1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Independent

March 3, 1991, Sunday

SECTION: FOREIGN NEWS PAGE; Page 2

LENGTH: 233 words

HEADLINE: Crisis in the Gulf / Gulf Briefing: Words of War and Peace

BODY:

Just off the target there was a load of flak. It was the longest minute of my life - RAF Flight-Lieutenant Mike Sears, on the air war

He Saddam Hussein is a man without pity and whatever his fate may be, I for one will not weep for him - John Major

Our strategy for dealing with this army is very simple - first we are going to cut it off them we are going to kill it - Gen Colin Powell

Hellacious - Lieut Col Cliff Myers on the Khafji battle

We don't feel we attacked the wrong bunker or made a mistake. We feel very comfortable that the attacked target was a legitimate target - Brigadier General Richard Neal

An old recipe served up in slightly different sauce - Air Chief Marshal Sir Patrick Hine on the first Iraqi peace offer

The mother of battles will be our battle of victory and martyrdom - Saddam Hussein rejecting the Soviet peace plan

They said he would last three days. He's in his fourth week and I believe his resistance will last at least three years - Yasser Arafat

He is neither a strategist nor is he schooled in the operational art, nor is he a tactician, nor is he a general, nor is he a soldier. Other than that he is a great military man - General Schwarzkopf

General Norman Schwarzkopf is undoubtedly the man of the match - Lieutenant General Sir Peter de la Billiere

The victories of peace will take longer to win than the battles of war - Margaret Thatcher

4TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

March 2, 1991, Saturday, CITY EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; NEW YORK DIARY; Pg. 10

LENGTH: 959 words

HEADLINE: VICTORY IN THE GULF;
'Schwarzie' Winning Hearts at Home

BYLINE: Dennis Duggan

DATELINE: West Point

KEYWORD: COLUMN; UNITED STATES; MILITARY ACADEMY; NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF; PROFILE; PERSIAN GULF WAR

BODY:

It was here that Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf learned how to fight wars, and it was here that he began honing the freewheeling style that has captured a victory-starved nation's fancy.

"He was that way when I met him in here," said classmate John Bahnsen, a retired brigadier general who lives on the U.S. Military Academy grounds here. "He's a muddy boots kind of guy, and he has fought the first war we've won since World War II."

Bahnsen, as outspoken as his now-famous classmate, doesn't count Panama and Grenada. "Those were exercises," he said. And he is filled with admiration for the man called "Stormin' Norman," or ''Schwarzie," the nickname given Schwarzkopf's father, who graduated from West Point a few months ahead of schedule in 1917 so he could fight in World War I.

No matter where a visitor goes - from the West Point grounds jutting out over the sweeping Hudson River to the hamlet outside them called Highland Falls - there echoed praise for the victorious general.

"God Bless Norman Schwarzkopf," cried Tony Ciccarello, the operator of a toy soldier gallery with a window display in which three American soldiers are depicted capturing three Iraqis holding white flags.

"He has given us back our pride," said Ciccarello. "Those two-bit countries are going to think twice before messing around with us again."

You can almost hear the pulse of patriotism beating here. There are the flags and the yellow ribbons, of course, but there are also the handwritten posters hanging in stores inviting troop supporters to a free spaghetti dinner at the firehouse tomorrow afternoon.

And there is a huge sign hanging outside a Highland Falls elementary school on Mountain Avenue, along with a gigantic yellow ribbon that says, "Hurry Back Sgt. Harvey Mathis." He is a soldier from another state that the third-grade class has adopted and has sent letters and parcels. Mathis and his wife have

promised to visit when he returns from the gulf.

The sweet taste of victory has elevated Schwarzkopf to the kind of fame usually reserved for home-run hitters or rock stars. The welcome mat has been rolled out for the 56-year-old West Pointer by Fortune 500 companies as well as by little guys all across America.

It wasn't just that he commanded the half-million soldiers of a 28-nation coalition to a stunning victory. He also broke the old mold of the taciturn, tight-lipped commanders we havebeen accustomed to. Generals like William Westmoreland, for instance, who seemed to bunch into himself as the Vietnam War went from bad to worse and finally to ignominious defeat.

"I think he is the new style of general," said cadet Nicholas Lewis at lunch yesterday in the mess hall, where 4,400 West Pointers were eating.

"The nation was ready for him," said Lewis. "He is straighforward and frank, and people feel they can trust him."

West Point is, and has been since its founding in 1802 by Thomas Jefferson, the incubator of military leaders. It was here from 1952 to 1956 that Schwarzkopf played soccer and football and studied hard enough to finish in the top 10 percent of his class.

Like many West Pointers, he followed in his father's footsteps. And he obviously has some of the physical characteristics that caught the attention of his father's biographers in the Howitzer yearbook who wrote of the elder Schwarzkopf: " . . . his shape is like a beer keg . . . To see 'Schwarzie' attack a 'football table' supper is to sit with mouth open in wonderment and go starved."

It was Schwarzkopf's father who organized the New Jersey State Police and who was instrumental in capturing Bruno Hauptmann, the man accused of kidnaping and killing the Charles Lindbergh baby. Later, his father was invited by the then reigning Shah of Iran to organize the secret police there.

On the steps of his brick home on Lee Road at West Point yesterday, Bahnsen, also known as Doc, recalled playing soccer with young Schwarzkopf and later meeting up with him on the battlefield in Vietnam.

"He learned from the mistakes we made there," said Bahnsen. "He used armor in this war instead of allowing unprotected soldiers to go into the battlefield. That's why his casualities were so low.

"He also kept the politicians and press at arm's length. If he had let the press go out into the field, they would have found every dissatisifed grunt around," added Bahnsen. "He is a man's man, a stud is what I call him. He came here with the spirit and the verve you see on television when he gives briefings, but he is also imbued with what I call the pride of West Point."

Bahnsen recalled that it was to West Point that the U.S. hostages returned in 1981 when they were freed by the Iranians. At the military academy, he said, "We mean it when we use words like duty, honor and country."

Bahnsen does not think his former classmate will leave the Army, as Schwarzkopf once said he might, for fame or riches. "If they want him to stay, he will. They should make him chief of staff, because he has credibility with the people and with Congress, said Bahnsen.

Lt. Gen. Peter de la Billiere, Schwarzkopf's counterpart in the British Army, said a few days ago that it was Schwarzkopf's war. "He is the man of the match, " he said, referring to the expression used by British sports commentators after a soccer game.

Schwarzkopf is that, and he seems to be one of our few media-hip military commanders, keeping a sometimes resentful press at bay occupied with meaningless tidbits, colorful banter and war charts.

At times, he seemed more like a weekend bowler than a full-time warrior, but he exuded the kind of confidence that troops in the field must have. If there must be wars, and history says there must, then this is the sort of leader you want.

GRAPHIC: Photo- Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf attended West Point 1952-1956 and graduated in the top 10 percent of his class.

4-point Speech
Mt. Vernon
7/4/18

III. The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct towards each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern the individual citizens of all modern states in their relations with one another; to the end that all promises and covenants may be sacredly observed, no private plots or conspiracies hatched, no selfish injuries wrought with impunity, and a mutual trust established upon the handsome foundation of a mutual respect for right.

IV. The establishment of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of free nations will check every invasion of right and serve to make peace and justice the more secure by affording a definite tribunal of opinion to which all must submit and by which every international readjustment that cannot be amicably agreed upon by the peoples directly concerned shall be sanctioned.

These great objects ~~can be~~ put into a single sentence. What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.

These great ends cannot be achieved by debating and seeking to reconcile and accommodate what statesmen may wish, with their projects for balances of power and of national opportunity. They can be realized only by the determination of what the thinking peoples of the world desire, with their longing hope for justice and for social freedom and opportunity.

I can fancy that the air of this place carries the accents of such principles with a peculiar kindness. Here were started forces which the great nation against which they were primarily directed at first regarded as a revolt against its rightful authority but which it has long since seen to have been a step in the liberation of its own people as well as of the people of the United States; and I stand here now to speak,—speak proudly and with confident hope,—of the spread of this revolt,

transcripts to Senator Hitchcock, who presented them to the Senate, which, on October 7, 1919, ordered them printed. They were printed by the Government Printing Office in 1919 as *Addresses of President Wilson: Addresses Delivered by President Wilson on his Western Tour, September 4 to September 25, 1919, on the League of Nations, Treaty of Peace with Germany, Industrial Conditions, High Cost of Living, Race Riots, Etc.*, 66th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. Doc. 120. Reprinted verbatim by Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds., *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson* (6 vols., New York, 1925-27), V-VI, they have to this time been regarded as the standard texts.

Transcripts of Wilson's speeches, prepared by their own reporters, were usually printed by all the newspapers of the cities in which he spoke; in addition, either full or partial texts were distributed by the national news services or printed in the newspapers which had special reporters on the tour. We have attempted to recover all versions of Wilson's speeches in all newspapers. Following our usual practice in reconstructing Wilson's speeches, we first compared Swem's transcripts to other versions. In addition, we read Swem's transcripts against his own shorthand notes. These exercises at once revealed that Swem made numerous errors of transcription. Moreover, his versions are highly critical ones, that is, he edited them extensively. He changed sentences to make them grammatical; omitted portions of speeches which, for various reasons, he thought ought not to be published; rearranged portions of speeches to make Wilson appear coherent; and expanded all contractions.

Following standard editorial method, we have regarded complete texts of Wilson's speeches as the basic texts. In several cases, Swem's texts are the only complete texts available; we have used them as the basic texts and have corrected them insofar as possible by a reading of Swem's transcripts of them against extant incomplete texts. In other cases, when complete texts, which appeared to us to be accurate renderings, were available in local newspapers, we used them as the basic texts and, whenever appropriate, have corrected them from a reading of Swem's texts and other complete or partial texts in other newspapers. Since the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, and so on of all these texts were those of the reporters who recorded them, we have modernized spellings, reparagraphed, and made such changes in capitalization and punctuation as seemed appropriate.

In all cases, Wilson delivered these speeches without a written text. As had been his practice since he entered public life in 1910, Wilson relied upon brief outlines to assist his memory of what he wanted to say. Also, probably at some time before he left on his western tour, Wilson typed eight pages of notes on special subjects: themes, the character and scope of the treaty, the Covenant of the League of Nations, the voting powers of the Assembly, and "Change of Policy." Either in California, or soon afterward, Wilson typed up new general outlines for speeches and extracts for quotation. All these notes are WWT MSS in WP, DLC. We do not print all of them because Wilson developed their points and subjects in his speeches repetitively.

An Address to the Columbus Chamber of Commerce

[[September 4, 1919]]

Mr. Chairman, Governor Campbell,[1] and my fellow citizens. (applause) 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.

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; they acknowledged that Germany was a great nation; and they had no purpose in over-

[1] The chairman was William Oxley Thompson, President of Ohio State University. Campbell was James Edwin Campbell, Democrat, Governor of Ohio, 1890-1892.

whelming 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 purpose that they had in mind, but they had deceived their people 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.

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 everything 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 which 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 that have just gone by. Let us never forget those 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.

I wonder if some of the opponents of the League of Nations have forgotten the promises we made our people before we went to that peace table. We had taken by process 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 concerting 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 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 statesmen 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.

Now, look what else is in the treaty. This treaty is unique in the history of mankind, because the center 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.

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 towards 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 for fear that that fine instinct of the heart should assert itself which binds families together.

Poland never could 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 counsel—that strategic considerations were not in our thought, that we were not now arranging for future wars but were giving people what belonged to them.

My fellow citizens, I do not think there is any 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 threat-

ening guns there, and the nations of the world will have concerted, 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 controversy. 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 claim, it will not press them.

The heart of the 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 wrongs 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 wrongs. It was a big job, and I don't say that we wished that it were bigger. 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.

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 their government—robbed, their human rights disregarded—and the slow agony of those hundreds of years had after a while gathered into a hot anger that could not be suppressed.

Revolutions don't spring up overnight. 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 processes 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 Silesia—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 elections. 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. 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 this 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 policy of, because various peoples were keen upon getting back portions of their populations which were separated from them by many miles of territory, and we couldn't spot the map over with little pieces of separated states. I even had to remind my Italian colleagues that, if they were going to claim every place where there was a large Italian population, we would have to cede New York to them, because there are more Italians in New York than in any Italian city. But I believe—I hope—that the Italians in New York City are as glad to stay there as we are to have them. But I would not have you suppose that I am intimating that my Italian colleagues entered any claim for New York City.

We of all peoples in the world, my fellow citizens, ought to be able to understand the questions of this treaty, and without anybody explaining them to us, for we are made up out of all the peoples of the world. I dare say that in this audience there are representatives of practically all the peoples dealt with in this treaty. You don't have to have me explain national ambitions to you, national aspirations. You have been brought up on them. You have learned of them since you were children, and it is those national aspirations which we sought to realize, to give an outlet to in this great treaty.

