Second Section--Pages 9 to 16

THE DEVILS LAKE WORLD

Second Section--Pages 9 to 16

VOLUME X. DEVILS LAKE, NORTH DAKOTA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1920 NUMBER 36

HARDING GLAD AMERICANS ARE A FREE PEOPLE

In Speech to Indiana Delegation Republican Nominee Declares for Security at Home.

EUROPE HAS EVEN NOW QUIT WILSON'S LEAGUE

Yet Democratic Party Leaders Would Have Us Bound by Original Pact With Its American Safeguards.

"STEADY AMERICA!"

"Mindful of our splendid example and renewing every obligation of association in war, I want America to be the rock of security at home, resolute in righteousness and unalterable in security and supremacy of the law.

"Let us be done with wiggling and wobbling.

"Steady America! Let us assure good fortune to all."

—Senator Warren G. Harding in address before the Indiana delegation at Marion.

Marion, O. (Special.)—Senator Warren G. Harding, Republican nominee for President, in a speech delivered to a delegation from Indiana which called on him here to pledge the support of Indiana Republicans, declared that twice President Wilson had an opportunity to obtain ratification of the League of Nations covenant and that he put ratification aside because he would not accept reservations designed solely to safeguard American rights. Senator Harding said:

"I greet you in a spirit of rejoicing; not a rejoicing in the narrow personal or partisan sense, not in the gratifying prospects of party triumph; not in the contemplation of abundance in the harvest fields and ripening corn fields and maturing orchards; not in the reassuring approach of stability after a period of wiggling and wobbling which magnified our uncertainty—though all of these are ample for our wide rejoicing—but I rejoice that America is still free and independent and in a position of self-reliance and holds to the right of self-determination, which are priceless possessions in the present turbulence of the world.

"Let us suppose the senate had ratified the peace treaty containing the league covenant as submitted to it by the president in July of last year, what would be the situation confronting our common country today? To my mind there is but one answer. Before this day we would have been called upon to fulfil the obligations which we had assumed under Article 10 of the league covenant, to preserve the territorial integrity of Poland 'as against external aggression.'

Sympathy for Poland.

"I shall not now attempt to measure the boundless sympathy for the just aspirations and restored independence of Poland. Our present concern is the international situation which Poland has brought to our attention.

"The council of the League of Nations would have reasoned, and reasoned correctly, that the United States could furnish the munitions and, if necessary, the men to withstand the hordes advancing from Russia far more easily than could the exhausted nations of Europe. Moreover, inasmuch as this would be the first test of the scheme of world government which was formulated and demanded by the President, speaking for the United States, the fact of a special responsibility, resting upon our shoulders, manifestly would have been undeniable. Undoubtedly the league council, in 'advising upon the means' by which the obligations to Poland should be fulfilled, as provided in the covenant, would have so held, and probably the conscience of America, certainly the opinion of the world, would have sustained that judgment.

"The conclusion that our country might now be confronted by such a situation, if the senate had ratified the league covenant, requires no stretch of the imagination. None can deny that it is possible. To many candid minds, as to my own, such a distressing situation will seem highly probable. Let us assume that the ratification had taken place. Let us assume, further, that the performance of the allied task required the waging of war upon the Russian people, as, of course, it would, what would result; what would of necessity have to result? Nothing necessarily, we are glibly informed, since only the Congress can declare war, and the Congress might reject the appeal of the executive. But would the Congress do that? Could the Congress do that without stalking indelibly the honor of the nation?

Answer is "No."

"I answer 'No' and I say it not as some sort of authority above the President of the United States. Upon that point I have no more authority than any other citizen, but I do speak with the conviction that the decision would take place at the meeting of the President and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations I raised the question by stating a hypothetical case precisely analogous to that which I have described and then inquired whether we might not rightfully be regarded as a perfidious people if we should fail to contribute an armed force, if called upon to do so. The President first replied, as I thought somewhat evasively, that we would be the judges as to whether we were obliged in these circumstances to act in that way or not. Pressed further, however, in response to a query incorporating the assumption that 'the case provided for and prescribed had arisen' and that 'the extraneous attack did exist precisely as it does exist today in Poland,' the President admitted specifically that 'we would be untrue if we did not keep our word.'

"Replying further to a question which perhaps I ought not to have considered necessary, the President pronounced a moral obligation 'of course, superior to a legal obligation' and of 'a greater binding force.'

