WILSON EXTOLS PACT; DEFIES OPPONENTS TO OFFER ANY BETTER PLAN

WILSON'S SPEECHES BREATHE DEFIANCE

Continued from First Page.

the allusion and the promise, it evoked yells of approval, for the Irish in Indiana are as down on the league as the Irish are elsewhere in the country. He said in this connection that Article X. of all the articles of the league was "nearest his heart."

Mr. Wilson spoke briefly of the secret treaties which came before the Peace Conference, and in that connection he mentioned the Shantung agreement. He did not undertake, he confessed, to defend that agreement, but he insisted that it was necessary in view of the secret engagement that had been made by the Allies with Japan before the United States entered the war. He sought to make it plain that these treaties could not be torn up and that therefore the allied promise of Shantung to Japan had to be acquiesced in by America. But that was the end and the last of the secret treaty business, he asserted, since the League of Nations never again would tolerate such private understandings.

Toward the very end of his speech he saw fit to utter the "put up or shut up" challenge to league antagonists, and he said it with fire in his eye. His audience yelled approval, but there were sober Democrats who shook their heads over that phrase. There are a lot of Democrats in Indiana who have been saying that the sooner a compromise is reached on the peace treaty controversy and necessary amendments or reservations are agreed to by the President the better it will be for the Democratic party and incidentally, of course, for the country.

After the speech the President returned immediately to his train and left at once for St. Louis, where he speaks to-morrow night.

Important Subjects Ignored.

The address at Columbus was remarkable for the peace treaty topics the President ignored. This thought pricked the mind of the mournful Chinese who sat all silent in the top of the gallery of Memorial Hall until the stir and shuffle of the disintegrating meeting and a glimpse of Mr. Wilson's retreating coat tails brought from them this question:

"What about the Shantung question, Mr. President?"

But answer he had none save the flat echo of his impassive voice.

Nor did anybody else in the singularly undemonstrative gathering of 4,000 persons receive an answer to hotly controversial questions bubbling in American minds—Article X. and American military participation in European quarrels, the Irish question, the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine, immigration safeguards and the right of withdrawal from the League of Nations.

Possibly the reason for avoidance of these topics is to be found in the President's expressed determination not to "debate" the provisions of the treaty or to travel about the country in long range controversy with the Senate. Certainly he exercised his privilege of praising and extolling those sections which have not excited special animosity.

If it be at all possible to identify threads in Mr. Wilson's fluency, then one can say that, in exhorting the people to read the treaty for themselves or else to take his word for what is in it and what it means, he emphasized these points: The treaty punishes Germany severely but not unjustly for the crimes she attempted. The treaty rectifies the wrongs of mankind, but does not humiliate Germany. The League of Nations will prevent war because the threat "mankind is combined against you" will be a persuasive threat to an evil planner.

Adriatic Dispute Explained.

Without a League of Nations war will be attempted just as soon as ambitious nations recover from financial stringency. He is a warm friend of the Italian people, but duty and the application of the principle that territory must go to the people that live upon it regulated his attitude in the Adriatic dispute.

The treaty rectifies some age long wrongs, removing the anger which breeds wars and revolutions, but it does leave unrighted some other age long wrongs, much to his regret, and it rights the history of Europe. The treaty is shot through with the American principle of the consent of the governed.

The labor section, glowingly expounded, is described as the Magna Charta of labor. The central ideal of the treaty is that nations consist not of Governments but of peoples, a principle hailed by the President to-day as "almost a discovery." Fine passions rule the world to-day, supplanting mind, therefore a proper title for the League of Nations is "the league of fine passions."

The treaty provides for all the reparation that a criminal Germany can be made to pay, and it does not contain a single act of annexation; Germany's seized colonies are beneficently "trusteed." And finally there was the plea, impassionedly delivered: "Don't let them pull it down. Don't let them misrepresent it."

If any of Mr. Wilson's devoted followers bent their ears toward the Columbus audience for a single rousing, "We won't, Mr. President!" then these devoted ones were sorely disappointed, for speech and pleafth climax were received with a sort of apathy not even barely relieved by the patter of handclapping.

Possibly the inhabitants of Ohio's capital are not a vociferous collection of humans. Possibly in habitual undemonstrativeness they resemble the distant Bostonese, though such as had travelled with Theodore Roosevelt hereabout might have a different opinion, but there is a probably truer estimate of their attitude which is based upon what many of them confided before and after the meeting to newspaper correspondents travelling with the President, and what they say comes to this:

The people of Ohio are worrying a lot more about the cost of beefsteak and shoes and clothes to wear than they are about the fate of "the league of fine passions." They are trying to figure out how to pay their bills on Saturday night. They want to know when the President or somebody is going to step in and wallop the profiteers.