But we do much more than that. This treaty contains, among other things, a Magna Carta of labor—a thing unheard of until this interesting year of grace. There is a whole section of the treaty devoted to arrangements by which the interests of those who labor with their hands all over the world—whether they be men or women or children—are all of them to be safeguarded. And next month there is to meet the first assembly under this section of the League—and let me tell you it will meet whether the treaty is ratified by that time or not. There is to meet an assembly which represents the interests of laboring men throughout the world. Not their political interests—there is nothing political about it. It is the interests of men concerning the conditions of their labor, concerning the character of labor which women shall engage in, the character of labor which children shall be permitted to engage in; the hours of labor; and, incidentally, of course, the remuneration of labor—that labor shall be remunerated in proportion, of course, to the maintenance of the standard of living, which is proper for the man who is expected to give his whole brain and intelligence and energy to a particular task. I hear very little said about this Magna Carta of labor which is embodied in this treaty. It forecasts the day, which ought to have come long ago, when statesmen will realize that no nation is fortunate which is not happy, and that no nation can be happy whose people are not contented—contented in their industry, contented in their lives, and fortunate in the circumstances of their lives.

If I were to state what seems to me to be the central idea of this treaty, it would be this—it is almost a discovery in international conferences—that nations do not consist of their government but consist of their people! That is a rudimentary idea. It seems to us to go without saying, to us in America, but, my fellow citizens, it was never the leading idea in any other international congress that I ever heard of; that is to say, any international congress made up of the representatives of governments. They were always thinking of national policy, of national advantages, of the rivalries of trade, of the advantages of territorial conquest. There is nothing of that in this treaty.

You will notice that even the territories which are taken away from Germany, like her colonies, are not given to anybody. There isn't a single act of annexation in this treaty. But territories inhabited by people not yet able to govern themselves, either because of economic or other circumstances or the stage of their development, are put under the care of powers who are to act as trustees—trustees responsible in the forum of the world at the bar of the League of Nations, and the terms upon which they are to exercise their trusteeship are outlined. They are not to use those people by way of profit and to fight their wars for them. They are not to permit any form of slavery among them, or of enforced labor. They are to see to it that there are humane conditions of labor with regard, not only to the women and the children, but the men, too. They are to establish no fortifications. They are to regulate the liquor and the opium traffic. They are to see to it, in other words, that the lives of the people whose care they assume—not sovereignty over whom

they assume, but whose care they assume—are kept clean and safe and wholesome. There again the principle of the treaty comes out—that the object of the arrangement is the welfare of the people who live there, and not the advantages of the government.

It goes beyond that. And it seeks to gather under the common supervision of the League of Nations the various instrumentalities by which the world has been trying to check the evils that were in some places debasing men, like the opium traffic, like the traffic—for it was a traffic—in men, women, and children, like the traffic in other dangerous drugs, like the traffic in arms among uncivilized people, who could use arms only for their detriment, for sanitation, for the work of the Red Cross. Why, those clauses, my fellow citizens, draw the hearts of the world into league, draw the noble impulses of the world together and make a poem of them.

I used to be told that this was an age in which mind was monarch, and my comment was that, if that were true, then mind was one of those modern monarchs that reigns and does not govern. But, as a matter of fact, we were governed by a great representative assembly made up of the human passions, and that the best we could manage was that the high and fine passions should be in a majority so that they could control the baser passions, so that they could check the things that were wrong. And this treaty seeks something like that. In drawing the humane endeavors together it makes a mirror of the fine passions of the world, of its philanthropic passions, of its passion of pity, of its passion of human sympathy, of its passion of human friendliness and helpfulness—for there is such a passion. It is the passion that has lifted us along the slow road of civilization. It is the passion that has made ordered government possible. It is the passion that has made justice and established the thing in some happy part of the world.

That is the treaty. Did you ever hear of it before? Did you ever know before what was in this treaty? Did anybody before ever tell you what the treaty was intended to do? I beg, my fellow citizens, that you and the rest of those Americans with whom we are happy to be associated all over this broad land will read the treaty for themselves, or, if they won't take time to do that—for it is a technical document that is hard to read—that they will accept the interpretation of those who made it and know what the intentions were in the making of it.

I hear a great deal, my fellow citizens, about the selfishness and the selfish ambitions of other governments, but I would not be doing justice to the gifted men with whom I was associated on the other side of the water if I didn't testify that the purposes that I have outlined were their purposes. We differed as to the method

very often. We had discussions as to the details, but we never had any serious discussion as to the principles. And, while we all acknowledged that the principles might perhaps in detail have been better, really we are all back of those principles. There is a concert of mind and of purpose and of policy in the world that was never in existence before.

I am not saying that by way of credit to myself or to those colleagues to whom I have alluded, because what happened to us was that we got messages from our people. We were there under instructions, whether they were written down or not, and we did not dare come home without fulfilling those instructions. If I could not have brought back the kind of treaty I brought back, I never would have come back, because I would have been an unfaithful servant, and you would have had the right to condemn me in any way that you chose to use. So that I testify that this is an American treaty, not only, but it is a treaty that expresses the heart of the peoples—of the great peoples—who were associated together in the war against Germany.

I said at the opening of this informal address, my fellow citizens, that I had come to make a report to you. I want to add to that a little bit. I have not come to debate the treaty. It speaks for itself, if you will let it. The arguments directed against it are directed against it with a radical misunderstanding of the instrument itself. Therefore, I am not going anywhere to debate the treaty. I am going to expound it, and I am going, right here, now today, to urge you, in every vocal method that you can use, to assert the spirit of the American people in support of it. Don't let them pull it down. Don't let them misrepresent it. Don't let them lead this nation away from the high purposes with which this war was inaugurated and fought. As I came through that line of youngsters in khaki a few minutes ago, I felt that I could salute it because I had done the job in the way I promised them I would do it. And when this treaty is accepted, men in khaki will not have to cross the seas again. That is the reason I believe in it.

I say "when it is accepted," for it will be accepted. I have never entertained a moment's doubt of that, and the only thing I have been impatient of has been the delay. It is not a dangerous delay, except for the temper of the peoples scattered throughout the world who are waiting. Do you realize, my fellow citizens, that the whole world is waiting on America? The only country in the world that is trusted at this moment is the United States, and they are waiting to see whether their trust is justified or not. That has been the ground of my impatience. I knew their trust was justified, but I begrudged the time that certain gentlemen oblige us to take in

telling them so. We shall tell them so in a voice as authentic as any voice in history, and in the years to come men will be glad to remember that they had some part in the great struggle which brought this incomparable consummation of the hopes of mankind.

Printed in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Sept. 5, 1919; with minor corrections from the complete texts in the Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Sept. 5, 1919, and the *New York Times*, Sept. 5, 1919.

Remarks on Board the Presidential Train at Richmond, Indiana

September 4, 1919.

I am trying to tell the people what is in the treaty. You would not know what is in it to read some of the speeches I read, and if you will be generous enough to me to read some of the things I say, I hope it will help to clarify a great many matters which have been very much obscured by some of the things which have been said. Because we have now to make the most critical choice we ever made as a nation, and it ought to be made in all soberness and without the slightest tinge of party feeling in it. I would be ashamed of myself if I discussed this great matter as a Democrat and not as an American. I am sure that every man who looks at it without party prejudice and as an American will find in that treaty more things that are genuinely American than were ever put into any similar document before.

The chief thing to notice about it, my fellow citizens, is that it is the first treaty ever made by great powers that was not made in their own favor. It is made for the protection of the weak peoples of the world and not for the aggrandizement of the strong. That is a noble achievement, and it is largely due to the influence of such great people as the people of America, who hold at their heart this principle, that nobody has the right to impose sovereignty upon anybody else; that, in disposing of the affairs of a nation, that nation or people must be its own master and make its own choice. The extraordinary achievement of this treaty is that it gives a free choice to people who never could have won it for themselves. It is for the first time in the history of international transactions an act of systematic justice and not an act of grabbing and seizing.

If you will just regard that as the heart of the treaty—for it is the heart of the treaty—then everything else about it is put in a different light. If we want to stand by that principle, then we can justify

the history of America as we can in no other way, for that is the history and principle of America. That is at the heart of it. I beg that, whenever you consider this great matter, you will look at it from this point of view: shall we or shall we not sustain the first great act of international justice? The thing wears a very big aspect when you look at it that way, and all little matters seem to fall away and one seems ashamed to bring in special interests, particularly party interests. What difference does party make when mankind is involved? Parties are intended, if they are intended for any legitimate purpose, to serve mankind, and they are based upon legitimate differences of opinion, not as to whether mankind shall be served or not, but as to the way in which it shall be served; and, so far as those differences are legitimate differences, they justify the differences between parties.

Printed in *Addresses of President Wilson*, with corrections from the complete text in the *New York Times*, Sept. 5, 1919.

An Address in the Indianapolis Coliseum

[[September 4, 1919]]

Mr. President, 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 upon a distinct errand, which it was our duty to perform in the spirit which you had 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 forenoon, where I was endeavoring to explain to a body of our fellow citizens there just what it was that the treaty of peace contains. 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.[1] 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 on the weak and helpless Kingdom of Serbia, 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.

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 ever gone into an 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 allowed time to confer with the governments at Vienna and Berlin, and 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 Covenant does not lie in any of the portions which have been discussed in public debate. The great bulk of the provisions of that Covenant contain 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.

[1] Of course, Archduke Francis Ferdinand was shot in Sarajevo, Bosnia, not Serbia.

If there had been nine days' 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. 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 concert of the purpose of nations that wars like this could not again occur. If the war has to be fought over again, then all our high ideals and purposes 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.

And you will remember how the conscience of mankind was shocked by what Germany did—not merely by the circumstances to which I have already adverted, that unconscionable demands were made upon a little nation which could not resist—but that immediately upon the beginning of the war solemn engagements of treaty were cast on one side, and the chief representative of the Imperial government of Germany said that, when national purposes were under discussion, treaties were mere scraps of paper. And immediately upon that declaration the German armies invaded the territories of Belgium, which they had engaged should be inviolate—invaded those territories with the half-avowed purpose that Belgium was necessary to be permanently retained by Germany in order that she should have a proper frontage on the sea and a proper advantage in her contest with the other nations of the world. So that that act, which was characteristic of the beginning of this war, was a violation of the territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Belgium.

We are presently, my fellow countrymen, to have the 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.[2] 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

[2] About Wilson's tour of the battlefields and ruined cities of Belgium, see the news reports and documents printed at June 18-19, 1919, Vol. 61.

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.

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 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 independence of choice 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 a 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. 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.

And I want you to realize 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. 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 this treaty, very few have 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. If I had done wrong, I would a great deal rather have a man shoot at me than stand me up for the judgment of my fellow men. I would a great deal rather see the muzzle of a gun than the look in their eyes. I would a great deal rather be put out of the world than live in a world boycotted and deserted. The most terrible thing is outlawry. The most formidable thing is to be absolutely isolated. And that is the kernel of this engagement. War is on the outskirts. War is a remote and secondary threat. War is a last resort. Nobody in his senses claims that the Covenant of the League of Nations is certain to stop war, but I confidently assert that it makes war violently improbable, and that, even if we cannot guarantee that it will stop war, we are bound in conscience to do our utmost in order to avoid and prevent it.

I was pointing out, my fellow citizens, this forenoon, that this Covenant is a part of a great document. I wish I had brought a copy of it along with me just to show you its bulk. It is an enormous volume, and almost all the things you hear talked about in that treaty are not the essential things. This is the first treaty in the history of civilization in which great powers have associated themselves together in order to protect the weak. 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. Everyone 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; that this war was an example which gave us the finger pointing to the way of escape; that as Austria and Germany had tried to put upon Serbia, so we must see to it that Serbia and the Slavic nations—peoples associated with her—and the peoples of Rumania and those of Bohemia, and the peoples of Hungary and of Austria, for that matter, should feel assured in the future that the strength of the great powers was behind their liberty and their independence and was not intended to be used, and never should be used, for aggression against them.

And so when you read the Covenant, read the treaty with it. 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. Those 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. There is one of the most noble chapters in the history of the world—that this war was concluded in order to remedy the wrongs which had beaten so deeply into the experience of the weaker peoples of that great continent. The object of the war was to see to it that there was no more of that sort of wrong done. Now, when you have that picture in your minds—that this treaty was meant to protect those who could not protect themselves—turn the picture and look at it this way.

Those very weak nations are situated through the very tract of country—between Germany and Persia—which Germany had intended to conquer and dominate, and if the nations of the world do not maintain their concert to sustain the independence and freedom of those peoples, Germany will yet have her will upon them. And we shall witness the very interesting spectacle of having spent millions upon millions of American treasure and, what is much more precious, hundreds of thousands of American lives, to do a futile thing, to do a thing which we will then leave to be undone at the leisure of those who are masters of intrigue, at the leisure of those who are masters in combining wrong influences to overcome right influences, of those who are the masters of the very things we hate and mean always to fight.

For, my fellow citizens, if Germany should ever attempt that again, whether we are in the League of Nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not stand off and see murder done. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends and advocates of free government and yet willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes. For if the power such as Germany was—but, thank God, no longer is—were to do this thing upon the fields of Europe, then America would have to look to it that she did not do it also upon the fields of the western hemisphere, and we should at last be face to face with a power which at the outset we could have crushed, and which now it is within our choice to keep within the harness of civilization.

I am not 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 of the 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 argue 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 spelt 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. You have been bred, I have no doubt, as I have been bred, in the Revolutionary school of American thought. I mean that school of American thought which takes its inspiration from the days of the American Revolution. There were only three million of us then, but we were ready to stand out against the world for liberty. There are more than one hundred million of us now, and we are ready to insist that everywhere men shall be champions of liberty.