"What, then, becomes of the argument that Congress, not the President, in this instance at any rate, might 'keep us out of war'? Technically, of course, it could do so. Morally, with equal certainty, it could not do so nor would it ever do so. The American people would never permit a repudiation of a debt of honor.

"Am I not right, my countrymen, in saying that we needed only the outbreak of war between Poland and Russia to make us realize at least one of the things which, in the words of Secretary Lansing, we would have been 'let in for,' but for the restraining hand of the senate, and to fetch home to us the danger of committing our country in advance to causes that we know not of?

Not Our Purpose.

"One can have no quarrel with those who have convinced themselves that our underlying purpose in entering the great conflict was to create a league of nations. The fact remains, however, that no such intent was officially acclaimed, no allusion, nor even a suggestion to that effect appeared in the joint resolution of Congress which declared the existence of a state of war between this country and Germany. For myself I left no room for doubt of the motives which led me to cast my vote in favor of that resolution. It so happened that I made the concluding speech upon the war resolution, from my place in the senate, on the night of April 4, 1917. These were my own words at that time:

"'I want it known to the people of my state and to the nation that I am voting for war tonight for the maintenance of just American rights, which is the first essential to the preservation of the soul of this republic.

"'I vote for this joint resolution to make war, not a war thrust upon us, if I could choose the language of the resolution, but a war declared in response to affronts; a war that will at least put a soul into our American life; a war not for the cause of the allies of Europe; a war not for France, beautiful as the sentiment may be in reviving at least our gratitude to the French people; not precisely a war for civilization, worthy and inspiring as that would be; but a war that speaks for the majesty of a people properly governed, who finally are brought to the crucial test where they are resolved to get together and wage a conflict for the maintenance of their rights and the preservation of the covenant inherited from their fathers.

"We have given to the world the spectacle of a great nation that could make war without selfish intent. We unsheathed the sword some eighteen years ago for the first time in the history of the world, in the name of humanity, and we gave proof to the world at that time of an unselfish nation. Now, whether it is the fate, or fortune, or travail of destiny, it has come to us to unsheathe the sword again, not alone for humanity's sake—though that splendid inspiration will be involved—but to unsheathe the sword against a great power in the maintenance of the rights of the republic, in the maintenance which will give to us a new guaranty of nationality. That's the great thing, and I want it known, Mr. President and senators, that this is the impelling thought with me for one, when I cast my vote.'

For Same Guaranty Today.

"It is for that same 'guaranty of nationality' that I stand today, and shall continue to stand inflexibly, so long as I shall be permitted to live. The independence of our great republic is to me a priceless and sacred inheritance. There was when an American did not hesitate to proclaim himself a patriot. To do so now, I am well aware, is sometimes to invite the charge of cynicism. But why should any true American not be free to say: 'I am a patriot, wholly devoted to my country, which I hold to be God's best inspiration to man for higher attainment and the production of the world's best civilization?'

"But I have a special reason for making this reference today. I challenge the statement that the patriotism which holds American dear comprehends either narrowness or selfishness, or an inspiration from complacence and jealousy of other peoples.

"To assert, as some have asserted recently, that those of us who believe that America's place is in the world are unmindful of our own, that we are unpatriotic, that we do not love our country, that we are seeking to make it a province subject to some other power in a united world government, such misrepresentation of the motives of hundreds of our own people in that unhappy country who were lawfully there and were entitled to protection. One must admit that these outrages upon Americans are largely the consequences of the wiggling and wobbling, the supine waiting of our own government, though the admission neither helps the hurt, nor gives the hope of security for the future while the present administration remains in power, or when one in 'complete accord' succeeds it.

"This admonition is not directed exclusively toward our next door neighbor to whom we would gladly hold forth a helping hand, and whom primarily, certainly in preference to far off peoples in Europe, Asia and Africa, it is our manifest duty to serve with a whole heart and generous tolerance. It is intended for a plain notice to every government on the face of the earth that the entire resources of this nation are pledged to maintain the sacredness of American lives and the just protection of American properties.

Line of Demarcation Plain.

"The line of demarcation between our attitude and that of our political opponents is perfectly plain. The president has made his position clear by his acts no less than by his words. Twice there came to him an opportunity to obtain ratification at the hands of the senate and twice he put the opportunity aside, because he would not accept reservations designed solely to safeguard American rights. He still holds Article 10 to be the heart of the covenant. So does the Democratic platform. So does the Democratic nominee. To assume that the nominee would accept the reservations rejected by the President and denounced by the party platform is to impugn his integrity. To insinuate, as these who in proclaiming themselves for the Democratic candidate and 'the league with reservations' do insinuate that he would pursue such a course in seeking ratification is not to pay him a compliment, but rather to challenge his sincerity.