Ohio is full of high cost of living investigation commissions. Ohio is also resounding with strikes. There was one in full blast, a street car strike, when the President got to Columbus to-day. These matetrs are very earthly, grossly material, it is true, and have nothing to do with the heart of the world, but they have a lot to do with Ohio. This state of mind quite frankly expressed by almost anybody questioned may explain the colorlessness, the duiness, the heaviness of the President's reception in a State which, like California, has to accept a lot of responsibility for four years of history. The attitude of respectful curiosity, of tonguetied staring, was as marked in Columbus this morning as it was in Boston the day the President first returned from Europe. The people turned out in excellent numbers, but they left their cheers at home.

Receptions at Towns on the Way.

Mr. Wilson stepped from the train at Columbus at 11 A. M., after a little handshaking and bowing at Dennison and Newark. In the early morning at the former city several hundred persons trotted along the station platform in a drizzle until they located the President's private car and finally glimpsed the President himself as he appeared smilingly at the car door. There were a good many women in the crowd, and these were obviously intent upon getting a glimpse of Mrs. Wilson. One such determined one was heard to exclaim: "You just quit acrowdin' in front of me, Joe, for I'm agoin' to see what she brought back from Paris." The woman was not fated to be gratified in this respect.

There was a bit of handshaking with the good people of Dennison, and then the long train slid into the mist upon the first stage of its 10,000 mile journey. Presently Newark and a fateful comment was reached, for in the Newark aggregation was an enthusiastic elderly person who shouted, some say: "We're going to give you back in 1920 what we took away from you." If there were those who heard it "We are going to back you in 1920" and thought they heard also the Wilsonian "No," then it may be stated on Wilsonian authority these persons need an amendment, or at least a reservation, to their hearing. Newark produced also J. Cookey Jones, Mayor of Buckeye Centre, who clambered to the private car Mayflower with a basket of flowers for Mrs. Wilson, a proceeding which pleased the Newarkers so thoroughly that they gave Cookey several cheers as he faded into the throng.

At other towns and villages in the soft coal and tobacco eating belt there was a fairish sprinkling of persons waiting to catch a glimpse of the President of the United States, for Presidents en tour never lack for crowds, but most of there were disappointed, for Columbus was nearing and Mr. Wilson was in seclusion.

Women Applaud, Men Are Silent.

At the Ohio capital excellent arrangements working smoothly conveyed the President from the Pennsylvania station to Memorial Hall in swift and frictionless fashion. He passed smilingly through thousands of people lining High street—people who had use for only one of their five senses. It may be the Ohioans are unusually tender handed and afraid of bruising their palms, but it would be difficult to imagine the progress of a President through a crowd so dumb and expressionless. Here and there groups of women clapped their hands, fluttered soprano cheers and giggled, but the men neither clapped nor fluttered nor giggled. They just stood and stared.

In Memorial Hall were 4,000 people and the venerable James E. Campbell, ex-Governor of the Buckeye State. Gov. Cox was not among the 4,000. Nobody seemed to know where the Governor was, and a lot of sensitive eyebrows were lifted because of this absenteeism. But "Uncle Jimmy" Campbell, a political warrior of the old days, the Foraker days, did his noblest for the guest of honor. When Frank L. Packard, president of the Chamber of Commerce, turned the meeting over to him he let fly with one resounding sentence:

"We are in the presence of the first citizen of the world, Woodrow Wilson," and sat down like a man who knows when to quit. At this point, of course, a trained band in the gallery tried out the greatest of all emotional accelerators, "Dixie," but the apathy of the audience was not to be disturbed.

Mr. Wilson commenced a fifty minute speech with the statement that he was "here to report to the only people I owe any report to," and then he began to lay, as he subsequently explained privately, the groundwork for a long series of League of Nations speeches which he is to make all the way out to the Pacific coast and back again. He told the audience that it was his purpose to expound to them just what the treaty contains and what it seeks to do, but thereafter he picked and selected his topics according to his own judgment of what needed expounding.

Reply Is Made to Knox.

The first part of his speech was taken as a direct reply to the protest made by Senator Knox (Pa.) the other day that the terms of the treaty with Germany were, many of them, too harsh to be enforced, and Mr. Wilson went on to say that while the terms were severe they were not unjust. They were designed to punish Germany, "which attempted an intolerable thing and she must be made to pay for the attempt." He could not see anywhere in the treaty any provision which humiliated Germany, since the terms were meant to rectify wrongs for which Germany was clearly responsible.

Reparations were fixed only to the elastic point of Germany's ability to pay without destroying her life, and those terms would be pressed to the utmost point that Germany can pay.

"The treaty means that mankind will unite to inflict the same punishment upon any other nation which should attempt an intolerable thing," said the President.

