the work of a madman. The empire we intend to found will be no Utopia. We have ready to hand the means of



Page

founding it and no coalition in the world can stop us." (Bron-sart von Schellendorf, quoted by H. A. L. Fisher in *The War, Its Causes and Issues*, 1914, p. 16.)

144. 10. In his published speeches the Kaiser never makes a down-right assertion of a wish to conquer other peoples. But he is continually "sharpening" his "sword," glorifying war and the military deeds of his ancestors, and urging his army to be ready for its great work. In much that he says this notion of aggression is implicit. The following excerpts show the dangerous drift of his mind, and that of his son and heir and of the ruler of the second kingdom in the Empire:

"The German people is of one mind with its princes and its Emperor in the feeling that in its powerful development it must set up a new boundary post and create a great fleet which will correspond to its needs." (Kaiser's speech, Berlin, Feb. 13, 1900. Christian Gauss, *The German Emperor as Shown in His Public Utterances*, 1913, p. 158.)

"I hope it [Germany] will be granted, through the harmoni-ous coöperation of princes and peoples, of its armies and its citizens, to become in the future as closely united, as powerful, and as authoritative as once the Roman world empire was, and that, just as in the old times they said 'Civis romanus sum,' hereafter, at some time in the future, they will say, 'I am a German citizen.'" (Kaiser's speech of Oct. 11, 1900, Christian Gauss, p. 169.)

"At the declaration of war Russia followed France, and then the English also fell upon us. . . . I am glad of it, and I am glad because we can now have a reckoning with our ene-mies and because now at length . . . we can get a direct outlet from the Rhine to the sea. Ten months have gone by since that time. Much precious blood has been shed. It has not, however, been shed for nothing. A strengthening of the German Empire and an expansion outward beyond its bound-aries as far as this is necessary—an expansion by which we shall be protected against further attacks—that will be the gain (*Frucht*) of this war." (Speech by the King of Bavaria, June 7, 1915, at the banquet of the Bavarian Canal Association.

page

Quoted by Grumbach, *Das annexionistische Deutschland*, [Germany with Annexations], 1917, page 5.)

44. "It is only by relying on our good German sword that we can hope to conquer that place in the sun which rightly belongs to us, and which the world does not seem willing to accord us . . . till the world comes to an end, the ultimate decision must rest with the sword." (Extract from the Crown Prince's introduction to *Germany in Arms*, issued in 1913.)

"War is the noblest and holiest expression of human activity. For us, too, the glad, great hour of battle will strike. Still and deep in the German heart must live the joy of battle and the longing for it. Let us ridicule to the utmost the old women in breeches who fear war and deplore it as cruel and revolting. No; war is beautiful. Its august sublimity elevates the human heart beyond the earthly and the common. In the cloud palace above sit the heroes Frederick the Great and Blücher, and all the men of action—the great Emperor, Moltke, Roon, Bismarck—are there as well, but not the old women who would take away our joy in war. When here on earth a battle is won by German arms and the faithful dead ascend to heaven, a Potsdam lance corporal will call the guard to the door, and 'old Fritz,' springing from his golden throne, will give the command to present arms. That is the heaven of young Germany." (*Jung Deutschland*, the official organ of the "Young German League," October, 1913. Quoted by J. P. Bang, *Hurrah and Hallelujah*, 1917, p. 212.)

This is the view of Otfried Nippold, for a time professor of church history at Jena. On his return from a residence of several years in Japan he was shocked to observe the extraordinary growth of jingoism in Germany. He gathered in most careful fashion a collection of statements advocating war and conquest, made in the years 1912-13 by prominent men, by well-known associations, and by leading newspapers. At the end of his book of more than a hundred pages this German scholar made the following careful statement of the situation:

"The evidence submitted in this book amounts to an irrefutable proof that a systematic stimulation of the war spirit is

page

going on, based on the one hand on the wishes of the Pan-German League and on the other on the agitation of the Defense Association (*Wehrverein*). One cannot but feel deep regret in discovering that in Germany, as well as in other countries, ill-feeling against other States and Nations is being stirred up so unjustifiably and that people are being so unscrupulously incited to war. . . .

144. "We have come across other speakers and writers—and they are decidedly in the majority, so far as the passages quoted in these pages are concerned—who deal with the matter in a much more thoroughgoing way. These men do not only occasionally incite people to war, but they systematically inculcate a desire for war in the minds of the German people. In the opinion of these instigators, the German Nation needs a war; a long-continued peace seems regrettable to them just because it is a peace, no matter whether there is any reason for war or not, and therefore, in case of need, one must simply strive to bring it about. . . .

"From this dogma (that war must come) it is only a step to the next chauvinistic principle, so dear to the heart of our soldier politicians who are languishing for war—the fundamental principle of the aggressive or preventive war. If it be true that war is to come, then let it come at the moment which is most favorable to ourselves. In other words, do not wait until there is a reason for war, but strike when it is most convenient. . . . And, above all, as soon as possible. . . .

"If their theory holds good, Germany, even if she conquered ever so many colonies, would again be in need of war after a few decades, since otherwise the German Nation would again be in danger of moral degeneration. The truth is that, to them, war is quite a normal institution of international intercourse and not in any way a means of settling great international conflicts—not a means to be resorted to only in case of great necessity." (*Der deutsche Chauvinismus*, [German Chauvinism], 1913, pp. 113-117.)

The powerful forces exciting the war mania were analyzed again and again by leading Social Democrats in the Reichstag.

Page

Their views confirm the following statement made by the French minister of foreign affairs in his report (July 30, 1913):

144. "Some want war because, in the present circumstances, they think it inevitable; and, as far as Germany is concerned, the sooner the better. Others regard war as necessary for economic reasons, based on overpopulation, overproduction, and the need for markets and outlets, and also for social reasons. . . . Others, uneasy for the safety of the Empire and believing that time is on the side of France, think that events should be brought to an immediate head. . . . Others are bellicose from 'Bismarckism,' as it may be termed. They feel themselves humiliated at having to enter into discussions with France. . . . Angry disappointment is the unifying force of the *Wehrvereine* and other associations of young Germany. . . . Others again want war from a mystic hatred of revolutionary France. . . . [The writer goes on to say that the country squires, the aristocracy, which is military in character, the higher bourgeoisie, the manufacturers, big merchants, and bankers are in favor of war]. The universities, if we except a few distinguished spirits, develop a warlike philosophy. . . . Historians, philosophers, political pamphleteers, and other apologists of German Kultur, wish to impose upon the world a way of thinking and feeling specifically German. . . . We come finally to those whose support of the war policy is inspired by rancour and resentment. . . ." (*French Yellow Book*, Doc. No. 5. *Diplomatic Documents*, Carnegie edition, 1916, I, pp. 551-553.)

It will not escape the reader's attention that these three statements from widely differing sources were made from one to three years before Germany plunged the world into the war she wanted.

As late as the end of 1917 the rulers of Germany could not abandon their schemes for annexation. The Reichstag, impelled probably by the growing peril of Germany's situation, voted against annexations and indemnities. Alarmed by this vote, the Pan-Germans began a campaign of mass meetings and telegrams. They sent a message to

## Page

chancellor Michaelis, urging that peace without indemnities and extensions of territory was impossible. To this the chancellor answered: "I am firmly confident that the splendid military situation will help us to a peace which will guarantee permanently the German Empire's condition of existence (*sic*) on the Continent and overseas." (*New York Times*, Aug. 10, 1917.) Michaelis's phrases were those commonly used by the Germans who wish extension of territory, but who express their wishes agreeably. He was indicating in a polite and guarded way that the Pan-Germans should understand that their plans of conquest had not been given up.

144. 11. In Roumania the house of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen; in Bulgaria the house of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha; in Albania the inglorious house of Wied. What the late Queen of Greece, the Kaiser's sister, accomplished for the German cause is sufficiently known. In Montenegro the heir apparent was married to a German princess. Only the Serbian royal house is without German connections.

12. Not long after the treaty of Berlin (1878) German officers, one of whom was General von der Goltz, set about reorganizing the Turkish Army. In 1888 German financiers, depending upon the Deutsche Bank, asked for a railway concession. In the next year the Kaiser, William II, visited Abdul Hamid. By 1891 German influence at Constantinople became evident. Germans in Turkey were directing the building of railways and Germans at home were urging the necessity of German railways to the Persian Gulf. In 1898 the Kaiser went to Constantinople and on to Palestine, where he declared himself the friend of 300,000,000 Moslems. In 1899 Dr. Siemens, a Berlin capitalist, signed the Bagdad Railway convention with Turkey. Although capitalists of other nations were allowed to share in financing the road, German interests maintained control over it. After that time German officers began going to Turkey in numbers, drilling the Turkish troops, teaching them modern warfare, equipping the army with the best new artillery, and thoroughly fortifying strategic points. Meanwhile German diplomats were studiously indifferent to Armenian atrocities



Page

perpetrated by the Turks. When the Young Turk movement culminated in the revolution of 1908 the Kaiser's government was quick to show favor to the new government. German officers assisted the Turks in their two Balkan wars, 1912-13. These different moves have all been part of a general plan. For two decades German policy had sought to create in Turkey a strong but subordinated military ally and to bring her within the German economic system. Rich territories in Asia Minor and the Mesopotamian valley might thus be developed, an all-German route to the East assured, and Britain's routes to India and her position in Egypt brought within striking distance.

144. 13. See the *French Yellow Book (Diplomatic Documents, Carnegie edition)*, for a secret German document bearing date of March 19, 1913, obtained from a reliable source and communicated to M. Jonnart, minister for foreign affairs, by M. Étienne, minister of war, April 2, 1913. The German writer discusses plans for increase of armament, and for war, particularly against France (pp. 542-3): "We must not be anxious about the fate of our colonies. The final result in Europe will settle their position. On the other hand, we must stir up trouble in the north of Africa and in Russia. It is a means of keeping the forces of the enemy engaged. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that we should open up relations, by means of well-chosen agents, with influential people in Egypt, Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco, in order to prepare the measures which would be necessary in the case of a European war. Of course, in case of war we would openly recognize these secret allies, and on the conclusion of peace we would secure to them the advantages which they had gained. These aims are capable of realization. The first attempt, which was made some years ago, opened up for us the desired relations. Unfortunately these relations were not sufficiently consolidated. Risings provoked in time of war by political agents need to be carefully prepared and by material means. They must break out simultaneously with the destruction of the means of communication; they must have a controlling head to be found among the influential leaders, religious or political. The Egyptian school is



## Page

particularly suited to this purpose; more and more it serves as a bond between the intellectuals of the Mohammedan world.”

144. For the detailed story of the activity in Egypt after this and before see *Times* (London), *History of the War*, III (1917), pp. 292-295. Von Bernstorff was then consular agent, and after him Prince von Hatzfeldt, and they conducted themselves somewhat as both did later in America.

On July 7, 1917, indictments were brought in the Federal court at San Francisco against 98 persons, including German consuls and consuls general. At the same time the following statement was made by the Federal district attorney, Mr. John W. Preston:

“For more than a year prior to the outbreak of the European war certain Hindus in San Francisco and certain Germans were preparing openly for war with England. At the outbreak of the war Hindu leaders, members of the German consulate here and attachés of the German Government, began to form plans to foment revolution in India for the purpose of freeing India and aiding Germans in their military operations.

“Hindus on the Pacific coast were canvassed and those willing to take part in the revolution were registered. Emissaries were financed by the German agents here and immediately dispatched to Germany. Shortly thereafter what is known as the India committee, an adjunct of the German foreign office, was created in Berlin. This India committee had the personal attention of Alfred Zimmermann, German Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

“Thereafter the operations of the plotters in the United States were directed from Berlin. The conspiracy took the form of various military enterprises. Arms and ammunition in large quantities were purchased with German money. Men were recruited and sent to India.”

145. 14. On June 28, 1914, there took place at Serajevo, Bosnia (Austrian territory since 1909), the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand and his wife. Serbians undoubtedly aided and abetted the criminals. The Austrian Government asserted that it traced the source of the deed to Serbian territory, and even

it maintained, to government and court circles in Belgrade, the Serbian capital.

145. For nearly a month nothing occurred. Then, on July 23, almost without warning, Austria-Hungary made known her demands upon Serbia. Their main purpose seemed to be the complete extirpation of the Pan-Serbian movement and the punishment of all Serbians implicated in the crime at Serajevo. The demands involved a practical denial of the sovereignty of Serbia. A reply was, furthermore, demanded by 6 o'clock on July 25, or within exactly 48 hours.

Serbia made a reply covering every point in the demands. It yielded to most of the demands and showed an extremely conciliatory spirit. On the question of allowing Austrian officers to enter Serbian territory in order to take part in the inquiries or judicial proceedings concerning the Serajevo murders, the Serbian Government declared that it would "admit such collaboration as agrees with the principle of international law, with criminal procedure, and with good neighborly relations." It added finally that if the Austro-Hungarian Government were "not satisfied with this reply, the Serbian Government, considering that it is not to the common interest to take precipitate action in the solution of this question, is ready, as always, to accept a pacific understanding, either by referring this question to the decision of the international tribunal at The Hague, or to the Great Powers which took part in the drawing up of the declaration made by the Serbian Government on the 18/31 of March, 1909."

A number of the Powers pleaded the Serbian cause, asking at least an extension of the time limit or a delay in making war, but the Austrian Government would abate not a jot or tittle of its demands. Its unyielding attitude and brusqueness startled the world, and have justified the suspicion that Austria-Hungary did not desire a satisfactory reply.

As if to lend color to this suspicion it has since come to light that in August, 1913, Austria-Hungary had already formed the plan to attack Serbia. Italy, though at that time in alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary, refused to support such

## Page

an aggression. (Declaration of Signor Giolitti to the Italian Parliament, Dec. 5, 1914.)

145. 15. Across the path of this railway to Bagdad lay Serbia—an independent country whose sovereign alone among those of southeastern Europe had no marriage connection with Berlin, a Serbia that looked toward Russia. That is why Europe was nearly driven into war in 1913; that is why Germany stood so determinedly behind Austria's demands in 1914 and forced war. She must have her "corridor" to the southeast; she must have political domination all along the route of the great economic empire she planned. She was unwilling to await the process of "peaceful penetration."

16. "We must create a central Europe which will guarantee the peace of the entire continent from the moment when it shall have driven the Russians from the Black Sea and the Slavs from the south, and shall have conquered large tracts to the east of our frontiers for German colonization. We can not let loose *ex abrupto* the war which will create this central Europe. All we can do is to accustom our people to the thought that this war must come." (Quoted by Ch. Andler, pp. 21, 22, from Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften*, 4th ed., 1903, p. 83.)

The projected Middle Europe would, through its hold on Constantinople, close the chief outlet for the exports of the Russian Republic. It would, through the erection of a kingdom of Poland, united to Middle Europe, take away from Russia almost its entire manufacturing area. Such an Empire would do little less than bring the Russian Republic into economic dependence upon the Teutonic Powers. And this economic dependence could be used as a club to bring political dependence as well. The results of this for the future of Russia are easy to see.

