

Woodrow Wilson, the First World War, and the League Fight



In August 1914, Europe descended into war. Then an imperial power and an active trader on the high seas, the United States became ensnared in a deadly conflict.

Until April 1917, however, President Woodrow Wilson struggled to define policies that would protect U.S. interests and principles, and the carnage, and permit him to influence the peace settlement. The president protested violations of U.S. neutral rights that interrupted trade and took human life (dramatized by the sinking of the *Lusitania* by a German submarine in May 1915) and offered to mediate a "peace without victory." Britain's naval blockade of the continent meanwhile directed the bulk of U.S. cargo to British ports, provoking Germany to denounce the trade as not neutral. When his peace advocacy faltered and Germany launched unrestricted submarine warfare, Wilson asked a divided but ultimately supportive Congress for a declaration of war.

Once the United States became a belligerent, Wilson strove not only to win the war but also to shape the peace. He called for a nonpunitive peace treaty and urged the creation of an association of nations, the League of Nations, to deter war. The president's Fourteen Points outlined his plans for shelving balance-of-power politics in favor of disarmament, the self-determination of nations, and open diplomacy. Having tipped the balance in favor of the Allies, the United States helped to force Germany to surrender on November 11, 1918. In January of the following year, Wilson journeyed to the Versailles Palace near Paris to negotiate a peace treaty and a covenant for the League of Nations that he believed would sustain a world order.

At home, however, many Americans questioned Wilson's handling of foreign policy, especially after they learned that he had compromised many of his principles at the conference to win approval for his League. Republican leaders, who had defeated Democrats in the 1918 congressional elections, calculated that the Democrat Wilson had become politically vulnerable. Supreme nationalists feared that an international organization would undermine American sovereignty and violate George Washington's venerable advice to avoid permanent alliances. Anti-imperialists noted that the Treaty of Versailles had not included provisions for the dismantling of European

empires. Wilson battled back, denouncing the naysayers as narrow, backward-looking people who did not understand humanity's demand for a new world order. He refused to abandon the collective security provision of Article 10 of the League Covenant. Unwilling to bargain with senators who demanded "reservations" (amendments), opposed to "irreconcilables" who rejected the League outright, and laid low by a debilitating stroke suffered in the summer of 1919, Wilson lost the fight. The Senate rejected the treaty and U.S. membership in the League of Nations.

America's participation in the First World War further elevated the nation to great-power status and enshrined many of Wilson's ideals as the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. Thus, it is not surprising that scholars have disagreed strongly in assessing "Wilsonianism." Some have praised Wilson for his breadth of vision, his willingness to make America assume a leadership role in world affairs, and his noble crusade against power politics. Others have labeled Wilson an impractical idealist, whose moralism led him to adopt an inconsistent neutrality in the early stages of the war, to underestimate the great-power nationalism of the Allies at war's end, and to render people of color residing in colonial areas incapable of governing themselves. Still others have analyzed the impact of partisan politics, the adversarial relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. governments, and Wilson's deteriorating health to explain the ultimate failure of Wilsonian diplomacy. Should Wilson be credited with designing a multilateral system that, once adopted after World War II, preserved the peace for over half a century? Or was Wilson's principal legacy the flawed Versailles treaty, which unwisely punished Germany, left the United States absent from the League of Nations, set the stage for the Second World War, and dodged the all-important issue of decolonization? To grapple with Wilsonianism and its legacy is to reach for an understanding of America's place in twentieth-century world affairs.



DOCUMENTS

When a German U-boat sank the British liner *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, killing 1,198, including 128 Americans, President Woodrow Wilson sent a strong note to Berlin. The May 13 warning, Document 1, demands that Germany disavow submarine warfare and respect the right of Americans to sail on the high seas. In January 1917, Germany declared unrestricted submarine warfare, and Wilson broke diplomatic relations with Berlin. On April 2, after the sinking of several American vessels, the president asked Congress for a declaration of war. His war message, Document 2, outlines U.S. grievances against Germany. One of the few dissenters in the Senate—the war measure passed, 82 to 6—was Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin. In his speech of April 4, Document 3, the great reform politician reveals his fear of an American "war machine."

