

can possibly rest on the American people or the American Senate, and no reproaches ought to be directed against them. The blame and the reproaches should be laid, if anywhere, at Mr. Wilson's door.

[*La Depeche de Toulouse, December 11, 1919*]

THE TREATY AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

BY C. BOUGLE

WE must confess that the American Senate is just at present making the task of America's friends and of the society of nations most difficult.

The period immediately following the war has brought us many disillusion. It is vain to deny that fact. But the present one is perhaps the greatest and the most embarrassing. It is the more disappointing because the arguments which the Republican Senators send to Europe to explain their reservations are far from convincing. We cannot escape the conclusion that if all the nations that pretend a desire for permanent peace were to present similar arguments, we should make little progress. More probably we should still continue to wallow in blood and misery.

The recalcitrant Senators say in substance: 'We are unwilling to sign the League Covenant because it violates our Constitution and also is incompatible with a fixed policy of our government, the Monroe Doctrine.'

How does the Covenant of the League of Nations violate the Constitution of the United States?

It provides in Article X that when any one of the signatory Powers is the victim of armed aggression by another Power, all the nations signing the Covenant shall come to its relief.

The Republican Senators declare that they cannot consent to this be-

cause the Constitution reserves the right to declare war to the Senate. They then go on to criticize the unconstitutional pretensions of Mr. Wilson. They assert that he did not realize that he would be unable to impose upon America the arbitrary procedure that was allowed to pass in Europe.

Just a moment! We want to see where the distinction lies. We rub our eyes in vain. It is not apparent.

Do these gentlemen mean to say that America is the only country where the right to declare war and to ratify treaties is reserved for a legislative assembly? Certainly they cannot mean this. Moreover, every democracy has taken under one form or another, great precaution to prevent the exercise of arbitrary power by its executive heads. But does this imply that any nation with a democratic government is by that very fact rendered incapable of making a firm covenant with other nations? The inference would be most embarrassing. We should have to admit that progress toward democracy is quite the reverse of progress toward peace. That would be an admission to rejoice the hearts of our Royalists. Do the Republicans enjoy this implication?

The fact is that all governments, whether democratic or otherwise, are now in the same boat. If they really desire to form an international organization, capable of maintaining peace, they must necessarily curtail their own sovereign rights in some fashion or other. They must recognize the moral validity of the contracts that they, after due deliberation, have signed. Unless they do this, what security is there for the world? There cannot be peace unless international pledges are respected.

The Republican Senators say that unfortunately they cannot pledge themselves to such a contract. There is

a superior principle that prohibits this. The Monroe Doctrine denies the right of America to intervene in European affairs at the same time that it denies the right of Europe to meddle in the affairs of the New World.

We confess that we cannot avoid a certain feeling of impatience whenever we see this threadworn argument reappear in the debates and arguments of the adversaries of Mr. Wilson. Are the gentlemen who repeat it *ad nauseam* incapable of learning anything? Have they, moreover, forgotten all they have ever learned?

Let them merely recall the circumstances that caused the Monroe Doctrine to be promulgated and to be extended under the pressure of new conditions. Its origin dates back a century, when the infant republic was summoned to resist the propaganda of the Holy Alliance and to prevent the newly liberated nations of the western hemisphere from being treated as the colonies of that autocratic coalition. This did not imply by any means that America was not interested in the progress of liberty among the peoples of Europe. Quite the contrary. The right of the latter to guide their own destinies was, as Mr. Wilson very properly says, 'a corollary of the Monroe Doctrine itself.' The Americans merely wished that others should enjoy the rights which they enjoyed. The United States is logically compelled by the Monroe Doctrine itself to oppose imperialism wherever it may show its head.

Quite apart from all this, and leav-

ing the logic of the case aside, has not the stern lesson of experience opened the eyes of Americans? The gentlemen who now take refuge behind the Monroe Doctrine forget that since it was promulgated the world has changed. It has become smaller. The speed and multiplicity of channels of communication have bound the continents together. Every nation is now so enmeshed with other nations by a thousand ties of interest that none of them can hold aloof from the others. No one of them can escape the complications that befell its neighbors. This is precisely the lesson taught America with one great flash of enlightenment by the great experience through which it has just passed. Are we to believe that the Republican Senators have already forgotten it? It is just as probable tomorrow as it was yesterday that if Germany should again inflame Europe, the sparks and embers of the conflagration would again reach America. It is true in any case that the ensuing economic ruin would impoverish America as well as Europe.

What are we to expect? Are local political quarrels still to obscure not only the radiant vision of that great ideal of humanity which the boys leaving for their crusade in Europe loved to invoke, but likewise all comprehension of the practical interests of America?

Let us hope not. We wish to believe that the public men of America will not betray the ideal for which their soldiers fought. Let us keep up courage.

[*Deutsche Politik, September 12, 1919*]

A GERMAN VIEW OF AMERICAN POLICY

BY DR. PAUL ROHRBACH

Two schools of thought have come into conflict in the American Senate and in public discussion in the United States. The nominal issue is whether that country shall ratify or reject the Treaty of Versailles. Party politics, presidential ambitions, and material interests inevitably play a part in this discussion. Both schools of thought are hostile to Germany. The American people were induced to go to war by being convinced of the necessity of a crusade against German imperialism. That sentiment still persists. Furthermore, English and French propagandists have not relaxed for a moment the efforts they made during the war to propagate distrust and hatred of Germany by biased reports. We have but one recourse against this — persistent labor to make the world understand how much of the responsibility for the war, how much of the inhumanity during the war, and how much of the selfishness that inspired that conflict, also stand to the account of the rulers of the Entente. Thanks to the skill of the political leaders of our opponents, the Americans comprehend these things less than any other nation. German propaganda may well be devoted now to re-establishing a fair balance of judgment among the American people. This is neglected because our government fails to comprehend the part psychology plays in foreign policy. We might say that it understands less than the old government did — if that would not be incredible. The better

informed among us will have to resign ourselves to this fatal misunderstanding. It is impossible as yet to foresee a time when the opinion of the world will refuse to be biased longer in our disfavor.

One of the principal opponents of ratification, Senator Knox, has criticized the irrational and unjust provisions of the treaty. At the same time he felt it necessary, in view of public sentiment and probably of his own feelings, to assure his hearers that he had no sympathy for the Germans, and that he assumed as a matter of course that their misdeeds must be punished. He did not refer to the inhumanity of killing 800,000 non-combatants in Germany by a famine blockade, and of crushing the spirit and ambition of the survivors by forcing upon them years of undernourishment, and of the moral degeneration which that produces. We are, therefore, called upon to emphasize this distinctly. He and his associates, however, have something else to say, something very important for America and indirectly for the rest of the world and for ourselves. These gentlemen are not willing to have their country become more deeply involved in the affairs of Europe and Asia. The only exception they consider are those parts of Eastern Asia which face the Pacific.

If America ratifies the Treaty, thereby engaging to assist in its enforcement, every one of the innumerable difficulties that will inevitably arise in so doing will force America