In his belief the League of Nations would prevent future wars simply because of the potency of the threat that the associated great Powers could bring to bear upon a plotter of evil. In this connection he asked if any one believed that Germany would have gone to war if Germany had known that Great Britain would fight; and he added that certainly Germany would not have started the war if she had believed that America would fight. In that potentiality lay the strength of the League of Nations, according to its chief sponsor.

He stated with finality that without the League of Nations and the overpowering threat of punishment it would contain, war will break out again whenever ambitious nations get enough money ahead.

Why Wilson Sided With Slavs.

From this he turned to a justification of the attitude he took against Italian aspirations, stating that duty bound him to the principle that territory must be given to the people that live upon it, and since territory claimed across the Adriatic was occupied by Slavs it had to go to Slavs, despite his own strong friendliness for the Italian people.

At this point some mention was expected of that special territory occupied by Chinese which is called the Province of Shantung, but Mr. Wilson was not Shantungling to-day and went soaring on to discuss the success of the Peace Conference in rectifying age old wrongs and in "rectifying the history of Europe." There was a hint of Ireland when he said that "some of us hoped that other age long wrongs could be righted," but the hint was as near to the Emerald Isle and the troublesome Irish question as the President got on the first day of his tour.

He said he could not understand why there had been so little attention paid to the great points of the labor section of the treaty, the Magna Charta of labor, and he proceeded for some minutes to paint in brilliant colors the benefits that the workers will derive under the League of Nations. On this point he said with something resembling a flare of spirit:

"Next month the first labor assembly is to meet in this country under the League of Nations, and let me tell you it will meet whether the treaty is ratified or not."

Only Benevolent Trusteeship.

Presently, after asserting that the treaty was devoid of annexations and contained only benevolent trusteeships, he coined his new phrase for the League of Nations, "The League of Fine Passions," saying: "For mind no longer rules the world, or, if so, rules as monarchs reign who do not govern."

He came at the last to his direct appeal for an unamended reservationless treaty, asking the people to pay no heed to misrepresenters of the document.

"I have not come," he said, "to debate the treaty, but to expound it. I urge you to assert the spirit of the American people. Don't let them pull it down. Don't let them misrepresent it. The ground of my impatience has been that I begrudge the time spent while a trusting world waits upon us."

He bowed and rapidly left the stage, not hearing, it appeared, the plaintive Chinese who called so forlornly: "Mr. President, what about Shantung question?"

Persons who were impressed to-day by the President's avoidance of the controversial points of the treaty are wondering just how long he can continue to avoid them, and there is an impression that hecklers are in ambush along the trail to the sunset.

The Presidential train left Indianapolis to-night for St. Louis, where President Wilson will speak to-morrow.

TELLS INDIANAPOLIS HIS ERRAND IS SOBER

Wilson Calls Speech Only "Report" of Servant.

INDIANAPOLIS, *Sept. 4.—The text of President Wilson's speech here to-night reads:*

My Fellow Citizens:

So great a company as this tempts me to make a speech (laughter and applause), and yet I want to say to you in all seriousness and soberness that I have not come here to make a speech, in the ordinary sense of that term.

I have come upon a very sober errand, indeed. I have come to report to you upon the work which the representatives of the United States attempted to do at the Conference of Peace on the other side of the sea, because I realize, my fellow citizens, that my colleagues and I in the task we attempted over there were your servants. We went there with a distinct errand, which it was our duty to perform in the spirit which you have displayed in the prosecution of the war and in conceiving the purposes and objects of that war.

I was in the city of Columbus this afternoon, where I was endeavoring to explain to a body of our fellow citizens there just what it was that the treaty of peace contained, for I must frankly admit that in most of the speeches that I have heard in debate upon the treaty of peace, it would be impossible to form a definite conception of what that instrument means.

I want to recall to you for the purposes of this evening, the circumstances of the war and the purposes for which our men spent their lives on the other side of the sea.

You will remember that a prince of the house of Austria was slain in one of the cities of Serbia. Serbia was one of the small kingdoms of Europe. She had no strength which any of the great Powers needed to fear. As we see the war now, Germany and those who conspired with her made a pretext of that assassination in order to make unconscionable demands upon the weak and helpless kingdom of Servia, not with a view of bringing about an acquiescence in those demands, but with a view to bringing about a conflict in which their purposes, quite separate from the purposes connected with these demands, could be achieved.

Just as soon as these demands were made, other nations of Europe sent telegraphic messages to their representatives at Vienna and Berlin, urging them to ask the Governments of Vienna and Berlin to enter into discussion of these matters.

War Was Begun Purposely.

I was recalling, my fellow citizens, the circumstances which began the terrible conflict that has just been concluded.