"For myself I do not question for a moment the truth of what the Democratic nominee says on this subject. He has flatly said he is 'in favor of going in' on the basis announced by the President. I am not. That is the whole difference between us, but it is a most vital one, because it involves the disparity between a world court of justice supplemented by a world association for conference, on the one hand, and the council of the league, on the other.

The Difference.

"The difference between a court of international justice and the council created by the league covenant is simple but profound.

"The one is a judicial tribunal to be governed by fixed and definite principles of law administered without passion or prejudice. The other is an association of diplomats and politicians whose determinations are sure to be influenced by considerations of expediency and national selfishness.

"I do not mean to say, nor do I mean to permit any such construction, that I would decline to co-operate with other nations in an honest endeavor to prevent wars. Nobody living would take that position. The only question is one of method or of practicability within the bounds prescribed by fundamental principles.

"There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is an offensive and defensive alliance of great powers, like that created at Versailles, to impose their will upon the helpless peoples of the world. Frankly, I am opposed to such a scheme as that, and I speak knowingly when I say that the associated powers with whom we fought the war were reluctant to accept such a proposition.

"I am opposed to the very thought of our republic becoming a party to so great an outrage upon other peoples, who have as good a right to seek their political freedom as we had in 1776 and have the same right to developing eminence under the inspiration of nationality as we held for ourselves.

The Other Type.

"The other type is a society of free nations, or an association of free nations, or a league of free nations, animated by considerations of right and justice, instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace, but so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility. Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinction as to whom credit is due.

"This is proposing no new thing. This country is already a member of such a society—The Hague tribunal, which, unlike the league of Versailles, is still functioning, and within a few weeks will resume its committee sessions under the chairmanship of an American representative.

"In that body we have the framework of a really effective instrumentality of enduring peace. The fact that the tribunal did not prevent the great war is, of course, manifest, but the cause of the failure is no less apparent. Germany, already secretly determined upon a ruthless invasion, was able to prevent the adoption of measures which might have proved effectual. The condition now is wholly different. Not only Germany, but the entire world has profited to the extent of an awful object lession, the impression of which cannot be erased from the human mind for generations to come. The horrors of war and the eagerness for peace have become universal. What once seemed at The Hague to be a mere academic discussion has become a positive, outstanding need of facing terrifying actualities. This makes vastly easier the task of so strengthening The Hague tribunal as to render its just decrees either acceptable or enforceable. It is not uncommon for the advocates of the league of Versailles to contrast unfavorably The Hague tribunal upon the ground that the tribunal 'lacks teeth.'

Let's Install the Teeth.

"Very well, then, let's put teeth into it. If, in the failed league of Versailles, there can be found machinery which the tribunal can use properly and advantageously, by all means let it be appropriated. I would even go further. I would take and combine all that is good and excise all that is bad from both organizations. This statement is broad enough to include the suggestion that if the league, which has heretofore riveted our considerations and apprehensions, has been so entwined and interwoven into the peace of Europe, that its good must be preserved in order to stabilize the peace of that continent, then it can be amended or revised so that we may still have a remnant of world aspirations in 1918 builded into the world's highest conception of helpful co-operation in the ultimate realization.

"I believe humanity would welcome the creation of an international association for conference and a world court whose verdicts upon justiciable questions, this country in common with all nations would be both willing and able to uphold. The decision of such a court or the recommendations of such a conference could be accepted without sacrificing on our part or asking any other power to sacrifice one iota of its nationality.

"The Democratic nominee has spoken about America abandoning her associates in war and deserting the allied nations in establishing the league of Versailles. I do not think it longer necessary to challenge that statement or pass further opinion upon the unfortunate league. It has already been abandoned by Europe, which had gone so far as to accept it by formal agreement in treaty. On this subject, we are fully informed at first hand. Only the other day the British premier said unresentfully that the essential co-operation of America might involve 'some change, at any rate, in the form of the covenant,' and he added, with characteristic outspokenness, 'it is quite possible it might be a change for the better.'

"Listen further, to the wise and far-seeing, former British ambassador, who was not permitted to present his credentials to our executive.

On Our Own Terms.