President Wilson issued his Fourteen Points in a speech on January 8, 1918, reprinted here as Document 4. Articles 10 through 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations hammered out at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 are included as Document 5. Wilson explained during his busy western U.S. speaking tour in September 1919 that these provisions would prevent wars. Excerpts from his speeches are featured in Document 6. Led by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, critics worked to add "reservations" to the covenant through a Lodge resolution dated November 19, 1919, Document 7. But neither an amended peace treaty (which contained the covenant) nor an unamended treaty passed the Senate.

Wilsonianism inflamed passions far beyond U.S. borders. Advocates of self-determination in colonial areas took umbrage when the great powers refused to consider decolonization at Versailles in 1919. In Document 8, an excerpt from his

The Youth's Movement in China (1927), the Chinese educator and nationalist Tsi C. Wang recalls the historic May Fourth protest against the transfer of Germany's concessions at Jiaochow (Kiaochow) and Qingdao (Tsing-tao) on the Shandong (Shantung) peninsula in northern China to arch-rival Japan. The student-led uprising pressured the divided Chinese government to reject the Treaty of Versailles in June of that year and marked the radicalization of modern Chinese nationalism.

DOCUMENT 1

The First *Lusitania* Note Demands That Germany Halt Submarine Warfare, 1915

The Government of the United States has been apprised that the Imperial German Government considered themselves to be obliged by the extraordinary circumstances of the present war and the measures adopted by their adversaries in seeking to cut Germany off from all commerce, to adopt methods of retaliation which go much beyond the ordinary methods of warfare at sea, in the proclamation of a war zone from which they have warned neutral ships to keep away. This Government has already taken occasion to inform the Imperial German Government that it cannot admit the adoption of such measures or such a warning of danger to operate as in any degree an abridgment of the rights of American shipmasters or of American citizens bound on lawful errands as passengers on merchant ships of belligerent nationality: and that it must hold the Imperial German Government to a strict accountability for any infringement of those rights, intentional or incidental. It does not understand the Imperial German Government to question those rights. It assumes, on the contrary, that the Imperial Government accept, as of course, the rule that the lives of noncombatants, whether they be of neutral citizenship or citizens of one of the nations at war, can not lawfully or rightfully be put in jeopardy by the capture or destruction of an unarmed merchantman, and recognize also, as all other nations do, the obligation to take the usual precaution of visit and search to ascertain whether a suspected merchantman is in fact of belligerent nationality or is in fact carrying contraband of war under a neutral flag.

The Government of the United States, therefore, desires to call the attention of the Imperial German Government with the utmost earnestness to the fact that the objection to their present method of attack against the trade of their enemies lies in the practical impossibility of employing submarines in the destruction of commerce without disregarding those rules of fairness, reason, justice, and humanity, which all modern opinion regards as imperative. It is practically impossible for the officers of a submarine to visit a merchantman at sea and examine her papers and cargo. It is practically impossible for them to make a prize of her, and, if they can not put a prize crew on board of her, they can not sink her without leaving her crew and all on board of her to the mercy of the sea in her small boats. These facts it is understood the Imperial German Government frankly admit. We are informed that, in the instances of which we have spoken, time enough for even that poor measure of safety was not given, and in at least two of the cases cited, not so much as a warning was received. Manifestly

This document can be found in U.S. Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1915, Supplement* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1928), 393-396.

submarines can not be used against merchantmen, as the last few weeks have shown, without an inevitable violation of many sacred principles of justice and humanity.

American citizens act within their indisputable rights in taking their ships and in traveling wherever their legitimate business calls them upon the high seas, and exercise those rights in what should be the well-justified confidence that their lives will not be endangered by acts done in clear violation of universally acknowledged international obligations, and certainly in the confidence that their own Government will sustain them in the exercise of their rights.

DOCUMENT 2

President Woodrow Wilson Asks Congress to Declare War Against Germany, 1917

On the third 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 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. 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 undersized craft in conformity with its promise then given to us 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, when 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 meagre 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. 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, 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 where lay the free highways of the world. By painful stage after stage has that law been built up, with meagre enough results, indeed, after all was accomplished that could be accomplished, but always with a clear view, at least of what the heart and

This document can be found in *Congressional Record*, LV (April 2, 1917), Part I, 102-104.