So soon as the unconscionable demands of Austria were made on Serbia the other Governments of Europe sent telegraphic messages to Berlin and Vienna asking that the matter be brought into a conference. And the significant circumstance of the beginning of this war is that the Austrian and German Governments did not dare to discuss the demands on Serbia or the purpose which they had in view.

It is universally admitted on the other side of the water that if they had gone into international conference on the Austrian demands the war never would have been begun. There was an insistent demand from London, for example, by the British Foreign Minister that the Cabinets of Europe should be given time to confer with the Governments at Vienna and Berlin. The Governments at Vienna and Berlin did not dare to admit time for discussion.

I am recalling these circumstances, my fellow citizens, because I want to point out to you what apparently has escaped the attention of some of the critics of the League of Nations, that the heart of the League of Nations does not lie in any of the portions which have been discussed in public debate. The great bulk of the provisions of that covenant contained these engagements and promises on the part of the States which undertook to become members of it: That in no circumstances will they go to war without first having either submitted the question to arbitration—in which case they agree to abide by the result; or, having submitted the question to discussion by the Council of the League of Nations, in which case they will allow six months for the discussion and engage not to go to war until three months after the council has announced its opinion upon the subject under dispute.

So that the heart of the covenant of the league is that the nations solemnly covenant not to go to war for nine months after a controversy becomes acute.

If there had been nine days of discussion Germany would not have gone to war. If there had been nine days within which to bring to bear the opinion of the world, the judgment of mankind upon the purposes of these Governments they never would have dared to execute those purposes.

Fought for High Ideals.

So that what it is important for us to remember is that when we sent those boys in khaki across the sea, we promised them, we promised the world that we would not conclude this conflict with a mere treaty of peace. We entered into solemn engagements with all the nations with whom we associated ourselves, that we would bring about such a kind of settlement, and such a consort of the purpose of nations that wars like this could not again occur.

If this war has to be fought over again then all our high ideals and purpose have been disappointed, for we did not go into this war merely to beat Germany. We went into this war to beat all purposes such as Germany entertained.

We are presently, my fellow countrymen, to have a very great pleasure of welcoming on this side of the sea the Queen and King of the Belgians (applause), and I for one am perfectly sure that we are going to make it clear to them that we have not forgotten the violation of Belgium; that we have not forgotten the intolerable wrongs which were put upon that suffering people. I have seen their devastated country. Where it was not actually laid in ruins every factory was gutted of its contents; all the machinery by which it would be possible for men to go to work again was taken away, and those parts of the machinery that they could not take away were destroyed by experts who knew how to destroy them.

"Belgium was a very successful competitor of Germany in some lines of manufacture, and the German armies were sent there to see to it that that competition was put a stop to. Their purpose was to crush the independent action of that little kingdom—not merely to use it as a gateway through which to attack France. And when they got into France they not only fought the armies of France, but they put the coal mines of France out of commission, so that it will be a decade or more before France can supply herself with coal from her accustomed sources.

Article X. Heart of Pact.

You have heard a great deal about Article X. of the covenant of the League of Nations. Article X. speaks the conscience of the world. Article X. is the article which goes to the heart of this whole bad business, for that article says that the members of this league—and that is intended to be all the great nations of the world—engage to resist 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 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 independence by articles of that sort. Every man who makes a choice to respect the rights of his neighbors, deprives himself of absolute sovereignty, but he does it by promising never to do wrong, and I cannot, for one, see anything that robs me of any inherent right that I ought to retain when I promise that I will do right.

We engage, in the first sentence of Article X., 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 of Nations disregards that promise, then what happens? The Council of the League advises what should be done 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 an occasion for 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 unanimous vote, and the unanimous vote would include 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 of the United States would not vote without instructions from their Government at home, and that what we united in advising we could be certain that our people would desire to do.

There is in that covenant not one note of 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.

Economic Boycott Planned.

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 in any exceptional disadvantages that may arise out of it.

And I want you to realise that this war was won not only by the armies of the world, but it was won by economic means as well. Without the economic means the war would have been much longer continued. What happened was that Germany was shut off from the economic resources of the rest of the globe and she could not stand it; and a nation that is boycotted is a nation that is in sight of surrender. Apply this economic, peaceful, silent, deadly remedy and there will be no need for force.

It is a terrible remedy. It does not cost a life outside the nation boycotted, but it brings a pressure upon that nation which, in my judgment, no modern nation could resist.

"I dare say that some of those ideas are new to you, because, while it is true, as I said this forenoon, in Columbus, that apparently nobody has taken the pains to say what is in the covenant of the League of Nations. They have discussed three—chiefly three—out of twenty-six Articles and the other Articles contain this heart of the matter, that instead of war there shall be arbitration; instead of war there shall be discussion; instead of war there shall be the closure of intercourse; that instead of war there shall be the irresistible pressure of the opinion of all mankind.

