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THE LEAGUE'S RELATION TO THE WAR

THE League to Enforce Peace is committed in advance to the support of the war against Prussian Militarism. In June, 1915, it put forth a series of proposals advocating a permanent League of Nations, pledged to joint military action against an aggressive nation that refused to submit its dispute to arbitration. This policy the League has been urging steadily ever since. The United States has now become a member of what Secretary of War Baker has called "a league to enforce peace with justice." We are engaged with our Allies in precisely the kind of a war the League's programme holds to be both justifiable and necessary. Having advanced the principle of joint action against an aggressor, the League is bound to throw its moral support behind the war, and to give it all the material support that its widespread and powerful organization can contribute. An organization so committed cannot do other than to insist that the war shall continue until Prussian Militarism is destroyed, either by Allied force or by the uprising of a German democracy, and a league of nations is established as a guarantee of permanent peace.
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THE LEAGUE'S DUTY
IN THE WAR

The supreme task before the country is that of conserving its life and institutions by winning the war against Prussian Militarism. Equally necessary to the interests of humanity is the preventing in the future of just such assaults on the rights and liberties of the world as Germany is now making, thus rendering it virtually impossible for such a catastrophe as the present war to overwhelm us again.

The League to Enforce Peace was organized and exists for the express purpose of securing a league of nations to prevent future war. The duty of winning this war is so urgent, however, that if the task of preventing such conflicts in the future were not immediately and vitally connected with it, patriotic citizens would wish to let organization against future wars wait while the whole attention and energy of the country were given to the business of conquering Germany.

But there is as necessary and vital a connection between the stating of the great objective for the war and the winning of the war, as between the mind of a man and the body which the mind directs. A nation, like an individual, works at a task with all its might and enthusiasm only when it has a clearly defined and well understood reason for doing it. Hence the urgent necessity for recruiting the moral purpose of the American people for the war, and for inspiring enthusiasm, self-devotion, and a willingness to sacrifice for it.
Before a crusading spirit can gather behind a war, making the people willing to sacrifice and die for victory, some great simple issue must frame itself in the heart of the nation, and be heard on the lips of every citizen. Only as the war against Germany is understood to be a world-struggle to the death between autocracy and democracy, will America rise in her full might to carry it to a successful issue and to conserve the fruits of victory by some lasting union of the nations to enforce peace.

President Wilson understood this when he said that the war is being fought to “make the world safe for democracy” by the establishment and the perpetuation of a league of nations to prevent aggression and to resist by arms the nation that commits aggression. An important war-time duty of the League to Enforce Peace is to place and to keep in the hearts of the American people this great end and object of the war as the only possible compensation for the most costly and tragic conflict in history.
ENGLAND, France, Russia, Italy, and now the United States, as allies, are engaged in the greatest war of history to secure permanent world peace. With twenty or more millions of men at the colors, with losses in dead, wounded and captured of more than twenty-five per cent., with debts piling mountain-high and reaching many, many billions, they are fighting for a definite purpose, and that is the defeat of German militarism.

If the Prussian military caste retains its power to control the military and foreign policy of Germany after the war, peace will not be permanent, and war will begin again when the chauvinistic advisers of the Hohenzollern dynasty deem a conquest and victory possible.

The Allies have made a stupendous effort and have strained their utmost capacity. Unready for the war, they have concentrated their energy in preparation. In this important respect they have defeated the plan of Germany “in shining armor” to crush her enemies in their unreadiness.

But the war has not been won. Germany is in possession of Belgium and part of northern France. She holds Serbia and Rumania, Poland and the Baltic Provinces of Russia. Peace now, even though it be made on the basis of the restoration of the status quo, “without indemnities and without annexations,” would be a failure to achieve the great pur-
pose for which the Allies have made heartrending sacrifice. Armaments would continue for the next war, and this war would have been fought in vain. The millions of lives lost and the hundreds of billions' worth of the product of men's labor, would be wasted.

He who proposes peace now, therefore, either does not see the stake for which the Allies are fighting, or wishes the German military autocracy still to control the destinies of all of us as to peace or war. Those who favor permanent world peace must oppose with might and main the proposals for peace at this juncture in the war.

The Allies are fighting for a principle the maintenance of which affects the future of civilization. If they do not achieve it they have sacrificed the flower of their youth and mortgaged their future for a century, and all for nothing.

This is not a war in which the stake is territory or the sphere of influence of one nation over another. The Allies cannot concede peace until they conquer it. When they do so, it will be permanent. Otherwise they fail.

There are wars like that between Japan and Russia, in which President Roosevelt properly and successfully intervened to bring about a peace that helped the parties to a settlement. The principle at stake and the power and territory were of such a character that a settlement might be made substantially permanent. But the present issue is like that in our Civil War, which was whether the Union was to be preserved and the cancer of slavery was to be cut out. Peace proposals to President Lincoln were quite as numerous as those of to-day, and were moved by quite as high motives. But there was no compromise possible. Slavery and disunion either lost or won. So to-day the great moral object of the war must be achieved or defeated.
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THE THINGS AGAINST WHICH
WE ARE FIGHTING

THE ATTEMPT TO CONQUER AND
PRUSSIANIZE THE WORLD

By William Howard Taft

FIFTY YEARS OF
PREPARATION TO
CONQUER THE WORLD

Under the first William, with his Prime Minister Bismarck, who came to power in 1862, a definite plan was adopted of perfecting the already well-disciplined Prussian army so that by "blood and iron" the unity of Germany should be achieved. The whole Prussian nation was made into an army, and it soon became a machine with a power of conquest equaled by no other. The cynical, unscrupulous, but effective, diplomacy of Bismarck first united Prussia with Austria to deprive Denmark of Schleswig-Holstein by force, then secured a quarrel with Austria over the spoils, and deprived her of all influence over the German states by humiliating defeat in the six weeks' war of 1866. After this war, several German states were annexed forcibly to Prussia and offensive and defensive alliances were made with others.

Then in 1870 the occasion was seized, when it was known that France was not prepared, to strike at her. France was beaten, and Alsace and Lorraine were taken from her. The German Empire was established with a Prussian King at its head. France was made to pay an indemnity of one billion dollars, with which the military machine of Germany was strengthened and improved. Then Germany settled down
to a period of peace to digest the territory which by these three wars had been absorbed. Bismarck’s purpose in maintaining the superiority of his army was to retain what had been taken by blood and iron, and at the same time by a period of prolonged peace to give to Germany a full opportunity for industrial development and the self-discipline necessary for the highest efficiency. And then, as the success of the German system in the material development of the Empire showed itself and became the admiration of the world, the destiny of Germany grew larger in the eyes of her Emperor and her people, and expanded into a dream of Germanizing the world. The German people were impregnated with this idea by every method of official instruction. A cult of philosophy to spread the propaganda developed itself in the universities and schools. The principle was that the state could do no wrong, that the state was an entity that must be sustained by force; that everything else must be sacrificed to its strength; that the only sin the state could commit was neglect and failure to maintain its power.