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 noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. The present war can be paid for, the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, 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. 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. . . .

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; 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. . . .

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 knew 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 towards life. The 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, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive 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 Honour.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friends is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government counsel, our peace within and without, our industries and our commerce. . . . That German Minister at Mexico City [the Zimmerman telegram] is eloquent evidence-

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. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with its 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 pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples 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. . . .

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.

D O C U M E N T 3

Senator Robert M. La Follette Voices His Dissent, 1917

The poor, sir, who are the ones called upon to rot in the trenches, have no organized power, have no press to voice their will upon this question of peace or war; but, oh, Mr. President, at some time they will be heard. I hope and I believe they will be heard in an orderly and a peaceful way. I think they may be heard from before long. I think, sir, if we take this step, when the people to-day who are staggering under the burden of supporting families at the present prices of the necessities of the life find those prices multiplied, when they are raised a hundred percent, or 200 percent, as they will be quickly, aye, sir, when beyond that those who pay taxes come to have their taxes doubled and again doubled to pay the interest on the nontaxable bonds held by Morgan and his combinations, which have been issued to meet this war, there will come an awakening; they will have their day and they will be heard. It will be as certain and as inevitable as the return of the tides, and as resistless, too. . . .

II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, 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 guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

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 interests 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 cooperation 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 treaty allies since the war has been the most complete failure of all justice and of all

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, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all

VII. Belgium, 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, 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.

XI Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be awarded occupied territories

XI. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly consul along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be secured.

XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured

opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

XIII. An independent Polish state 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 covenants.

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

DOCUMENT 5

Articles 10 Through 16 of the League of Nations Covenant, 1919

Article 10. The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Article 11. Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations....

It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

Article 12. The Members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the Council.

In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

Article 13. The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration....

Article 14. The Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Council may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

Article 15. If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council....

Article 16. Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

DOCUMENT 6

Wilson Defends the Peace Treaty and League, 1919

Indianapolis, Indiana, September 4

You have heard a great deal about article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations. Article 10 speaks the conscience of the world. Article 10 is the article which goes to the heart of this whole bad business, for that article says that the members of this league, that is intended to be all the great nations of the world, engage to respect and to preserve against all external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of the nations concerned. That promise is necessary in order to prevent this sort of war from recurring, and we are absolutely discredited if we fought this war and then neglect the essential safeguard against it. You have heard it said, my fellow citizens, that we are robbed of some degree of our sovereign independent choice by boys deprives himself of absolute sovereignty, but he does it by promising never to do wrong, and I can not for one see anything that robs me of any inherent right that I ought to retain when I promise that I will do right, when I promise that I will respect the thing which, being disregarded and violated, brought on a war in which millions

of men lost their lives, in which the civilization of mankind was in the balance, in which there was the most outrageous exhibition ever witnessed in the history of man, kind of the rapacity and disregard for right of a great armed people. We engage in the first sentence of article 10 to respect and preserve from external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence not only of the other member States, but of all States, and if any member of the league advises what should be done promise, then what happens? The council of the nation attempting to violate to enforce the respect for that covenant on the part of the nation attempting to violate it, and there is no compulsion upon us to take that advice except the compulsion of our good conscience and judgment. So that it is perfectly evident that if in the judgment of the people of the United States the council adjudged wrong and that this was not a case of the use of force, there would be no necessity on the part of the Congress of the United States to vote the use of force. But there could be no advice of the council on any such subject without a unanimous vote, and the unanimous vote includes our own, and if we accepted the advice we would be accepting our own advice, for I need not tell you that the representatives of the Government at home, and that what we united in advising we could be certain that the American people would desire to do. There is in that covenant not only a surrender of the independent judgment of the Government of the United States, but an expression of it, because that independent judgment would have to join with the judgment of the rest.