17. "And over all these; over the Germans, French, Danes, and Poles in the German Empire; over the Magyars, Germans, Roumanians, Slovaks, Croats, and Serbs in Hungary; over the Germans, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, and southern Slavs in Austria, let us imagine once again the controlling concept

Page

of Mid-Europe. Mid-Europe will have a German nucleus, will voluntarily use the German language, which is known all over the world and is already the language of intercourse within Central Europe, but must from the outset display toleration and flexibility in regard to all the neighboring languages that are associated with it." (F. Naumann, *Central Europe*, 1916, pp. 108-109.)

145. 18. The German government of Alsace-Lorraine was typical of what could have been expected if Germany had annexed more territory as a result of this war. Belgium, Luxemburg, and Russian Poland had no more wish to be forcibly joined to Germany today than had Alsace-Lorraine in 1870; and if they had suffered that fate nothing but force would have kept them in submission. In the more than forty years since its annexation by Germany, Alsace-Lorraine has been largely Germanized, yet in 1914 it was still bitterly opposed to a Prussianized Government.

Until their liberation, the Alsatians looked more than ever toward France. In 1911 public demonstrations against the Prussian rule became more pronounced and continued intermittently down to the beginning of the war in 1914. In 1912 the Emperor threatened the discontented Alsatians with complete suppression of their constitution unless they ceased their agitations. At the same time noticeable increases were made in the garrisons of the leading cities, and work upon the fortifications was rushed. In 1913 occurred the historic Zabern incident which showed the complete dominance of the military power over civilian government and rights. "Lieutenant von Forstner, of the garrison, one day remarked in the street that he would give ten marks to any soldier who would run his bayonet through an Alsatian blackguard. In spite of popular indignation he was upheld by his superiors, . . . but he was afraid to appear in the streets without a corporal's guard. He still further earned the hatred of the town by striking with his sword a lame shoemaker who had laughed at him." Among the unmilitaristic classes in Germany there was great indignation; but in the Reichstag, the ministry, by order of the Emperor, upheld the army, without compromise or apology.

Page

Prussian Poland and North Schleswig fared little if any better. The three and a half million Poles in Prussia had been subjected to more severe persecutions than their compatriots in autocratic Russia. They had, of course, been deprived of their own laws since 1815. More recently, their religious liberty had been restricted, and the Polish language forbidden in education, in public business, and (with certain temporary exceptions) in public meetings, though the great majority of the Polish people understand no other language. As a supreme effort at assimilation the Prussian Government tried, partly by vast expenditure of money and partly by force, to compel the Poles to sell their lands and to introduce German colonists to take their places. This interference with the Polish laws, religion, language, and property was not provoked in the first instance by disloyalty, though the Poles became disloyal in consequence of it. Nor were the 150,000 Danes in North Schleswig saved by their inoffensive obscurity, their Lutheran religion, or even their Teutonic blood, from similar persecutions, with similar results. If Belgium had been forced to remain in German hands she would have become another Schleswig, another Poland.

In Austria-Hungary the situation was even worse. The South Slavs and the Roumanians in Hungary were deprived of the right to vote (although guaranteed to them in 1867); their educational institutions were hampered or closed, their economic development interfered with. And this was the work of the Hungarian Government which had Germany's warmest approval in all such measures.

146. 19. The German cruisers, the *Goeben* and *Breslau*, took refuge in the Dardanelles at the outbreak of the war. Instead of interning these fugitive ships in accordance with international law, the Turkish Government, already under German influence, pretended to buy them. In this manner the German Government became master of the situation and Turkey lost whatever independence it may still have had; for the German admiral and crews remained on board and a German element was introduced into the remainder of the Turkish fleet. It



age

was this Turco-German fleet, under effective German control, that forced Turkey's reluctant entrance into the war. By order of the German admiral, it bombarded Russian Black Sea ports, without provocation, without warning, without previous authorization of the Ottoman Government, and contrary to the desires of a majority of its members. (*Diplomatic Documents*, Carnegie edition, part ii. pp. 1057-1205 and 1385-1437.)

20. The Imperial Government continued to maneuver for peace, a peace to be arranged in conference at a "green table," with Germany holding as trumps the overrun territories still in her possession, and not for a peace guaranteed "by the major force of mankind." When the Reichstag voted for peace without annexations, the chancellor, Michaelis, spoke vaguely at first, but then hastened to reassure the alarmed Pan-Germans. When the Pope's proposals were brought forward, he welcomed them, but remained hopelessly indefinite as to whether Germany would assent to the details.

21. The rapid industrial development of Germany after the war of 1870, though due to economic causes, greatly enhanced the prestige of the military classes, who assumed the credit for it. Their position during the war was highly advantageous to them from an economic point of view, for they controlled the chief centers of European industry outside Great Britain. They held the greater part of Belgium, one of the most highly developed industrial centers of the world. They were exploiting the chief mining and manufacturing part of France, the oil and wheat fields of Roumania, and one of the few important manufacturing districts of Russia. They had secured the Balkan corridor to the Near East, with its boundless possibilities of commercial exploitation and of further political aggression in the direction of Egypt and India. If they had retained these conquests they would have been permanently enriched at the expense of their impoverished neighbors. If they could have capitalized their advantageous positions on the war map, whether by annexations or otherwise, the late war also, like that of 1870, would have appeared in the light of a



Page

profitable business adventure. War itself would indeed have become one of the greatest of national industries, with the military caste necessarily in supreme political control. In such an atmosphere democracy cannot develop. Nor can the triumph of democracy be expected in Germany till the prestige of the military caste has been destroyed. The celebrated Prof. Hans Delbrück, of the University of Berlin, wrote early in 1914: "Anyone who has any familiarity at all with our officers and generals knows that it would take another Sedan, inflicted on us instead of by us, before they would acquiesce in the control of the army by the German Parliament."

148. 22. America no longer occupies a position of charmed isolation. In the late war, navies transported great armies thousands of miles. The wireless kept Germany informed almost constantly of developments in the United States. German submarines appeared in our ports and sank ships off our coasts. If disaster had come to the British and American navies the war might have been brought within our borders.

During the war more than ever before we faced the problem of defending with a real force or with adequate guaranties our traditional policy—the Monroe doctrine. The facilities of the entire Holy Alliance in 1823 for the violation of American territory were small as compared with the power of Germany alone. If Germany had emerged from the war victorious and unreformed, then we, like France, Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland during the past decades, would have had to prepare indeed for self-defense. It would have been necessary for us to shoulder a burden of military preparedness in time of peace such as America has never known.

23. See note 20.

24. The terrifying bitterness of the struggle between the Imperial Government and the Social Democratic Party came to light in a speech by the Kaiser to the army recruits in 1891, in which he referred to his political opponents as "the internal foe," and said: ". . . It may come to pass that you will have to shoot down and stab your own relations and brothers." Upon another occasion he said: ". . .

age

To me every Social Democrat is synonymous with an enemy of the realm and of the Fatherland.”

At the outbreak of the war the Socialists abandoned their opposition to the Government and the Kaiser announced that there were no longer any parties in Germany. “In time of peace this or that party has attacked me; I forgive them now with all my heart.” Nevertheless some Socialists who subsequently adopted an independent tone were placed in jail. The majority seemed content to be the cat’s-paw of the military authorities in working upon the Russian Socialists for a separate peace. The hollowness of the reconciliation and the Government’s insincerity in permitting the use of Socialist peace formulas (see note 20) may be inferred from a passage in Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg’s speech of July 7, 1917, in which he is reported to have said that it was impossible to accept the socialist propositions in behalf of peace “because they had proved unsuccessful in Russia.”

#### FRANKLIN KNIGHT LANE 1864- —)

Franklin Knight Lane, born 1864 in Prince Edward’s Island, Canada, removed in childhood to California, where he was educated at the State University. After a successful career in the law he entered politics and became later a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, until appointed Secretary of the Interior by President Wilson.

#### WHY WE ARE AT WAR

157. 1. See *Flag Day Address*, Note 4.
158. 2. In the Revolution and the War of 1812.
160. 3. At the beginning of the ruthless submarine war by Germany von Bethmann-Hollweg explained that the reason it had not been entered upon earlier was because Germany was not ready. In other words, the promise to respect international law in this matter made by Germany at the time of the *Sussex* case was merely a dishonest piece of temporizing.
4. The Treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, so called by von Bethmann-Hollweg in a speech in the Reichstag at the opening of the war in 1914.

## Page

5. For the Zimmermann Note, see *War Message*, Note 22.

6. In the feudal system there was no such thing as political equality. The vassal was bound by fealty to his lord and forced to render certain dues including war-service. The lord did as he willed, the vassal had to serve him and obey.

161. 7. This is the German adaptation of the political maxim of absolutism, "The King can do no wrong." The Emperor who told his people that he ruled by divine right alone and not by the will and sanction of his people and parliament, still acted on this principle of irresponsibility.

8. On the departure of the German troops for China in July, 1900, the Emperor addressed them as follows:

"If you come to grips with him (the enemy) be assured quarter will not be given, no prisoners will be taken. Use your weapons in such a way that for a thousand years no Chinese shall dare to look upon a German askance. Show your manliness. . . . Open the way for Kultur once for all!"

ELIHU ROOT (1845- —)

Elihu Root, born 1845 in New York State, and graduated from Hamilton College in 1864, rose rapidly to recognition as one of the greatest legal minds of his day and one of the foremost interpreters of our Constitution. He filled with distinguished ability the posts of Secretary of War under President McKinley and Secretary of State under Roosevelt. In 1917 he was chosen by President Wilson as Head of the American Mission to Russia.

#### THE DUTIES OF THE CITIZEN

164. 1. See the Preamble to the Constitution, Appendix. Indeed, it will be well for the reader to read through the Constitution in connection with this address, made by one of its greatest interpreters.

2. Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

3. Constitution, Article II, Section 2.

165. 4. The Senate voted 82 to 6 for war and the House of Representatives, 373 to 50.

1. 5. This philosophy of the *Notrecht*, "Necessity knows no law," as Bethmann-Hollweg put it, had been expounded with favor by many of the leading German authorities on International Law. (See *International Law Imperilled*, by Prof. E. S. Corwin, in the *World Peril*, Princeton University Press, 1917.)

2. 6. The Tartar conqueror, 1162-1227.

4. 7. Frederick of Hohenzollern came into possession of Brandenburg by very questionable methods in 1411, but the real power of the house in Europe dates back only to the time of the Great Elector who ruled from 1640 to 1688. In the latter year the population of Prussia was 1,500,000.

8. Frederick the Great, whose principles were given by Mr Root in the quotation on page 172. Born 1712, he ruled from 1740 to 1786 and laid the foundations both of Germany's later power and her later international morality.

6. 9. This characteristically imperialistic pronouncement was made by the German Kaiser to an Englishman who reported it to the English statesman, Joseph Chamberlain: "If I had had a larger fleet I would have taken Uncle Sam by the scruff of the neck." Probably the statement was not made at the time of the Venezuelan Dispute; in any case, the Emperor was referring to the time of our war with Spain in 1898. (See *The Life and Letters of John Hay* by William Roscoe Thayer, Boston, 1915. Vol. II., Page 279.)

The Emperor's conduct in the Venezuelan Dispute was none the less interesting. In 1902 Venezuela owed Germany, England, and Italy considerable sums, which she was either unwilling or unable to pay. Germany and England broke off relations with her and established a "pacific blockade" of Venezuelan ports. John Hay, our Secretary of State, protested and England and Italy came to an understanding. Germany refused. She stated that if she took possession of territory, such possession would be "temporary." Such a threat of occupation of South American territory was a serious challenge to the Monroe Doctrine and President Roosevelt took up the challenge. He told Dr. Holleben, the German Ambassa-

## Page

dor, that unless Germany consented to arbitrate, Dewey's American squadron would in ten days be given orders to proceed to the coast of Venezuela and prevent any occupation. Roosevelt refused to argue the question. When a week later, Holleben called upon the President, Roosevelt inquired as he was leaving about Venezuela. When Holleben said he had received no word, Roosevelt said he would send Dewey one day sooner unless the Emperor agreed to arbitrate, within forty-eight hours. The Emperor agreed to do so the next day. (See *Life and Letters of Hay*, Vol. II; pp. 288-289.)

178. 10. In the Hague Peace Conference, at which the United State was represented, the rights and status of neutrals were defined.

## WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS

184. 1. German industries are organized into combinations called "Cartels" which have some of the characteristics both of our pools and trusts. The government consistently favored these Cartels in their efforts at home and also in their efforts to capture the foreign markets with subsidies direct or indirect. In many cases they were given especially low transportation rates over government owned or controlled railroad or steamship lines to foreign points, to enable them to get their goods there more cheaply than their competitors, the government accepting the loss in transportation charges. This led to the policy of "dumping" goods at points outside of Germany. This process of "dumping" goods in the United States and selling them cheaper in one section than another is forbidden by our anti-trust legislation. It was the basis of many indictments against the now discredited methods of the Standard Oil Company of former years. In fact, the German government acted like a gigantic trust and inaugurated a policy of "Cut-throat" international competition. Plans for economic domination after the war received much attention in Germany during the conflict. As Germany surmised that her traveling salesmen would not be welcome in Russia for some years after the war, it was reported on good authority that Russian prisoners were utilized to teach Russian to thousands of young women who were to act



ge

as agents for German companies after peace was declared. The German government in 1917 voted a large sum to German ship owners on condition that they build ships. Since the cost of construction was greater then than in peace times, the government agreed to give as rebate to the builders from fifty to seventy percent of this added cost.

2. Berlin to Bagdad railway. See Note 15, *Flag Day Speech*.

3. The Pan-German movement was a force in German politics, for at least two decades. It insisted upon a greater army and navy, and a policy of colonization and expansion directed toward world domination. It began to find its reflection in the speeches of Wilhelm II about 1896.

The designs of this very important party in Germany are best illustrated in the speeches of von Tirpitz, who loudly insisted upon annexation and indemnities for Germany both from the East and the West. They of course planned to retain Belgium.

4. Colonel E. M. House was head of the American Commission which arrived in London early in November, 1917, to take part in the Allied War Council to be held in Paris in that month. The Commission included Admiral Benson, Chief of Naval Operations, and General Bliss, Chief of War Operations, as well as representatives of the various war boards. In announcing the arrival of the Commission in London, Secretary of State Lansing was careful to emphasize that the Paris conference was primarily a war conference to bring about more effective coöperation of the Allies against the Central Powers.

5. In the autumn of 1917 a number of persons in various parts of the country were seized by mobs and submitted to punishment and indignities for supposed or real pacifist or Pro-German sentiments. The most striking case was probably that of the Rev. Herbert Bigelow who was severely maltreated and beaten in the neighborhood of Cincinnati by a body of masked men.

6. President Wilson doubtless had in mind groups like the Industrial Workers of the World, who in 1917 caused disturbances in various labor centers.