"I need not tell you that I speak with knowledge in this matter—knowledge of the purpose of the men with whom the men representing America were associated at the peace table. Every one I consulted with came there with the same idea, that wars had arisen in the past because the strong had taken advantage of the weak and that the only way to stop war was to band ourselves together to protect the weak.

"And so, when you read the covenant, read the treaty with it.

Poland's Case an Example.

"I have no doubt that in this audience there are many men who come from that ancient stock of Poland, for example, men in whose blood there is the warmth of old affections connected with that betrayed and ruined country; men whose memories run back to insufferable wrongs endured by those living in that country, and I call them to witness that Poland never could have won unity and independence by herself. These gentlemen sitting at Paris presented Poland with a unity she could not have won, and an independence which she cannot defend, unless the world guarantees it to her.

I am arguing this thing with you, my fellow citizens, as if I had any doubt of what the verdict of the American people would be. I haven't the slightest doubt. I just wanted to have the pleasure of pointing out to you how absolutely ignorant of the treaty and of the covenant some men are who have been opposing it. If they do read the English language they do not understand the English language as I understand it.

If they have really read this treaty and this covenant they only amaze me by their inability to understand what is plainly expressed. So that my errand upon this journey is not to arouse these matters, but to recall you to the real issues which are involved.

And one of the things that I have most at heart in this report to my fellow citizens, is that they should forget what party I belong to, and what party they belong to. I am making this journey as a Democrat, but I am spelling it with a little "d," and I don't want anybody to remember, so far as this errand is concerned, that it is ever spelled with a big "D."

I am making this journey as an American, and as a champion of the rights which America believes in, and I need not tell you that as compared with the importance of America the importance of the Democratic party and the importance of the Republican party and the importance of every other party is absolutely negligible. Parties, my fellow citizens, are intended to embody in action different policies of government. They are not, when properly used, intended to traverse the principles which underlie government, and the principles which underlie the Government of the United States have been familiar to us ever since we were children.

I want you to notice another interesting point that has never been dilated upon in connection with the League of Nations. I am now treading upon delicate ground, and I must express myself with caution.

There were a good many delegations that visited Paris wanting to be heard by the Peace Conference, who had real causes to present, and which ought to be presented to the view of the world. But we had to point out to them that they did not happen, unfortunately, to come within the area of settlement; that their questions were not questions which were necessarily drawn into the things that we were deciding.

I therefore want to call your attention, if you will turn it up when you go home, to Article XI., following Article X., of the covenant of the League of Nations.

Peace Everybody's Business.

That Article XI., 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 and 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.

In other words, at present we have to mind our own business. Under the covenant of the League of Nations we can mind other people's business, and anything that affects the peace of the world, whether we are parties to it or not, can by our delegates be brought to the attention of mankind.

There is not an oppressed people in the world which cannot, henceforth get a hearing at the forum. And you know my fellow citizens, what a hearing will mean if the cause of those people is just. The one thing which those who have reason to dread, have most reason to dread, is publicity and discussion; because if you are challenged to give a reason why you are doing a wrong thing it has to be an exceedingly good reason, and if you give a bad reason you confess judgment and the opinion of mankind goes against you.

There is another thing in this covenant which was one of a number of difficulties that we encountered at Paris. I need not tell you that at every turn in these discussions we came across some secret treaty, some understanding that had never been made public before; some understanding that embarrassed the whole settlement.

Disapproves Shantung.

I think it will not be improper for me to refer to one of these matters. When we came to the settlement of the Shantung question, with regard to China, we found that Great Britain and France were under specific treaty obligations to Japan that she should get exactly what she got in the with Germany; and the most that we could do—I mean the most that the United States could do—was to urge upon the representatives of Japan the very fatal policy that was involved in such a settlement, and obtain from her the promise, which she gave, that she would not take advantage of those portions of the treaty, but would return without qualification the sovereignty which Germany had enjoyed in Shantung Province, to the Republic of China. We have had repeated assurances since then that Japan intends to fulfill those promises in absolute good faith.

JUSTICE KEYNOTE OF COLUMBUS SPEECH

Wilson Says One of Greatest Wrongs Is Punished.

COLUMBUS, *Sept. 4.—In his speech here to-day in Memorial Hall President Wilson said:*

Mr. Chairman, Gov. Campbell and My Fellow Citizens:

It is with very profound pleasure that I find myself face to face with you. I have for a long time chafed at the confinement of Washington. I have for a long time wished to fulfill the purpose with which my heart was full when I returned to our beloved country, namely, to go out and report to my fellow countrymen concerning those affairs of the world which now need to be settled.