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. We were sitting there with the pieces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in our hands. It had fallen apart. It never was naturally cohesive. We were sitting there with various dispersed assets of the German Empire in our hands, and with regard to every one of them we had to determine what we were going to do, but we did not have our own dispersed assets in our hands. We did not have the assets of the nations which constituted the body of the nations associated against Germany to dispose of, and, therefore, we had often, with whatever regret, to turn

away from questions that ought to some day be discussed and settled and upon which the opinion of the world ought to be brought to bear.

I therefore want to call your attention, if you will turn to it when you go home, to Article XI, following Article X, of the Covenant of the League of Nations. 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 peoples' 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. We can force a nation on the other side of the globe to bring to that bar of mankind any wrong that is afoot in that part of the world which is likely to affect the peace of the world, which is likely to affect the good understanding between nations, and we can oblige them to show cause why it should not be remedied.

There is not an oppressed people in the world which cannot henceforth get a hearing at that 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.

At present what is the state of international law and understanding? No nation has the right to call attention to anything that does not directly affect its own affairs. If it does, it cannot only be told to mind its own business, but it risks the cordial relationship between itself and the nation whose affairs it draws into discussion; whereas under Article XI, the very sensible provision is made that the peace of the world transcends all the susceptibilities of nations and governments, and that they are obliged to consent to discuss and explain anything that does affect the understanding between nations.

Not only that, but 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. I think it will not be improper for me to refer to one of those 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 treaty with Germany, and the most that we 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.

But my present point is that there stood at the very gate of that settlement a secret treaty between Japan and two of the great powers engaged in this war on our side. We could not ask them to disregard those promises. This war had been fought in part because of the refusal to observe the fidelity which is involved in a promise, in a failure to regard the sacredness of treaties. And this Covenant of the League of Nations provides that no secret treaty shall have any validity. It provides in explicit terms that every treaty, every international understanding, shall be registered with the Secretary of the League, that it shall be published as soon as possible after it is there registered, and that no treaty that is not there registered will be regarded by any of the nations engaged in the Covenant. So that we not only have the right to discuss anything, but we make everything open for discussion. And if this Covenant accomplished little more than the abolition of private arrangements between great powers, it would have gone far toward stabilizing the peace of the world and securing the justice which it has been so difficult to secure so long as nations could come to secret understandings with one another.

When you look at the Covenant of the League of Nations thus in the large, you wonder why it is a bogey to anybody. You wonder what influences have made gentlemen afraid of it. You wonder why it is not obvious to everybody, as it is to those who study it with disinterested thought, that this is the central and essential Covenant of the whole peace. As I said this forenoon, I can come through a double row of men in khaki and acknowledge their salutes with a free heart, because I kept my promise to them. I told

them when they went to this war that this was a war, not only to beat Germany, but to prevent any subsequent wars of this kind. I can look all the mothers of this country in the face and all the sisters and sweethearts and say, "The boys will not have to do this again."

You would think to hear some men discuss this Covenant that it is an arrangement for sending men abroad again just as soon as possible. It is the only conceivable arrangement which will prevent our sending our men abroad again very soon. And, if I may use a very common expression, I would say, if it is not to be this arrangement, what arrangement do you suggest to secure the peace of the world? It is a case of "put up or shut up." Opposition is not going to save the world. Negations are not going to construct the policies of mankind. A great plan is the only thing that can defeat a great plan. The only triumphant ideas in this world are the ideas that are organized for battle. The only thing that equals an organized program is a better program. If this is not the way to secure peace, I beg that the way may be pointed out. If we must reject this way, then I beg that, before I am sent to ask Germany to make a new kind of peace with us, I should be given specific instructions as to what kind of peace it is to be. If the gentlemen who don't like what was done at Paris think that they can do something better, I beg that they will hold their convention soon and do it now. They cannot in conscience or good faith deprive us of this great work of peace without substituting some other that is better.

And so, my fellow citizens, I look forward with profound gratification to the time, which I believe will now not much longer be delayed, when the American people can say to their fellows in all parts of the world: "We are the friends of liberty; we have joined with the rest of mankind in securing the guarantees of liberty; we stand here with you the eternal champions of what is right, and may God keep us in the covenant that we have formed."

Printed in the *Indianapolis News*, Sept. 5, 1919, with a few corrections and additions from the text in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Sept. 5, 1919, and the T MS in WP, DLC.

From Samuel Gompers and Others

Washington D C Sept 4 1919

The executive committee representing the various international unions in the iron and steel industry met today to consider the awful situation which exists in many of the iron and steel industry centers. The coercion and the brutality employed to prevent men and unions from meeting in halls engaged upon private property

An Address to a Joint Session of Congress

8 Jan'y, 1918.[1]

Gentlemen of the Congress: Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible bases of a general peace. Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk between representatives of the Central Powers, to which the attention of all the belligerents has been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement. The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace, but also an equally definite programme of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific programme of practical terms was added. That programme proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied,—every province, every city, every point of vantage,—as a permanent addition to their territories and their power. It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own peoples' thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significance. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Empires speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties, that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan states which have felt obliged to become their associates in this war? The Russian representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy, that the conferences they have been holding

[1] WWhw.

with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open, not closed doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired. To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the Resolutions of the German Reichstag of the ninth of July last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world.

But, whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candor. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definitive terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them. Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candor and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war, lies with Germany and her Allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of the very life of Society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered. And yet their

soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe. They call to us to say what it is that we desire, in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond, with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow now or at any other time the objects it has in view.

We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us. The programme of the world's peace, therefore, is our programme; and that programme, the only possible programme, as we see it, is this:

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

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 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 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 interests of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

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 counsel 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 entered into.

XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently 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 covenant.

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.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the Imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end.

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this programme does remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this programme that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world,—the new world in which we now live,—instead of a place of mastery.

Wilson

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole programme I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything that they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.

!

Printed reading copy (WP, DLC).

To Raymond Poincaré

My dear Mr. President: [The White House] 8 January, 1918

The French Ambassador was kind enough to communicate to me your Excellency's important message with regard to the use to which the American troops were to be put in cooperating with the troops of France, and I want to assure your Excellency that the question is one to which we have been giving a great deal of careful and anxious thought and with regard to which we are all not only willing but anxious to do the best and most effective thing for the accomplishment of the common purpose to which we are devoting our arms.

General Bliss, who is kindly conveying this letter to you for me, is, as your Excellency probably knows, to be the representative of the United States in the Supreme War Council, and I have instructed him that this particular question which you have very properly called to my attention ought to be discussed with the greatest fullness and frankness in that Council. The judgment of the Council with regard to it will, I need hardly assure you, be conclusively influential with the Government of the United States. Our only desire is to do the best thing that can be done with our

These are the days when in other countries ignorant people are often disposed to imagine that progress consists of converting oneself from a monarchy into a republic. In this country we have known the blessings of limited monarchy. Great traditional and constitutional chains of events have come to make an arrangement, to make a situation, unwritten, which enables our affairs to proceed on what I believe is a superior level of smoothness and democratic progress.

I had not previously met Mr. Curtin, except in correspondence during the present struggle, but I have met him now, and joined the right hand of friendship with that most commanding, competent, wholehearted leader of the Australian people in all the vicissitudes and mortal terrors through which they have now, I think I might venture to say, safely passed.

Other struggles lie ahead, perhaps long struggles, in the Pacific theatre. I am sure the Australian people will never forget the immense services which have been rendered to Australia by the armed forces and Government of the United States.

We divided the spheres of responsibility with the United States at the beginning of 1942. We did our part in the Atlantic, and they undertook with their strong arm to ward off the menace of Japan and aid Australia to develop her full strength. The whole story is one eminently satisfactory, eminently creditable to the English-speaking peoples all over the world, and will never be made the subject of invidious comparison.

Mr. Curtin has certainly made a great impression on all who have been brought in contact with him, especially in matters of serious business. I trust he will go back safely over the long distances which must be passed before he regains his country. I know he will speak a good word for us wherever he goes. My feeling is that we had made on him an impression about the state of our affairs in our Island which will perhaps be confirmed by history, and is at present expressed in the well-known and never to be too much known words of Macaulay:–

Then none was for a party;
Then all were for the state;
Then the great man helped the poor
And the poor man loved the great;
Then lands were fairly portioned
And the Huns were fairly sold;
The Britons were like brothers
In the brave days of old.

THE WORLD SITUATION

May 24, 1944

House of Commons

The meeting of Dominion Prime Ministers, which covered the best part of three weeks, has now concluded, and very full statements to Parliament and the public have been made, individually by the Prime Ministers themselves, and collectively by the declaration to which we have all subscribed. I could not pretend that we have arrived

at hard and fast conclusions or precise decisions upon all the questions which torment this afflicted globe, but it can fairly be said that, having discussed a great many of them, there was revealed a core of agreement which will enable the British Empire and Commonwealth to meet in discussion with other great organisms in the world in a firmly-knit array. We have advanced from vague generalities to more precise points of agreement, and we are in a position to carry on discussions with other countries, within the limits which we have imposed upon ourselves.

But this is a Debate upon Foreign Affairs, and nothing was more remarkable than the cordial agreement which was expressed by every one of the Dominion Prime Ministers on the general conduct of our Foreign Affairs and on the principles which govern that conduct, and, I should add, on the skill and consistency with which they have been treated by my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary. The utmost confidence was expressed in him and in his handling of all those very difficult affairs, in spite of the complications by which they are surrounded, and, in spite of the need for prompt action which so often arises–for prompt action by the Mother Country before there is time to have full consultation. In spite of all these difficulties, the fullest confidence and pleasure was expressed in the work which my right hon. Friend has done. We therefore embark upon the present Debate with the backing of goodwill from all these representatives of the Commonwealth and Empire–the word "Empire" is permitted to be used, which may be a great shock to certain strains of intellectual opinion. And we embark upon the present Debate not only with this backing of hearty goodwill, but with the feeling that this meeting of Prime Ministers from all over the Empire and the representatives of India in the midst of a second deadly war is in fact the highest pinnacle which our world-wide family association has yet reached. At this time, in policy and in war, our objective is the same, namely, to beat the enemy as soon as possible; and I am not aware of any action or of any studied inaction for which His Majesty's Government are responsible that has not been directly related to that single and dominant purpose.

The duty of all persons responsible for the conduct of Foreign Affairs in a world war of this deadly character, and of all who, in different ways, exercise influence, is to help the fighting men to perform the heavy tasks entrusted to them and to ensure them all possible ease in execution and advantage in victory. Everyone in a position to guide opinion, like Members of this House or of another place, or newspaper editors, broadcasters, calumnists or columnists–I remember a tendency to throw the accent forward–and others–all of these should keep this very clear duty before their eyes. They should always think of the soldier in the battle and ask themselves whether what they say or write will make his task easier or harder. We long for the day to come when this slaughter will be over, and then this additional restraint which imposes itself on every conscientious man in war-time can be relaxed or will vanish away entirely.

I must make my acknowledgments, first of all, to the very great degree with which these precepts are followed among those who accept the task of guiding public opinion, and especially in the House of Commons, which is always so careful of the public interest and which in other ways has shown itself to be possessed of those steadfast and unyielding qualities in the face of danger and fatigue for which it has always been renowned, but never more renowned than now. I shall try to practise what I have been preaching in the remarks I have to make, and I am sure the

Committee will remember how many different audiences I have to address at the same moment, not only here but out of doors, and not only in this Island, but throughout the Empire, not only among our Allies, great and small, west or east, but finally among our enemies, besides, of course, satellites and neutrals of various hues. I must, therefore, pick my way among heated ploughshares, and in this ordeal the only guides are singleness and simplicity of purpose and a good or, at any rate, a well-trained conscience.

Since I last spoke here on Foreign Affairs, just about three months ago, almost all the purposes which I mentioned to you have prospered, severally and collectively. First of all, let us survey the Mediterranean and the Balkan spheres. The great disappointment which I had last October, when I was not able to procure the necessary forces for gaining the command of the Aegean Sea following upon the collapse of Italy and gaining possession of the principal Italian islands, has, of course, been accompanied by an exaggerated attitude of caution on the part of Turkey. The hopes we cherished of Turkey boldly entering the war in February or March, or at least according us the necessary bases for air action—those hopes faded. After giving £20,000,000 worth of British and American arms to Turkey in 1943 alone, we have suspended the process and ceased to exhort Turkey to range herself with the victorious United Powers, with whom she has frequently declared that her sympathies lie, and with whom, I think, there is no doubt that her sympathies do lie. The Turks at the end of last year and the beginning of this year magnified their dangers. Their military men took the gloomiest view of Russian prospects in South Russia and in the Crimea.

They never dreamed that by the early Summer the Red Army would be on the slopes of the Carpathians, drawn up along the Pruth and Sereth Rivers, or that Odessa and Sebastopol would have been liberated and regained by the extraordinary valour, might and energy of the Soviet onslaught. Consequently the Turks did not measure with sufficient accuracy what might have occurred, or would occur, in Rumania and Bulgaria or, I may add, Hungary, what would be the result on all those countries if these tremendous Russian hammer blows struck, even in months which are particularly unsuitable for operations in these regions and which normally would be devoted to the process of replenishing the advancing front for future action. Having over-rated their dangers, our Turkish friends increased their demands for supplies to such a point that, having regard to the means of communication and transport alone, the war would probably be over before these supplies could reach them.