With that dogmatic logic which pleases the German mind, and to which it readily adapts itself, this proposition easily led into the further conclusion that there could be no international morality; that morality and its principles applied only to individuals, but that when the action of the state was involved, considerations of honor, of the preservation of obligations solemnly made, must yield if the interests of the state required. These were the principles taught by Treitschke in the University of Berlin and maintained by German economic philosophers and by the representatives of the military régime in Bernhardi.

Bismarck had been keen enough in his diplomacy to await the opportunity that events presented for seeming to be forced into a war which he had long planned. This was the case with Denmark. This was the case with Austria. This was the case with France. German diplomacy has lost nothing of this characteristic in the present war. Germany did not plan the killing of the Austrian Archduke and his consort, but the minute that that presented the likelihood of war, Germany accepted it as the opportunity for her to strike down her neighbors, Russia and France, and to en-
large her power. She gladly gave her consent to the ultimatum of Austria to Serbia that was sure to bring on war, and then posed as one driven into war by the mobilization of Russia.

She knew that Russia was utterly unprepared. She knew that France was unprepared. She knew that Great Britain was unprepared. She herself was ready to the last cannon and the last reservist. Therefore, when appealed to by Great Britain and by all the other Powers to intervene and prevent Austria from forcing a universal war, Germany declined to act. Not a telegram or communication between Germany and Austria has ever been given to the public to show the slightest effort to induce delay by Austria. While Germany would pose as having acted only as Austria’s ally and as unwilling to influence her against her interest and independent judgment, the verdict of history unquestionably will be that the war is due to Germany’s failure to prevent it and to her desire to accept the opportunity of the assassination of the Austrian Archduke as a convenient time to begin a war she long intended. The revelation of their unpreparedness is sufficient to show that England, France and Russia did not conspire to bring the war on. On the other hand, before the war began Germany had constructed a complete system of strategic railways on her Belgian border, adapted not to commercial uses, but only to the quick invasion of Belgium.

Indeed, every fact as the war has developed forms one more circumstance in the irrefragable case against Germany as the Power responsible for this world disaster. The preparation of fifty years, the false philosophy of her destiny and of the exaltation of force, had given her a yearning for conquest, for the expansion of her territory, the extension of her influence, and the Germanization of the world. She alone is responsible for the incalculable destruction of this war. She led on in the armament of the world that she might rule it. She promoted therefore the armament of other nations. Her system was followed, though not as effectively, by other countries in pure defense of their peace and safety.

And now her Emperor, her Prussian military caste, and her wonderful but blinded people, have the blood of the
millions who have suffered in this world catastrophe on their hands.

**PRUSSIAN FRIGHTFULNESS**

The German military doctrine, that when the interests of the state are concerned, the question is one of power and force, and not of honor or obligation or moral restraint, finds its most flagrant examples in Germany's conduct of this war.

Her breach of a solemn obligation entered into by her and all the Powers of Europe, in respect to Belgium's neutrality, was its first exhibition. It was followed by the well proven, deliberate plan of atrocities against the men, women and children of a part of Belgium in order to terrorize the rest of the population into complete submission. It was shown in the prompt dropping of bombs on defenseless towns from Zeppelins and other aircraft; in the killing of non-combatant men, women and children by the naval bombardment of un­fortified towns; in the use of liquid fire and poison gases in battle. All of these had been condemned as improper in declarations in the Hague treaties.

**GERMAN INTRIGUE**

The Reptile Fund, which was used under Bismarck for the bribery of the press and for the maintenance of a spy system, has been enlarged and elaborated, so that German bribery has extended the world over, and the German espionage has exceeded anything known to history. The medieval use by the Hohenzollerns of dynastic kinship has paralyzed the action of the peoples of Greece and Russia. And now we know, by recent revelation, of the aid that Swedish diplomats are furnishing to Germany in her submarine warfare against neutral ships, and that it is made possible by the influence of the German consort of the Swedish King.

Intrigue, dishonor, cruelty, have characterized the entire military policy of Germany. The rules of international law have been cast to the winds. The murderous submarine has sunk without warning the non-combatant commercial vessels of the enemy and sent their officers, their crews and their passengers, men, women and children, to the bottom without warning. Not only has this policy been pursued against enemy commercial vessels, but also against neutral commer-
cial vessels, and parts of the crew have been assembled on the submarine and then the submarine has been submerged and the victims left struggling in the ocean’s waste to drown. We find a German diplomat telegraphing from a neutral port to the German headquarters advising that if the submarine be used against the vessels of that neutral Power it leave no trace of the attack. In other words, the murder of the crews must be complete, because “dead men tell no tales.”

Having violated the neutrality of Belgium, having broken its sacred obligations to that country and her people, it is now enslaving them by taking them from Belgium and enforcing their labor in Germany. This is contrary to every rule of international law, and is in the teeth of the plainest principles of justice and honor. All these things are done for the state. It is not that the nature of the German people generally is cruel—that is not the case. But the minds of the German people have been poisoned with this false philosophy; and the ruling caste in Germany, in its desperate desire to win, has allowed no consideration of humanity or decency or honor to prevent its use of any means which in any way could by hook or crook accomplish a military purpose.

**AUTOCRACY versus DEMOCRACY**

When the war began, Germany was able to convince her people and to convince many in the world that the issue in the war was not the exaltation of the military power of Germany and the expanding of her plan of destiny, but that it was a mere controversy between the Teuton and the Slav, and Germany asked with great plausibility, “Will you have the world controlled by the Slav or by the German?” Those who insisted that the issue was one of militarism against the peace of the world, of democracy against military autocracy, of freedom against military tyranny, were met with the argument, “Russia is an ally. She is a greater despotism and a greater military autocracy than Germany.” As the war wore on, the real issue was cleared of this confusion. Russia became a democracy. The fight was between governments directed by their people on the one hand, and the military dynasties of Germany, Austria, and Turkey, on the other,
THE PURPOSE OF THE WAR

President Wilson says the Allies are fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Some misconception has been created on this head. The Allies are not struggling to force a particular form of government on Germany. If the German people continue to wish an Emperor it is not the purpose of the Allies to require them to have a republic. Their purpose is to end the military policy and foreign policy of Germany that looks to the maintenance of a military and naval machine, with its hair-trigger preparation for use against her neighbors. If this continues, it will entail on every democratic government the duty of maintaining a similar armament in self-defense, or, what is more likely, the duty will be wholly or partly neglected. Thus the policy of Germany, with her purpose and destiny, will threaten every democracy. This is the condition which it is the determined purpose of the Allies, as interpreted by President Wilson, to change.