The only people I owe any report to are you and the other citizens of the United States, and it has become increasingly necessary, apparently, that I should report to you. After all the various angles at which you have heard the treaty held up perhaps you would like to know what is in the treaty. I find it very difficult in reading some of the speeches that I have read to form any conception of that great document.

It is a document unique in the history of the world for many reasons, and I think I cannot do you a better service or the peace of the world a better service than by pointing out to you just what this treaty contains and what it seeks to do.

In the first place, my fellow countrymen, it seeks to punish one of the greatest wrongs ever done in history, the wrong which Germany sought to do to the world and to civilization, and there ought to be no weak purpose with regard to the application of the punishment. She attempted an intolerable thing and she must be made to pay for the attempt.

Simple Justice Only Aim.

The terms of the treaty are severe, but they are not unjust. I can testify that the men associated with me at the Peace Conference in Paris had it in their hearts to do justice, and not wrong, but they knew perhaps with a more vivid sense of what had happened than we could possibly know on this side of the water—the many solemn covenants which Germany had disregarded, the long preparation she had made to overwhelm her neighbors, the utter disregard which she had shown for human rights, for the rights of women and children and those who were helpless. They had seen their lands devastated by an enemy that devoted itself not only to the effort of victory, but to the effort of terror, seeking to terrify the people whom they fought, and I wish to testify that they exercised restraint in the terms of this treaty. They did not wish to overwhelm any great nation, and they had no purpose in overwhelming the German people, but they did think that it ought to be burned into the consciousness of men forever that no people ought to permit its Government to do what the German Government did.

In the last analysis, my fellow countrymen, as we in America would be the first to claim a people are responsible for the acts of their Government, if their Government purposes things that are wrong, they ought to take measures and see to it that that purpose is not executed.

Germany was self-governed. Her rulers had not concealed the purposes that they had in mind, but they had deceived their pepole as to the character of the methods they were going to use, and I believe from what I can learn that there is an awakened consciousness in Germany itself of the deep iniquity of the thing that was attempted.

Austrians Admitted Crime.

When the Austrian delegates came before the Peace Conference they, in so many words, spoke of the origination of the war as a crime and admitted in our presence that it was a thing intolerable to contemplate. They knew in their hearts that it had done them the deepest conceivable wrong; that it had put their people and the people of Germany at the judgment seat of mankind and throughout this treaty every term that was applied to Germany was meant not to humiliate Germany, but to rectify the wrong that she had done. And if you will look even into the severe terms of reparation, for there was no indemnity,—no indemnity of any sort was claimed—merely reparation, merely paying for the destruction done, merely making good the losses, so far as the losses could be made good, which she had unjustly inflicted, not upon the Governments—for the reparation is not to go to the Governments—but upon the people whose rights she had trodden upon, with absolute absence of anything that even resembled pity. There is no indemnity in this treaty, but there is reparation and even in the terms of reparation a method is devised by which the reparation shall be adjusted to Germany's ability to pay it.

I am astonished at some of the statements I see made about this treaty and the truth is that they are made by persons who have not read the treaty, or who, if they have read it, have not comprehended its meaning.

There is a method of adjustment in the treaty by which the reparation shall not be pressed beyond the point which Germany can pay, but she will be pressed to the utmost point that she can pay which is just, which is righteous. It would be intolerable if there had been anything else, for, my fellow citizens, this treaty is not meant merely to end this single war, it is meant as a notice to every Government, who in the future will attempt this thing, that mankind will unite to inflict the same punishment.

There is no national triumph sought to be recorded in this treaty. There is no glory sought for any particular nation. The thought of the statesmen collected around that table was of their people, of the sufferings that they had gone through, of the losses they had incurred, that great throbbing heart which was so depressed, so forlorn, so sad in every memory that it had had of the five tragical years, my fellow countrymen. Let us never forget the purpose, the high purpose, the disinterested purpose with which America lent its strength not for its own glory, but for the advance of mankind.

And as I said, this treaty was not intended merely to end this war; it was intended to prevent any similar war.

Future Peace Was Promised.

I wonder if some of the opponents of the League of Nations have forgotten the promises we made our people before we went to the peace table. We had taken by processes of law the flower of our youth from every countryside, from every household, and we told those mothers and fathers and sisters and wives and sweethearts, that we were taking those men to fight a war which would end business of that sort, and if we do not end it, if we do not do the best that human concert of action can do to end it, we are of all men the most unfaithful—the most unfaithful to the loving hearts who suffered in this war; the most unfaithful to those households bowed in grief, yet lifted with the feeling that the lad laid down his life for a great thing, among other things in order that other lads might not have to do the same thing.

That is what the League of Nations is for, to end this war justly, and it is not merely to serve notice on governments which would contemplate the same things which Germany contemplated, that they will do it at their peril, but also concerning the combination of power which will prove to them that they will do it at their peril. It is idle to say the world will combine against you because it may not, but it is persuasive to say the world is combined against you and will remain combined against any who attempt the same things that you attempted.