*In the notes to the Second War Message and Program of the World's Peace very liberal use has been made of the excellent material recently made available by the Committee on Public Information. The editor has drawn especially upon the information provided in the "War Cyclopedia," edited by Professors Frederick D. Paxson, Edward S. Corwin, and Samuel B. Harding; in "German War Practices, Parts I. and II.," by Professor Dana C. Munro, and in "Conquest and Kultur," by Professors Wallace Notestein and Elmer E. Stoll.*

## SECOND WAR MESSAGE

Page

- 195 1. Cf. *Macbeth*, Act V, Scene 5.  
 196 2. The aims and spirit of the more influential leaders in Germany in 1917 are shown in characteristic extracts like the following from the *Deutsche Tageszeitung*:

"Not courts of arbitration and paper treaties, but only an increase of power which will make us unconquerable in every direction can be the reward for these endless sacrifices."

- 197 3. The formula "no annexations, no indemnities" was used by Philip Scheidemann, one of the leaders of the German Social Democrats, and Matthias Erzberger of the Center Party. A resolution was passed by the Reichstag on July 9, 1917, which seemed to favor their idea, but any hope that might have been entertained from it was negated by the "rider" that "the German people . . . will fight until the rights of Germany and its allies to life and development are secured."

This resolution was passed in all probability as a concession to the German liberal parties for the purpose of influencing the impending Stockholm Conference which had been manipulated before its meetings were to begin, so that the pro-Germans counted on controlling 155 out of 202 prospective delegates. It was also made use of, as Trotzky declared, to deceive the Bolsheviki delegates at Brest-Litovsk. In spite of this statement of principles the Germans refused to evacuate Poland, Lithuania, Courland, and Esthonia and held that these powerless provinces occupied by German armies had already declared for Germany. The German government was openly and justly accused of double-dealing by the Bolsheviki delegates.

That the Chancellors Michaelis and von Hertling and their masters never intended to act honestly on this principle of "no

annexations and no indemnities" is evident from Michaelis's statement quoted at the close of Note 10 to the *Flag Day Address*.

4. The Belgian Government in 1917 issued a map showing the location of 43,000 estates destroyed by German orders. "By 66 separate decrees in less than two years the Germans seized many thousands of machines, countless machine tools, lathes, oils and fats, chemical and mineral products, wool, linen, jute, cotton, thread of all kinds, rubber, automobiles, locomotives, motors, horses and other animals, hides, and many other products, completely stripping Belgium." The ultimate purpose of these seizures is disclosed in a speech of Herr Beumer in the Prussian Diet February, 1917: "Anybody who knows the present state of things in Belgian industry will agree with me that it must take at least some years—assuming that Belgium is independent at all—before Belgium can even think of competing with us in the world market. And anybody who has traveled, as I have done, through the occupied districts of France will agree with me that so much damage has been done to industrial property that no one need be a prophet in order to say that it will take more than 10 years before we need think of France as a competitor or of the reestablishment of French industry." (*War Cyclopedia*, article "Belgium, Economic Destruction.") On reading the list of the articles requisitioned in Belgium by the German authorities it is difficult to see how the inhabitants of territory occupied by Germans could live on what had been left them.

5. This was part of the German plan of creating "Middle Europe." (Cf. *Flag Day Address*, pp. 144-146 and Notes 16 and 17 to that address; also Note 1 to *Program of the World's Peace*.)

6. The German army (February 1918) occupied about 12,500 square miles of French territory. How this was ruined and for what purpose is evident from Note 4 above.

7. According to the German Constitution the Emperor had the power to declare war when the war was defensive. The decision as to the character of any particular war was left with him.

Page

At the beginning of the late war he announced, August 6, 1914, "The enemy surprises us while we are entirely at peace. Therefore, to arms!" This fiction he attempted to maintain in spite of the palpable contradictions in Germany's attitude before the declaration of war and after. In 1917 a deputy in the Reichstag declared that a conference had been held at Potsdam on July 5, 1914, between Austrian and German dignitaries, who after considering the consequences determined to use the murder of the Archduke Ferdinand as a pretext to crush Serbia. (Cf. *Flag Day Address*, Note 14.) The German ambassador at Constantinople who had attended the conference reported it to the Italian ambassador at Constantinople, and to Mr. Morgenthau, the American ambassador. An account of what happened is given in the letters of Dr. Muehlon, a former director of Krupp's.

The attitude of a goodly portion of the dominant party in Germany was forcibly expressed by Karl A. Kuhn in *Die Wahren Ursachen des Kriegs* (The True Causes of the War), 1914, "Must Kultur rear its domes over mountains of corpses, oceans of tears, and the death rattle of the conquered? Yes, it must . . . The might of the conqueror is the highest law before which the conquered must bow." See also Notes 15 and 17, to Wilson's *War Message*.

201. 8. It is impossible to catalogue at all briefly the wrongs committed by Germany in this war. Two pamphlets issued by the government, *German War Practices*, Parts I and II, deal in detail only with wrongs committed on the Western Front. Some of the wrongs committed by Germany against the United States are mentioned in Wilson's *War Message* and *Flag Day Address* and their notes.

9. The Congress of Vienna, 1814-15, was called to rearrange the states of Europe after the fall of Napoleon. The representatives of the "great powers" or rather of the powerful rulers of Europe decided the questions before them in accordance only with dynastic aims and ambitions. The will of the inhabitants of any province, as well as the principle of nationality, was entirely disregarded. It was largely a series of trades of territory and compromises between jealous rulers, and it was

age

- opposed in spirit to the spread of democracy. The seeds of many of the wars in the nineteenth century were sown by this Congress and it is responsible for the sufferings of many of the oppressed nationalities.
2. 10. Cf. *War Message*, Note 15.
11. In reply to President Wilson's request of Dec. 18, 1916, the Allied Governments stated their terms of peace (Jan. 10, 1917) in general proposals which afforded a basis for negotiations: the Central Powers gave no statement of terms. (Cf. *A World League for Peace*, p. 102.) After Kerensky became head of the Russian government, July 20, 1917, he repeatedly urged the Allies to make a fuller and more definite statement. The present statement of President Wilson was followed early in January, 1918, by one from Lloyd George and on January 8 by another to the same end by President Wilson. (Cf. *Program of the World's Peace*, pp. 209-218.)
12. In the meantime German propaganda had been carried on in Russia most diligently. A trustworthy report from Washington announced that \$8,000,000 had been spent by Germany for this purpose. That the German government was actuated by no sympathy for Russia and proceeded for purely selfish reasons is plain from the fact that Trotzky himself accused them of double dealing. (Cf. Note 3 above.)
03. 13. Cf. *A World League for Peace*, p. 109.
14. At this time we had not declared war on Austria, Bulgaria, or Turkey.
15. Congress declared war on Austria-Hungary on Dec. 7, 1917.
04. 16. The Austrian army was brought largely under the control of Germany after its disastrous defeat by the Russians in 1915, after which it was stiffened by Prussian troops and officers. Germany's loans to Austria brought the latter still further under Prussian domination. The easy-going Austrian has nevertheless always detested the over-weening Prussian.
05. 17. Paragraphs 4607 ff of the Revised Statutes deal with the restrictions placed upon enemy aliens. Among other things they are forbidden to have arms or explosives in their possession, to approach arsenals, forts, munition works, etc., to publish

## Page

attacks on the government or its members, to abet hostile acts against the United States, or give its enemies information or aid and comfort.

18. The causes of the alarming rise in prices have been summarized as due to (1) increased foreign demand, (2) domestic hoarding, (3) speculation, (4) coöperation of sellers to push prices. Each rise in food prices was used as an excuse for a rise in the price of other commodities. The result was a scale of prices which worked hardship to the masses of the people and called for government intervention, for even in time of peace, businesses "affected with a public interest" are subject to regulation as to prices.

206. 19. This project has not yet received its final form.

20. Although this recommendation was not immediately carried out, the government fixed prices of commodities like steel and copper, and Mr. Steffinius was appointed purchasing agent.

21. On Dec. 26, President Wilson issued a proclamation stating that at noon of Dec. 28 the government would take over the railroads and that W. G. McAdoo had been appointed director-general.

207. 22. For a list of Germany's violations of international law and the laws of humanity see *German War Practices* published by the Committee on Public Information. These German outrages were the more distressing as they were not the acts of isolated individuals but the results of a deliberately ordered policy of inhumanity and terrorism. (Cf. also *War Message*, Note 24.)

23. Cf. the Zimmermann note, *War Message*, Note 22.

## PROGRAM OF THE WORLD'S PEACE

209. 1. In 1917 "Mittel-Europa" was an accomplished fact, militarily speaking. If Germany had not been defeated she would have emerged from the war the political and economic master of the territory stretching from Hamburg to Mesopotamia. To preserve these conquests was the object of her intrigues for peace. Germany had Montenegro, Albania, Serbia, most of Roumania, 161,556 square miles of Russia, nearly all of Belgium, 12,427 square miles of France, making 310,685 square



age

miles of conquered territory. In this territory she had "scientifically enslaved" 42,000,000 human beings, a large number of whom were forced to labor for her. She had seized the war material and the railroads; she had seized and taken away animals, grains, potatoes, sugar, alcohol, metals of many kinds, oils, textile fabrics, motors, machinery, rolling mills, electrical engines, looms, etc. She had helped herself to the personal property of the inhabitants—tapestries, rugs, pictures, jewels, securities, etc. By her system of loans to her allies she had brought Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey absolutely under her control. These countries owe Germany not only the money advanced to them but enormous sums for war material as yet unpaid for. This control meant that she would have a monopoly in exploiting the great resources of the Balkan States and Asia Minor. Further, her position in Middle Europe and Constantinople would force the economic subordination of Russia, whose resources she would exploit.

"Germany has really wrung from the war present and future profits which can be computed only in *hundreds of billions of francs*. This war therefore has brought Germany boundless material gain such as no war in history has ever brought to one people.

"German victory and the fruition of her most important war advantages depend directly on the maintenance of Central Pan-Germany, made up of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Turkey. Now, this maintenance is based on two prime conditions: (1) The continuance of Serbia's state of subjection to Austria-Hungary. (2) The preservation of the new economic and military lines of communication between Berlin on the one side and Vienna, Budapest, Sofia, and Constantinople on the other . . . Finally, if the present order of things is preserved, Germany can maintain the Hamburg-Bagdad line. This would be assured by the adoption of the formula 'peace without indemnities and annexations.' " (Chéradame, in *Atlantic Monthly*, November, 1917.)

Reread also *Flag Day Address*, pp. 144-149.

2. On Dec. 15, 1917, an armistice was signed between Ger-



## Page

many and the Bolsheviki Government at Brest-Litovsk and peace negotiations were begun on Dec. 23. These were broken off for the reasons given in Note 3 to Wilson's *Second War Message*. The armistice was however renewed in January, 1918, the Bolsheviki doubtless hoping that the bad faith of the German officials would bring an effective protest from the German people. In this hope they were disappointed.

3. In addition to "no annexations and no indemnities" the Bolsheviki delegates insisted on the "right of self-determination" for all subject nationalities. That is, the people of any province, Poland, for instance, should be allowed to determine the character of their government, and whether they should be independent or incorporate themselves with others. To do this therefore they would have to be unmolested, and the Bolsheviki demanded that the German troops evacuate the Russian occupied territory. This the Germans refused to do. (Cf. Note 3 to *Second War Message*.) The Germans likewise refused to allow the transfer of the negotiations to Stockholm, where the Russians doubtless felt they would be freer than in their own occupied territory.

The Bolsheviki could not be recognized as the regularly constituted government of Russia since they arrived at power by overthrowing the ministry established by the Russian Duma and forced the Constituent Assembly, which alone had authority to ratify or constitute a government, to disperse (Dec. 11, 1917). For this reason as well as the patent bad faith of the Central Powers none of the Allies sent representatives to the Congress.

210. 4. Representatives were present from Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria as well as from Germany, though the former, as in other matters of policy, seem to have been entirely dominated by the German representatives. These included General von Hoffmann, Military Commander of the District, and von Kühlmann, the German Foreign Secretary. It is evident that they did not speak in the spirit of liberalism.

211. 5. Cf. in this volume *A World League for Peace* (pp. 102-

ge  
112), *War Message* (p. 137), *Reply to the Pope* (pp. 151-155), *Second War Message* (pp. 194-203).

6. Lloyd George's address delivered only a few days before President Wilson's present speech was so similar in spirit that it was at first stated that the two had consulted with each other. It appears now that there had been no consultation and that each was merely expressing the fundamental principles of those who combat Prussian militarism. The two are agreed on practically all points though President Wilson expressed a more hopeful and sympathetic attitude toward the present revolutionary government of Russia.

7. On Nov. 2, 1917, Kerensky announced that Russia had done her work in the war and was worn out. After that the disintegration of her political and industrial life was rapid and she seemed to be warding off collapse with difficulty.

8. Cf. *War Message* and Notes.

9. Cf. *A World League for Peace*, pp. 108-109.

10. Germany had always opposed arbitration and disarmament. She was the one great power which had steadily refused to sign an arbitration treaty with the United States. Not only have her influential writers and statesmen glorified war but the former Emperor himself had done so. His was the most serious opposition encountered at the Hague Peace Conferences. Andrew D. White, late Ambassador to Germany, reports in his *Autobiography*, Vol. II, p. 265, "He (Count Münster, chairman of the German delegation) insisted that arbitration must be injurious to Germany; that *Germany is prepared for war as no other country is or can be; that she can mobilize her army in ten days; and that neither France, Russia, nor any other power can do this. Arbitration, he said, would simply give rival powers time to put themselves in readiness, and would therefore be a great disadvantage to Germany.*"

11. No accredited spokesman for Germany had yet announced Germany's willingness to withdraw from Belgium. Her plans are best seen in the following interview between our ex-Ambassador James W. Gerard and von Bethmann-Hollweg:

Page

“Finally in January, 1917, when he (Bethmann-Hollweg) was again talking of peace, I said, ‘What are these peace terms to which you refer continually? Will you allow me to ask a few questions as to the specific terms of peace? First, are the Germans willing to withdraw from Belgium?’ The chancellor answered, ‘Yes, but with guarantees.’ I said, ‘What are these guarantees?’ He said, ‘We must positively have the forts of Liege and Namur; we must have other forts and garrisons throughout Belgium. We must have possession of the railroad lines. We must have possession of the ports and other means of communication. The Belgians will not be allowed to maintain an army, but we must have the commercial control of Belgium.’ I said, ‘I do not see that you have left much for the Belgians except that King Albert will have the right to reside in Brussels with an honor guard.’ And the chancellor said, ‘We can not allow Belgium to be an outpost of England’; and I said, ‘I do not suppose the English, on the other hand, wish it to become an outpost of Germany, especially as von Tirpitz has said that the coast of Flanders should be retained in order to make war on England and America.’ I continued, ‘How about northern France?’ He said, ‘We are willing to leave northern France, but there must be a rectification of the frontier.’ ” (James W. Gerard: *My Four Years in Germany*, 1917, pp. 365-366.)

12. Alsace-Lorraine, rich provinces belonging to France previous to 1870, contain 5,604 square miles of territory and a population of 1,874,014. After the Franco-Prussian War Germany took the provinces as a part of the price of peace, despite the protest of the inhabitants. They were at once made imperial territory, directly subject to the German Emperor and the Federal Council. The so-called constitution of 1911 did not improve the strained relations between the provinces and the Government, which throughout **had** been unable to reconcile a large portion of the inhabitants or to prevent them from showing their attachment to France on every occasion.