"'As long,' said Viscount Grey, hardly a month ago, 'as long as the richest, most powerful, the greatest, both for population and territory, of the civilized countries of the world stands outside the league, the league will be unable to fulfil its destiny. To put it in quite plain terms, the Americans must be told that if they will only join the league they can practically name their own terms.' Undoubtedly that is the fact. I ask, is there any good reason why we should not avail ourselves of this privilege? I do not mean in any arrogant or selfish way, but simply as a matter of fairness and right to our own people. Surely it is becoming, and a duty as well, to safeguard our own people, inasmuch as we are the main contributors, while asking nothing for ourselves except to participate as a contributor to the prevention of world peace.

A Second Suggestion.

"Thereafter Sir Edward Grey continues: 'Some suggestion has been made that the American Americans should be intrusted with the task of drafting a reconstruction scheme.' Then he suggests further that 'a committee of the senate—we must never forget the senate's rights and duties in regard to foreign affairs being re-enforced by the members of the house of representatives, and also by nominees of the President, and Supreme Court—could draw up suggestions for the reconstruction of the league, which would be consonant with the feeling not of one, but of all parties in America.'

"Frankly, I value that suggestion very highly, because it is proffered obviously in a helpful and friendly spirit and reveals an important Old World opinion on the necessity of amendment, revision or reconstruction. It comprehends substantially what I would propose to do if elected president. I do not mean precisely that. It would be clearly unwise to undertake specific suggestions or to attempt to pass upon suggestions now. What is in my mind is the wisdom of calling into real conference the ablest and most experienced minds of this country, from whatever walks of life they may be derived and without regard to party affiliation, to formulate a definite, practical plan along the lines already indicated for the consideration of the controlling foreign powers.

"The objection, strongly uttered in some quarters, that this course would involve the reconvening of the entire convention may be regarded as a very slight one. The acceptance of our proposals by the few principal nations would undoubtedly be followed promptly by the acceptance on the part of the minor members of the alliance.

"There would be no material delay. One can not disregard the leadership or have any doubt about the influence of the principal allied and associated powers. Insofar as I could do so, without disregarding the proprieties, I should give very earnest and practically undivided attention to this very vital subject from the day of my election and I should ask others to do likewise as a matter of public and patriotic duty. Indeed, I should hope to have behind me, after the decision on the national referendum we are soon to have, a country wholly united in earnest endeavor to achieve a true solution of this problem upon which the future civilization so largely depends.

Already Announced.

"I have already announced that I shall urge prompt passage of the resolution, vetoed by the president, declaring at an end the preposterous condition of technical war when we are actually at peace. Simultaneously, I shall naturally advise the resumption by the Congress of its exceptional powers, which have been vested by war legislation in the executive. I have no expectation whatever of finding it necessary or advisable to negotiate a separate peace with Germany.'

"In view of the simple fact that the allied powers with whom we were associated in the war have already formally concluded their peace, the passage of the peace resolution by congress would merely give formal recognition to an obvious fact.

Our Unselfishness Emphasized.

"Let us take stock for a moment of America in the world, aye, and of America at home. The end of the war found our unselfishness emphasized to all mankind, and the garlands of world leadership were bestowed from every direction. We had only to follow the path of America, rejoicing in the inheritance which led to our eminence, to rivet the gaze of all peoples upon our standards of national righteousness and our conception of international justice. Moreover, the world was ready to give us its confidence. It was the beckoning opportunity of the centuries, not for the glorification of the new world republic, but for America to hold every outpost of advancing civilization and invite all nations to join the further advance to heights dreamed of, but never approached before. But force of example was flung aside for force of armed alliance. We neglected our readjustments and restorations at home, and the cruel sacrifice of millions of lives and billions of treasure left us and the world groping in uncertainty and anxiety instead of revealing us in the sunlight of a new day, with lines formed, ready for the onward march of peace and all its triumphs.

Let's Resume Our Place.

"Mindful of our splendid example and renewing every obligation of association in war, I want America to be the rock of security at home, resolute in righteousness and unalterable in security and supremacy of the law. Let us be done with wiggling and wobbling. 'Steady, America! Let us assure good fortune to all. We may maintain our eminence as a great people at home and resume our high place in the estimate of the world. Our moral leadership was lost when 'Ambition' sought to superimpose a reactionary theory of discredited autocracy upon the progressive principle of living, glowing democracy. My chief aspiration, my countrymen, if clothed with power, will be to regain that lost leadership not for myself, not even for my party, though honoring and trusting it and do, but for my country, the country that I love from the bottom of my heart and with every fiber of my being serve all else in the world.

[illegible]

The End of a Perfect Day