But when is that judgment going to be expressed, my fellow citizens? Only after it is evident that every other resource has failed, and I want to call your attention to the central machinery of the league of nations. If any member of that league or any nation not a member refuses to submit the question at issue either to arbitration or to discussion by the council, there ensues automatically, by the engagements of this covenant, an absolute economic boycott. There will be no trade with that nation by any member of the league. There will be no interchange of communication by post or telegraph. There will be no travel to or from that nation. Its borders will be closed. No citizen of any other State will be allowed to enter it and no one of its citizens will be allowed to leave it. It will be hermetically sealed by the united action of the most powerful nations in the world. And if this economic boycott bears with unequal weight, the members of the league agree to support one another and to relieve one another in any exceptional disadvantages that may arise out of it.

I want to call your attention, if you will turn it up when you go home, to article 11, following article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations. That article, let me say, is the favorite article in the treaty, so far as I am concerned. It says that every matter which is likely to affect the peace of the world is everybody's business; that it shall be the friendly right of any nation to call attention in the league to anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, upon which the peace of the world depends, whether that matter immediately concerns the nation drawing attention to it or not.

St. Louis, Missouri, September 5

There can hereafter be no secret treaties. There were nations represented around that board—I mean the board at which the commission on the league of nations sat.

where 14 nations were represented—there were nations represented around that board who had entered into many a secret treaty and understanding, and they made not the least objection to promising that hereafter no secret treaty should have any validity whatever. The provision of the covenant is that every treaty or international understanding shall be registered. I believe the word is, with the general secretary of the league, that the general secretary shall publish it in full just so soon as it is possible for him to publish it, and that no treaty shall be valid which is not thus registered. It is like our arrangements with regard to mortgages on real estate, that until they are registered nobody else need pay any attention to them. And so with the treaties; until they are registered in this office of the league nobody, not even the parties themselves, can insist upon their execution. You have cleared the deck thereby in most dangerous thing and the most embarrassing thing that has hitherto existed in international politics.

Sioux Falls, South Dakota, September 8

I can not understand the psychology of men who are resisting it [the treaty]. I can not understand what they are afraid of, unless it is that they know physical force and do not understand moral force. Moral force is a great deal more powerful than physical. Govern the sentiments of mankind and you govern mankind. Govern their fears, govern their hopes, determine their fortunes, get them together in concerted masses, and the whole thing sways like a team. Once get them suspecting one another, once get them antagonizing one another, and society itself goes to pieces. We are trying to make a society instead of a set of barbarians out of the governments of the world. I sometimes think, when I wake in the night, of all the wakeful nights that anxious fathers and mothers and friends have spent during those weary years of this awful war, and I seem to hear the cry, the inarticulate cry of mothers all over the world, millions of them on the other side of the sea and thousands of them on this side of the sea. "In God's name, give us the sensible and hopeful and peaceful processes of right and of justice."

America can stay out, but I want to call you to witness that the peace of the world can not be established without America. America is necessary to the peace of the world. And reverse the proposition. The peace and good will of the world are necessary to America. Disappoint the world, center its suspicion upon you, make it feel that you are hot and jealous rivals of the other nations, and do you think you are going to do as much business with them as you would otherwise do? I do not like to put the thing on that plane, my fellow countrymen, but if you want to talk business, I can talk business. If you want to put it on the low plane of how much money you can make, you can make more money out of friendly traders than out of hostile traders. You can make more money out of men who trust you than out of men who fear you.

San Francisco, California, September 17

The Monroe doctrine means that if any outside power, any power outside this hemisphere, tries to impose its will upon any portion of the Western Hemisphere the United States is at liberty to act independently and alone in repelling the aggression; that it does not have to wait for the action of the league of nations; that it does not have to wait for anything but the action of its own administration and its own Congress. This is the first time in the history of international diplomacy that any great government



has acknowledged the validity of the Monroe doctrine. Now for the first time all the great fighting powers of the world except Germany, which for the time being has ceased to be a great fighting power, acknowledge the validity of the Monroe doctrine and acknowledge it as part of the international practice of the world.