216 13. The districts around Trent and Trieste to the north of Italy are mainly or in part Italian in population, and since the

Page

founding of the present Kingdom of Italy (1861) attempts have been made to incorporate these Italian districts into the kingdom.

216 14. At this time the Czechs (Bohemians) in Austria and the Jugo-Slavs in Hungary were very seriously discriminated against and deprived of their national rights.

15. At present Serbia has no seaport. (Cf. Article II, p. 214.)

16. Cf. *A World League for Peace*, page 108.

## ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

219 1. The Austrian communications throughout 1918 seem to have been couched in more conciliatory terms than the German. Until October, however, it is plain that Austria was acting in concert with the Berlin government. Indeed, sometimes it would seem as if she acted at the suggestion, if not the dictation, of Germany. Austria, however, was more anxious for peace, because of her serious internal situation, which was worse than Germany's, both on the economic and the political side. In addition to the distress due to lack of textiles and food, the discontent was very marked among the population, and especially among the peoples of the oppressed nationalities, particularly the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs. The failure of the Austrian offensive along the Piave in the early summer of 1918 made it plain that Austria must grow weaker the longer the war continued. This being the case, she was anxious to have peace negotiations started even before they were begun by Germany.

220 2. It was announced in the press that Count Czernin had declared that he had communicated the substance of his address to President Wilson before it was delivered. The President disclaims any such advance knowledge, and probably wishes to make it plain here that he does not care to discuss such matters privately. To do so would be in contradiction with Article I of his *Program of the World's*

Page

*Peace* which insists upon "open covenants of peace," and that diplomacy shall proceed always "frankly and in the public view."

3. The time has not come to write the history of the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. It should be said, however, that that peace was not made with the Russian people or their representatives, but with the leaders of the Bolshevik Party, who had driven out the Kerensky government and dispersed the delegates to the Constituent Assembly. There is also unfortunately a suspicion that there was a certain amount of collusion and fraud with regard to the negotiations. The Bolshevik leaders issued an invitation to the Entente Allies to participate in the negotiations and submitted certain principles, such as the recognition of the right to self-determination of peoples and no annexations or indemnities, and that all negotiations should be conducted in the open. These the representatives of the German civil power announced that they accepted. The Allies refused to participate. The negotiations were ostensibly carried on in the open, though there was a suspicion at the time that dust was being thrown into the eyes of the public. It was apparent after the conclusion of the peace that the principles had not been adhered to, that the German military authorities were imposing their own terms, and it was suspected that in spite of all the publicity there were secret articles to the conventions. This suspicion became a certainty when, in late September, 1918, at the sitting of the Main Committee of the Reichstag, the socialist Scheidemann criticized the government for the "treaties supplementary to the Brest-Litovsk convention," and announced that it was characteristic that Dr. Solf, who was a member of the government at that time, knew nothing of these treaties. It is plain therefore that the secret articles were not only hidden from the general public but even from certain members of the civil power of Germany.

222 4. See Note 9 to page 201, *Second War Message*.

5. The Reichstag passed a resolution on July 19, 1917, announcing that Germany had taken up arms in defense of



Page

its liberty and independence and for the integrity of its territories. It contained the following phrases: "The Reichstag labors for peace and a mutual understanding and lasting reconciliation among the nations. Forced acquisitions of territory and political, economic, and financial violations are incompatible with such a peace." When a little later, through the collapse of Russia, possibilities of annexation and the violation of these principles appeared at Brest-Litovsk and at Bucharest (when peace was forced upon Roumania), these resolutions were disregarded without, it must be said, any serious protests from the Reichstag itself.

224 6. To interfere in European affairs would be a violation of the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. President Wilson has made it plain that we were forced to enter the war against the Central Powers. We did so with no desire of territorial or other gain. He had, however, also insisted that we were interested in securing a lasting peace and that territorial questions must therefore be settled in such a way as not to leave the seeds for future wars.

225 7. From the first President Wilson had insisted upon the necessity of an independent Poland.\* See *A World League for Peace* which in January, 1917, called for "a united, independent, and autonomous Poland" (page 108). This demand is repeated again in the *Program of the World's Peace*, Article XIII, page 216.

#### THE END OF SELFISH DOMINION

229 1. Congress declared war on Germany April 6, 1917.

2. This address was delivered by President Wilson at the opening of the campaign for the Third Liberty Loan.

231 3. The German peace proposals on December 12, 1916, which were addressed to all the belligerents, make this statement. It is also implied in the Reichstag Resolution of July 19, 1917. On September 15, 1918, the Austro-Hungarian government sent a note to all the belligerent governments asking them "to send delegates to a confi-



Page

dential and unbinding discussion on the basic principles for the conclusion of peace." This action was taken with the approval of Germany, and in Germany's reply to the note of her ally she announced her willingness to do this. Within an hour of the time that the Austro-Hungarian note was received at Washington, President Wilson answered:

"The Government of the United States feels that there is only one reply which it can make to the suggestion of the Imperial Austro-Hungarian Government. It has repeatedly and with entire candor stated the terms upon which the United States would consider peace and can and will entertain no proposal for a conference upon a matter concerning which it has made its position and purpose so plain."

4. The German Chancellor, Count von Hertling, replied to President Wilson's speech of January 8, 1918, on January 24. President Wilson summarized that reply in his speech of February 11. The general tone of Hertling's reply was far from conciliatory and, as the President said though he seemed to agree to the principles, in almost every case his suggested application of these principles belied the principles themselves. He announced agreement with the policy of no forcible annexations, but refused to give up Alsace-Lorraine and removed the "Belgian affair" from the entire discussion. With regard to France, he said that the evacuation "must take account of Germany's vital interests" and with regard to points 9, 10, 11, and 12 he left those to Austria-Hungary and Turkey to be decided only by the powers concerned. He announced that the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk were "conducted with full publicity" (see Note 3 to page 222, *Message to Congress*).

5. After the Central Powers had made peace with the Bolshevik Government and with the Ukraine, Roumania was cut off from her allies and forced to conclude peace at Bucharest on May 6, 1918. By this peace she was despoiled of her rich province Dobrudja, part of which was given to Bulgaria, and the Germans set up a condominium over the

Page

most important part between Constanza and the mouths of the Danube. This gave her control of the pipe lines to the rich Roumanian oil fields, which Roumania was forced to lease to her for ninety-nine years. In addition Austria took for herself stretches along the previous Roumanian frontier, including the Carpathian passes. She was "compensated" by being allowed to unite with Bessarabia, which had formerly been part of Russia, and whose National Assembly had voted for union with Roumania. The attitude of the Roumanians is well represented in the statement of General Averescu, the Prime Minister:

"If Roumania accepts the humiliating German peace terms and is ready to yield to her enemies the dearest part of her territory, she does it not only to spare the lives of the remnants of her army, but for the sake of her Allies, too. If Roumania refuses the German conditions today she may be able to resist another month, but the results will be fatal. A month later she might have to lose even the shadow of independence which is left to her now; and then, no doubt, the Germans would deal with her in the same way as they dealt with occupied France and with Belgium. The whole Roumanian army would be made prisoners, and would be sent to work on the western front against the Allies, while the civilian population would be compelled to work in ammunition and other factories for the Kaiser's army. I fought in the ranks in 1877 to help my country to win the Dobrudja. You may imagine how I feel now, having to sign the treaty which gives it to our worst enemies. But we are compelled to amputate an important part of our body in order to save the rest of it. However painful it may be, we are bound to do it."

With the collapse of Bulgaria in September, 1918, and the advance of the allied armies in the Balkans, the position of Roumania was much improved, and it was evident that the shameful peace forced upon her could not be maintained.

233

6. See President Wilson's Address of January 8, 1918.

Page

7. President Wilson was doubtless thinking not only of the peace of Brest-Litovsk (see Note 3 to President Wilson's *Reply to Chancellor von Hertling and Count Czernin*) but also of Germany's selfish and rapacious conduct in the East and in the Baltic provinces after the conclusion of that peace.

#### THE MOUNT VERNON ADDRESS

- 236 1. It was at Runnymede, an island in the Thames, that the English Barons in 1215 forced King John to agree to and sign the *Magna Charta*, or Great Charter which was the foundation of English liberty and one of the great steps in the creation of modern democracy. The Barons, as the President says, were acting for the whole of England, and the rights they won were extended to all. One of its famous provisions laid the basis of the English judicial system and ran: "No free man shall be seized, or imprisoned, or dispossessed, or outlawed, or in any way brought to ruin. We will not go against any man, save by legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." Another article ran: "To no man will we sell, or deny, or delay right or justice." In addition, the great reforms of the past reigns were recognized and the basis laid on which rests English parliamentary life. The rights which the Barons claimed for themselves they claimed for the nation at large.
- 237 2. Diplomatic representatives of the foreign nations were present at the ceremony.
- 238 3. This article was specifically quoted in President Wilson's note to the German Government, October 14, 1918, in reply to their request for an armistice.
- 239 4. Note that all of these articles, like those of the January 8 speech, have to do with the rights and status of nations. Indeed, it would seem that as the war progressed it became clear that the questions at issue really centered in the one problem of the rights and duties of nations great and small. In fact just as the Wars of Religion were fought to determine the rights to freedom of conscience, and were

Page

to lay the basis out of which the idea of religious liberty and toleration was finally to spring, and thus complete the work of the Reformation, so this war also would seem to end that period in history which marked the growth of nationalities and their final arrival at independence.

#### PEACE WITH JUSTICE

240 1. Although the Fourth Liberty Loan was the largest loan ever called for by a government from its people, the results justified the President's confidence. The amount, \$6,000,000,000, was oversubscribed.

243 2. For the peace of Brest-Litovsk, see Note 3 in President Wilson's *Reply to Chancellor von Hertling and Count Czernin*.

3. For the peace of Bucharest, see Note 5 to President Wilson's Speech *The End of Selfish Dominion*, April 6, 1918.

4. Our inability to deal with the then "monarchical autocrats" of Germany is brought out very plainly in the concluding sentences of President Wilson's *Reply to the German Government* of October 23, 1918, in the negotiations for an armistice.

244 5. A League of Nations was one of the central points in every one of President Wilson's statements on peace from the time of his address to the Senate of Jan. 22, 1917. It means the final abandonment of any idea of "balance of power," for which he would substitute a "concert of power." This idea received widespread acceptance among allied statesmen, though there seemed to be no agreement on the terms of Germany's admittance to such a League. Some held that the League should be started by the present allied powers, and that other nations, especially Germany, were to be admitted only as they proved themselves qualified for membership. A treatise on *The League of Nations* was published by Viscount Edward Grey in June, 1918, and the House of Lords late in that month debated and approved the idea.

6. The phrase "no annexations and no indemnities" seems to have originated with the people. It was heard in socialist circles and then re-echoed in Russia where it was made a slogan before the peace of Brest-Litovsk.

7. Such demands were frequently made in Parliament by members of the British Labor Party; and in the French Chamber of Deputies by the Socialists. The Socialist and Labor Parties of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium issued a pamphlet, "A Clean Peace," on their terms of peace along the general line here indicated. They accepted the four articles of President Wilson's *Reply to Chancellor von Hertling and Count Czernin*, and also insisted on enforcing Wilson's idea of "making the world safe for democracy." Attempts were frequently made to bring about meetings of all socialists of belligerent nations beginning with the Stockholm Conference. These were unsuccessful largely because of the suspicion, seemingly warranted, that the German government was using the socialist party as a cat's-paw to obtain its ends.

#### ATTITUDE OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARD MEXICO

250 1. From the beginning of President Wilson's administration, Mexico had been in a state of turmoil, which at times assumed proportions of serious civil war. In 1913 the United States had refused to recognize General Huerta, who after the murder of President Madero had made himself military dictator. There was much disorder and marauding by armed bands of guerillas, besides the armed factions who were fighting for the control of the Government. This resulted in the death of a number of American citizens and in the loss of much American property. President Wilson, however, refused to intervene, though an important element in the United States was urging that this be done in order to protect the interests of United States citizens in Mexico. The President announced that his policy was one of "watch-

ful waiting." With regard to this policy General Carranza's legal representative at Washington was to announce on November 2, 1917, "I do not hesitate to say, now that we see it in retrospect, that the policy pursued by President Wilson was the only one that could have produced the re-establishment of constitutional government in Mexico, and it has already proved to be the biggest asset the United States has in Mexico."

This refusal to intervene in Mexican affairs or to take advantage of Mexico's disorganization also contributed to win back for the United States much of the good will of South American countries which had been alienated by our action in Panama before the building of the Panama Canal.

2. On April 9, 1914, a party of American bluejackets, who in a launch flying the United States flag, had landed at Tampico to purchase gasoline, were arrested by troops of General Huerta. They were released soon after. Admiral Mayo demanded that as the American flag had been insulted a salute should be fired to the flag. President Wilson insisted to Huerta on April 18 that this must be done. Huerta was obdurate. While the matter was pending, President Wilson ordered the seizure of the customs at Vera Cruz to prevent ammunition on board a German steamer from being landed, and Vera Cruz was occupied by American troops. The diplomatic representatives of the A B C powers (Argentina, Brazil, and Chile) were requested to join a conference as mediators. The United States troops withdrew on November 23. General Huerta was rapidly losing his power, and left Mexico for Spain though the situation was not much improved by his departure, owing mainly to dissensions between Generals Carranza and Villa, who had previously worked together for the Constitutionalist Party. In January, 1916, Villa's band stopped a train, took off nineteen Americans, and after lining them up against a wall, shot them. He was now acting like an outlaw and desperado, and on March 9 crossed the border into New Mexico at Colum-



Page

bus, sacked and looted the town, and killed eleven civilians and nine troopers. Serious difficulties arose with General Carranza, who was head of the *de facto* government, when the United States asked permission to pursue Villa on Mexican territory. In spite of serious objections by General Carranza an understanding was finally reached and an American force under General Pershing was sent across the border to capture Villa, since Carranza was unable to maintain order. American troops therefore entered Mexico and continued their pursuit of Villa. He withdrew to the interior of Mexico for the rest of the year and remained at large. Important contingents of the United States National Guard were ordered to the Mexican border to maintain order.

- 251 3. There was not the slightest doubt about the activity of German spies in Mexico or their attempt to start trouble between that country and ourselves. In January, 1915, German agents began intriguing with General Huerta, the unsuccessful claimant to the Mexican presidency. When Huerta sailed from Spain to New York, von Rintelen, a German of high rank and friend of the Crown Prince, met him there. Huerta proposed an invasion of Mexico. Von Rintelen agreed to furnish him arms, ammunition, and possibly German reservists. It was hoped to start trouble in Mexico and then unite Mexico against the United States. Such a war would have tied up the oil wells at Tampico, from which the British navy draws supplies, and would have kept the United States so busy that it could not allow the exportation of arms to Europe. It would further have compelled the United States to keep hands off in Europe. Huerta started west, pretending to visit the San Francisco Exposition, but when he turned south toward El Paso he was arrested by United States Government agents. After that time there followed a series of plots by Germans to stir up trouble for us in Mexico. Several Mexican newspapers were said to be in the pay of the German Government, and the German propaganda was very active in every way.