We have, therefore, with great regret, discontinued the process of arming Turkey, because it looks probable that, in spite of our disappointment in the Aegean, the great Allies will be able to win the war in the Balkans and generally throughout South Eastern Europe without Turkey being involved now at all, though naturally the aid of Turkey would be a great help and acceleration of that process. This, of course, is a decision for Turkey to take. We have put no pressure upon them, other than the pressure of argument and of not giving the supplies we need for ourselves and other nations that are fighting. But the course which is being taken, and has been taken so far, by Turkey will not, in my view, procure for the Turks the strong position at the peace which would attend their joining the Allies.

I must, however, note the good service and significant gesture rendered to us by the Turkish Government quite recently, and it is said that it has been rendered to us on the personal initiative of Turkey's honoured President, General Inonu, namely the

complete cessation of all chrome exports to Germany. It is not too much to expect that the assistance given us in respect of chrome will also shortly be extended to cover other commodities, the export of which, even if of less importance than chrome, is of material assistance to the enemy. If so, we shall endeavour to compensate the Turkish people for the sacrifice which their cooperative action might entail by other means of importation.

Turkey and Britain have a long history. The Turks entered into relations with us before the war when things looked very black. They did their best through difficult times. I have thought it better to put things bluntly to-day, but I cannot conclude, notwithstanding anything I have said in criticism, without saying that we hope with increasing confidence that a still better day will dawn for the relations of Turkey with Britain and, indeed, with all the great Allies. Always in recent decades there has been in the Mediterranean a certain tension between Turkey and Italy on account of Italian ambitions in the Greek Islands, and also, possibly, in the Adana Province of Turkey. The Turks could never be sure which way the Italian dictator would turn his would-be conquering sword. On that score Turkish anxiety has certainly been largely removed.

The fate of Italy is indeed terrible, and I personally find it very difficult to nourish animosity against the Italian people. The overwhelming mass of the nation rejoiced in the idea of being delivered from the subtle tyranny of the Fascists, and they wished, when Mussolini was overthrown, to take their place as speedily as possible by the side of the British and American Armies who, it was expected, would quickly rid the country of the Germans. However, this did not happen. All the Italian forces which could have defended Italy had either been squandered by Mussolini in the African desert or by Hitler amid the Russian snows, or they were widely dispersed combating, in a half-hearted way, the patriots of Yugoslavia. Hitler decided to make great exertions to retain Italy, just as he has decided to make great exertions to gain the mighty battle which is at the moment at its climax to the South of Rome. It may be that after the fall of Mussolini our action might have been more swift and audacious. As I have said before, it is no part of my submission to the House that no mistakes are made by us or by the common action of our Allies; but, anyhow, here is this beautiful country suffering the worst horrors of war, with the larger part still in the cruel and vengeful grip of the Nazis, and with a hideous prospect of the red-hot rake of the battle-line being drawn from sea to sea right up the whole length of the peninsula.

It is clear that the Germans will be driven out of Italy by the Allies, but what will happen on the moving battle fronts and what the Germans will do on their way out in the way of destruction to a people they hate and despise, and who, they allege, have betrayed them, cannot be imagined or forecast. All I can say is that we shall do our utmost to make the ordeal as short and as little destructive as possible. We have great hopes that the city of Rome may be preserved from the area of struggle of our Armies. The House will recall that when I last spoke on foreign matters I expressed the view that it would be best that King Victor Emmanuel, and above all Marshal Badoglio, should remain at the head of the Executive of the Italian nation and armed forces until we reached Rome, when it was agreed by all that a general review of the position must be made.

Such a policy naturally entailed differences of opinion, which were reflected not only among the Allied Governments but inside every Allied country. However, I am

happy to say that after various unexpected happenings and many twists and turns the situation is now exactly what I ventured to suggest and as I described it to the House three months ago. In addition, far beyond my hopes, an Italian Government has been formed, of a broadly based character, aroung the King and Badoglio, and the King himself has decided that on the capture of Rome he will retire into private life for ever and transfer his constitutional functions to his eldest son, the Prince of Piedmont, with the title of Lieutenant of the Realm.

I have good confidence in this new Italian Government which has been formed. It will require further strengthening and broadening, especially as we come more closely into touch with the populous industrial areas of the North—that is essential—but at any rate it is facing its responsibilities manfully and doing all in its power to aid the Allies in their advance. Here I may say we are doing our best to equip the Italian forces who are eager to fight with us and are not in the power of the Germans. They have played their part in the line on more than one occasion. Their fleet is discharging a most useful and important service for us not only in the Mediterranean but in the Atlantic; and the loyal Italian Air Force has also fought so well that I am making special efforts to supply them with improved aircraft of British manufacture. We are also doing our best to assist the Italian Government to grapple with the difficult financial and economic conditions which they inherited from Fascism and the war, and which, though improving, are still severe behind the lines of the Army. It is understood throughout Italy, and it is the firm intention of the United Nations, that Italy, like all other countries which are now associated with us, shall have a fair and free opportunity, as soon as the Germans are driven out and tranquillity is restored, of deciding on whatever form of democratic Government, whether monarchical or republican, they desire. They can choose freely for themselves. I emphasize, however, the word "democratic," because it is quite clear that we should not allow any form of Fascism to be restored or set up in any country with which we have been at war.

From Italy one turns naturally to Spain, once the most famous Empire in the world, and down to this day a strong community in a wide land, with a marked personality and a culture distinguished among the nations of Europe. Some people think that our foreign policy towards Spain is best expressed by drawing comical or even rude caricatures of General Franco; but I think there is more to it that that. When our present Ambassador to Spain, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chelsea (Sir S. Hoare), went to Madrid almost exactly four years ago to a month, we arranged to keep his airplane waiting on the airfield, as it seemed almost certain that Spain, whose dominant party were under the influence of Germany because Germany had helped them so vigorously in the recently-ended civil war, would follow the example of Italy and join the victorious Germans in the war against Great Britain. Indeed, at that time the Germans proposed to the Spanish Government that triumphal marches of German troops should be held in the principal Spanish cities, and I have no doubt that they suggested to them that the Germans would undertake, in return for the virtual occupation of their country, the seizure of Gibraltar, which would then be handed back to a Germanized Spain. This last would have been easier said than done.

There is no doubt that if Spain had yielded to German blandishments and pressure at that juncture our burden would have been much heavier. The Straits of Gibraltar would have been closed, and all access to Malta would have been cut off from the West. All the Spanish coast would have become the nesting-place of German

U-boats. I certainly did not feel at the time that I should like to see any of those things happen, and none of them did happen. Our Ambassador deserves credit for the influence he rapidly acquired and which continually grew. In this work he was assisted by a gifted man, Mr. Yencken, whose sudden death by airplane accident is a loss which I am sure has been noted by the House. But the main credit is undoubtedly due to the Spanish resolve to keep out of the war. They had had enough of war, and they wished to keep out of it. [An hon. Member: "That is a matter of opinion."] Yes, I think so, and that is why my main principle of beating the enemy as soon as possible should be steadily followed, But they had had enough, and I think some of the sentiment may have been due to the fact that, looking back, the Spanish people, who are a people who do look back, could remember that Britain had helped Spain to free herself from the Napoleonic tyranny of 130 years ago. At any rate the critical moment passed; the Battle of Britain was won; the Island power which was expected to be ruined and subjugated in a few months was seen that very winter not only intact and far stronger in the homeland, but also advancing by giant strides, under Wavell's guidance, along the African shore, taking perhaps a quarter of a million Italian prisoners on the way.

But another very serious crisis occurred in our relations with Spain before the operation designated "Torch," that is to say the descent of the United States and British forces upon North-West Africa, was begun. At that moment Spain's power to injure us was at its very highest. For a long time we had been steadily extending our airfield at Gibraltar and building it out into the sea, and for a month before zero hour, November 7th, 1942, we had sometimes 600 airplanes crowded on this airfield in full range and in full view of the Spanish batteries. It was very difficult for the Spaniards to believe that these airplanes were intended to reinforce Malta, and I can assure the House that the passage of those critical days was very anxious indeed. However, the Spaniards continued absolutely friendly and tranquil. They asked no questions, they caused no inconveniences.

If, in some directions, they have taken an indulgent view of German U-boats in distress, or continued active exportations to Germany, they made amends on this occasion, in my view, so far as our advantage was concerned, for these irregularities, by completely ignoring the situation at Gibraltar, where, apart from aircraft, enormous numbers of ships were anchored far outside the neutral waters, inside the Bay of Algeciras, always under the command of Spanish shore guns. We should have suffered the greatest inconvenience if we had been ordered to move those ships. Indeed, I do not know how the vast convoys could have been marshalled and assembled. I must say that I shall always consider a service was rendered at this time by Spain, not only to the United Kingdom and to the British Empire and Commonwealth, but to the cause of the United Nations. I have, therefore, no sympathy with those who think it clever, and even funny, to insult and abuse the Government of Spain whenever occasion serves.

I have had the responsibility of guiding the Government while we have passed through mortal perils, and I therefore think I have some means of forming a correct judgment about the values of events at critical moments as they occur. I am very glad now that, after prolonged negotiations, a still better arrangement has been made with Spain, which deals in a satisfactory manner with the Italian ships that have taken refuge in Spanish harbours, and has led to the hauling-down of the German flag in Tangier and the breaking of the shield over the Consulate, and which will, in a few

days, be followed by the complete departure of the German representatives from Tangier, although they apparently still remain in Dublin. Finally, it has led to the agreement about Spanish wolfram, which has been reached without any affront to Spanish dignity, and has reduced the export of wolfram from Spain to Germany during the coming critical period to a few lorry-loads a month.

It is true that this agreement has been helped by the continuous victories of the Allies in many parts of the world, and especially in North Africa and Italy, and also by the immense threat by which the Germans conceive themselves to be menaced, by all this talk of an invasion across the Channel. This, for what it is worth, has made it quite impossible for Hitler to consider reprisals on Spain. All his troops have had to be moved away from the frontier, and he has no inclination to face bitter guerrilla warfare, because he has got quite enough to satisfy him in so many other countries which he is holding down by brute force.

As I am here to-day speaking kindly words about Spain, let me add that I hope she will be a strong influence for the peace of the Mediterranean after the war. Internal political problems in Spain are a matter for the Spaniards themselves. It is not for us—that is the Government—to meddle in such affairs—

[Editor's Note: At this point a member interrupted Mr. Churchill to ask why, if the Government would not allow a Fascist government in Italy, they would allow one in Spain? Churchill replied]: The reason is that Italy attacked us. We were at war with Italy. We struck Italy down. A very clear line of distinction can be drawn between nations who go to war with us, and nations who leave us alone.

I presume we do not include in our programme of world renovation forcible action against any and every Government whose internal form of administration does not come up to our own ideas, and any remarks I have made on that subject referred only to enemy Powers and their satellites who will have been struck down by force of arms. They are the ones who have ventured into the open, and they are the ones whom we shall not allow to become, again, the expression of those peculiar doctrines associated with Fascism and Nazism which have, undoubtedly, brought about the terrible struggle in which we are engaged. Surely, anyone can see the difference between the one and the other. There is all the difference in the world between a man who knocks you down and a man who leaves you alone. You may, conceivably, take an active interest in what happens to the former in case his inclination should recur, but we pass many people in the ordinary daily round of life about whose internal affairs and private quarrels we do not feel ourselves called upon to make continual inquiry.

Well, I say we speak the same words to the Spaniards in the hour of our strength as we did in the hour of our weakness. I look forward to increasingly good relations with Spain, and to an extremely fertile trade between Spain and this country which will, I trust, grow even during the war and will expand after the peace. The iron from Bilbao and the North of Spain is of great value to this country both in war and peace. Our Ambassador now goes back to Spain for further important duties, and I have no doubt he goes with the good wishes of the large majority of the House and of all thoughtful and unprejudiced persons. I am sure that no one more than my hon. Friend opposite [Mr. Shinwell] would wish that he should be successful in any work for the

common cause. My hon. Friend has been often a vigilant and severe critic of His Majesty's Government, but as a real Opposition figure he has failed, because he never can conceal his satisfaction when we win—and we sometimes do.

I am happy to announce a hopeful turn in Greek affairs. When I spoke last on this I described them as the saddest case of all. We have passed through a crisis of a serious character since then. A Greek brigade and a large proportion of the Greek Navy mutinied, declaring themselves, in one way or other, on the side of the organization called E.A.M., the Greek freedom movement, and, of course, against the King and his Government. The King of Greece, who was in London, was advised by nearly everyone concerned in Cairo not to go back, and warned that his life would be in danger. He returned the next day. The situation was then most serious. The Greek brigade was encircled by British forces some 30 miles away from Alexandria, and the Greek ships which had mutinied in Alexandria harbour were lying under the guns both of the shore batteries and of our superior naval forces, which had rapidly gathered. This tension lasted for nearly three weeks. In due course the mutinies in the Fleet were suppressed. The disorderly ships were boarded by Greeks, under the orders of the Greek Government, and, with about 50 killed and wounded, the mutineers were collected and sent ashore. The mutinous brigade in the desert was assaulted by superior British forces, which captured the eminences commanding the camp, and the 4,000 men there surrendered. There were no casualties among the Greeks, but one British officer was killed in the attack upon the eminences. This is a matter which cannot be overlooked. The greatest patience and tact were shown by the British military and naval authorities involved, and for some weeks past order has been firmly established, and the Greek forces who were misled into evil deeds by subversive movements have been interned for the time being.