They [critics] are nervous about domestic questions. They say, "It is intolerable to think that the league of nations should interfere with domestic questions," and whenever they begin to specify they speak of the question of immigration, of the question of naturalization, of the question of the tariff. My fellow citizens, no competent or authoritative student of international law would dream of maintaining that these were anything but exclusively domestic questions, and the covenant of the league expressly provides that the league can take no action whatever about matters which are in the practice of international law regarded as domestic questions.

San Francisco, California, September 18

In order that we may not forget, I brought with me the figures as to what this war [First World War] meant to the world. This is a body of business men and you will understand these figures. They are too big for the imagination of men who do not handle big things. Here is the cost of the war in money, exclusive of what we loaned one another: Great Britain and her dominions, \$38,000,000,000; France, \$26,000,000,000; the United States, \$22,000,000,000 (this is the direct cost of our operations); Russia, \$18,000,000,000; Italy \$13,000,000,000; and the total, including Belgium, Japan, and other countries, \$123,000,000,000. This is what it cost the Central Powers: Germany, \$39,000,000,000, the biggest single item; Austria-Hungary, \$21,000,000,000; Turkey and Bulgaria, \$3,000,000,000; a total of \$63,000,000,000, and a grand total of direct war costs of \$186,000,000,000—almost the capital of the world. The expenditures of the United States were at the rate of \$1,000,000 an hour for two years, including nighttime with daytime. The battle deaths during the war were as follows: Russia lost in dead 1,700,000 men, poor Russia that got nothing but terror and despair out of it all; Germany, 1,600,000; France, 1,385,000; Great Britain, 900,000; Austria, 800,000; Italy, 364,000; the United States, 50,300 dead. The total for all the belligerents, 7,450,200 men—just about seven and a half million killed because we could not have arbitration and discussion, because the world had never had the courage to propose the conciliatory methods which some of us are now doubting whether we ought to accept or not.

San Diego, California, September 19

It is feared that our delegates will be outvoted, because I am constantly hearing it said that the British Empire has six votes and we have one. I am perfectly content to have only one when the one counts six, and that is exactly the arrangement under the league. Let us examine that matter a little more particularly. Besides the vote of Great Britain herself, the other five votes are the votes of Canada, of South Africa, of Australia, of New Zealand, and of India. We ourselves were champions and advocates of giving a vote to Panama, of giving a vote to Cuba—both of them under the direction and protectorate of the United States—and if a vote was given to Panama and to Cuba, could it reasonably be denied to the great Dominion of Canada? Could it be denied to that stout Republic in South Africa, that is now living under a nation which did, indeed, overcome it at one time, but which did not dare retain

Objectives: Students will analyze the impact of the First World War on international relations.

its government in its hands, but turned it over to the very men whom it had fought? Could we deny it to Australia, that independent little republic in the Pacific, which has led the world in so many liberal reforms? Could it be denied New Zealand? Could we deny it to the hundreds of millions who live in India? But, having given these six votes, what are the facts? For you have been misled with regard to them. The league can take no active steps without the unanimous vote of all the nations represented on the council, added to a vote of the majority in the assembly itself. These six votes are in the assembly, not in the council. The assembly is not a voting body, except upon a limited number of questions, and whenever those questions are questions of action, the affirmative vote of every nation represented on the council is indispensable, and the United States is represented on the council.

Salt Lake City, Utah, September 23

I am not going to stop, my fellow citizens, to discuss the Shantung provision [which shifted control of the area from Germany to Japan] in all its aspects, but what I want to call your attention to is that just so soon as this covenant is ratified every nation in the world will have the right to speak out for China. And I want to say very frankly, and I ought to add that the representatives of those great nations themselves admit, that Great Britain and France and the other powers which have insisted upon similar concessions in China will be put in a position where they will have to reconsider them. This is the only way to serve and redeem China, unless, indeed, you want to start a war for the purpose. At the beginning of the war and during the war Great Britain and France engaged by solemn treaty with Japan that if she would come into the war and continue in the war, she could have, provided she in the meantime took it by force of arms, what Germany had in China. Those are treaties already in force. They are not waiting for ratification. France and England can not withdraw from those obligations, and it will serve China not one iota if we should dissent from the Shantung arrangement; but by being parties to that arrangement we can insist upon the promise of Japan—the promise which the other Governments have not matched—that she will return to China immediately all sovereign rights within the Province of Shantung. We have got that for her now, and under the operations of article 11 and of article 10 it will be impossible for any nation to make any further inroads either upon the territorial integrity or upon the political independence of China.