How is the change to be effected? By defeating Germany in this war. The German people have been very loyal to their Emperor, because his leadership accords with the false philosophy of the state and German destiny, with which they have been indoctrinated and poisoned. A defeat of the military machine, a defeat of the Frankenstein of the military dynasty to which they have been sacrificed, must open their eyes to the hideous futility of their political course. The German Government will then be changed as its people will have it changed, to avoid a recurrence of such a tragedy as they have deliberately prepared for themselves.

Men who see clearly the kind of peace which we must have, in order to be a real and lasting peace, can have no sympathy therefore with a patched-up peace, one made at a council table, the result of diplomatic chaffering and bargaining. Men who look forward to a League of the World to Enforce Peace in the future can have no patience with a compromise that leaves the promoting cause of the present awful war unaffected and unremoved. This war is now being fought by the Allies as a League to Enforce Peace. Unless they compel it by victory, they do not enforce it. They do not make the military autocracies of the world into nations fit for a World League, unless they convince them by a lesson of defeat.
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GERMAN PLOTS AND CONSPIRACIES IN THE UNITED STATES

(From President Wilson’s Flag-Day Address delivered at Washington: June 14, 1917)

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. They sought by violence to destroy our industries and arrest our commerce. 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. 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. And many of our own people were corrupted. 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.
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THE WORLD FOR WHICH WE ARE FIGHTING

(Excerpts from President Wilson's State Papers)

A WORLD IN WHICH NATIONALITIES AND PEOPLES, SMALL OR GREAT, THE GERMAN PEOPLE INCLUDED, WILL BE GIVEN EQUAL RIGHT TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

The American people . . . 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 freedom 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.

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.

(From the reply to Pope Benedict's identic letter to the belligerent governments: August 27, 1917)

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, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples 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.

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.

(From the address to the Senate: January 22, 1917)

A WORLD OPEN TO THE COMMERCE OF EVERY NATION: A REAL "FREEDOM OF THE SEAS," AND FREEDOM OF INTERCOURSE FOR THE LAND

So far as practicable, moreover, every great people now struggling towards 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.

(From the address to the Senate: January 22, 1917)
A World Unthreatened by Hostile Armies and Navies

It (the freedom of the seas) is a problem closely connected with the limitation of naval armaments and the cooperation 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 programmes 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 armaments 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.

(From the address to the Senate: January 22, 1917)

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.

(From the reply to Pope Benedict’s peace proposal: August 27, 1917)

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 Peoples’ 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.

(From the Flag-Day speech at Washington: June 14, 1917)

A World Pervaded by a New Spirit of Frankness and Sincerity among Nations, Compelling an Open, Unselfish and Honest Diplomacy

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: that no nation should seek to extend
The World for Which We Are Fighting

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.

*(From the address to the Senate: January 22, 1917)*

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. 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.

One of the things that has 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 counsel, our peace within and without, our industries and our commerce.

*(From the message to Congress: April 2, 1917)*

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 a test which goes to the root of the matter; and it is the test which must be applied. . . .

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.

(From the reply to Pope Benedict's identical letter to the belligerent governments: August 27, 1917)

A World in which the Combined Force of all the Democratic Nations Guarantees the Freedom and Safety of Each

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 tested foundations of political liberty.

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.

(From the message to Congress: April 2, 1917)
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THE PREAMBLE AND PROPOSALS OF THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

Adopted at the Organization Meeting held in Independence Hall, Philadelphia: June 17, 1915

THE WARRANT FROM HISTORY

Throughout five thousand years of recorded history, peace, here and there established, has been kept, and its area has been widened, in one way only. Individuals have combined their efforts to suppress violence in the local community. Communities have coöperated to maintain the authoritative state and to preserve peace within its borders. States have formed leagues or confederations or have otherwise coöperated to establish peace among themselves. Always peace has been made and kept, when made and kept at all, by the superior power of superior numbers acting in unity for the common good.

Mindful of this teaching of experience, we believe and solemnly urge that the time has come to devise and to create a working union of sovereign nations to establish peace among themselves and to guarantee it by all known and available sanctions at their command, to the end that civilization may be conserved, and the progress of mankind in comfort, enlightenment and happiness may continue.

THE PROPOSALS*

We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding the signatories to the following:

First: All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the

* These proposals were put forward by the Independence Hall Conference as pointing out the road along which the nations must sooner or later travel in their efforts to establish a just and stable peace, and not as a complete and final plan. The representatives of the nations assembled to draw up a treaty which should establish a League to Enforce Peace would no doubt modify them. They might not be willing to go so far as is here proposed; they might wish to go much farther, and to provide for a more complete form of world government than is now suggested.
limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

**Second:** All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation.

**Third:** The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

The following interpretation of Article 3 has been authorized by the Executive Committee:

"The signatory powers shall jointly employ diplomatic and economic pressure against any one of their number that threatens war against a fellow signatory without having first submitted its dispute for international inquiry, conciliation, arbitration or judicial hearing, and awaited a conclusion, or without having offered so to submit it. They shall follow this forthwith by the joint use of their military forces against that nation if it actually goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be dealt with as provided in the foregoing."

**Fourth:** Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in Article One.
A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE LEAGUE'S PROGRAMME

Briefly, it is proposed that a League of Nations, including the United States, be created at the end of the present war. An invitation to join the League would probably be extended to all civilized and progressive nations. A general treaty would be signed, by the terms of which the member-nations would mutually agree to submit to public hearing any and all disputes which might arise among them. Such an agreement would not apply to quarrels of a purely national character and would not, therefore, interfere with insurrections or prevent revolutions.

To carry out the programme it would become necessary to set up two international tribunals: a Judicial Court for the purpose of hearing and deciding those questions that can be determined by the established and accepted rules of international law and equity; and a Council of Conciliation for the purpose of composing, by compromise, all other questions that come up which, unless settled, would be likely to lead to war. A peaceful way would thus be provided to change unjust conditions, however arising. The Court, after preliminary inquiry, would determine before which tribunal a given case would go.