How active these German spies were, we may judge from the fact that the notorious Zimmermann note (see note 22 to page 136 on President Wilson's *War Message*) was addressed to the German minister in Mexico. In a letter dated March 8, 1916, which has been made public by the State Department, the German minister to Mexico, Herr von Eckhart, wrote the German chancellor, asking him to reward Herr Folke Cronholm, the Swedish chargé d'affaires in Mexico City, for his services in behalf of Germany. "He is," the letter ran, "the only diplomat through whom information from the hostile camp can be obtained. Moreover, he acts as intermediary for official intercourse between the legation and your excellency." Herr von Eckhart recommended, however, that Herr Cronholm's reward, which was to be some sort of decoration, be kept secret till the close of the war in order to avoid suspicion.

2 4. President Wilson had opened the Red Cross Campaign for funds with a speech in the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City, in which he had said that the United States was not going to withhold its assistance from Russia.

4 5. We have seen that in the famous message of President Monroe he had stated that it was a principle of American policy not to meddle in European affairs, and had given warning that any attempt on the part of the monarchies of Europe "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere would be considered by the United States as dangerous to our peace and safety." The message also stated that the American continent was no longer subject to colonization. This action had been taken by the United States independent of the South American powers. President Wilson was now urging that the Monroe Doctrine be accepted as a principle by all of the American peoples and that measures be taken to enforce it against any one, even ourselves, who might try to infringe it.

## THE END OF THE WAR

257 1. On October 6, 1918, the German government sent a communication to President Wilson in which it announced its readiness to make peace on the basis of the terms laid down by him in the speech of January 8 and his subsequent addresses. After the exchange of several notes in which Germany gave assurances that a new government, controlled by the people, was in power and that they accepted these terms not merely for purposes of discussion, but in order to agree upon the practical details of their application, the correspondence was turned over to the Supreme War Council and Germany was instructed that the military details of the armistice would have to be arranged with Marshal Foch. The German delegates met General Foch and the allied representatives behind the French lines and accepted the terms of the armistice on November 11. Later in the day President Wilson announced this momentous event to the assembled Congress in the present address.

2. At this point the President read to Congress the terms of the armistice as they had been decided upon before Marshal Foch met the German representatives. The terms as announced by the President had been slightly altered in some respects during the conference between General Foch and the German delegates, and were not therefore in all points similar to the President's announcement. They included immediate cessation of hostilities six hours after the signing, immediate evacuation of all the invaded countries, including Alsace-Lorraine, to be completed within fifteen days, and the repatriation within the same period of all inhabitants of occupied territory. The German armies were to surrender 5,000 guns, 30,000 machine guns, 3,000 minenwerfers, 2,000 aeroplanes, a great quantity of railroad equipment, locomotives, and motor lorries. They were also to return without reciprocity all allied and United States prisoners of war. They were furthermore to evacuate all territory up to the Rhine and allow Allied and United States garrisons to hold the principal crossings. On the

age

right bank of the Rhine, they were to leave a neutral zone of ten kilometers. With regard to the naval conditions, Germany was to surrender all of her submarines, 50 destroyers, 6 battle cruisers, 10 battleships, 8 light cruisers, and other miscellaneous vessels.

Germany on the financial side was to make restitution for all damage done by the German army and to return immediately all the financial resources touching public or private interests in the invaded countries. She was also to abandon the treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk, withdraw all her troops and agents from Roumania and Russia, and give the Allies free access to the territories evacuated.

58

3. The internal situation was evidently giving great concern to the German government, which changed very rapidly. The German Emperor left the country and crossed the frontier into Holland. The heads of the lesser German states likewise gave up their thrones. Prince Maximilian of Baden, who had been Chancellor when the negotiations regarding the armistice began, resigned and seemed finally to have been succeeded by the socialist Ebert. Disorders were reported in various parts of Germany, though at this time they were probably not so serious as announced in the press. The food situation was acute and German women issued appeals to Miss Jane Addams and to Mrs. Woodrow Wilson to alleviate the distress in Germany. The Allies and the President had promised that this would be done, and Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, the National Food Administrator who had been so successful in Belgium and in the United States, immediately left for Europe to investigate the food situation there.

59

4. It was plain that we were no longer dealing with William II. In the first days after the signing of the armistice the changes in the German government were very rapid, and of course it would necessarily be a long time before the German constitution would be changed and before it would be known what the form of the new German government would be.

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE (1863-—)

David Lloyd George was born, 1863, in Manchester, England, of Welsh parentage, and was educated for the law. He was President of the Board of Trade, 1905-1908, and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1908-1915. Long before the outbreak of the war he was recognized as one of the leaders in the liberal movement in England. In 1915 he was made Minister of Munitions, in 1916 Secretary of State for War, and then Premier. His speeches are distinguished by their clearness of vision and tonic, optimistic spirit, as well as by their forceful, original, incisive manner of statement.

MEANING OF AMERICA'S ENTRANCE INTO THE WAR

App.

1. See President Wilson's *War Message*, April 2, 1917.
2. Against Denmark for a portion of her territory, 1864; against Austria, to establish Prussian supremacy over the German States, 1866; against France, for Alsace-Lorraine and a huge indemnity, 1870.
3. The Kaiser in his speeches to his troops always impressed them with the idea of their invincibility. In them occur phrases such as: "The only pillar on which the Empire rested was the army. So it is today." (Oct. 18, 1894.)
4. Since the early sixties the main interest of the rulers of Germany was in the development of the army, and since the nineties, of the army and navy.
5. With respect to the French Colonies in Africa Germany's course was that of a swaggering bully and both in 1905 and 1911 she seemed to have brought France to the verge of war. On the latter occasion she forced France to a humiliating cession of African territory. That Germany did not precipitate actual war was looked upon as a regrettable weakness by many leaders of German opinion.
6. Deleassé, in connection with the African Colonies question (see note 5), was driven from his position as French Minister of Foreign Affairs by the Germans.
7. Battle of Vimy Ridge, April 9, 1917.

# BRITAIN'S WAR AIMS NEWLY DEFINED

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

[ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE TRADE UNION CONFERENCE  
ON MAN POWER, JANUARY 5, 1918.]

When the Government invite organized labor in this country to assist them to maintain the might of their armies in the field, its representatives are entitled to ask that any misgivings and doubts which any of them may have about the purpose to which this precious strength is to be applied should be definitely cleared. And what is true of organized labor is equally true of all citizens in this country, without regard to grade or avocation.

When men by the million are being called upon to suffer and die, and vast populations are being subjected to sufferings and privations of war on a scale unprecedented in the history of the world, they are entitled to know for what cause or causes they are making the sacrifice.

It is only the clearest, greatest, and justest of causes that can justify the continuance, even for one day, of this unspeakable agony of the nation, and we ought to be able to state clearly and definitely not only the principles for which we are fighting, but also their definite and concrete application to the war map of the world.

We have arrived at the most critical hour in this terrible conflict, and before any Government takes a fateful decision as to the conditions under which it ought either to terminate or to continue the struggle, it ought to be satisfied that the conscience of the nation is behind these conditions, for nothing else can sustain the effort which is necessary to achieve a righteous end to this war.

I have, therefore, during the last few days taken special pains to ascertain the view and attitude of representative men of all sections of thought and opinion in the country.

Last week I had the privilege not merely of perusing the



declared war aims of the Labor Party, but also of discussing in detail with labor leaders the meaning and intention of that declaration.

I have also had opportunity of discussing this same momentous question with Mr. Asquith and Viscount Grey. Had it not been that the Nationalist leaders are in Ireland engaged in endeavoring to solve the tangled problem of Irish self-government, I should have been happy to exchange views with them, but Mr. Redmond, speaking on their behalf, has, with his usual lucidity and force, in many of his speeches made clear what his ideas are as to the object and purpose of the war. I have also had an opportunity of consulting certain representatives of the great dominions overseas.

I am glad to be able to say, as a result of all these discussions, that, although the Government are alone responsible for the actual language I purpose using, there is a national agreement as to the character and purpose of our war aims and peace conditions, and in what I say to you today, and through you to the world, I can venture to claim that I am speaking not merely the mind of the Government, but of the nation and of the empire as a whole.

We may begin by clearing away some misunderstandings and stating what we are not fighting for.

We are not fighting a war of aggression against the German people. Their leaders have persuaded them that they are fighting a war of self-defense against a league of rival nations, bent on the destruction of Germany. That is not so. The destruction or disruption of Germany or the German people has never been a war aim with us from the first day of this war to this day.

Most reluctantly, and indeed quite unprepared for the dreadful ordeal, we were forced to join in this war, in self-defense of the violated public law of Europe and in vindication of the most solemn treaty obligations on which the public system of Europe rested and on which Germany had ruthlessly trampled in her invasion of Belgium. We had to join in the struggle or stand aside and see Europe go under and brute force triumph over public right and international justice.

It was only the realization of that dreadful alternative that

forced the British people into the war, and from that original attitude they have never swerved. They have never aimed at a breakup of the German people or the disintegration of their State or country. Germany has occupied a great position in the world. It is not our wish or intention to question or destroy that position for the future, but rather to turn her aside from hopes and schemes of military domination.

Nor did we enter this war merely to alter or destroy the imperial Constitution of Germany, much as we consider that military and autocratic Constitution a dangerous anachronism in the twentieth century. Our point of view is that the adoption of a really democratic Constitution by Germany would be the most convincing evidence that her old spirit of military domination has, indeed, died in this war and would make it much easier for us to conclude a broad, democratic peace with her. But, after all, that is a question for the German people to decide.

We are not fighting to destroy Austria-Hungary or to deprive Turkey of its capital or the rich lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish.

It is now more than a year since the President of the United States, then neutral, addressed to the belligerents a suggestion that each side should state clearly the aims for which they were fighting.

We and our allies responded by the note of Jan. 10, 1917.

To the President's appeal the Central Empires made no reply, and in spite of many abjurations, both from their opponents and from neutrals, they have maintained complete silence as to the objects for which they are fighting. Even on so crucial a matter as their intention with regard to Belgium they have uniformly declined to give any trustworthy indication.

On Dec. 25 last, however, Count Czernin, speaking on behalf of Austria-Hungary and her allies, did make a pronouncement of a kind. It is, indeed, deplorably vague.

We are told that it is not the intention of the Central Powers to appropriate forcibly any occupied territory or to rob of its independence any nation which has lost its political independence during the war.

It is obvious that almost any scheme of conquest and annexation could be perpetrated within the literal interpretation of such a pledge. Does it mean that Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania will be as independent and as free to direct their own destinies as Germany or any other nation? Or does it mean that all manner of interferences and restrictions, political and economical, incompatible with the status and dignity of free and self-respecting people, are to be imposed? If this is the intention, then there will be one kind of independence for the great nation and an inferior kind of independence for the small nation.

We must know what is meant, for equality of right among the nations, small as well as great, is one of the fundamental issues this country and her allies are fighting to establish in this war.

Reparation for the wanton damage inflicted on Belgian towns and villages and their inhabitants is emphatically repudiated. The rest of the so-called offer of the Central Powers is almost entirely a refusal of all concessions. All suggestions about the autonomy of subject nationalities are ruled out of the peace terms altogether. The question whether any form of self-government is to be given to the Arabs, Armenians, or Syrians is declared to be entirely a matter for the Sublime Porte. A pious wish for the protection of minorities, "in so far as it is practically realizable," is the nearest approach to liberty which the Central statesmen venture to make.

On one point only are they perfectly clear and definite. Under no circumstances will the German demand for the restoration of the whole of Germany's colonies be departed from. All principles of self-determination, or, as our earlier phrase goes, government by the consent of the governed, here vanish into thin air.

It is impossible to believe that any edifice of permanent peace could be erected on such a foundation as this. Mere lip-service to the formula of no annexations and no indemnities or the right of self-determination is useless. Before any negotiations can even be begun the Central Powers must realize the essential facts of the situation.

The days of the Treaty of Vienna are long past. We can no longer submit the future of European civilization to the arbitrary decisions of a few negotiators trying to secure by chicanery or persuasion the interests of this or that dynasty or nation.

The settlement of the new Europe must be based on such grounds of reason and justice as will give some promise of stability. Therefore, it is that we feel that government with the consent of the governed must be the basis of any territorial settlement in this war. For that reason, also, unless treaties be upheld, unless every nation is prepared, at whatever sacrifices, to honor the national signature, it is obvious that no treaty of peace can be worth the paper on which it is written.

The first requirement, therefore, always put forward by the British Government and their allies has been the complete restoration, political, territorial, and economic, of independence of Belgium and such reparation as can be made for the devastation of its towns and provinces.

This is no demand for a war indemnity, such as that imposed on France by Germany in 1871. It is not an attempt to shift the cost of warlike operations from one belligerent to another, which may or may not be defensible. It is no more and no less than an insistence that before there can be any hope for stable peace, this great breach of the public law of Europe must be repudiated and so far as possible repaired.

Reparation means recognition. Unless international right is recognized by insistence on payment for injury, done in defiance of its canons, it can never be a reality.

Next comes the restoration of Serbia, Montenegro, and the occupied parts of France, Italy, and Rumania. The complete withdrawal of the allied (Teutonic) armies, and the reparation for injustice done is a fundamental condition of permanent peace.

We mean to stand by the French democracy to the death in the demand it makes for a reconsideration of the great wrong of 1871, when without any regard to the wishes of the population, two French provinces were torn from the side of France and incorporated in the German Empire.

This sore has poisoned the peace of Europe for half a century, and, until it is cured, healthful conditions will not have

been restored. There can be no better illustration of the folly and wickedness of using a transient military success to violate national right.

I will not attempt to deal with the question of the Russian territories now in German occupation. The Russian policy since the revolution has passed so rapidly through so many phases that it is difficult to speak without some suspension of judgment as to what the situation will be when the final terms of European peace come to be discussed.

Russia accepted war with all its horrors because, true to her traditional guardianship of the weaker communities of her race, she stepped in to protect Serbia from a plot against her independence. It is this honorable sacrifice which not merely brought Russia into the war, but France as well.

France, true to the conditions of her treaty with Russia, stood by her ally in a quarrel which was not her own. Her chivalrous respect for her treaty led to the wanton invasion of Belgium, and the treaty obligations of Great Britain to that little land brought us into the war.

The present rulers of Russia are now engaged, without any reference to the countries whom Russia brought into the war, in separate negotiations with their common enemy. I am indulging in no reproaches. I am merely stating the facts with a view to making it clear why Great Britain cannot be held accountable for decisions taken in her absence and concerning which she has not been consulted or her aid invoked.

No one who knows Prussia and her designs upon Russia can for a moment doubt her ultimate intention. Whatever phrases she may use to delude Russia, she does not mean to surrender one of the fair provinces or cities of Russia now occupied by her forces. Under one name or another (and the name hardly matters) those Russian provinces will henceforth be in reality a part of the dominions of Prussia. They will be ruled by the Prussian sword in the interests of the Prussian autocracy, and the rest of the people of Russia will be partly enticed by specious phrases and partly bullied by the threat of continued war against an impotent army into a condition of complete economic and ultimate political enslavement to Germany.