The then Prime Minister, M. Tsouderos, had already tried, before these things happened, to arrange a meeting of representatives of all Greek opinion, and to construct his administration so as to include them. He acquitted himself with dignity, and was helped by M. Venizelos, the son of the great Venizelos whom we all esteemed so highly in the first world war. At this moment there emerged upon the scene M. Papandreou, a man greatly respected, who had lived throughout the war in Athens and was known as a man of remarkable character and one who would not be swayed by party interests, his own party being a very small one. M. Papandreou became the King's new Prime Minister, but before forming his Government he called a conference which met last week in the Lebanon. Every party in Greek life was represented there, including E.A.M., the Communists and others—a dozen parties or more. The fullest debate took place and all expressed their feelings freely.

This disclosed an appalling situation in Greece. The excesses of E.L.A.S., which is the military body operating under E.A.M. had so alienated the population in many parts that the Germans had been able to form security battalions of Greeks to fight the E.A.M. These security battalions were made up of men of whom many would far rather have been out in the hills maintaining the guerrilla warfare. They had been completely alienated. At the same time, the state of hostility and suspicion which led last autumn to an actual civil war existed between E.A.M. and the other resistance organizations, especially the E.D.E.S. under Colonel Zervas, a leader who commands

the undivided support of the civilian population in his area and has always shown the strictest compliance with the orders sent him from G.H.Q., Middle East, under whom all his forces have been placed. Thus it seemed to be a question of all against all, and no one but the Germans rejoicing.

After prolonged discussion complete unity was reached at the Lebanon Conference, and all parties will be represented in the new Government, which will devote itself to what is after all the only purpose worthy of consideration, namely the formation of a national army in which all the guerrilla bands will be incorporated, and the driving, with this army, of the enemy from the country or, better still, destroying him where he stands.

On Monday there was published in the newspapers the very agreeable letter which I received from the leaders of the Communists—that is more than I have ever received from the hon. Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher); perhaps he might write me one, to tell me that he confirms it—and the extreme Left wing party. There is published to-day in the papers the letter I have received from M. Papandreou, and another to my right hon. Friend expressing the hopes which he has for the future of his Government, and thanks for the assistance we have given in getting round these troubles—what I call the diseases of defeat, which Greece has now a chance of shaking off. I believe that the present situation—I hope and pray that it may be so—indicates that a new and fair start will come to Greece in her struggle to cleanse her native soil from the foreign invader. I have, therefore, to report to the House that a very marked and beneficial change has occurred in the situation in Greece, which is more than I could say when I last spoke upon this subject. There was trouble with the destroyer we were giving the Greeks here, and while matters remained so uncertain, we were not able to hand her over, but I have been in correspondence with the Admiralty, and I hope that as a result of this reconstructed Government, and the new start that has been made, this ship will soon be manned and go to strengthen the Greek Navy as it returns to discipline and duty.

I gave some lengthy account last time of the position in Yugoslavia and of our relations with the different jurisdictions there. The difficulty and magnitude of this business are very great, and it must be remembered that not only three strongly-marked races—the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes—are involved, but farther south, the Albanians are also making a bold bid for freedom from German rule. But they, too, at the present time are split into several competing and even antagonistic groups. Nothing is easier than to espouse any one of the various causes in these different countries, with all their claims and counter-claims, and one can find complete satisfaction in telling the tale from that particular standpoint. The best and easiest kind of speech to make is to take a particular cause and run it home on a single-track line without any consideration of anything else; but we have to think of policy as well as oratory, and we have to consider the problem as a whole, and also to relate our action to the main purpose which I proclaimed at the beginning of my speech, namely, beating the enemy as soon as possible, and gathering all forces for that purpose in priority to any other.

I can only tell the Committee to-day the further positions which have been reached in Yugoslavia as the result of the unremitting exertions of our foreign policy. They are, in my opinion, far more satisfactory than they were. I have received a

message from King Peter that he has accepted the resignation of Mr. Puric and his Cabinet, and is in process of forming a new and smaller Cabinet with the purpose of assisting active resistance in Yugoslavia and of uniting as far as possible all fighting elements in the country. I understand that this process of forming the new Government involves the severance from the Royal Yugoslav Government of General Mihailovitch in his capacity as Minster of War. I understand also that the Ban of Croatia is an important factor in the new political arrangements, around whom, or beside whom, certain other elements may group themselves for the purpose of beating the enemy and uniting Yugoslavia. This, of course, has the support of His Majesty's Government. We do not know what will happen in the Serbian part of Yugoslavia.

The reason why we have ceased to supply Mihailovitch with arms and support is a simple one. He has not been fighting the enemy, and moreover, some of his subordinates have made accommodations with the enemy from which have arisen armed conflicts with the forces of Marshal Tito, accompanied by many charges and counter-charges, and the loss of patriot lives to the German advantage. Mihailovitch certainly holds a powerful position locally as Commander-in-Chief, and his ceasing to be Minister of War will not rob him of his local influence. We cannot predict what he will do or what will happen. We have proclaimed ourselves the strong supporters of Marshal Tito because of his heroic and massive struggle against the German armies. We are sending, and planning to send, the largest possible supplies of weapons to him and make the closest contacts with him. I had the advantage on Monday of a long conversation with General Velebit, who has been over here on a military mission from Marshal Tito, and it has been arranged among other things that the Marshal shall send here a personal military representative in order that we may be kept in the closest touch with all that is being done and with the effects of it in Yugoslavia. This is, of course, additional to the contacts established with Marshal Tito at General Wilson's headquarters in Algiers, and will, of course, be co-ordinated therewith.

It must be remembered, however, that this question does not turn on Mihailovitch alone; there is also a very large body, amounting to perhaps 200,000, of Serbian peasant proprietors who are anti-German but strongly Serbian, and who naturally hold the views of a peasant-owner community in regard to property, and are less enthusiastic in regard to communism than some of those in Croatia or Slovenia. Marshal Tito has largely sunk his communist aspect in his character as a Yugoslav patriot leader. He repeatedly proclaims that he has no intention of reversing the property and social systems which prevail in Serbia, but these facts are not accepted yet by the other side. The Serbians are a race with an historic past; it was from Serbia came the spark which fired the explosion of the first world war: we remember their historic retreat over the mountains. Our object is that all forces in Yugoslavia, and the whole united strength of Serbia, may be made to work together under the military direction of Marshal Tito for a united independent Yugoslavia which will expel from their native soil the Hitlerite murderers and invaders, and destroy them until not one remains. The cruelties and atrocities of the Germans in Greece and in Yugoslavia exceed anything that we have heard, and we have heard terrible things, but the resistance of these heroic mountaineers has been one of the most splendid features of the war. It will long be honoured in history, and I am sure that children will read the romance of this struggle

and will have imprinted on their minds that love of freedom, that readiness to give away life and comfort, in order to gain the right to live unmolested on their native heath, which their fathers are showing now.

All I can say is that we must be given a little reasonable latitude to work together for this union. It would be quite easy, as I said just now, to take wholeheartedly one side or the other. I have made it very plain where my sympathies lie, but nothing would give greater pleasure to the Germans than to see all these hearty mountaineers engaged in intestine strife against one another. We cannot afford at this crisis to neglect anything which may obstruct a real unity throughout wide regions in which at present upwards of 12 German divisions are gripped in Yugoslavia alone and 20 in all—that is another eight in the Balkans and the Aegean Islands. All eyes must be turned upon the common foe. Perhaps we have had some success in this direction in Greece. At any rate it sums up our policy towards Yugoslavia, and the House will note that all questions of monarchy or republic or Leftism or Rightism are strictly subordinated to the main purpose which we have in mind. In one place we support a king, in another a Communist—there is no attempt by us to enforce particular ideologies. We only want to beat the enemy, and then, in a happy and serene peace, let the best expression be given to the will of the people in every way.

For a long time past the Foreign Secretary and I have laboured with all our strength to try to bring about a resumption of relations between the Soviet Government and the Polish Government which we have always recognized since the days of General Sikorski. We were conscious of the difficulty of our task, and some may say we should have been wiser not to attempt it. Well, we cannot accept that view. We are the Ally of both countries. We went to war because Germany made an unprovoked attack upon our Ally, Poland. We have signed a 20-year treaty with our Ally, the Soviet Union, and this Treaty is the foundation of our policy. Polish forces are fighting with our armies and have recently distinguished themselves remarkably well. Polish forces under Russian guidance are also fighting with the Soviet army against the common enemy.

Our effort to bring about the renewal of relations between the Polish Government in London and Russia has not succeeded. We deeply regret that fact, and we must take care to say nothing that would make agreement more difficult in the future. I must repeat that the essential part of any arrangement is regulation of the Polish eastern frontier, and that, in return for any withdrawal made by Poland in that quarter, she should receive other territories at the expense of Germany, which will give her an ample seaboard and a good, adequate and reasonable homeland in which the Polish nation may safely dwell. Nothing can surpass the bravery of our Polish Allies in Italy and elsewhere daily on the sea and in the air, and in the heroic resistance of the underground movement to the Germans. I have seen here men who came a few days ago out of Poland, who told me about it, and who are in relation with, and under the orders of, the present Polish Government in London. They are most anxious that this underground movement should not clash with the advancing Russian Army, but should help it, and orders have been sent by the Polish Government in London that the underground movement should help the Russian Armies in as many ways as possible. There are many ways in which guerrillas can be successful, and we must trust that statesmanship will yet find some way through.

I have the impression—and it is no more than an impression—that things are not so bad as they may appear on the surface between Russia and Poland. I need not say that we—and I think I may certainly add, the United States—would welcome any arrangement between Russia and Poland, however it were brought about, whether directly between the Powers concerned, or with the help of His Majesty's Government, or any other Government. There is no question of pride on our part, only of sincere good will to both, and earnest and anxious aspirations toward a solution of problems fraught with grave consequences to Europe and the harmony of the Grand Alliance. In the meantime our relations, both with the Polish and the Soviet Governments, remain regulated by the public statements which have been made and repeated from time to time from this bench during the present war. There I leave this question, and I trust that if it is dealt with in Debate those who deal with it will always consider what we want, namely, the united action of all Poles with all Russians against all Germans.

We have to rejoice at the brilliant and skilful fighting of the French Moroccan and Algerian Divisions, and the brilliant leading they have had from their officers in the heart-shaking battle to which I have referred, and which is now at its climax. The French Committee of National Liberation in Algiers has the credit of having prepared these troops, which were armed and equipped by the United States under President Roosevelt's personal decision. The French Committee also places at the full service of the Allies a powerful Navy including, in the *Richelieu,* one of the finest battleships in the world. They guide and govern a vast Empire, all of whose strategic points are freely placed at the disposal of the United Nations. They have a numerous and powerful underground army in France, sometimes called the Maquis, and sometimes the French Army of the Interior, which may be called upon to play an important part before the end of the war.

There is no doubt that this political entity, the French Committee of National Liberation, presides over, and directs, forces at the present time which, in the struggle against Hitler in Europe, give it the fourth place in the Grand Alliance. The reason why the United States and Great Britain have not been able to recognize it yet as the Government of France, or even as the Provisional Government of France, is because we are not sure that it represents the French nation in the same way as the Governments of Britain, the United States and Soviet Russia represent the whole body of their people. The Committee will, of course, exercise leadership in establishing law and order in the liberated areas of France under the supervision, while the military exigency lasts, of the supreme Allied Commander; but we do not wish to commit ourselves at this stage to imposing the Government of the French Committee upon all of France which might fall under our control, without more knowledge than we now possess of the situation in the interior of the country. At the same time I must make it clear that we shall have no dealings with the Vichy Government, or any one tainted with that association, because they have decided to follow the path of collaboration with our enemies. Many of them have definitely desired, and worked for, a German victory.

In Norway and the Low Countries it is different. If we go there we shall find that the continuity of lawful government is maintained by the Governments which we recognize, and with which we are in intimate relations. The Governments of King Haakon and Queen Wilhelmina are the lawfully-founded Governments of those states,

with perfect and unbroken continuity, and should our liberating Armies enter those countries we feel we should deal with them and also, as far as possible, with the Belgian and Danish Governments, although their Sovereigns are prisoners, but with whose countries we have the closest ties. On the other hand, we are not able to take a decision at this time to treat the French Committee of National Liberation, or the French Provisionsal Government, as it has been called, as the full, final, and lawful embodiment of the French Republic. It may be that the Committee itself may be able to aid us in the solution of these riddles, and I must say that I think their decree governing their future action constitutes a most forceful and helpful step in that direction. With the full approval of the President of the United States, I have invited General de Gaulle to pay us a visit over here in the near future, and my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary has just shown me a telegram from Mr. Duff Cooper in Algiers, saying that he will be very glad to come. There is nothing like talking things over, and seeing where we can get to. I hope he will bring some members of his Government with him so that the whole matter can be reviewed.

As this war has progressed, it has become less ideological in its character, in my opinion. The Fascist power in Italy has been overthrown and will, in a reasonable period of time, be completely expunged, mainly by the Italian democracy themselves. If there is anything left over for the future we will look after it. Profound changes have taken place in Soviet Russia. The Trotskyite form of Communism has been completely wiped out. The victories of the Russian Armies have been attended by a great rise in the strength of the Russian State, and a remarkable broadening of its views. The religious side of Russian life has had a wonderful rebirth. The discipline and military etiquette of the Russian Armies are unsurpassed. There is a new National Anthem, the music of which Marshal Stalin sent me, which I asked the B.B.C. to play on the frequent occasions when there are great Russian victories to celebrate. The terms offered by Russia to Rumania make no suggestion of altering the standards of society in that country, and are in many respects, if not in all, remarkably generous. Russia has been very patient with Finland. The Comintern has been abolished, which is sometimes forgotten. Quite recently, some of our representatives from the Ministry of Information were allowed to make a considerable tour in Russia, and found opportunities of seeing for themselves whatever they liked. They found an atmosphere of candid friendliness and a keen desire to see British films, and hear about our country and what it was doing in the war. The children in the schools were being informed about the war on the seas, and of its difficulties and its perils, and how the Northern convoys got through to Russia. There seemed a great desire among the people that Britain and Russia should be friends. These are very marked departures from the conceptions which were held some years ago, for reasons which we can all understand.