In the event of any member-nation threatening war against any other member-nation, without first submitting its quarrel to public review and report, all the other nations who are members of the League would immediately join in bringing to bear both diplomatic and economic pressure to stop the would-be aggressor. If, after this joint protest, it persisted with overt acts of hostility and actually commenced war, then the other member-nations, with their combined military and naval forces, would come to the defense of the one attacked. It is confidently expected that the acceptance and operation of the programme would result in the gradual reduction of armaments,—if indeed a specific agreement to reduce armaments were not made one of the essential terms of the treaty creating the League of Nations.
The military forces of the League would be used to compel submission of matters in dispute to a Court of Inquiry before any war was begun by any member. It is believed that the prolonged postponement, plus the public discussion, plus the justice of the decision or award, would tend to ensure acceptance in the vast majority of cases.

The programme begins with a proposal which is substantially the same as the essential provision in the arbitration treaties which have been signed between the United States and some thirty nations, viz.: to submit all questions to a public hearing and to delay hostilities for a year or more. The programme also makes provision for holding legislative assemblies or conferences from time to time, similar to those held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907, for the purpose of broadening and clarifying the rules of international law, which shall by mutual agreement govern in the decisions of the International Court. To these provisions the programme adds what the lawyers call a "sanction," to compel and enforce the main provision. It is this guarantee of international agreements by the joint force of the nations that really constitutes the distinctive mark of the programme of the League.

ECONOMIC PRESSURE AS A MEANS TO PREVENT WAR

(From a Report of the Special Committee Appointed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to consider Economic Results of the War and American Business. This Recommendation was Endorsed by a Two-thirds Vote of the 282 Commercial Organizations Constituting the Membership of the Chamber)

Just as, within the state, there are many things we use, besides the militia and before we use the state militia or call upon Federal troops for the enforcement of a law or the execution of a court's judgment, so there are forces we can use internationally before we employ our armies and navies. These forces can be summarized in the term economic
pressure, by which we mean the commercial and financial boycott of any nation that goes to war without submitting its dispute to judgment or inquiry. Our plea is that in the first instance the use of economic force is clearly indicated, and that military force should be resorted to only if economic pressure prove ineffective.

In considering such a use of economic pressure, it should be borne in mind that it already comes to pass automatically within a more limited area when nations go to war. Warring nations promptly boycott each other. This is important to keep in mind because confusion on this point sometimes prompts the argument that "non-intercourse would be a more expensive weapon than war," as though the fact of going to war in some way avoided non-intercourse. What your committee really means by its recommendation is that, in the future, arrangements for international enforcement of the economic boycott should be organized on a world-wide scale, and that in these world-wide arrangements nations better fitted to cooperate with economic than with military power could also have a part in the application of the pressure needed to preserve the world's prosperity and progress.

The boycott could be of progressive severity. In the first, and what would probably usually be the effective, stage, the signatory nations would refuse to buy from or sell to the offending nation. If the offenses, however, were aggravated and persistent, all intercourse could be suspended, and if that proved insufficient, then, as the last step, recourse could be taken to military force.

It is the deterrent effect of organized non-intercourse which would make war less likely, since it would be a terrible penalty to incur and one more difficult in a sense to fight against than military measures. Further, its systematic organization would tend to make any subsequent military action by the cooperating nations more effective.

Many states that, for various reasons, might not be able to cooperate with military force could cooperate by their economic force, and so render the action against the offending state more effective, and that, in the end, would be more humane.
THE NECESSITY FOR A LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO ENFORCE PEACE

(Excerpts from addresses and state papers by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States)

JOINT GUARANTEES OF PEACE

The whole world is tremulous with the influences of passion and of desperate struggle, and the only great disengaged nation is this nation which we love and whose interests we would conserve. . . . I pray God that if this contest have no other result, it will at least have the result of creating an international tribune and producing some sort of joint guarantee of peace on the part of the great nations of the world.

(From the address at Des Moines, Iowa: February 1, 1916)

A CONSTABLE TO KEEP THE PEACE

We have undertaken very much more than the safety of the United States; we have undertaken to keep what we regard as demoralizing and hurtful European influences out of this hemisphere, and that means that if the world undertakes, as we all hope it will undertake, a joint effort to keep the peace, it will expect us to play our proportional part in manifesting the force which is going to rest back of that. In the last analysis the peace of society is obtained by force, and when action comes it comes by opinion, but back of the opinion is the ultimate application of force. The greater body of opinion says to the lesser body of opinion, "We may be wrong, but you have to live under our direction for the time being, until you are more numerous than we are." That is what I understand it amounts to. Now, let us suppose that we have formed a family of nations and that family of nations says, "The world is not going to have any more wars of this sort without at least first going through certain processes to show whether there is anything in its
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case or not.” If you say, “We shall not have any war,” you have got to have the force to make the “shall” bite. And the rest of the world, if America takes part in this thing, will have the right to expect, from her that she contribute her element of force to the general understanding. Surely that is not a militaristic ideal. That is a very practical ideal.

(From the address before the Union Against Militarism: May 8, 1916)

A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Only when the great nations of the world have reached some sort of agreement as to what they hold to be fundamental to their common interest, and as to some feasible method of acting in concert when any nation or group of nations seeks to disturb those fundamental things, can we feel that civilization is at last in a way of justifying its existence and claiming to be finally established. It is clear that nations must in the future be governed by the same high code of honor that we demand of individuals.

Repeated utterances of the leading statesmen of most of the great nations now engaged in war have made it plain that their thought has come to this—that the principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations, and that the nations of the world must in some way band themselves together to see that that right prevails as against any sort of selfish aggression; that henceforth alliance must not be set up against alliance, understanding against understanding, that at the heart of that common object must lie the inviolable rights of peoples and of mankind. . . . If it should ever be our privilege to suggest or initiate a movement for peace among the nations now at war, I am sure that the people of the United States would wish their Government to move along the line of . . . a universal association of the nations to maintain the inviolate security of the highway of the seas for the common and unhindered use of all the nations of the world, and to prevent any war begun either contrary to treaty covenants or without warning and full submission of the causes to the opinion of the world,—a virtual guarantee of terri-
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torial integrity and political independence. . . . I feel that the world is even now upon the eve of a great consummation, when some common force will be brought into existence which shall safeguard right as the first and most fundamental interest of all peoples and all governments, when coercion shall be summoned not to the service of political ambition or selfish hostility, but to the service of a common order, a common justice, and a common peace. God grant that the dawn of that day of frank dealing and of settled peace, concord and cooperation may be near at hand!

(From the address to the League to Enforce Peace, Washington, D. C.: May 27, 1916)

A DISENTANGLING ALLIANCE OF NATIONS

I shall never myself consent to an entangling alliance, but would gladly assent to a disentangling alliance, an alliance which would disentangle the peoples of the world from those combinations in which they seek their own separate and private interests, and unite the peoples of the world to preserve the peace of the world upon a basis of common right and justice. There is liberty there, not limitation. There is freedom, not entanglement. There is the achievement of the highest thing for which the United States has declared its principles.