Denver, Colorado, September 25

The adoption of the treaty means disarmament. Think of the economic burden and the restraint of liberty in the development of professional and mechanical life that resulted from the maintenance of great armies, not only in Germany but in France and in Italy and, to some extent, in Great Britain. If the United States should stand off from this thing we would have to have the biggest army in the world. There would be nobody else that cared for our fortunes. We would have to look out for ourselves, and when I hear gentlemen say, "Yes; that is what we want to do; we want to be independent and look out for ourselves" I say, "Well, then, consult your fellow citizens. There will have to be universal conscription. There will have to be taxes such as even yet we have not seen. There will have to be concentration of authority in the Government capable of using this terrible instrument. You can not conduct a war or command an army by a debating society. You can not determine in

community centers what the command of the Commander in Chief is going to be; you will have to have a staff like the German staff, and you will have to center in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the right to take instant action for the protection of the Nation. "America will never consent to any such thing."

DOCUMENT 7

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge Proposes Reservations to the League Covenant, 1919

1. In case of notice of withdrawal from the league of nations, as provided in said article [Article I], the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations... have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal... may be given by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States.
2. The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country... under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which... has the sole power to declare war... shall... so provide.
3. No mandate shall be accepted by the United States under article 22... except by action of the Congress of the United States.
4. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction....
5. The United States will not submit to arbitration or to inquiry by the assembly or by the council of the league of nations... any questions which in the judgment of the United States depend upon or relate to... the Monroe doctrine; said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone and is... wholly outside the jurisdiction of said league of nations....
6. The United States withholds its assent to articles 156, 157, and 158 [Shantung clauses]....
7. The Congress of the United States will provide by law for the appointment of the representatives of the United States in the assembly and the council of the league of nations, and may in its discretion provide for the participation of the United States in any commission.... No person shall represent the United States under either said league of nations or the treaty of peace... except with the approval of the Senate of the United States....
9. The United States shall not be obligated to contribute to any expenses of the league of nations... unless and until an appropriation of funds... shall have been made by the Congress of the United States.
10. If the United States shall at any time adopt any plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the league... it reserves the right to increase such armaments without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war....

DOCUMENT 8

The Chinese Reformers Tsi C. Wang Recalls the Shandong Question and China's May Fourth Movement, 1927

Japan took possession of Kiaochow [Jiaozhou] and Tsing-tao [Qing-dao] in Shantung [Shandong] Province in 1914, and in 1915 she sent the so-called 'Twenty-one Demands' to China which China was forced to accept. The intellectuals with high hope believed that the principles of Woodrow Wilson would prevail at the Peace Conference, and that Japan would be forced to withdraw. When on April 30, 1919, the Peace Conference decided the Shantung issue in favor of Japan, the alert in China were deeply stirred....

The famous parade of the Peking students on May 4th, was the outcome of this unrest. The following description is written by one of the students who took part in the strike:

"At 1 p.m., May 3rd, 1919, a notice was posted calling for a mass meeting. More than 1,000 students were present at the meeting. Mr. Lo, one of the student-leaders in the Literary Revolution Movement was among those in charge of the meeting.

"We first discussed the problem of our national crisis and we all agreed that the Shantung Problem was caused by corruption and in justice, and that we as students must fight to show the world that 'Might should never be right!' Four methods of procedure were then discussed. They were as follows: 1. To get the people of the country to fight together; 2. To send telegrams to the Chinese delegates in Paris and ask them not to sign the treaty; 3. To send telegrams to all provinces in the country asking them to parade on May 7th, the National Humiliation Day; 4. To decide on the coming Sunday (May 4th) to meet the students of all of the schools in Peking at 'Tieng-Ang Mien [Tiananmen Gate]' and to show our discontent by a great mass parade.