The League of Nations is the only thing that can prevent the recurrence of this dreadful catastrophe and redeem our promises. And the character of the league is based upon the experience of this very war.

I did not meet a single public man who did not admit these things, that Germany would not have gone into this war if she had thought Great Britain was going into it, and that she most certainly would never have gone into this war if she had dreamed America was going into it, and they have all admitted that a notice beforehand that the greatest Powers of the world would combine to prevent this sort of thing it would have prevented it absolutely.

When gentlemen tell you, therefore, that the League of Nations is intended for some other purpose than this, merely reply this to them: "If we do not do this thing, we have neglected the central covenant that we made to our people," and there will be no statesman of any country who can thereafter promise his people any alleviation from the perils of war.

The passions of this world are not dead; the rivalries of this world have not cooled; they have been rendered hotter than ever. The harness that is to unite nations is more necessary now than it ever was before and unless there is this sureness of combined action before wrong is attempted, wrong will be attempted just so soon as the most ambitious nations can recover from the financial stress of this war.

Weak Nations Safeguarded.

Now look what else is in the treaty. This treaty is unique in the history of mankind because the centre of it is the redemption of weak nations. There never was a congress of nations before that considered the rights of those who could not enforce their rights. There never was a congress of nations before that did not seek to effect some balance of power brought about by means of serving the strength and interest of the strongest Powers concerned, whereas this treaty builds up nations that never could have won their freedom in any other way. It builds them up by gift, by largess, not by obligation; builds them up because of the conviction of the men who wrote the treaty that the rights of people transcend the rights of governments, because of the conviction of the men who wrote that treaty that the fertile source of war is wrong; that the Austro-Hungarian Empire, for example, was held together by military force and consisted of peoples who did not want to live together; who did not have the spirit of nationality as toward each other; who were constantly chafing at the bands that held them. Hungary, though a willing partner of Austria, was willing to be her partner, because she could share Austria's strength for accomplishing her own ambitions and her own ambitions were to hold under the Jugo-Slavic peoples that lie to the south of her. Bohemia, an unhappy partner—a partner by duress, flowing in all her veins the strongest national impulse that was to be found anywhere in Europe, and north of that pitiful Poland, a great nation divided up among the great Powers of Europe, torn asunder—kinship disregarded, natural ties treated with contempt and an obligatory division among sovereigns imposed upon her, a part of her given to Russia, a part of her given to Austria and a part of her given to Germany and great bodies of Polish people never permitted to have the normal intercourse with their kinsmen or fear that that fine instinct of the heart should assert itself which binds families together. Poland could never have won her independence. Bohemia never could have broken away from the Austro-Hungarian combination. The Slavic peoples to the south running down into the great Balkan peninsula had again and again tried to assert their nationality and their independence and had as often been crushed, not by the immediate Power they were fighting, but by the combined power of Europe. The old alliances, the old balances of power, were meant to see to it that no little nation asserted its rights to the disturbance of the peace of Europe, and every time an assertion of rights was attempted they were suppressed by combined influence and force, and this treaty tears away all that and says these people have a right to live their own lives under the governments which they themselves choose to set up. That is the American principle and I was glad to fight for it and when strategic considerations were urged I said—not I alone—but it was a matter of common council that strategic conditions were not in our thoughts, that we are not now arranging for future wars, but were giving people what belonged to them.

Stern Duty in Adriatic Case.

My fellow citizens, I do not think there is a man alive who has a more tender sympathy for the great people of Italy than I have, and a very stern duty was presented to us when we had to consider some of the claims of Italy on the Adriatic because strategically from the point of view of future wars Italy needed a military foothold on the other side of the Adriatic, but her people did not live there except in little spots. It was a Slavic people and I had to say to my Italian friends that everywhere else in this treaty we have given territory to the people who lived on it and I do not think that it is for the advantage of Italy and I am sure it is not for the advantage of the world to give Italy territory where other people live. I felt the force of the argument for what they wanted, and it was the old argument that had always prevailed, namely, that they needed it from a military point of view, and I have no doubt that if there is no League of Nations they will need it from a military point of view, but if there is a league of nations they will not need it from a military point of view. If there is no League of Nations the military point of view will prevail in every instance and peace will be brought into contempt, but if there is a League of Nations Italy need not fear the fact that the shores on the other side of the Adriatic tower above her lower, sandy shores on her side of the sea because there will be no threatening guns there and the nations of the world will have considered not merely to see that the Slavic peoples have their rights, but that the Italian people have their rights as well. I would rather have everybody on my side than be armed to the teeth and every settlement that is right, every settlement that is based upon the principles I have alluded to is a safe settlement because the sympathy of mankind will be behind it.