(From the Memorial Day address: May 30, 1916)

A MONROE DOCTRINE FOR THE WORLD

You have heard of the Monroe Doctrine, gentlemen. You know that we are already spiritual partners with both continents of this hemisphere, and that America means something which is bigger even than the United States, and that we stand here with the glorious power of this country ready to swing it out into the field of action whenever liberty and independence and political integrity are threatened anywhere in the western hemisphere. And we are ready.

(From the Commencement Address at West Point: June 13, 1916)
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A FEASIBLE ASSOCIATION OF NATIONS

We believe that every people has the right to choose the sovereignty under which it shall live; that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy from other nations the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon; and that the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression or disregard of the rights of peoples and nations; and we believe that the time has come when it is the duty of the United States to join with the other nations of the world in any feasible association that will effectively serve those principles to maintain inviolate the complete security of the highway of the sea for the complete and unhindered use of all nations.

(From a public address: June 17, 1916)

A JUST AND SETTLED PEACE

There must be a just and settled peace, and we here in America must contribute the full force of our enthusiasm and of our authority as a nation to the organization of that peace upon world-wide foundations that cannot easily be shaken. No nation should be forced to take sides in any quarrel in which its own honor and integrity and the fortunes of its own people are not involved; but no nation can any longer remain neutral as against any wilful disturbance of the peace of the world. The effects of war can no longer be confined to the areas of battle. No nation stands wholly apart in interest when the life and interests of all nations are thrown into confusion and peril. If hopeful and generous enterprise is to be renewed, if the healing and helpful arts of life are indeed to be revived when peace comes again, a new atmosphere of justice and friendship must be generated by means the world has never tried before. The nations of the world must unite in joint guarantees that whatever is done to disturb the whole world's life must first be tested in the court of the whole world's opinion before it is attempted. These are the new foundations the world must build for itself, and we must play our part in the reconstruction, gen-
erously and without too much thought of our separate interests. We must make ourselves ready to play it intelligently, vigorously and well.

(From the Speech of Acceptance at Long Branch: September 2, 1916)

**AMERICA AND THE WORLD**

When we look forward to the years to come—I wish I could say the months to come—to the end of this war, we want all the world to know that we are ready to lend our force without stint to the preservation of peace in the interest of mankind. The world is no longer divided into little circles of interest. The world no longer consists of neighborhoods. The world is linked together in a common life and interest such as humanity never saw before, and the starting of wars can never again be a private and individual matter for the nations. What disturbs the life of the whole world is the concern of the whole world, and it is our duty to lend the full force of this nation, moral and physical, to a league of nations which shall see to it that nobody disturbs the peace of the world without submitting his case first to the opinion of mankind.

(From the Semi-Centennial Address at Omaha, Nebraska: October 6, 1916)

**SECURING THE PEACE OF THE WORLD**

In the measures to be taken to secure the future peace of the world the people and Government of the United States are as vitally and as directly interested as the Governments now at war. Their interest, moreover, in the means to be adopted to relieve the smaller and weaker peoples of the world of the peril of wrong and violence is as quick and ardent as that of any other people or Government. They stand ready, and even eager, to cooperate in the accomplishment of these ends when the war is over with every influence and resource at their command.

(From the President's identical note to the nations at war: October 18, 1916)
A DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

The business of neutrality is over. . . . War now has such a scale that the position of neutrals sooner or later becomes intolerable, just as neutrality would be intolerable to me if I lived in a community where everybody had to assert his own rights by force and I had to go around among my neighbors and say, "Here, this cannot last any longer; let us get together and see that nobody disturbs the peace any more." That is what society is, and we have not yet a society of nations. We must have a society of nations. Not suddenly, not by insistence, not by any hostile emphasis upon the demand, but by the demonstration of the needs of the time. The nations of the world must get together and say that nobody can hereafter be neutral as respects the disturbance of the world's peace for an object which the world's opinion cannot sanction. The world's peace ought to be disturbed if the fundamental rights of humanity are invaded, but it ought not to be disturbed for any other thing that I can think of, and America was established in order to indicate, at any rate in one government, the fundamental rights of man. America must hereafter be ready as a member of the family of nations to exert her whole force, moral and physical, to the assertion of those rights throughout the round globe.

(From an address before the Woman's City Club of Cincinnati: October 25, 1916)

NATIONS TO-DAY ARE NEIGHBORS

The world will never be again what it has been. The United States will never be again what it has been. The United States was once in enjoyment of what we used to call splendid isolation. The three thousand miles of the Atlantic seemed to hold all European affairs at arm's length from us. The great spaces of the Pacific seemed to disclose no threat of influence upon our politics. Now from across the Atlantic and from across the Pacific we feel to the quick the influences which are affecting ourselves. . . . It does not suffice to look, as some gentlemen are looking, back over their shoulders, to suggest that we do again what we did
when we were provincial and isolated and unconnected with the great forces of the world, for now we are in the great drift of humanity which is to determine the politics of every country in the world.

(From an address delivered at Long Branch, N. J.: November 4, 1916)

A COVENANT OF COöPERATIVE 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.

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. . . . 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, 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 afterwards, 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. . . . 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, or 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.

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: 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.

(From the address to the Senate: January 22, 1917)

A LEAGUE OF HONOR

Our object is to vindicate the principles of peace and 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.

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. . . .

We are now about to accept 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 tested 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.

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—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.

(From the War Message to Congress: April 2, 1917)
This legislation makes no attempt to solve the question of a permanent military policy for the country, chiefly for the reason that in these anxious and disordered times a clear view cannot be had either of our permanent military necessities or of the best mode of organizing a proper military peace establishment. The hope of the world is that when the European war is over, arrangements will have been made composing many of the questions which have hitherto seemed to require the arming of the nations, and that in some ordered and just way the peace of the world may be maintained by such co­operations of force among the great nations as may be necessary to maintain peace and freedom throughout the world. When these arrangements for a permanent peace are made, we can determine our military needs and adapt our course of military preparation to the genius of a world organized for justice and democracy.

(From the statement on the General Staff Bill, issued April 6, 1917)

We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and the unddictated development of all peoples, and every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. Wrongs must first be righted, and then adequate safeguards must be created to prevent their being committed again. We ought not to consider remedies merely because they have a pleasing and sonorous sound. Practical questions can be settled only by practical means. Phrases will not accomplish the result. Effective readjustments will; and whatever readjustments are necessary must be made.

But they must follow a principle, and that principle is plain. No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live. No territory must change hands except for the purpose of securing those who inhabit it a fair chance of life and liberty. No indemnities must be insisted on except those that constitute payment for manifest wrongs done. No readjustments of power must be made
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except such as will tend to secure the future peace of the world and the future welfare and happiness of its peoples.