"During the meeting, a student of the Law School, Mr. Tchia, deliberately broke his finger and wrote on the wall in blood 'Return Our Tsing-tao!' The students were all quiet.

"Next morning at 10 o'clock, a meeting of the school representatives of about eighteen leading schools in Peking was held at the Peking Law College to plan the procedure of the afternoon mass parade. After dinner all of us marched out toward Tieng-Ang Mien. A representative of the Board of Education came to our school and advised us not to go, but we refused to listen. When we arrived at Tieng-Ang Mien, a few thousand students of other schools had already gathered there. All of them met in the big yard in front of the gate. They stood in order, group after group, according

to their schools. All of them had in their hands white flags made of paper or cloth, bearing the inscriptions, 'Self-determination'; 'International Justice'; 'Abolish the Twenty-one Demands'; 'Return Our Tsing-tao'; 'Down with the Traitors' [(a reference to three Chinese government officials who signed secret treaties that ceded Shandong to Japan)]; and the like. About thirty schools were present with more than 10,000 students! . . .

"It was about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, more than 10,000 strong, we paraded the streets, and the people in Peking were greatly aroused. Three thousand of us paraded to the Legation Quarter to ask the Allied Ministers to aid us in securing justice, but the police of the special extraterritorial district refused to let us enter. Four representatives, including Mr. Lo, were then appointed to see the American Minister. The Minister was absent; it was Sunday.

"After waiting in vain for a time, we marched on through Chang-Ang Street, and passed by the residence of one of the so-called 'traitors,' Tsao Ju-lin, then Minister of Communication. The students tried to see him, but his home was guarded by soldiers and policemen. All of us called loudly, 'The Traitor! The Traitor!' We threw all our small white flags through the windows, and there were so many that we could see the array of white colored flags from a long distance. Finally a conflict took place, for suddenly the door of the building was opened and the students marched in. They saw one of the 'traitors' conversing with a group of Japanese. . . . They went forward to question him, but they were stopped by the Japanese. . . . The students dispersed because a fire suddenly broke out from the building and the soldiers fired at them. Thirty-two were arrested." . . .

Not only were students of other schools sympathetic with the movement, but merchants, newspaper organizations, scholars, and others sent telegrams to Peking, directed both to the Government and to the students in Peking. . . .

Although the thirty-two students were released, the Government continued to make many arrests. . . . At the same time the Government used mandates to suppress the activities of students in different places. . . .

The indifference of the Government led to a general strike of all Peking students. Propaganda spread. Student unions organized throughout the whole country. Strikes in other cities occurred as follows: Peking, May 19th; Tientsin, May 23rd; Tsinan, May 24th; Shanghai, May 26th; Nanking, May 27th; Paotingfu, May 28th; Anking, May 30th; Hankow, Wushang, and Kaifeng, May 31st. In Foochow, Canton, Amoy, Hangchow, and practically all over the country there were also student strikes. . . .

Places of detention for students were getting full. The fact that Shanghai merchants had struck and Peking merchants had threatened to take similar steps at last brought the government to its senses. On June 6th guards were taken away from the prisons. Doors were thrown open, but the students proposing to be released on their own terms, embarrassed the government by remaining in "jail" all night and the day following, sending four demands to the government. 1. That three officials in the government should be dismissed; 2. That the students should be allowed freedom of speech; 3. That they should be allowed to parade through the streets of Peking on being released from prison; 4. That the government make them a public apology.

It is significant that security and understanding were demonstrated, sent a nation as it were of the prison doors.

The day that the Peking. Everywhere shouted: "Long live the National University the freed students with

More than that, the cabinet was altered refused to sign the tr



ESSAYS

In the first essay, The sympathetic but not drew on both progress toward Europe's war advance his liberal d America entered the controversial peace backing of the progress reaction at home and

"In the second e a biting assessment of the president's response neutral rights, rather did not take into account that Europe awaited mediated peace convinced himself that a noble battle between

In the last essay Wilsonianism on the of self-determination president's crusade experienced deep d national self-determination that championed na Wilson's conviction government and we by more civilized p moment" led antic to embrace revolution transforming intern