Some gentlemen have feared with regard to the League of Nations, that we will be obliged to do things we don't want to do. If the treaty were wrong that might be so; but if the treaty is right we will wish to preserve right. I think I know the heart of this great people whom I for the time being have the high honor to represent better than some other men that I hear talk.

I have been bred and am proud to have been bred in the old revolutionary stock which set this Government up, when America was set up as a friend of mankind, and I know—if they do not—that America has never lost that vision or that purpose.

But I haven't the slightest fear that arms will be necessary if the purpose is there. If I know that my adversary is armed and I am not, I do not press the controvery, and if any nation entertains selfish purposes set against the principles established in this treaty, and is told by the rest of the world that it must withdraw its claims, it will not press them.

The heart of this treaty then, my fellow citizens, is not even that it punishes Germany—that is a temporary thing—it is that it rectifies the age-long wrong which characterized the history of Europe.

There were some of us who wished that the scope of the treaty would reach some other age-long wrong. It was a big job and I don't say that we wished that it were larger, but there were other wrongs elsewhere than in Europe, and of the same kind, which no doubt ought to be righted, and some day will be righted, but which we could not draw into the treaty because we could deal only with the countries whom the war had engulfed and affected. But so far as the scope of our treaty went, we rectified the wrongs which have been the fertile source of war in Europe.

Revolutions Evolved Slowly.

Have you ever reflected, my fellow countrymen, on the real source of revolutions? Men don't start revolutions in a sudden passion. Do you remember what Thomas Carlyle said about the French Revolution? He was speaking of the so-called Hundred Days Terror which reigned, not only in Paris, but throughout France, in the days of the French Revolution, and he reminded his readers that back of that Hundred Days of Terror lay several hundred years of agony and of wrong. The French people had been deeply and consistently wronged by the Government, robbed, their human rights disregarded, and the slow agony of those hundreds of years had after a while gathered into a hot agony that could not be suppressed. Revolutions don't spring up over night; revolutions gather through the ages; revolutions come from the long suppression of the human spirit; revolutions come because men know that they have rights and that they are disregarded. And when we think of the future of the world in connection with this treaty, we must remember that one of the chief efforts of those who made this treaty was to remove that anger from the heart of great peoples, great peoples who had always been suppressed and always been used, who had always been the tools in the hands of Governments—generally of alien Governments—not their own. And the makers of the treaty knew that if these wrongs were not removed, there could be no peace in the world, because, after all, my fellow citizens, war comes from the seed of wrong, and not from the seed of right. This treaty is an attempt to right the history of Europe, and in my humble judgment, it is a measurable success.

I say "measurable," my fellow citizens, because you will realize the difficulty of this. Here are two neighboring peoples. The one people have not stopped at a sharp line and the settlements of the other people, or their migrations, begun at that sharp line; they have intermingled. There are regions where you can't draw a national line and say there are Slavs on this side and Italians on that; there is this people there and that people there. It can't be done. You have to approximate the line. You have to come to it, as near to it as you can, and then trust to the process of history to redistribute, it may be, the people who are on the wrong side of the line. And there are many such lines drawn in this treaty, and to be drawn in the Austrian treaty, and where perhaps there are more lines of that sort than in the German treaty.

When we came to draw the line between the Polish people and the German people, not the line between Germany and Poland—there wasn't any Poland, strictly speaking—the line between the German people and the Polish people. There were districts like the upper part of Silesia, or rather the eastern part of Silesia which is called "Upper Silesia," because it is mountainous, and the other part is not. High Silesia is chiefly Polish, and when we came to draw a line to represent Poland, it was necessary to include High Silesia. If we were really going to play fair and make Poland up of the Polish peoples wherever we found them in sufficiently close neighborhood to one another.

But it wasn't perfectly clear that Upper—that High Silesia wanted to be part of Poland. At any rate there were Germans in High Silesia who said that it did not, and therefore we did there what we did in many other places; we said, "Very well, then, we will let the people that live there decide." We will have a referendum within a certain length of time after the war, under the supervision of an international commission, which will have a sufficient armed force behind it to preserve order and see that nobody interferes with the election. We will have an absolutely free vote and High Silesia shall go either to Germany or to Poland, as the people in High Silesia prefer.

And that illustrates many other cases where we provided for a referendum, or a plebiscite, as they choose to call it; and are going to leave it to the people themselves as we should have done, what government they shall live under.

Americanism in the Treaty.

It is none of my prerogative to allot peoples to this government and the other. It is nobody's right to do that allotting, except the people themselves, and I want to testify that the treaty is shot through with the American principle of the choice of the governed.

Of course at times it went further than we could make a practical pol-