We have no need to look back into the past and add up the tale and tally of recrimination. Many terrible things have happened. But we began thirty years ago to march forward with the Russians in the battle against the German tyranny of the Kaiser, and we are now marching with them, and I trust we shall until all forms of German tyranny have been extirpated. As to Nazism, the other ideology, we intend to wipe that our utterly, however drastic may be the methods required. We are all agreed on that in this House, whatever our political views and doctrines may be. Throughout

the whole of the British Dominions and the United States, and all the United Nations, there is only one opinion about that; and for the rest, whatever may be said as to former differences, there is nothing that has occurred which should in any way make us regret the twenty years' Treaty which we have signed with the Russians, and which will be the dominating factor in the relations which we shall have with them.

I see that in some quarters I am expected to-day to lay out, quite plainly and decisively, the future plan of world organization, and also to set the Atlantic Charter in its exact and true relation to subsequent declarations and current events. It is easier to ask such questions than to answer them. We are working with 33 United Nations and, in particular with two great Allies who, in some forms of power, far excel the British Empire. Taking everything into consideration, including men and money, war effort, and expanse of territory, we can claim to be an equal to those great Powers, but not, in my view, a superior. It would be a great mistake for me, as head of the British Government, or, I may add, for this House, to take it upon ourselves to lay down the law to all those different countries, including the two great Powers with which we have to work, if the world is to be brought back into a good condition.

This small Island and this marvellous structure of States and dependencies which have gathered round it will, if we all hold together, occupy a worthy place in the vanguard of the nations. It is idle to suppose that we are the only people who are to prescribe what all other countries, for their own good, are to do. Many other ideas and forces come into play, and nothing could be more unwise than for the meeting of Prime Ministers, for instance, to attempt to prescribe for all countries the way they should go. Consultations are always proceeding between the three great Powers and others, and every effort is being made to explore the future, to resolve difficulties, and to obtain the greatest measure of common agreement on levels below the Ministerial level in a way which does not commit the Government.

A few things have already become quite clear and very prominent at the Conference which has just concluded. The first is that we shall all fight on together until Germany is forced to capitulate and until Nazism is extirpated and the Nazi party are stripped of all continuing power of doing evil. The next is that the Atlantic Charter remains a guiding signpost, expressing a vast body of opinion amongst all the Powers now fighting together against tyranny. The third point is that the Atlantic Charter in no way binds us about the future of Germany, nor is it a bargain or contract with our enemies. It has no quality of an offer to our enemy. It was no invitation to the Germans to surrender. If it had been an offer, that offer was rejected. But the principle of unconditional surrender, which has also been promulgated, will be adhered to so far as Nazi Germany and Japan are concerned, and that principle itself wipes away the danger of anything like Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points being brought up by the Germans after their defeat, claiming that they surrendered in consideration of them.

I have repeatedly said that unconditional surrender gives the enemy no rights but relieves us from no duties. Justice will have to be done, and retribution will fall upon the wicked and the cruel. The miscreants who set out to subjugate first Europe and then the world must be punished, and so must their agents who, in so many countries, have perpetrated horrible crimes, and who must be brought back to face the judgment of the population, very likely in the very scenes of their atrocities. There is no

question of Germany enjoying any guarantee that she will not undergo territorial changes, if it should seem that the making of such changes renders more secure and more lasting the peace of Europe.

Scarred and armed with experience, we intend to take better measures this time than could ever previously have been conceived in order to prevent a renewal, in the lifetime of our children or our grandchildren at least, of the horrible destruction of human values which has marked the last and the present world wars. We intend to set up a world order and organization, equipped with all the necessary attributes of power, in order to prevent the breaking out of future wars, or the long planning of them in advance by restless and ambitious nations. For this purpose there must be a World Council, a controlling council, comprising the greatest States which emerge victorious from this war, who will be under obligation to keep in being a certain minimum standard of armaments for the purpose of preserving peace. There must also be a World Assembly of all Powers, whose relation to the World Executive, or controlling power, for the purpose of maintaining peace I am in no position to define. I cannot say what it will be. If I did, I should only be stepping outside the bounds which are proper for us.

The shape of these bodies, and their relations to each other, can only be settled after the formidable foes we are now facing have been beaten down and reduced to complete submission. It would be presumption for any one Power to prescribe in detail exactly what solution will be found. Anyone can see how many different alternatives there are. A mere attempt on our part to do so, or to put forward what is a majority view on this or that, might prejudice us in gaining consideration for our arguments when the time comes.

I shall not even attempt to parade the many questions of difficulty which will arise and which are present in our minds. Anyone can write down on paper at least a dozen large questions of this kind—should there be united forces of nations, or should there be a world police, and so on. There are other matters of a highly interesting character which should be discussed. But it would be stepping out of our place in the forward march for us to go beyond the gradual formulation of opinions and ideas which is constantly going on inside the British Commonwealth and in contact with our principal Allies. It must not be supposed, however, that these questions cannot be answered and the difficulties cannot be overcome, or that a complete victory will not be a powerful aid to the solution of all problems, and that the good will and practical common sense which exist in the majority of men and in the majority of nations will not find its full expression in the new structure which must regulate the affairs of every people in so far as they may clash with another people's. The future towards which we are marching, across bloody fields and frightful manifestations of destruction, must surely be based upon the broad and simple virtues and upon the nobility of mankind. It must be based upon a reign of law which upholds the principles of justice and fair play, and protects the weak against the strong if the weak have justice on their side. There must be an end to predatory exploitation and nationalistic ambitions.

This does not mean that nations should not be entitled to rejoice in their traditions and achievements, but they will not be allowed, by armed force, to gratify appetites of aggrandisement at the expense of other countries merely because they are smaller or weaker or less well prepared, and measures will be taken to have ample

Armies, Fleets and Air Forces available to prevent anything like that coming about. We must undoubtedly in our world structure embody a great part of all that was gained to the world by the structure and formation of the League of Nations. But we must arm our world organization and make sure that, within the limits assigned to it, it has overwhelming military power. We must remember that we shall be hard put to it to gain our living, to repair the devastation that has been wrought, and to bring back that wider and more comfortable life which is so deeply desired. We must strive to preserve the reasonable rights and liberties of the individual. We must respect the rights and opinions of others, while holding firmly to our own faith and convictions.

There must be room in this new great structure of the world for the happiness and prosperity of all, and in the end it must be capable of bringing happiness and prosperity even to the guilty and vanquished nations. There must be room within the great world organization for organisms like the British Empire and Commonwealth, as we now call it, and I trust that there will be room also for the fraternal association of the British Commonwealth and the United States. We are bound as well by our twenty-year Treaty with Russia, and besides this—I, for my part, hope to deserve to be called a good European—we have the duty of trying to raise the glorious Continent of Europe, the parent of so many powerful States, from its present miserable condition as a volcano of strife and tumult to its old glory as a family of nations and a vital expression of Christendom. I am sure these great entities which I have mentioned—the British Empire, the conception of a Europe truly united, the fraternal association with the United States—will in no way disturb the general purposes of the world organization. In fact, they may help powerfully to make it run. I hope and pray that all this may be established, and that we may have the strength and the will to secure those permanent and splendid achievements which alone can make amends to mankind for all the miseries and toil which have been their doom, and for all the heroism and sacrifice which have been their glory.

THE INVASION OF FRANCE

June 6, 1944

House of Commons

On June 4, British and American troops entered Rome. On June 6 the long-awaited Allied invasion of Europe began, the principal landings being in Normandy. Churchill's statement that fighting was taking place in Caen was, however, incorrect.

The House should, I think, take formal cognisance of the liberation of Rome by the Allied Armies under the Command of General Alexander, with General Clark of the United States Service and General Oliver Leese in command of the Fifth and Eighth Armies respectively. This is a memorable and glorious event, which rewards the

AT BOSTON

ADDRESS ON RETURN TO AMERICA, FEBRUARY 24, 1919. FROM OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION IN MR. WILSON'S FILES.

GOVERNOR COOLIDGE, MR. MAYOR, FELLOW CITIZENS:

I wonder if you are half as glad to see me as I am to see you. It warms my heart to see a great body of my fellow citizens again because in some respects during recent months I have been very lonely, indeed, without your comradeship and counsel, and I tried at every step of the work which fell to me to recall what I was sure would be your counsel with regard to the great matters which were under consideration.

I do not want you to think that I have not been appreciative of the extraordinarily generous reception which was given me on the other side, in saying it makes me very happy to get home again. I do not mean to say I was not very deeply touched by the cries that came from greater crowds on the other side. But I want to say to you in all honesty, I felt them to be the call of greeting to you rather than to me. I did not feel that the greeting was personal. I had in my heart the overcrowning pride of being your representative and of receiving the plaudits of men everywhere who felt that your hearts beat with theirs in the cause of liberty. There was no mistaking the tone in the voices of these great crowds. It was not the tone of mere greeting, it was not the tone of mere generous welcome, it was the calling of comrade to comrade, the cry that comes from men who say we have waited for this day when the friends of liberty should come across the sea and shake hands with us to see that the new world was constructed upon a new basis and foundation of justice and right.

I cannot tell you the inspiration that came from the sentiments that came out of these simple voices of the crowd. And the proudest thing I have to report to you is that this great country of ours is trusted throughout the world. I have not come to report the proceedings or results of the proceedings of the peace conference—that would be premature. I can say that I have received very happy impressions from this conference, impressions that while there are many differences of judgment, while there are some divergencies of object, there is nevertheless a common spirit and a common realization of the necessity of setting up a new standard of right in the world. Because the men who are in conference in Paris realize as keenly as any American can realize that they are not masters of their people, that they are servants of their people, and that the spirit of their people has awakened to a new purpose and a new conception of their power to realize that purpose, and that no man dare go home from that conference and report anything less noble than was expected of it.

The conference seems to you to go slowly; from day to day in Paris it seems to go slowly, but I wonder if you realize the complexity of the task which is undertaken. It seems as if the settlements of this war affect, and affect directly, every great, and I sometimes think every small, nation in the world. And no one decision can prudently be made which is not properly linked in with the great series of other decisions which must accompany it, and it must be reckoned in with the final result if the real quality and character of that result is to be properly judged.

What we are doing is to hear the whole case, hear it from the mouths of the men most interested, hear it from those who are officially commissioned to state it, hear the rival claims, hear the claims that affect new nationalities, that affect new areas of the world, that affect new commercial and economic connections that have been established by the great world war through

in the same atmosphere, and except for the differences of languages, which puzzled my American ear very sadly, I could have believed I was at home in France or Italy or in England when I was on the streets, when I was in the presence of crowds, when I was in great halls where men were gathered irrespective of class. I did not feel quite as much at home there as I do here, but I felt that now, at any rate after this storm of war had cleared the air men were seeing eye to eye everywhere and that these were the kind of folks who would understand what the kind of folks at home would understand; that they were thinking the same things.

It is a great comfort, for one thing, to realize that you all understand the language I am speaking. A friend of mine said that to talk through an interpreter was like witnessing the compound fracture of an idea. But the beauty of it is that whatever the impediments of the channel of communication the idea is the same, that it gets registered, and it gets registered in responsive hearts and receptive purposes. I have come back for a strenuous attempt to transact business for a little while in America, but I have really come back to say to you, in all soberness and honesty, that I have been trying my best to speak your thoughts. When I sample myself I think I find that I am a typical American, and if I sample deep enough and get down to what probably is the true stuff of the man, then I have hope that it is part of the stuff that is like the other fellow's at home. And, therefore, probing deep in my heart and trying to see things that are right without regard to the things that may be debated as expedient, I feel that I am intepreting the purpose and the thought of America; and in loving America I find I have joined the great majority of my fellow men throughout the world.

PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION

ADDRESS OF WELCOME TO A CONFERENCE OF GOVERNORS AND MAYORS, CALLED TO CONSIDER RECONSTRUCTION PROBLEMS, MARCH 3, 1919. FROM "OFFICIAL U. S. BULLETIN," NO. 551.

I WISH that I could promise myself the pleasure and the profit of taking part in your deliberations. I find that nothing deliberate is permitted me since my return. I have been trying, under the guidance of my secretary, Mr. Tumulty, to do a month's work in a week, and I am hoping that not all of it has been done badly, but inasmuch as there is a necessary pressure upon my time I know that you will excuse me from taking a part in your conference, much as I should be profited by doing so.

My pleasant duty is to bid you a very hearty welcome and to express my gratification that so many executives of cities and of States have found the time and the inclination to come together on the very important matter we have to discuss. The primary duty of caring for our people in the intimate matters that we want to discuss here, of course, falls upon the States and upon the municipalities, and the function of the Federal Government is to do what it is trying to do in a conference of this sort—draw the executive minds of the country together so that they may profit by each other's suggestions and plans, and so that we may offer our services to coördinate their efforts in any way that they may deem it wise to coördinate. In other words, it is the privilege of the Federal Government in matters of this sort to be the servants of the executives of the States and municipalities and counties, and we shall perform that duty with the greatest pleasure if you will guide us with your suggestions.