And then the free peoples of the world must draw together in some common covenant, some genuine and practical coöperation that will in effect combine their force to secure peace and justice in the dealings of nations with one another. The brotherhood of mankind must no longer be a fair but empty phrase; it must be given a structure of force and reality. The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing power.

(From the message to the Russian Government: published June 10, 1917)

A COVENANTED PEACE 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.

(From the reply to Pope Benedict: August 27, 1917)
EUROPEAN STATESMEN URGE
A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

THE RIGHT HONORABLE DAVID LLOYD GEORGE
PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

The world will then be able, when this war is over, to attend to its business in peace. There will be no war or rumors of war to disturb and to distract. We can build up, we can reconstruct, we can till, we can cultivate and enrich, and the burden and terror and waste of war will have gone. The best security for peace will be that nations band themselves together to punish the peace-breaker. In the armories of Europe, every weapon will be a sword of justice. In the government of men, every army will be the constabulary of peace.

(From the address at Guildhall: January 11, 1917)

THE RIGHT HONORABLE HERBERT ASQUITH
FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

We are bound, and not only bound, but glad, to give respectful attention to such pronouncements as the recent speech of . . . President Wilson. That speech was addressed . . . to the American Senate, and through them to the people of the United States. It was, therefore, a declaration of American policy, or, to speak more precisely, of American ideals. The President held out to his hearers the prospect of an era when the civilization of mankind, banded together for the purpose, will make it their joint and several duty to repress by their united authority, and if need be by their combined naval and military forces, any wanton or aggressive invasion of the peace of the world. It is a fine ideal, which must arouse all our sympathies.

(From the speech in the House of Commons: February 1, 1917)
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THE RIGHT HONORABLE ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR
BRITISH SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We are forced to the sorrowful recognition of the weakness of international law so long as it is unsupported by international authority. . . . Here we come face to face with the great problem which lies behind all the changing aspects of this tremendous war. When it is brought to an end, how is civilized mankind so to reorganize itself that similar catastrophes shall not be permitted to recur? . . . The problem is insistent. . . . Surely, even now, it is fairly clear that if substantial progress is to be made towards securing the peace of the world and a free development of its constituent nations, the United States of America and the British Empire should explicitly recognize, what all instinctively know, that on these great subjects they share a common ideal. . . . If, in our time, any substantial effort is to be made toward securing the permanent triumph of the Anglo-Saxon ideal, the great communities which accept it must work together. And in working together they must remember that law is not enough. Behind law there must be power. It is good that arbitration should be encouraged. It is good that the accepted practices of warfare should become ever more humane. It is good that before peace is broken the would-be belligerents should be compelled to discuss their differences in some congress of the nations. It is good that the security of the smaller States should be fenced round with peculiar care. But all the precautions are mere scraps of paper unless they can be enforced.

Speaking myself more than two years ago in the early months of the war, at Dublin, of the ends which we as a people ought to keep in view, taking as my text Mr. Gladstone’s words that the greatest triumph of our time would be the enthronement of the idea of public right as the governing idea of European politics, and asking what that meant, or what it ought to mean when translated into practice, I said, I believe with the general approval of my fellow-countrymen, what I am going to quote:—It means, finally, or it ought to mean, perhaps by a slow and gradual process, the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambition, for groupings and alliances of a precarious equipoise,
of a real European partnership, based on the recognition of equal right, and established and enforced by a common will.

I am not sure that there is any substantial difference between President Wilson’s ideal and the one which I thus endeavored to depict, except—and this I admit is a large step in advance—that he would blot out the geographical limitation of Europe, and associate the United States, and indeed all civilized peoples, in the same peace-preserving fraternity. We never have had the faintest desire for the annihilation of the German people, or of the German state. Destruction, widespread and terrible to contemplate, is a necessary incident of all war, but our object in this war is not to destroy, but to reconstruct on a deeper-laid and a more enduring basis the wantonly broken fabric of public right and national independence.

(From an interview in THE LONDON TIMES: May 18, 1916)

VISCOUNT GREY OF FALLODON
FORMER BRITISH SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

If the peace of Europe can be preserved and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavor will be to promote some arrangement, to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia and ourselves, jointly or separately. The idea has hitherto been too Utopian to form the subject of definite proposals, but, if this present crisis, so much more acute than any that Europe has gone through for generations, be safely passed, I am hopeful that the relief and reaction which will follow may make possible some more definite rapprochement between the Powers than has been possible hitherto.

(From the statement to Sir Edward Goschen: July 30, 1914)
versy should be settled by methods other than those of war. Such other methods are always successful when there is goodwill and no aggressive spirit. We believe in negotiations. We have faith in international conferences.

Long before the war I hoped for a league of nations that would be united, quick, and instant to prevent, and, if need be, to punish violations of international treaties of public right and of national independence, and would say to nations that come forward with grievances and claims: “Put them before an impartial tribunal. If you can win at this bar, you will get what you want; if you cannot, you shall not have what you want; and if you attempt to start a war we all shall adjudge you the common enemy of humanity, and treat you accordingly.” As footpads, safe-breakers, burglars, and incendiaries are suppressed in a community, so those who would commit these crimes, and incalculably more than these crimes, will be suppressed among the nations.

(From an interview in THE CHICAGO NEWS: May 13, 1916)

If the nations of the world after this war are to do something more effective than they were ever able to do before this war, to combine themselves for the common object of preserving peace, they must be prepared not to undertake more than they are able to uphold by force, and to see when the time of crisis comes that it is upheld by force.

(From an address before the Foreign Press Association of London: October 23, 1916)

I sincerely desire to see a league of nations formed and made effective to secure the future peace of the world after this war is over. I regard this as the best, if not the only, prospect of preserving treaties and of saving the world from aggressive wars in years to come.

(From a cablegram to the League to Enforce Peace: November 24, 1916)
THE RIGHT HONORABLE ANDREW BONAR LAW
BRITISH CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER

President Wilson’s aim is to have peace now and security for peace in the future. That is our aim also and it is our only aim. He hopes to secure this by a league of peace, and he not only spoke in favor of such a league but he is trying to induce the American Senate to take the steps necessary to give effect to it. It would not be right to look upon the question as altogether Utopian. You know that only quite recently, almost up to our own time, duelling was common, and now the idea that private quarrels should be settled by the sword has become unthinkable. I think it is not impossible—I hope it may prove possible—that the time may come when the nations of the world will look upon what Cromwell described as his great work as their work too—that of being a constable to preserve peace in the parish.