We all deplore the prospect. The democracy of this country means to stand to the last by the democracies of France and Italy and all our other allies. We shall be proud to stand side by side by the new democracy of Russia. So will America and so will France and Italy. But if the present rulers of Russia take action which is independent of their allies, we have no means of intervening to arrest the catastrophe which is assuredly befalling their country. Russia can only be saved by her own people.

We believe, however, that an independent Poland, comprising all those genuinely Polish elements who desire to form a part of it, is an urgent necessity for the stability of Western Europe.

Similarly, though we agree with President Wilson that a break-up of Austria-Hungary is no part of our war aims, we feel that unless genuine self-government on true democratic principles is granted to those Austro-Hungarian nationalities who have long desired it, it is impossible to hope for a removal of those causes of unrest in that part of Europe which have so long threatened the general peace.

On the same grounds we regard as vital the satisfaction of the legitimate claims of the Italians for union with those of their own race and tongue. We also mean to press that justice be done to the men of Rumanian blood and speech in their legitimate aspirations. If these conditions are fulfilled, Austria-Hungary would become a power whose strength would conduce to the permanent peace and freedom of Europe instead of being merely an instrument to the pernicious military autocracy of Prussia that uses the resources of its allies for the furtherance of its own sinister purposes.

Outside of Europe we believe that the same principles should be applied. While we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople, the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea being internationalized and neutralized, Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine are, in our judgment, entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions.

What the exact form of that recognition in each particular case should be need not here be discussed beyond stating that



it would be impossible to restore to their former sovereignty the territories to which I have already referred.

Much has been said about the arrangements we have entered into with our allies on this and on other subjects. I can only say that as the new circumstances, like the Russian collapse and the separate negotiations, have changed the conditions under which those arrangements were made, we are, and always have been, perfectly ready to discuss them with our allies.

With regard to the German colonies, I have repeatedly declared that they are held at the disposal of a conference whose decision must have primary regard to the wishes and interests of the native inhabitants of such colonies. None of those territories are inhabited by Europeans. The governing consideration, therefore, must be that the inhabitants should be placed under the control of an administration acceptable to themselves, one of whose main purposes will be to prevent their exploitation for the benefit of European capitalists or Governments.

The natives live in their various tribal organizations under chiefs and councils who are competent to consult and speak for their tribes and members and thus to represent their wishes and interests in regard to their disposal. The general principle of national self-determination is, therefore, as applicable in their cases as in those of the occupied European territories.

The German declaration that the natives of the German colonies have through their military fidelity in war shown their attachment and resolve under all circumstances to remain with Germany is applicable, not to the German colonies generally, but only to one of them, and in that case, German East Africa, the German authorities secured the attachment, not of the native population as a whole, which is and remains profoundly anti-German, but only of a small warlike class, from whom their askaris, or soldiers, were selected. These they attached to themselves by conferring on them a highly privileged position, as against the bulk of the native population, which enabled these askaris to assume a lordly and oppressive superiority over the rest of the natives.

By this and other means they secured the attachment of a

very small and insignificant minority, whose interests were directly opposed to those of the rest of the population and for whom they have no right to speak. The German treatment of the native populations in their colonies has been such as amply to justify their fear of submitting the future of those colonies to the wishes of the natives themselves.

Finally, there must be reparation for the injuries done in violation of international law. The peace conference must not forget our seamen and the services they have rendered to and the outrages they have suffered for the common cause of freedom.

One omission we notice in the proposal of the Central Powers which seems to us especially regrettable. It is desirable and essential that the settlement after this war shall be one which does not in itself bear the seed of future war. But that is not enough. However wisely and well we may make territorial and other arrangements, there will still be many subjects of international controversy. Some, indeed, are inevitable.

Economic conditions at the end of the war will be in the highest degree difficult owing to the diversion of human effort to warlike pursuits. There must follow a world shortage of raw materials, which will increase the longer the war lasts, and it is inevitable that those countries which have control of raw materials will desire to help themselves and their friends first. Apart from this, whatever settlement is made will be suitable only to the circumstances under which it is made, and as those circumstances change, changes in the settlement will be called for.

So long as the possibility of a dispute between nations continues—that is to say, so long as men and women are dominated by impassioned ambition and war is the only means of settling a dispute—all nations must live under a burden, not only of having from time to time to engage in it, but of being compelled to prepare for its possible outbreak.

The crushing weight of modern armaments, the increasing evil of compulsory military service, the vast waste of wealth and effort involved in warlike preparation—these are blots on our civilization of which every thinking individual must be ashamed. For these and other similar reasons we are confident that a great attempt must be made to establish, by some inter-

national organization, an alternative to war as a means of settling international disputes.

After all, war is a relic of barbarism, and, just as law has succeeded violence as a means of settling disputes between individuals, so we believe that it is destined ultimately to take the place of war in the settlement of controversies between nations.

If, then, we are asked what we are fighting for, we reply, as we have often replied, We are fighting for a just and a lasting peace, and we believe that before permanent peace can be hoped for three conditions must be fulfilled: First, the sanctity of treaties must be re-established; secondly, a territorial settlement must be secured, based on the right of self-determination or the consent of the governed, and, lastly, we must seek, by the creation of some international organization, to limit the burden of armaments and diminish the probability of war. On these conditions its peoples are prepared to make even greater sacrifices than those they have yet endured.

# INDEX

(*Figures in italics refer to Appendix*)

- Africa, 158  
Agassiz, 20  
Aid and comfort to enemies, giving,  
  defined, 56  
*Al Jonquin*, sinking of the, 46  
Alien enemies, proclamation relating  
  to, 205  
Alliances, entangling, 111  
Allies, help from United States, 132  
Alsace-Lorraine:  
  Bitterly opposed to Prussian gov-  
    ernment, 75  
  Germany refuses to give up, 96  
  Zabern incident, the, 75  
America, example of, 79  
America First, 81-89, 41  
American:  
  Constitution, framers of, 33; text  
    of, 9-28  
  History, fascination of, 82  
  Principles, defense of, 125  
  Revolution, memories of, 81  
  Spirit, meaning of, 91  
  Wealth, 95  
Americanization, as regards immi-  
  grants, 97  
Anarchy, 160  
*Ancona* case, the, 53  
Anglo-Saxon civilization, 158  
Annexations, Germany's schemes  
  for, 69  
"Anzacs," 158  
Appropriations of public moneys, 206  
*Arabic*, sinking of the, 179, 54  
Arcadia, 22  
Aristotle, 20, 31  
Armistice, terms of, 257, 104  
Arras, battle of, 6  
*Asturias*, sinking of the, 45  
Austria-Hungary:  
  America declares war against, 203  
  Demands upon Serbia, 144, 73  
  Endorses Germany's submarine  
    policy, 137  
Australia, 158  
Autocratic governments, not to be  
  trusted, 134  
*Aztec*, sinking of the, 46  
Bacon, Lord, 37  
Balance of power, 106, 171, 175, 42  
Bailli of Mirabeau, 44  
Balkan states:  
  Problems of, 152, 198, 199, 210, 221  
  Ruled by German Princes, 144  
Banking system of U. S. reorganized,  
  66  
Bavarian king, extract from speech  
  by, 66  
Belgium:  
  Invasion of, 156, 171, 178  
  Relief ships of, sunk, 45  
  Restoration of, 225  
Berlin to Bagdad Railway, 185, 70, 74  
Bernhardi, von, "mouthpiece of the  
  Prussian military caste," 56  
Bernstorff, Count von, dismissed by  
  President Wilson, 55, 57, 58  
Bethlehem Steel Works, 58  
Bethmann Hollweg, fall of, 62  
Bill of Particulars, 64  
Bismarck, 176, 60, 61, 67  
Boers, the, 25, 32  
Bolshevik Party, 94  
Bopp, consul-general, conviction of, 51  
Bourdaluoué, 26, 32  
Boy-Ed, conspirator, 57  
Brandenburg, 174  
Brest-Litovsk, parleys at, 209, 210,  
  220, 231, 94; treaty annulled, 105  
*Britannic*, sinking of the, 45  
British constitution, 27

- British Labor Party, 100  
 Browning, Robert, 38  
 Bucharest, peace of, 243  
   Terms broken, 105  
 Bundesrat:  
   Body through which Kaiser controlled Germany, 61  
   Composition of, 61  
   Real power in German parliament, the, 61  
 Bunker Hill, 158  
 Canada, 158  
 Capital and labor, question of, 191  
 Caribbean, danger of German naval base in, 176  
 Carlyle, Thomas, 36  
 Central Powers:  
   A single power, 146  
   Signifies desire to discuss peace, 102  
   Text of note from, 115  
 Charles V, 26  
 City of Memphis, sinking of the, 264  
 Cleveland, Grover:  
   Message of Washington, The, 49-58, 38  
   Biography of, 38  
 Columbus, 27  
 Commercial Enterprises of the United States, 67  
 Communism, meaning of, 46  
 Concert of powers, 111, 99  
 Congress of the United States, extraordinary session of, 126  
 Congress of Vienna, The, 201  
 Conquest, not sought for by the United States, 137  
 Constitution, American, 91, 122, 134, 35  
 Countries controlled by Germany, 186  
 Court of review, 56  
 Credit, granting to government, 131  
 Czecho-Slovaks, 93  
 Czernin, Count, 219, 225  
 Daughters of the American Revolution, address of President Wilson before, 81-89  
 Days of 1776, 71  
 Declaration of Independence, 66, 74  
 Defense, national, demands of, 169  
 Dekker, old dramatist, 32, 34  
 Delcassé, French minister, driven from office by Germans, 106  
 Democracy:  
   Commands of, 101  
   "Disease of," 24  
   Faith in, 98  
   Sacred mystery of, 97  
   World to be made safe for, 137  
 Diplomatic relations, severance of between United States and Germany, 113, 116  
 Dirigibles, 161  
 Disloyalty, repression of, 139  
 Divine right of kings, 180, 80  
 "Dollar diplomacy," 68  
 Dominion, not sought by United States, 137  
 Duties of the Citizen, The, 163-181  
 Eckhart, von, German minister to Mexico, 103  
 Effrontery, German official, 59  
   Stated, 134, 135, 142, 160, 51, 57, 59  
 Emancipation of the Jews, 30  
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 43  
 Enemies of the Government, 205  
 Enemy aliens, proclamations relating to, 205  
 England, acquisition of colonies, 175  
 English blockade, the, 44  
 Entangling alliances, 111  
 Equality:  
   Of nations, 107  
   Of rights, 107  
   Of territory, 107  
 Equipment of United States navy, 131  
 Equitable taxation, 131  
 Espionage by Germany in United States, 134, 135, 142, 160  
 Europe, racial and political units of, 145

- Falaba*, sinking of the, 179  
 Federal Reserve Act, 40  
 Feudalism, making its last stand, 160  
 Finland, 231  
 First Napoleon, 44  
 Flag, American:  
   Meaning of, 70  
   Of humanity, 73  
 Flag Day Address, 141-150  
 Foch, Marshal, 257, 104  
 France:  
   Acquisition of colonies, 175  
   Colonies of, in Africa, 106  
   Revolution in, 44, 35  
 Frederick the Great, 171, 47, 43, 62, 67, 81  
 Free governments, 45  
 Freedom:  
   Of life, 107  
   Of the seas, 109, 112, 114, 127, 151  
 French Revolution, 44, 35  
*Frye*, sinking of the, 120  
 Genghis Khan, 172, 81  
 George, David, Lloyd, 1-8; 105  
 German Colonies, disposition of, 221  
 Germany:  
   Armistice terms, 259  
   Autocracy in, 43, 62  
   Allies of, 161  
   A natural foe to liberty, 136  
   Commercial position of, 183  
   Conceptions and plans, quotations showing, 64 ff.  
   Condominium, Germany sets up, 97  
   Constitution of, 60  
   Criminal intrigues of, in United States, 135, 143, 149, 179, 187  
   Cruisers of, in the Dardanelles, 76  
   Enemy of four-fifths of the world, 152  
   Fall of government, 259  
   Foments Hindu plots on Pacific coast, 72  
   Incites plots in Mexico against United States, 136  
   Industrial development of, 77  
   Insults and aggressions of, 142  
   Irresponsible government in, 138  
   Military statesmen of, 146  
   Mobilization of army of, 60  
   Objects in war, 230, 232  
   Outlines peace plan 146  
   Plots in, 58, 71  
   Press of, 121  
   Ruthless naval program of, 117, 119  
   Social democratic party in, 78, 79  
   Socialists in, 148  
   Spies in her Embassy at Washington, 142  
   Secret service, 58  
   Strong peace party in, 49  
   Submarine policy of, concerning Great Britain and Ireland, 119  
   United States friendship for people of, 117, 133  
   Word of present rulers of, not to be taken, 154  
*Gloucester Castle*, sinking of the, 45  
 Gompers, Samuel, 188, 58  
 Government:  
   By consent of the governed, 107, 112  
   Granting credit to, 131  
 Great Frederick, 174  
 Grey, Viscount, 99  
*Gulflight*, sinking of the, 179  
 Hague, The, peace conferences at, 170, 50, 73, 82  
 Hamburg to Persian Gulf, control of desired by Germany, 146  
*Healdton*, sinking of the, 46  
 Henry, Patrick, 158  
 Hertling, von, 220, 222, 63  
 Hindenburg line, 4  
 Hindenburg, von, Marshal, 5  
 Hohenzollern:  
   Hereditary policy of, 173  
   House of, 81  
   Rulers of Europe, 70  
 Holland, acquisition of colonies, 175  
 Holy Roman Empire, The, 32



- Hospital ships sunk by Germany, 127  
*Housatonic*, sinking of the, 120, 46  
 House and Senate, members of, 65  
 House, Colonel, 187, 83  
 Hudson, George, railway king, 42, 37  
 Huerta, U. S. refuses to recognize, 100  
 Humanity, cause of, for America, 85, 110  
 Hyphenated Americans, 94  
  
 "Ichabod," 29  
 Igel von, 57  
 Immigrants, instruction of, 93, 95  
 Indemnities, not sought by United States, 137  
 Independence Square, 70  
 India, German schemes about, 72  
 India and Egypt, Germany plots rebellions in, 144  
 Industrial Workers of the World, 83  
 International laws:  
     Reasons for origin of, 127  
     Reconsideration of, 109  
     Violation of, by Germany, 113, 119, 128, 159, 160, 171, 175  
 International obligations, America's, 103  
 Intrigue, German, in United States, 135, 143, 149, 179, 187  
  
 Japan, 142  
 Jellaladeen, Persian poet, 32  
 Jugo-Slavs, 93  
  
 Kaiser, the:  
     Autocratic authority of, 49  
     Extracts from speeches of, 66  
 Kerensky government driven out, 94  
 Kings, divine right of, 180, 80  
 "Kultur," 174, 80  
  
 Lafayette, Marquis de la, 52, 158  
 Lamb, Charles, 190  
 Lane, Franklin K., Why We Are at War, 156-162, 79; biography, 79  
 Lansing, Robert, 155, 83  
 Laws, international, 109  
  