From the Diary of Henry Fountain Ashurst

November 11, 1918.

Senate Sergeant-at-arms 'phoned me the President would address the two Houses in joint session this day.

The Senators led by the Vice-President went to the House. At one pm President Wilson appeared and shook hands with Vice-President Marshall and with Speaker Clark. The galleries were filled and many celebrities occupied seats. The faces of Lansing, Sec. of State, McAdoo of Treasury, Baker of War and Daniels of Navy, beamed, whilst Lane, Sec. of Interior, sat an unreadable sphinx. The Chief Justice of the United States accompanied by the Associate Judges sat in a semi-circle around the rostrum where the President stood. Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, former Governor of New York, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and lately Republican nominee for President, led the applause. Senator La Follette who usually remains quiet joined in the applause. This dauntless little giant from Wisconsin, this man of keen intellect and phenomenal industry has borne with much fortitude the insults and the lampoons which his attitude toward the War brought him.

The President used but few words by way of preface, and at once read the Terms of the Armistice, signed by Germany; he had read but a few sentences, when out rolled the statement that Alsace-Lorraine must be evacuated. The pent-up emotions of his auditors whose nerves were at high tension, then broke loose. Tumultuous shouts seemed to rive the stained-glass roof; the portraits of Washington and LaFayette to the right and left respectively of the President, seemed to smile benignantly.

The President read the message (which took 30 minutes) without rhetorical effort, dramatic pose or note of triumph. "The war thus comes to an end" was the only sentence he emphasized.

After the joint session my wife and I entertained the Ambassador of France and Madame Jusserand at lunch at the Senate Restaurant and the brilliant diplomat wept from joy.

T MS (AzU).

An Address to a Joint Session of Congress

Speaking Copy,—11 Nov., 1918.

Gentlemen of the Congress: In these anxious times of rapid and stupendous change it will in some degree lighten my sense of responsibility to perform in person the duty of communicating to you some of the larger circumstances of the situation with which it is necessary to deal.

The German authorities who have, at the invitation of the Supreme War Council, been in communication with Marshal Foch have accepted and signed the terms of armistice which he was authorized and instructed to communicate to them. Those terms are as follows:

I. Military Clauses on Western Front.

One. Cessation of operations by land and in the air six hours after the signature of the armistice.

Two. Immediate evacuation of invaded countries: Belgium, France, Alsace Lorraine, Luxemburg, so ordered as to be completed within fourteen days from the signature of the armistice. German troops which have not left the above mentioned territories within the period fixed will become prisoners of war. Occupation by the Allied and United States forces jointly will keep pace with evacuation in these areas. All movements of evacuation and occupation will be regulated in accordance with a note annexed to the stated terms.[1]

Three. Repatriation beginning at once and to be completed within fourteen days of all inhabitants of the countries above mentioned, including hostages and persons under trial or convicted.

Four. Surrender in good condition by the German armies of the following equipment: Five thousand guns (two thousand five hundred heavy, two thousand five hundred field), thirty thousand machine guns; three thousand minenwerfer;[2] two thousand aeroplanes (fighters, bombers—firstly D; Seventy-threes and night bombing machines.) The above to be delivered in Simmstu [*situ*] to the allies and United States troops in accordance with the detailed conditions laid down in the annexed note.

Evacuation by the German armies of the countries on the left bank of the Rhine. These countries on the left bank of the Rhine shall be administered by the local authorities under the control of the allied and United States armies of occupation. The occupation of these territories will be determined by allied and United States garrisons holding the principal crossings of the Rhine, Mayenee [Mainz], Coblenz, Cologne, together with bridgeheads at these points in thirty kilometer radius on the right bank and by garrisons similarly holding the strategic points of the regions. A neutral zone shall be reserved on the right of the Rhine between the stream and a line drawn parallel to it forty kilometers to the east from the frontier of Holland to the parallel of Gernsheim and as far as practicable a distance of thirty kilometers from the east of stream from this parallel upon Swiss frontier. Evacuation by the enemy of the

[1] The "annexures" to the Armistice agreement were conveyed in EMH to WW, No. 97, Nov. 12, 1918, T telegram (WP, DLC).

[2] That is, trench mortars.

Rhine lands shall be so ordered as to be completed within a further period of eleven days, in all nineteen days after the signature of the armistice. All movements of evacuation and occupation will be regulated according to the note annexed.

Six. In all territory evacuated by the enemy there shall be no evacuation of inhabitants; no damage or harm shall be done to the persons or property of the inhabitants. No destruction of any kind to be committed. Military establishments of all kinds shall be delivered intact as well as military stores of food, munitions, equipment not removed during the periods fixed for evacuation. Stores of food of all kinds for the civil population, cattle, etc., shall be left in situ. Industrial establishments shall not be impaired in any way and their personnel shall not be moved. Roads and means of communication of every kind, railroad, waterways, main roads, bridges, telegraphs, telephones, shall be in no manner impaired.

Seven. All civil and military personnel at present employed on them shall remain. Five thousand locomotives, fifty thousand wagons and ten thousand motor lorries in good working order with all necessary spare parts and fittings shall be delivered to the Associated Powers within the period fixed for the evacuation of Belgium and Luxemburg. The railways of Alsace-Lorraine shall be handed over within the same period, together with all pre-war personnel and material. Further material necessary for the working of railways in the country on the left bank of the Rhine shall be left *in situ*. All stores of coal and material for the up-keep of permanent ways, signals and repair shops left entire *in situ* and kept in an efficient state by Germany during the whole period of armistice. All barges taken from the allies shall be restored to them. A note appended regulates the details of these measures.

Eight. The German command shall be responsible for revealing all mines or delay acting fuses disposed on territory evacuated by the German troops and shall assist in their discovery and destruction. The German command shall also reveal all destructive measures that may have been taken (such as poisoning or polluting of springs, wells, etc.,) under penalty of reprisals.

Nine. The right of requisition shall be exercised by the Allied and the United States armies in all occupied territory. The up-keep of the troops of occupation in the Rhine land (excluding Alsace Lorraine) shall be charged to the German Government.

Ten. An immediate repatriation without reciprocity according to detailed conditions which shall be fixed, of all Allied and United States prisoners of war. The Allied Powers and the United States shall be able to dispose of these prisoners as they wish.

Eleven. Sick and wounded who cannot be removed from evac-

uated territory will be cared for by German personnel who will be left on the spot with the medical material required.

II. Disposition Relative to the Eastern Frontiers of Germany.

Twelve. All German troops at present in any territory which before the war belonged to Russia, Roumania or Turkey shall withdraw within the frontiers of Germany as they existed on August first, 1914.

Thirteen. Evacuation by German troops to begin at once and all German instructors, prisoners, and civilian as well as military agents, now on the territory of Russia (as defined before 1914) to be recalled.

Fourteen. German troops to cease at once all requisitions and seizures and any other undertaking with a view to obtaining supplies intended for Germany in Roumania and Russia (as defined on August 1, 1914).

Fifteen. Abandonment of the treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk and of the supplementary treaties.

Sixteen. The allies shall have free access to the territories evacuated by the Germans on their eastern frontier either through Danzig or by the Vistula in order to convey supplies to the populations of those territories or for any other purpose.

III. Clause Concerning East Africa.

Seventeen. Unconditional capitulation of all German forces operating in East Africa within one month.

IV. General Clauses.

Eighteen. Repatriation, without reciprocity, within a maximum period of one month, in accordance with detailed conditions hereafter to be fixed, of all civilians interned or deported who may be citizens of other Allied or Associated States than those mentioned in clause three, paragraph nineteen, with the reservation that any future claims and demands of the Allies and the United States of America remain unaffected.

Nineteen. The following financial conditions are required: Reparation for damage done. While such armistice lasts no public securities shall be removed by the enemy which can serve as a pledge to the allies for the recovery or repatriation for war losses. Immediate restitution of the cash deposit, in the National Bank of Belgium, and in general immediate return of all documents, specie, stock, shares, paper money together with plant for the issue thereof, touching public or private interests in the invaded countries. Restitution of the Russian and Roumanian gold yielded to Germany or taken by that power. This gold to be delivered in trust to the allies until the signature of peace.

V. Naval Conditions.

Twenty. Immediate cessation of all hostilities at sea and definite information to be given as to the location and movements of all German ships. Notification to be given to neutrals that freedom of navigation in all territorial waters is given to the naval and mercantile marines of the Allied and Associated Powers, all questions of neutrality being waived.

Twenty-one. All naval and mercantile marine prisoners of war of the Allied and Associated Powers in German hands to be returned without reciprocity.

Twenty-two. Surrender to the Allies and the United States of America of one hundred and sixty German submarines (including all submarine cruisers and mine laying submarines) with their complete armament and equipment in ports which will be specified by the Allies and the United States of America. All other submarines to be paid off and completely disarmed and placed under the supervision of the Allied Powers and the United States of America.

Twenty-three. The following German surface warships which shall be designated by the Allies and the United States of America shall forthwith be disarmed and thereafter interned in neutral ports, or, for the want of them, in allied ports, to be designated by the Allies and the United States of America and placed under the surveillance of the Allies and the United States of America, only caretakers being left on board, namely: Six battle cruisers, ten battleships, eight light cruisers, including two mine layers, fifty destroyers of the most modern type. All other surface war ships (including river craft) are to be concentrated in German naval bases to be designated by the Allies and the United States of America, and are to be paid off and completely disarmed and placed under the supervision of the Allies and the United States of America. All vessels of the auxiliary fleet (trawlers, motor vessels, etc.,) are to be disarmed.

Twenty four. The Allies and the United States of America shall have the right to sweep up all mine fields and obstructions laid by Germany outside German territorial waters, and the positions of these are to be indicated.

Twenty five. Freedom of access to and from the Baltic to be given to the naval and mercantile marines of the Allied and Associated Powers. To secure this the Allies and the United States of America shall be empowered to occupy all German forts, fortifications, batteries and defense works of all kinds in all the entrances from the Categat into the Baltic, and to sweep up all mines and obstructions within and without German territorial waters without any question

of neutrality being raised, and the positions of all such mines and obstructions are to be indicated.

Twenty six. The existing blockade conditions set up by the Allies and Associated Powers are to remain unchanged and all German merchant ships found at sea are to remain liable to capture.

Twenty seven. All naval aircraft are to be concentrated and immobilized in German bases to be specified by the Allies and the United States of America.

Twenty eight. In evacuating the Belgian coasts and ports, Germany shall abandon all merchant ships, tugs, lighters, cranes and all other harbor materials, all materials for inland navigation, all aircraft and all materials and stores, all arms and armaments, and all stores and apparatus of all kinds.

Twenty nine. All Black Sea ports are to be evacuated by Germany; all Russian war vessels of all descriptions seized by Germany in the Black Sea are to be handed over to the Allies and the United States of America; all neutral merchant vessels seized are to be released; all warlike and other materials of all kinds seized in those ports are to be returned and German materials as specified in clause twenty eight are to be abandoned.

Thirty. All merchant vessels in German hands belonging to the Allied and Associated Powers are to be restored in ports to be specified by the Allies and the United States of America without reciprocity.

Thirty one. No destruction of ships or of materials to be permitted before evacuation, surrender or restoration.

Thirty two. The German Government shall formally notify the neutral Governments of the world, and particularly the Government[s] of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, that all restrictions placed on the trading of their vessels with the Allied and Associated Countries, whether by the German Government or by private German interests, and whether in return for specific concessions such as the export of shipbuilding materials or not, are immediately canceled.

Thirty three. No transfers of German merchant shipping of any description to any neutral flag are to take place after signature of the armistice.

VI. Duration of Armistice.

Thirty four. The duration of the armistice is to be thirty days, with option to extend. During this period, on failure of execution of any of the above clauses, the armistice may be denounced by one of the contracting parties, on forty eight hours previous notice.

VII. Time Limit for Reply.

Thirty five. This armistice to be accepted or refused by Germany within seventy two hours of notification.

The war thus comes to an end; for, having accepted these terms of armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it.

It is not now possible to assume the consequences of this great consummation. We know only that this tragical war, whose consuming flames swept from one nation to another until all the world was on fire, is at an end and that it was the privilege of our own people to enter it at its most critical juncture in such fashion and in such force as to contribute in a way of which we are all deeply proud to [of] the great result. We know, too, that the object of the war is attained: the object upon which all free men had set their hearts; and attained with a sweeping completeness which even now we do not realize. Armed imperialism such as the men conceived who were but yesterday the masters of Germany is at an end, its illicit ambitions engulfed in black disaster. Who will now seek to revive it? The arbitrary power of the military caste of Germany which once could secretly and of its own single choice disturb the peace of the world is discredited and destroyed. And more than that—much more than that—has been accomplished. The great nations which associated themselves to destroy it have now definitely united in the common purpose to set up such a peace as will satisfy the longing of the whole world for disinterested justice, embodied in settlements which are based upon something much better and much more lasting than the selfish competitive interests of powerful states. There is no longer conjecture as to the objects the victors have in mind. They have a mind in the matter, not only, but a heart also. Their avowed and concerted purpose is to satisfy and protect the weak as well as to accord their just rights to the strong.