(From the speech at Bristol: January 24, 1917)

EARL CURZON
LORD PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH WAR COUNCIL

They would be surprised if when the war was over the better judgment of mankind did not rally in force and say that these abominations must not be again in the world. Mankind must be saved from the peril of its own passion. Machinery must be devised to prevent the reign of brute force in the world.

(From his statement as Chairman of the Atlantic Union: May 16, 1916)

LORD ROBERT CECIL
BRITISH MINISTER OF BLOCKADE

Are we to go back after the war to just the same international system as prevailed before it? Is nothing to be done to rescue Europe at least from international anarchy? Surely we will try for something better.

(From the Inaugural Address, Cambridge Summer Meeting: August 2, 1916)
Keeping the World Safe

The war aims of the Entente Allies as previously announced still hold good; there is sympathy with the Russian programme of no annexations and no indemnities, on the understanding that this refers to annexations and indemnities for purposes of political aggrandizement; but there will be annexations to complete the freedom of the peoples enslaved by the Teutonic Powers and indemnities for the wrongs committed in Belgium, France, Serbia and Poland. We at any rate are determined not to accept a peace that will be no peace. The peace that we accept must be a peace that will be durable. I have always been an adherent of the idea of a league of nations, . . . but such a league must be founded upon a sound, just, and equitable basis.

(From an address to the British House of Commons: May 16, 1917)

THE RIGHT HONORABLE ARTHUR HENDERSON
FORMER MEMBER OF THE BRITISH WAR COUNCIL
FORMER SECRETARY OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

Such a peace can only be satisfactory if founded upon the defeat of unrestrained militarism, and accompanied by a League of Nations sufficiently strong to keep the existing armies in their proper places, prevent the inflation of armaments, and secure the enforcement of international law. It must be a peace which will serve to remove, or at least weaken, the causes of unrest between nations, and bring into universal disfavor acts of aggression.

(From a speech to Croydon North End Brotherhood: January 18, 1917)

GENERAL THE HONORABLE JAN C. SMUTS, K.C., N.L.A.
MINISTER OF DEFENSE, UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

We must have not merely agreements between nations, but a bedrock of honesty and sincerity in the peoples, on which a lasting agreement could be built. We must have a public opinion which would be the best guarantee of peace, and
which would see that governments were kept in order. Na­tions must decide their own fate and no longer be disposed of by statesmen and governments. . . . We must in some form bring about a League of Nations, with some common organ of consultation and decision on vital issues.

(From an address at the League of Nations Mass Meeting, held in Central Hall, Westminster: May 14, 1917)

It is expedient in the interest of mankind that some ma­chinery should be set up after the present war for the pur­pose of maintaining international right and general peace, and this meeting welcomes the suggestion put forward for this purpose by the President of the United States and other influential statesmen in America, and commends to the sym­pathetic consideration of the British people the idea of form­ing a union of free nations for the preservation of perma­nent peace.

(From a resolution introduced by General Smuts, seconded by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and unanimously adopted at the League of Nations Mass Meeting, Central Hall, Westminster: May 14, 1917)

---

LORD NORTHCLIFFE
BRITISH EDITOR
HEAD OF THE AMERICAN MISSION

A close federation of the nations now fighting the good fight will be the only insurance against the autocracy that made this war possible and the horrors that the armies of the autocrat perpetrated on innocent non-combatants. The world must be made free for democracy.

(From an address before the Players Club, New York City: June 28, 1917)
Keeping the World Safe

PROFESSOR PAUL PAINLEVÉ
PREMIER OF FRANCE

If France pursues this war, it is neither for conquest nor out of vengeance. It is to defend her liberty, her independence, and, at the same time, the liberty and independence of the civilized world. Her claims are those of right itself. . . . The disannexation of Alsace-Lorraine, reparation for the ruin caused by the enemy, and the conclusion of a peace that will not be a peace of constrained violence, comprising within itself germs of wars to come, but a peace that is a just peace, in which there are efficacious guarantees to protect the society of nations against all aggressions from one among them—such are the noble aims of France.

(From the Ministerial Declaration read in the French Chamber of Deputies, Paris: September 18, 1917)

M. ALEXANDRE RIBOT
FORMER PREMIER OF FRANCE

It is necessary that a League of Peace be founded in the same spirit of democracy that France has had the honor of introducing into the world. The nations now in arms will constitute the Society of Nations. This is the future of humanity, or one might well despair of the future. President Wilson upon this point is with us. All nations not predatory must unite to prevent others from disturbing the peace. They must unite in an armed league to make respected throughout the world, peace, justice and liberty.

(From an address to the French Senate: June 6, 1917)

M. ARISTIDE BRIAND
FORMER PREMIER OF FRANCE

A solid, lasting peace guaranteed against any return of violence by appropriate international measures.

(From a public statement: September 14, 1916)
And now we see all America rise and sharpen her weapons in the midst of peace for the common struggle. Together we will carry on that struggle; and when by force we have at last imposed military victory, our labors will not be concluded. Our task will be—I quote the noble words of President Wilson—to organize the society of nations. . . . After material victory we will win this moral victory. We will shatter the ponderous sword of militarism, we will establish guarantees for peace, and then we can disappear from the world's stage, since we shall leave at the cost of our common immolation the noblest heritage future generations can possess.

(From the speech before the United States Senate: May 1, 1917)

Your flag bears forty-eight stars representing forty-eight states. Each state has its own legislature, but all are subject to Federal laws that were made for all. May we not hope for the day when all the nations of the earth will be united as are your states, under certain broad and general restrictions that will make it forever impossible for some mad autocrat to play havoc with the universe?

(From the speech at the Boston Public Library: May 13, 1917)

Peaceful in its intentions, striving for a lasting peace based on democratic principles and established by democratic will, the Russian people and its army are rallying their forces around the banners of freedom, strengthening their ranks in cheerful self-consciousness to die but not to be slaves. Russia wants the world to be safe for democracy. To make it safe means to have democracy rule the world.
... Russia will not fail to be a worthy partner in the "League of Honor."

(From an address before the United States Senate: June 26, 1917)

Russia believes that a permanent peace can be enacted when all democracies will agree to hold to and follow certain precepts and embody them with all sincerity and without reserve. The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against aggressions of autocracy.

(From an address at Carnegie Hall, New York: July 6, 1917)

PROFESSOR PAUL N. MILIUKOFF
FORMER RUSSIAN MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The definition by President Wilson of the purposes of the war corresponds entirely with the declarations of the statesmen of the allied powers. M. Briand, Mr. Asquith, and Viscount Grey all expressed themselves continually on the necessity of seeking to prevent conflicts of armed forces by providing peaceful methods of solution for international disputes and creating a new organization of nations based upon order and justice in international life. The democracy of free Russia is able to associate itself completely with these declarations.