 Lazarus and Dives, 26, 33  
 League of Honor, 134, 135  
 League of nations, 221, 244, 245  
 Lexington, 158  
 Liberty:  
     Principles of, 83  
     Statue of, 83  
 Liberty Loan, 229, 240  
 Liege, treaty torn to pieces at, by Germany, 157  
 Limitation:  
     Of armies, 109  
     Of navies, 109  
 Lincoln:  
     Biography of, 29  
     Gettysburg address, 17, 30  
     Preserver of republic, 62  
     Second inaugural address, 56  
 Loans, Liberty 229, 240  
 Loans, vast, not desirable, 131  
 Louis Napoleon, 42  
 Lowell, James Russell:  
     Address on Democracy, 10-48, 31  
     Biography, 30  
*Lusitania*, sinking of the, 150, 179, 54, 57  
 Luxemburg, invasion of, 171  
*Lyman M. Law*, sinking of the, 120, 46  
  
 "Made in Germany," 184  
 Magna Charta, 98  
 Mahomet, 158, 160  
 Massachusetts, state of, 22, 36, 31  
 Material resources, mobilization of, 131  
 Maxmilian, chancellor, resigns, 105  
 Meaning of the Declaration of Independence, The, 63-74, 40  
 Mediterranean, Germany's submarine policy concerning, 126  
 Mercier, Cardinal, 158  
 Message of Washington, The, 49-58, 38  
 Message to Congress, 113-118  
 Mexico:  
     Attitude of U. S. to, 250

- Disorders in, fomented by Germany, 51, 103
- Insults U. S. flag, 101
- Loss of lives of foreigners in, 69
- Loss of property of foreigners in, 69
- Mexico and Japan, 142, 160, 179
- Michaelis, Chancellor, 63, 70
- Middle Europe, the projected, 74, 75
- Military masters of Germany:
  - See their mistake, 147
  - War begun by, 144
- Mines, laying of in neutral waters, 156
- Misprision of treason, penalty for, 55
- Mob spirit, 191
- Mobilization of material resources, 131
- Monroe Doctrine:
  - Germany's feelings concerning, 176
  - Imperilled by Germany, 177, 178, 78
  - Meaning of, 111, 170, 95
  - Note on, 43
  - President Wilson urges support of, 103
  - Supported by British fleet, 170, 175
- Monroe, James, President, 111
- Montesquieu, 26, 32
- National workshops, 26, 32
- Navagero, Bernardo, 25
- Naval program, Germany's, 117
- Navy, United States, equipment of, 131
- Neutrality:
  - A negative word, 84
  - Armed, 122, 129
  - Character of, 114
  - No longer feasible in United States, 133
  - Violated by Germany, 178
- Neutral nation, rights as, 121
- New Jersey, woman suffrage in, 88
- New Zealand, 158
- "Nicky" and "Willy," czar and kaiser, 63
- Nippold, Professor, remarks on jingoism in Germany, 67, 68
- Non-combatants, rights of, 125
- Oath of Allegiance:
  - Meaning of, 75
  - Quoted, 169
- Objectives of America, 194
- Organization of material resources, 131
- Ottoman Empire, 221
- Our Responsibilities as a Nation, 59-62
- Paine, Thomas, 33
- Palermo, 120
- Panama canal, the, 176, 40
- Pan-American agreement, 254
- Pan-Germans, 186, 187, 68, 70
- Papen, von, 51, 57
- Parker, Theodore, 32, 30, 34
- Peace, as outlined by Germany, 146, 148
- Peace drives, 249
- Peoples' war, 241
- Persia, German schemes, 232
- Persia*, sinking of the, 179
- Peter the Great, 51
- Piave, failure of Austrian offensive at, 93
- "Place in the sun," Germany's, 176, 67
- Plato, 20, 31
- Plots, German, 58, 71
- Poison gas, 161
- Poland, restitution of, 108, 152, 221, 225
- Polish language, use of forbidden by Germany, 76
- Pope Benedict XV, 151
- Portugal, acquisition of colonies, 175
- Potsdam, 2
- Powers of the world, America's relations with, 60
- Priestly, Joseph, 30, 33
- Principle, American, 84
- Program of the World's Peace, 209-218
- Proudhon, 26, 32
- Prussia.
  - Constitution of, 48

- Voters divided into three classes, 62
- Prussian autoeracy, 135, 145, 173, 176, 193, 2
- Prussian Poland, 76
- Public moneys, appropriations of, 206
- Punitive damages, not desired by United States, 154
- Red Cross ships sunk by Germany, 159
- Reichstag:
- How chosen, 61
  - Powers of, 49
  - Resolutions of the, 211, 222, 223
  - Social democrats in, 68
- Request for a Grant of Power, 119-125
- Rights of man, 27, 34, 63, 64, 68, 73, 124, 129, 137, 180
- Rights of nations, 137
- Rintelin von, conspirator, 57, 103
- Romanoff dynasty, 51
- Roosevelt, Theodore:
- Biography of, 39
  - Our Responsibilities as a Nation, 59-62
- Root, Elihu, The Duties of the Citizen, 163-181; biography, 80
- Roumania, German acts in, 231, 97
- Runnymede, 226, 98
- Russia:
- America's friendship for, 253
  - Autoeracy in, 135
  - Black Sea, ports of, bombarded, 77
  - Democracy in, 135
  - German acts in, 231
- Scarborough, attacks on, 156
- Scheidemann, criticizes government, 94
- School of Citizenship, The, 90-95, 41
- "Scrap of paper," 160
- Second War Message, 194-208
- Sedition, 142
- Self Determination of people, 223
- Serajevo, 50, 72
- Serbia:
- Austria's demands on, 144, 73
  - Invasion by Austria, 171
  - Service, universal liability to, 131
  - Severance of diplomatic relations between United States and Germany, 116
  - Sherbrooke, Lord, 44, 37
  - Socialism, meaning of, 46
  - Socialists, in Germany, 148, 61
  - Spain, acquisition of colonies, 175
  - Spanish succession, war of, 50
  - Statue of Liberty, meaning of, 83
  - Status of belligerent accepted by United States, 130
  - Status quo ante bellum, 151, 152
  - Stephano*, sinking of the, 55
  - Submarine warfare:
    - Austria-Hungary endorses Germany's policy, 137
    - Germany's policy, 113, 121, 126, 128, 160, 161
  - Subsidies, 71
  - Supreme War Council at Versailles, 258, 104
  - Supply and demand, law of, 205
  - Sussex*, sinking of the, 113, 159, 179, 44, 54, 55, 79
  - Tarnowski, Count, 137
  - Taxation, special, 131
  - Terrorization, Germany's system of, 161
  - Thane of Cawdor, 29
  - Tirpitz, von, 50
  - Treason, defined, 55
  - Treaty obligations, 71
  - Turco-German fleet, the, 77
  - Turk, dark rule of the, 8
  - Turkey:
    - Armies drilled by Germany, 146, 70
    - Visited by German emperor, 70
  - Turkish statesmen take their orders from Berlin, 146
  - Ukraine, German acts in, 231
  - United States:
    - Armed forces of, addition to, 131

- Constitution of, 9-28  
 Driven to state of war, 130  
 Gives help to Allies, 132  
 Purposes in war, 107  
 Reasons for entering war, 229  
 Universal liability to service, 131  
 Universal suffrage, 41  
 Unwritten constitution, 44
- Vera Cruz, occupied by U. S. troops, 101
- Venezuelan dispute, 176, 81  
 "Verboten," 157
- Versailles, Supreme War Council at, 258
- Vienna, Congress of, 222  
*Vigilancia*, sinking of the, 46  
 Vimy Ridge, battle of, 106  
 Villa, unlawful acts of, 101
- War:  
   Begun by military masters of Germany, 144  
   For conquest, 133  
   Zone prescribed by Germany, 116  
 War message, 126-140, 44  
 Washington, George:  
   Founder of the republic, 62, 48  
   Speech on, 49-58  
 Welland Canal, destruction of, plotted, 57  
 Why We Are at War, 156-162  
 William II, fall of, 105  
 Wilson, Woodrow, biography, 39  
 Wilson, Woodrow, addresses:  
   America First, 81-89  
   American of Foreign Birth, The, 75-80  
   Attitude of the U. S. toward Mexico, 250-256  
   End of Selfish Dominion, The, 229-235  
   End of War, The, 257-261  
   Flag Day Address, 141-150  
   Meaning of the Declaration of Independence, The, 63-74  
   Message to Congress, 113-118; 219-228  
   Mount Vernon Address, The, 235-239  
   Peace with Justice, 240-249  
   Program of the World's Peace, 209-218  
   Reply to the Pope, 151-155  
   Request for a Grant of Power, 119-125  
   School of Citizenship, The, 90-101  
   Second War Message, 194-208  
   War Message, 126-140  
   What Democracy Means, 182-193  
   World League for Peace, 102-112  
 Woman suffrage in New Jersey, 88, 41  
 World League for Peace, A, 102-112 41  
 World to be made safe for democracy, 137  
 Young Turk movement, 71
- Zabern incident, the historic, 75  
 Zimmermann, Alfred, supervises Hindu plot, 72  
 Zimmermann note, the, 160, 52, 80  
 Zola, M., 24, 31  
 Zone, naval war, 44  
   War, prescribed by Germany, 116

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

(Prepared by George L. Marsh, author of *Manual for the Study of English Classics*)

### HELPS TO STUDY

(Roman page numbers refer to the body of the text; italic page numbers to the Appendix.)

#### THE EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

What has been the natural effect of our extremely mixed population on the lack of a "consciousness of any fixed, national purpose . . . in the minds and hearts of Americans" (p. 7)? Why is a "common, ordered intention" (p. 8) to be desired for a nation? Do you think it can be obtained in a nation that has been called, very aptly, a "melting pot"? Had the "melting pot" character of the country any serious effect on its participation in the late war?

What is the essential difference between democracy and republicanism (p. 8)? Note the confusion that has come about through the association of these words with specific political parties. Have they, as names of parties, any real meaning in harmony with their etymology?

What is the historical position of the United States among republics (p. 9)? Among democracies? What essentially democratic ideas and institutions did we get from Great Britain? Consider the question whether our government or the British government is in actual practice the more democratic.

What is the essential difference between democracy and autocracy (p. 11)? Collect in the speeches of President Wilson (and others if you can) material which amplifies or makes more clear this distinction. Is any autocratic authority now left in the world? Answer as specifically as possible.

What arguments are sometimes made against democracy (p. 13)? Consider these carefully and answer them systematically on the basis of material found throughout the book, and wherever else you can find material.

Why is it desirable to deal in schools with the ideals of democracy (p. 14)?

#### LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

What was the historical setting for this speech (p. 29)? What quotation from, or allusion to, the Declaration of Independence does it contain? What portions of this speech have been most quoted? Read the last sentence aloud with the proper emphasis (p. 29).

In what characteristics—or, more specifically, what words, phrases, etc.—do you find this speech notably poetic? Why do you suppose it is so short? Can you imagine any way in which it might have been improved by expansion?

Other important speeches by Lincoln may be found in the Lake Classics edition of *Washington, Webster, and Lincoln*.

#### LOWELL ON DEMOCRACY

What was the occasion of this speech? How old was Lowell when he delivered it (p. 30)? What public services had he rendered? For a general estimate of Lowell's importance in literature see Newcomer's *American Literature*; for selections from Lowell, see Newcomer and Andrews, *Three Centuries of American Poetry and Prose*.

Find the specific portions of this address that justify the editor's statement (p. 15) that it "shows us still on the defensive" as to democracy. Is there at any point a confession of weakness in Lowell's defensive attitude; or is it in part due to the nature of his audience—to his desire to be ingratiating, conciliatory?

Why does Lowell make his apology about time and tell his story of Agassiz (p. 21)? Note the distinction he makes between "wisest" and "most prudent" (p. 21).

What were the conditions of suffrage in our early days?



Where, and why, were there bad effects from universal suffrage (p. 23)?

In relation to the latter part of the paragraph ending on page 23, compare the attitude of the Russian peasants very recently, after the land was divided among them on the theory that it should be administered according to socialistic principles. As soon as they became land-owners they ceased to be socialists; they refused to do with the land otherwise than as private owners!

For the passage from Burke alluded to on page 24 (p. 31 also), see the new Lake Classics edition (1919) of speeches by Burke.

Why was democracy not popular in France (pp. 24, 31)? Was the French government less democratic in 1884 than now?

What was the nature of the British trouble with the Boers (pp. 25, 32)? How long after this address did the Boer war occur? What was the attitude of the Boers in the recent war? Note the prominence of a Boer general in British councils.

What was Lowell's purpose in the historical allusions on page 26 (see p. 32)? What applicability today has the last sentence of the paragraph ending on that page?

What famous associations has the phrase "the rights of man" (p. 33)?

The phrase "a deed without a name" (p. 29) is used by the Weird Sisters in answer to a question by Macbeth (Act IV, Scene 1) as to what they are doing. See the Lake edition of the play.

Consider the present applicability of the last sentence on page 29, both to labor unions in the United States and to the labor party in Great Britain.

Explain the distinction meant by Theodore Parker (Note how the speeches of President Wilson, farther along book, are characterized by the idealism emphasized on page 26).

Make a systematic summary of Lowell's answers to questions against democracy. Do they seem to you adequate? Can you supplement them in any way?

What are the objections to compromises (p. 35)? Note the way in which the Peace Treaty prepared at Paris in 1919, and

the Constitution of the League of Nations, illustrate these objections.

Does the story on page 36 cast any real light on the "Irish question"?

What important prophecy is to be found on page 37?

Explain fully the sentence introducing the poetical quotation on page 38. Does this imply that all governments are more or less bad? Is it an argument for anarchy?

Explain the allusions at the top of page 43. How and why did the person first mentioned gain so much power? What sort of use did he make of it? Can similar comment now be applied to any other American? Why and to what extent?

Does the comment at the bottom of page 44 apply with much force to the American constitution? Study the amendments (pp. 23-28—another may now be added) and consider to what extent they involve "tinkering." Are they very numerous considering the number of years since the constitution was adopted, the increase in the population of the country, the general progress of the world?

What was Henry George's plan of taxation (pp. 46, 38)? What do you take to be Lowell's view of it?

On the whole what do you think of Lowell's speech? Was it adapted to his audience? Too conservative or cautious? Does it require very much modification on account of the events of thirty-five years? Note the witty turns of expression; the happy allusions; the figures of speech. What impression does it give you of Lowell's ability as a diplomat?

#### CLEVELAND ON "THE MESSAGE OF WASHINGTON"

With this whole speech compare Webster's speech on Washington in the Lake Classics volume of selections from Washington, Webster, and Lincoln. See also Washington's Farewell Address in the same volume.

Consider whether "harmony, honesty, industry, and frugality" (p. 52) are any more or less practiced in this country now than at the time Cleveland spoke. Has the Great War had any effect in this matter? Have all our people been affected in the same way?

Explain the distinction between "the land we live in" and "the land that lives in us" (p. 57).

Study the style of this speech. Do you notice any difference as to length of words, formality of sentence structure, directness and idiomatic simplicity, between this speech and the speeches of President Wilson.

#### ROOSEVELT ON "OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A NATION"

What changes would now have to be made in some parts of this speech (e. g., p. 59)? What problems mentioned or implied in it still exist? Sum up its main ideas in a few sentences.

Do you detect any important differences in style or manner between this speech and the preceding one by Cleveland, or the speeches of President Wilson?

#### SPEECHES BY PRESIDENT WILSON—BEFORE THIS COUNTRY ENTERED THE WAR

"The Meaning of the Declaration of Independence"—How long had Mr. Wilson been President at the time of this address? How long was it before war was declared in Europe? Had the event which primarily caused the war happened? What is the main point made as to the nature of the Declaration of Independence (pp. 63-4)? Note the extremely direct and specific nature of this speech; before the end of the second page a "bill of particulars" is commenced. Contrast it in this regard with the preceding speeches by Cleveland and Roosevelt. What view of the Mexican trouble is here expressed? Compare the speech given nearly four years later on the Mexican problem (pp. 250 ff.). What is the distinction made in the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 71?

"The American of Foreign Birth"—What was the situation of the war at the time of this speech? Is it alluded to? Do you find that the material and the way of presenting it are made especially appropriate to the class of persons addressed (Nearly all of Mr. Wilson's speeches may profitably be examined on this point.) What do you think was meant by the expression "too proud to fight"? Was the way in which this expression was taken up and made fun of, justified?

“America First”—What important “peculiarity of patriotism in America” is emphasized (p. 81)? How was this practically demonstrated after this country entered the war? Make a list of specific ways. What seems to have been the President’s attitude in relation to the war at this time (p. 41)? Did the foreign-born citizens of the country justify the faith in them expressed in this speech? If you think they did, specify how and to what extent.

“The School of Citizenship”—What changes had occurred, between the time of this speech and the preceding one, in relation to Americans of foreign birth (pp. 94, 57 ff.)?

“Abraham Lincoln”—In what ways is this speech for a very definite occasion brought into relation with the general principles of democracy? Do you get any new light on Lincoln? Amplify the distinction made at the bottom of page 98. In what sense are men like Washington and Lincoln not really “typical Americans” (p. 99)? In what sense can they be called typical?

“A World League for Peace”—How soon after this address did the United States break diplomatic relations with Germany? How soon was war declared? In what ways and for what reasons is it evident that the war has come closer to the United States than the preceding speeches indicated? Note the primary reason for a “concert of power” (p. 103); find places in the following speeches where this point is reiterated on every occasion. Trace through this speech elements of preparation for the constitution of the League of Nations as finally formulated in 1919. Is the peace formulated in Paris in 1919 a “peace without victory” (p. 106)? What document is quoted (without quotation marks) near the bottom of page 107? How is the point that is made near the top of page 109 applied in certain practical details of the peace treaty as formulated in Paris?

“Message to Congress . . . on Severing Diplomatic Relations”—Note differences in character between this speech and most of the others by Mr. Wilson in this volume, due to the fact that this is in the main a simple statement of fact and quotation from documents. Mr. Wilson has ordinarily delivered his

speeches to Congress in person, whereas the President's messages previously were generally sent over and read by the reading clerk.

“Request for a Grant of Power”—How much change in the situation has come about between the time of this speech and the preceding one? It is important through the whole series to trace the development of events and the consequent changes in action.

“War Message”—What violations of international law are recited? List them all, with use of the notes (pp. 44 ff.). Why was the “armed neutrality” suggested in the preceding message impracticable (p. 129)? Is it effective to have the series of sentences (pp. 130, 131) beginning, “It will involve,” etc.? Note the way in which a distinction is made between the German people and their government (p. 133). Have you found this earlier in Mr. Wilson's speeches? Trace it in his later messages and speeches, and note that in fact the German people were ultimately set against the rulers who had driven them into war. How do the comments on Russia apply to later conditions in that country (p. 135)? Pick out in this important message the most significant phrases as to war aims that have been repeated or varied only slightly throughout the President's utterances; make lists of repetitions or variations of each expression of the sort, noting how consistent a line of policy has been followed. In the formulation of the peace treaty, has this country lived up to the statement of purposes in the first complete paragraph on page 137? Have other countries shown an attitude in any respect similar? What turned out to be the facts, in general, as to Americans of German birth (p. 139)? See an explanation as to the laws of treason on page 55 ff., in the Appendix.

#### SPEECHES BY PRESIDENT WILSON—AFTER THIS COUNTRY ENTERED THE WAR

“Flag Day Address”—How long after the declaration of war was this speech delivered? How much preparation for active participation had been made by this time? How soon did the first draft registration take place? Were there American soldiers in France yet? Study carefully (pp. 57-60) the series of



events that are rapidly summed up on page 142-3. Note the real nature of the German government as explained on pages 60-63 (Appendix). Sum up the Pan-German aims and the plans for Middle-Europe (pp. 144-46, 63 ff.). What remarkably accurate prophecy did Mr. Wilson make in this speech (p. 147)?

“Reply to the Pope”—Just what does restoration of the “status quo ante bellum” mean (p. 151)? Sum up the President’s objections to such a peace.

“What Democracy Means”—What reasons for the success of German industry before the war were unfair from an economic point of view (p. 82)? How far was Germany seemingly successful at the time this speech was made (pp. 185-7)? What attitude toward labor is shown in this speech? What warning as to certain kinds of labor organizations is given? Is the speech well adapted to its audience? What do you think of the paragraphing on page 190?

“Second War Message”—What progress in preparation had the country made by the time of this message? What does the President stress as of primary importance (p. 194)? What does he have to say to those who call for peace? What sort of peace does he favor (p. 197)? Discuss the extent to which the peace terms announced from Paris in May, 1919, harmonize with this formula. How do you account for variations—or apparent variations, if you regard them as such? Study the paragraph occupying most of page 196 and try to account for its power and effectiveness. What do you consider to be the purpose of the last paragraph on page 199? Where, in this speech, is there preparation for harsh treatment of Germans after the war? In what way does President Wilson think the Russian situation might have been better handled (p. 202)?

“Program of the World’s Peace”—What moves in the direction of peace prompted this address (pp. 209-11)? Note that among the conditions of the armistice of November 11, 1918, the Germans were required to give up their fraudulent treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the later, equally unfair peace with Roumania. What was the substance of the resolutions of the reichstag of July 9, 1917 (pp. 94-5)? How far was the President’s wish as to the “processes of peace” (p. 213) fulfilled? Note that the



maintaining of a censorship on news, in order to prevent international misunderstandings during discussion, is not the same thing as having secret understandings between nations. A careful study of the famous "fourteen points" (pp. 214-17), in comparison with the terms of the treaty of peace as finally formulated, is both interesting and important. Newspapers at the time of the announcing of the terms of the treaty generally gave the impression of a much greater divergence from the "fourteen points" than a close study shows. Allowances must be made for the inevitable compromises involved in satisfying so many different countries with equal voice in the proceedings.

"Address to Congress"—What was the occasion for this speech? Sum up the criticisms of Count von Hertling's reply to the "fourteen points." What relations do the four "principles" stated on pages 226-7 bear to the "fourteen points"? Study, in the way suggested above, the extent to which these principles were followed in the formulation of the peace terms. How, specifically, do these principles apply to the case of Fiume and Dalmatia? The case of the Shantung peninsula?

"The End of Selfish Dominion"—What was the status of the war at the time of this speech? Note, throughout, the effective reiteration of phrases which the President had already used more than once as to our war aims, our wishes as to peace, etc.

"The Mount Vernon Address"—What noteworthy change in the trend of the war had occurred by this time? Observe the effectiveness of the introduction; the suitability of the speech to the place and the occasion; its tone of calm faith in the ultimate prevalence of the right. What striking sustained figure of speech is there (p. 237)? Study the relation of the four numbered paragraphs on page 238 to the previously announced "fourteen points" and to the terms of the actual peace treaty. How soon was the prophecy in the middle of the last paragraph realized?

"Peace with Justice"—What results were gained in all the "liberty loan" campaigns? Study the relations of the series of questions on page 242 to Mr. Wilson's other statements of war aims, conditions for peace, etc. What reasons are given for making the League of Nations a part of the arrangements for

peace (p. 244)? What was the President's success in this matter? How does he answer the criticism that this country is disregarding important advice in Washington's Farewell Address (p. 246)? Study the related portions of Washington's speech in the *Lake Classics* edition of selections from Washington, Webster, and Lincoln. What is the meaning of the term "peace drives" (p. 249)? How many such drives had there been up to this time?

"Attitude of the United States Toward Mexico"—Compare the first selection from Mr. Wilson in this volume (pp. 63-74). Sum up the relations of this country with Mexico during his administration (pp. 100-103). What is the point of the first sentence of the paragraph beginning near the bottom of page 253? Note the emphasis on the League of Nations even in this speech.

"The End of the War"—Sum up rapidly the events of the last month or two before the date of this address, both military events and the negotiations looking toward peace (pp. 104-5). What do you take to be the main idea and purpose of this little speech?

#### SECRETARY LANE'S "WHY WE ARE AT WAR"

This is valuable as an impassioned summing up of the whole case, to be supplemented by specific evidence in the various speeches of President Wilson and the notes on pages 41 ff. (Appendix). Why are there so many short paragraphs on pages 158-160?

#### SENATOR ROOT'S "THE DUTIES OF THE CITIZEN"

This cool, clear-cut statement of law should be compared with the Constitution of the United States (pp. 9-28). What is the big, important truth stated for the benefit and instruction of people who opposed this country's entering the war? Is the repetition on page 166 useful, needed? What is the effect of the series of sentences beginning similarly on page 170? What important points as to the Monroe Doctrine does Mr. Root make (p. 176)? What previous trouble had occurred with Germany as to this principle (pp. 81-2)?

## SPEECHES BY PREMIER LLOYD GEORGE

What evidences of adaptation to the particular audience do you find in the speech on "The Meaning of America's Entrance into the War"? Is it true that the United States "never engaged in war except for liberty" (p. 1)? What is the essence of the characterization of Prussia (pp. 2, 3)? Note the striking prophecy as to the Kaiser's promise. What was the ground for, and the soundness of, the German view as to the entrance of the United States into the war (p. 5)? How did America study the Allies' blunders (p. 6)? Compare the latter part of this speech with Mr. Wilson's "fourteen points" and with the terms of the peace treaty.

With the speech entitled "Britain's War Aims Newly Defined" (pp. 107-116), compare especially Mr. Wilson's "Program of the World's Peace" (pp. 209-218), delivered three days later than Mr. Lloyd George's utterance. Do you attach any special significance to the fact that the latter was given at a trade union conference? Look up the war papers of the British Labor Party, which are among the most enlightened documents of the period. Collect points of harmony (and of difference if you find important differences) between the aims expressed in this speech and in Mr. Wilson's speeches.

## CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

What was the purpose of the constitution? Under what sort of government had the United States been operating between 1776 and 1787?

Work out the changes in each case in which a part of the original constitution was changed by amendment (pp. 9, 10, 15, 16, 17). Sec. 3 (p. 10) is changed by the XVIIth amendment; the first sentence on page 15 by the XVIth amendment; the whole system of electing the President (pp. 16, 17) by the XIIth amendment.

Why was the representation in the House of Representatives fixed according to population, while all the states, regardless of size, have equal representation in the Senate? Does this operate fairly?

Note portions of the constitution rendered obsolete by the abolition of slavery (pp. 14, 20).

Explain the actual working of the election of the President under our party system, and show how it differs from the method intended by the XIIth amendment (pp. 25-6).

### THEME SUBJECTS

1. Is there such a thing as typical Americanism (see pp. 7, 70, 77-79, etc.)?
2. The difference between democracy and republicanism (p. 8).
3. The significance of Gettysburg (pp. 17-18, 29-30).
4. Lowell as a diplomat (pp. 19-48, 30).
5. Summary of Lowell's arguments for democracy.
6. "Harmony, honesty, industry, and frugality" (p. 58) in relation to the war.
7. Application to problems of today of the principles outlined in Roosevelt's speech (pp. 59-62).
8. Application of the Declaration of Independence to our life today. (Which, if any, of its principles seem obsolete? Which are of most importance?)
9. President Wilson and Mexico (pp. 69, 250-56, 100-103).
10. The American of foreign birth in the war (his duties, how he performed them, etc.—material to be collected from many places in the book; e. g., pp. 75 ff., 86, 94, etc.).
11. A character study of Lincoln—using material on pages 96-101, supplemented by other available information.
12. A character sketch of President Wilson—on the basis, primarily, of his speeches in this volume.
13. An argument for, or against, "a world league for peace" (pp. 102 ff.).
14. A simple narrative of the events leading up to the war in Europe. (This may be gleaned largely from the notes in this volume.)
15. The relations of this country with the war up to April, 1917 (see the notes).

16. Why America entered the war (pp. 156-62, supplemented by more specific details in Mr. Wilson's speeches and in the notes).

17. Our war aims (a rapid summary of the most important points reiterated in many places).

18. The German government before the war (pp. 48, 60-62, etc.).

19. War preparations in the United States (taking account of such matters as the draft, the "liberty loans," the organization of industry, the ship-building, etc., etc.).

20. America's share in the final victory.

21. A summary of Mr. Root's speech (pp. 163 ff.).

22. Pan-German ideas of Middle-Europe (pp. 185-6, 64 ff., etc.).

23. President Wilson's "fourteen points" (pp. 214-17)—explanation of them in the simplest possible terms; how they grew out of this war, etc.

24. How the "fourteen points" fared at the peace table.

25. More specific discussion as to any one of the disputed or compromised questions; e. g., the trouble between Italy and Jugo-Slavia, between Japan and China, the Poland-Danzig situation, the case of Russia, etc.

26. Points of agreement and difference between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George (pp. 1-8, 107-116, and Mr. Wilson's speeches).

## SELECTIONS FOR CLASS READING

1. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address (pp. 17-18).
2. What democracy is (pp. 31-34).
3. Lowell's arguments for democracy (pp. 38-43).
4. "Our Responsibilities as a Nation" (pp. 59-62).
5. Liberty and patriotism (pp. 64-66, 70-72).
6. "The American of Foreign Birth" (pp. 75-80).
7. "The School of Citizenship" (pp. 90-95).
8. "Abraham Lincoln" (pp. 96-101).
9. Arguments for "a world league for peace" (pp. 104-112).
10. The occasion for the "War Message" (pp. 126-130).
11. America's object in entering the war (pp. 133-140).
12. "Flag Day Address" (pp. 141-150).
13. "Why We Are at War" (pp. 156-62).
14. The status of those opposed to war (pp. 163-69).
15. Germany's crimes (pp. 172-181).
16. America's first task in the war (pp. 194-8).
17. President Wilson's "fourteen points" (pp. 213-18).
18. "The Mount Vernon Address" (pp. 235-39).
19. What will be a just peace (pp. 241-49)?
20. The importance of America's entering the war (pp. 4-8).
21. "Britain's War Aims Defined" (pp. 108-116).



H 94 89 1









Decidified using the Bookkeeper process.  
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide  
Treatment Date:

JUN 2001

**Preservation Technologies**

**A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION**

111 Thomson Park Drive  
Cranberry Township PA 16066  
(724) 779-2111



**HECKMAN  
BINDERY INC.**



**AUG 89**

**N. MANCHESTER,  
INDIANA 46962**





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 007 706 175 7 ●