(From a statement to the Associated Press: April 7, 1917)

SR. AUGUSTO CIUFFELLI
MEMBER OF THE ITALIAN WAR MISSION

This must be the last war. Nations cannot in the future squander all their money on military preparedness. The new spirit must make us live together in the ideals of peace and justice. Italy is eager to take her place in a new world organized for peace.

(From a statement to the press: June 1, 1917)
HR. GUNNAR KNUDSEN
NORWEGIAN MINISTER OF STATE

It has been difficult to realize the meaning of this world catastrophe. But now we are beginning to find the reason, in what seemed quite beyond reason. Democracy has gained great victories in Europe during the war. And the work of creating right and justice between the peoples through a general cooperation for preventing new wars has gained an actuality as never before. If this war brings, as a result, the democratizing of the peoples and the substitution of right instead of might, then the war has not been too dear.

(From a statement in Christiania on Constitution Day: May 15, 1917)

HIS HOLINESS POPE BENEDICT

We now wish to make a more concrete and practical proposal and to invite the governments of the belligerents to come to an agreement upon the following points which seem to be a basis of a just and durable peace, leaving to them the task of analyzing and completing them.

First of all, the fundamental point must be that the material force of arms be substituted by the moral force of right, from which shall arise a fair agreement by all for the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments, according to the rules and guarantees to be established, in a measure necessary and sufficient for the maintenance of public order in each state.

Then in the substitution for armies of the institution of arbitration with its high pacifying function, according to the rules to be laid down and the penalties to be imposed on a state which would refuse either to submit a national question to arbitration or to accept its decision.

(From the message to the belligerent governments: August 1, 1917)
GOVERNMENTS PLEDGE SUPPORT TO
A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Official Correspondence and Resolutions

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

In the measures to be taken to secure the future peace of the world the people and Government of the United States are as vitally and as directly interested as the Governments now at war. Their interest, moreover, in the means to be adopted to relieve the smaller and weaker peoples of the world of the peril of wrong and violence is as quick and ardent as that of any other people or government. They stand ready, and even eager, to cooperate in the accomplishment of these ends when the war is over with every influence and resource at their command.

(From President Wilson's identical note to the warring nations: dated Washington, December 18, 1916)

THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE ENTENTE ALLIES

In a general way they (the Allied Governments) desire to declare their respect for the lofty sentiments inspiring the American Note (of December 18th) and their whole-hearted agreement with the proposal to create a League of Nations which shall assure peace and justice throughout the world. They recognize all the benefits that would accrue to the cause of humanity and civilization from the institution of international arrangements designed to prevent violent conflicts between nations, and so framed as to provide the sanctions necessary to their enforcement, lest an illusory security should serve merely to facilitate fresh acts of aggression.

(From the joint reply to the American Note: dated Paris, January 10, 1917)
THE GOVERNMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

His Majesty's Government ... feels strongly that the durability of peace must largely depend on its character and that no stable system of international relations can be built on foundations which are essentially and hopelessly defective. ... There are those who think that for this disease international treaties and international laws may provide a sufficient cure. ... The people of this country ... do not believe peace can be durable if it be not based on the success of the allied cause. For a durable peace can hardly be expected unless three conditions are fulfilled: the first is that the existing causes of international unrest should be as far as possible removed or weakened; the second is that the aggressive aims and the unscrupulous methods of the Central Powers should fall into disrepute among their own peoples; the third is that behind international law and behind all treaty arrangements for preventing or limiting hostilities some form of international sanction should be devised which would give pause to the hardiest aggressor.

(From a letter from Foreign Secretary Balfour to Sir Cecil Spring-Rice: dated London, January 13, 1917)

THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT

The Chamber of Deputies, the direct expression of the sovereignty of the French people, expects that the efforts of the armies of the Republic and her allies will secure, once Prussian militarism is destroyed, durable guarantees for peace and independence for peoples great and small, in a league of nations such as has already been foreshadowed.

(From a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Deputies and approved by the Senate: dated Paris, June 4 and June 6, 1917)

THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT

Russia has always been in full sympathy with the broad, humanitarian principles expressed by the President of the United States. His message to the Senate, therefore, has
made a most favorable impression upon the Russian Government. Russia will welcome all suitable measures which will help prevent a recurrence of the world war. Accordingly we can gladly indorse President Wilson's communication.

(From a statement given out by the Foreign Office to the Associated Press: dated Petrograd, January 26, 1917)

THE GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND

It is with very great interest that we have taken note of the programme of your humanitarian movement. In asking us to associate ourselves in it you have given us a new proof of the sympathy of the United States for Switzerland and we desire to say to you how much we appreciate it. The League to Enforce Peace, which counts among its members so many eminent personalities, aims to insure the maintenance of peace after it shall have been concluded; truly a delicate mission, but the difficulties of which are not to be allowed to discourage your efforts. You regard as one of the most efficacious means to that end a treaty of arbitration conceived in the same spirit as the treaty of February 13, 1914, between Switzerland and the United States, a treaty which all the countries are to sign and by which they will undertake to submit to the decision of a supreme international tribunal the conflicts which may arise between them in order to avoid, as far as possible, a return of the catastrophe which desolates the world to-day. Switzerland is so much the better placed to appreciate the work of which the United States has taken the initiative, because, surrounded on all sides by war, peopled by the race and inheriting the language and the culture of three among the combatant nations, she is better able than any other country to realize the fact that war is inhuman, and is contrary to the superior interest of civilization which is the common patrimony of all men. If, then, at the conclusion of peace, the occasion should present itself for us to unite our efforts to yours, we will not fail to do so, and we will be happy to
make our contribution toward rendering peace more secure when reëstablished.

(From a letter written by Dr. Arthur Hoffman as head of the Political Department of the Division of Foreign Affairs, to the Hon. Theodore Marburg, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Organization of the League to Enforce Peace: dated Berne, December 11, 1916)

THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT

His Majesty's Government is following with keen sympathy the idea of establishing, after the end of the present war, an international league for the purpose of preventing the peace of the world being again disturbed, and when the opportunity of doing so arrives, with a guarantee of success, will lend its concourse to the realization of such a humanitarian and lofty project.

(A cablegram from Don Amalio Gimeno, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the League to Enforce Peace: dated Madrid, January 13, 1917)

Note: Viscount Motono, Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs (January 15, 1917) and Viscount Ishii, Japanese Ambassador Extraordinary to the United States (August 30, 1917) have expressed themselves as in sympathy with the movement for a League of Nations.
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