The humane temper and intention of the victorious governments has already been manifested in a very practical way. Their representatives in the Supreme War Council at Versailles have by unanimous resolution assured the peoples of the Central Empires that everything that is possible in the circumstances will be done to supply them with food and relieve the distressing want that is in so many places threatening their very lives; and steps are to be taken immediately to organize these efforts at relief in the same systematic manner that they were organized in the case of Belgium. By the use of the idle tonnage of the Central Empires it ought presently to be possible to lift the fear of utter misery from their oppressed populations and set their minds and energies free for the

great and hazardous tasks of political reconstruction which now face them on every hand. Hunger does not breed reform; it breeds madness and all the ugly distempers that make an ordered life impossible.

For with the fall of the ancient governments which rested like an incubus upon the peoples of the Central Empires has come political change not merely, but revolution; and revolution which seems as yet to assume no final and ordered form but to run from one fluid change to another, until thoughtful men are forced to ask themselves, With what governments, and of what sort, are we about to deal in the making of the covenants of peace? With what authority will they meet us, and with what assurance that their authority will abide and sustain securely the international arrangements into which we are about to enter? There is here matter for no small anxiety and misgiving. When peace is made, upon whose promises and engagements besides our own is it to rest?

Let us be perfectly frank with ourselves and admit that these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered now or at once. But the moral is not that there is little hope of an early answer that will suffice. It is only that we must be patient and helpful and mindful above all of the great hope and confidence that lie at the heart of what is taking place. Excesses accomplish nothing. Unhappy Russia has furnished abundant recent proof of that. Disorder immediately defeats itself. If excesses should occur, if disorder should for a time raise its head, a sober second thought will follow and a day of constructive action, if we help and do not hinder.

The present and all that it holds belongs to the nations and the peoples who preserve their self-control and the orderly processes of their governments; the future to those who prove themselves the true friends of mankind. To conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest; to conquer the world by earning its esteem is to make permanent conquest. I am confident that the nations that have learned the discipline of freedom and that have settled with self-possession to its ordered practice are now about to make conquest of the world by the sheer power of example and of friendly helpfulness.

The peoples who have but just come out from under the yoke of arbitrary government and who are now coming at last into their freedom will never find the treasures of liberty they are in search of if they look for them by the light of the torch. They will find that every pathway that is stained with the blood of their own brothers leads to the wilderness, not to the seat of their hope. They are now face to face with their initial test. We must hold the light steady until they find themselves. And in the meantime, if it be possible,

we must establish a peace that will justly define their place among the nations, remove all fear of their neighbours and of their former masters, and enable them to live in security and contentment when they have set their own affairs in order. I, for one, do not doubt their purpose or their capacity. There are some happy signs that they know and will choose the way of self-control and peaceful accommodation. If they do, we shall put our aid at their disposal in every way that we can. If they do not, we must await with patience and sympathy the awakening and recovery that will assuredly come at last.

Printed reading copy (WP, DLC).

Three Telegrams from Edward Mandell House

Paris. Nov. 11, 1918.[1]

Number 89. For the President.

Italian affairs. If you decide to recognize the national council of Zagreb as representative of the Serbo-Croat-Slovene nation, or the territory formerly belonging to the Austro Hungarian monarchy it would be well to assure *the affairs*. If you decide in a very guarded way that the question of their territorial aspirations is a matter to be decided by the peace conference. This action is advised in order to reassure them in the face of the Italian occupation of the Dalmatia coast along the line of the convention of London, against which I protested and consented only upon the explicit promise that this territory should have the same status as the territory to be occupied under the terms of the German armistice. It is to the interest of Italy also that the conditions of the armistice be not made the pretext for presaging this most difficult territorial question. United States now is in a position to speak (?) caution since France and Great Britain are committed by the Pact of London. A statement that its frontiers would be determined in the interests of all concerned and in accordance with principles accepted by all the Allies would be reassuring to all small nationalities who are now in a state high tension. Edward House.

T telegram (WP, DLC).

[1] The copy of this telegram in the House Papers reads as follows: "For the President Number 89 PRIORITY. Concerning Jugo-Slav Italian affairs STOP If you decide to recognize the national council of Zagreb as representative of the Serbo-Slovene nation in territories formerly belonging to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy it would be well to assure the Jugo-Slavs in a very guarded way that the question of their territorial aspirations is a matter to be decided by the peace conference STOP This action is advisable in order to reassure them in the face of the Italian occupation of the Dalmatian coast along the line of the convention of London, against which I protested and consented only upon the explicit promise that this territory should have the same status as the territory to be

PEACE

ir hearts that it had done
e wrong, that it had put
of Germany at the judg-
roughout this treaty every
rmany was meant, not to
ectify the wrong that she

terms of reparation—for
indemnity of any sort was
nerely paying for the de-
; good the losses so far as
od which she had unjustly
ments, for the reparation
ents, but upon the people
ıpon with absolute absence
ıbled pity. There was no
there is reparation, and
on a method is devised by
e adjusted to Germany's

of the statements I hear
ruth is that they are made
the treaty or who, if they
ıended its meaning. There
that treaty by which the
d beyond the point which
will be pressed to the ut-
pay—which is just, which
been intolerable if there
, my fellow citizens, this
end this single war. It
government which in the
; that mankind will unite
t. There is no national
l in this treaty. There is
ular nation. The thought
ınd that table was of their
hey had gone through, of

Western Tour
Columbus, OH
9/4/19

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 that have gone. Let us never forget those 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 defense of mankind.

As I said, this treaty was not intended merely to end this war. It was intended to prevent any similar war. I wonder if some of the opponents of the League of Nations have forgotten the promises we made our people before we went to that peace table. We had taken by processes of law the flower of our youth 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 and yet lifted with the feeling that the lad laid down his life for a great thing and, among other things, in order that other lads might never have to do the same thing. That is what the League of Nations is for, to end this war justly, and then not merely to serve notice on governments which would contemplate the same things that 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 the things that Germany attempted. The League of Nations is the only thing that can prevent the recurrence of this dreadful catastrophe and redeem our promises.

The character of the League is based upon the experi-

ence 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 dreamed America was going into it. And they all admitted that a notice beforehand that the greatest powers of the world would combine to prevent this sort of thing would prevent 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 then be no statesmen of any country who can thereafter promise his people 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 assurance 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.

Now, look what else is in the treaty. This treaty is unique in the history of mankind, because the center 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; builds them up by gift, by largess, not by obligations; 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 fer-

So Belgium has, so to say, once more come into her own through this deep valley of suffering through which she has gone. Not only that, but her cause has linked the governments of the civilized world together. They have realized their common duty. They have drawn together as if instinctively into a league of right. They have put the whole power of organized mankind behind the conception of justice, which is common to mankind. That is the significance, gentlemen, of the League of Nations.

The League of Nations was an inevitable consequence of this war. It was a league of right, and no thoughtful statesman who let his thought run into the future could wish for a moment to slacken those bonds. His first thought would be to strengthen them and to perpetuate this combination of the great governments of the world for the maintenance of justice. The League of Nations is the child of this great war for right. It is the expression of those permanent resolutions which grew out of the temporary necessities of this great struggle, and any nation which declines to adhere to this Covenant deliberately turns away from the most telling appeal that has ever been made to its conscience and to its manhood. The nation that wishes to use the League of Nations for its convenience, and not for the service of the rest of the world, deliberately chooses to turn back to those bad days of selfish contest, when every nation thought first and always of itself and not of its neighbor, thought of its rights and forgot its duties, thought of its power and overlooked its responsibility. Those bad days, I hope, are gone, and the great moral power, backed if need be, by the great physical power of the civilized nations of the world will now stand firm for the maintenance of the fine partnership which we have thus inaugurated.

It cannot be otherwise. Perhaps the conscience of some chancellories was asleep and the outrage of Germany awakened it. You cannot see one great nation

Belgian Ch. of Deputies 4/19/19

violate every principle of right without beginning to know what the principles of right are and to love them, to despise those who violate them, and to form the firm resolve that such a violation shall now be punished and in the future be prevented.

These are the feelings with which I have come to Belgium, and it has been my thought to propose to the Congress of the United States as a recognition, as a welcome of Belgium into her new status of complete independence, to raise the mission of the United States of America to Belgium to the rank of an Embassy and send an Ambassador. This is the rank which Belgium enjoys in our esteem. Why should she not enjoy it in form and in fact?

So, gentlemen, we turn to the future. M. Hymans has spoken in true terms of the necessities that lie ahead of Belgium, and of many another nation that has come through this great war with suffering and with loss. We have shown Belgium, in the forms which he has been generous enough to recite, our friendship in the past. It is now our duty to organize our friendship along new lines. The Belgian people and the Belgian leaders need only the tools to restore their life. Their thoughts are not crushed. Their purposes are not obscured. Their plans are complete, and their knowledge of what is involved in industrial revival is complete. What their friends must do is to see to it that Belgium gets the necessary priority with regard to obtaining raw materials, the necessary priority in obtaining the means to restore the machinery by which she can use these raw materials, and the credit by which she can bridge over the years during which it will be necessary for her to wait to begin again. These are not so much tasks for governments as they are tasks for thoughtful business men and financiers and those who are producers in other countries. It is a question of shipping also, but the shipping of the world will be relieved of its burdens of troops in a comparatively near future, and there will be

Univ of Paris
12/21/18

clearly revealed to the historian, of men of indomitable spirit everywhere struggling toward the right and seeking above all things else to be free. The triumph of freedom in this war means that spirits of that sort now dominate the world. There is a great wind of moral force moving through the world, and every man who opposes himself to that wind will go down in disgrace. The task of those who are gathered here, or will presently be gathered here, to make the settlements of this peace is greatly simplified by the fact that they are masters of no one; they are the servants of mankind, and if we do not heed the mandates of mankind we shall make ourselves the most conspicuous and deserved failures in the history of the world.

My conception of the League of Nations is just this, that it shall operate as the organized moral force of men throughout the world, and that whenever or wherever wrong and aggression are planned or contemplated, this searching light of conscience will be turned upon them and men everywhere will ask, "What are the purposes that you hold in your heart against the fortunes of the world?" Just a little exposure will settle most questions. If the Central powers had dared to discuss the purposes of this war for a single fortnight, it never would have happened, and if, as should be, they were forced to discuss it for a year, war would have been inconceivable.

So I feel that this war is, as has been said more than once to-day, intimately related with the university spirit. The university spirit is intolerant of all the things that put the human mind under restraint. It is intolerant of everything that seeks to retard the advancement of ideals, the acceptance of the truth, the purification of life; and every university man can ally himself with the forces of the present time with the feeling that now at last the spirit of truth, the spirit to which universities have devoted themselves, has prevailed and is triumphant. If there is one point of pride that I venture to

"LEAVE OUT OF YOUR VOCABULARY THE WORD 'PRUDENT' "

ADDRESS TO THE OFFICERS OF THE ATLANTIC FLEET AUGUST 11, 1917.[1] FROM OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION IN MR. WILSON'S FILES

I HAVE not come here with malice prepense to make a speech, but I have come here to have a look at you and to say some things that perhaps may be intimately said and, even though the company is large, said in confidence. Of course, the whole circumstance of the modern time is extraordinary and I feel that just because the circumstances are extraordinary there is an opportunity to see to it that the action is extraordinary. One of the deprivations which any man in authority experiences is that he cannot come into constant and intimate touch with the men with whom he is associated and necessarily associated in action.

Most of my life has been spent in contact with young men and, though I would not admit it to them at the time, I have learned a great deal more from them than they ever learned from me. I have had most of my thinking stimulated by questions being put to me which I could not answer, and I have had a great many of my preconceived conceptions absolutely destroyed by men who had not given half the study to the subject that I myself had given. The fact of the matter is that almost every profession is pushed forward by the men who do not belong to it and know nothing about it, because they ask the ignorant questions which it would not occur to the professional man to ask at all; he supposes that they have been answered, whereas it may be that most

[1] The President went to sea in the *Mayflower*, boarded an American dreadnaught, and talked to the officers like "a football coach to his team between the halves."

moving from one part of this beloved country to another that makes me so profoundly proud to be an American. It was not, indeed, my choice to be an American, because I was born in it, and I suppose that I can't ascribe any credit to myself for being an American. But I do claim the profoundest pleasure in sharing the sentiments and in having had the privilege for a few short years of trying to express the sentiment of this free nation, to which all the world looks for inspiration and guidance.

That is the dominating thought I had—I won't say the dominating thought—it is the controlling knowledge that I have. For I learned on the other side of the water that all the world was looking to us for its inspiration, and we will not deny it to them.

Printed in the *Seattle Times*, Sept. 14, 1919.

[1] James Williams Spangler, vice-president of the Seattle National Bank and of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

[2] About Wilson's earlier visit to and speeches in Seattle, see Vol. 23, pp. 76-80.

An Address in the Seattle Arena

[[September 13, 1919]]

Mr. Chairman,[1] my fellow countrymen, I esteem it a great privilege to have the occasion to stand before this great audience and expound some part of the great question that is now holding the attention of America and the attention of the world.

I was led to an unpleasant consciousness today of the way in which the debate that is going on in America has attracted the attention of the world. I read in today's papers the comments of one of the men[2] who was recently connected with the Imperial Government of Germany, saying that some aspects of this debate seemed to him like the red that precedes a great dawn. He saw in it the rise of a certain renewed sympathy with Germany. He saw in it an opportunity to separate America from the governments and peoples with whom she had associated in the war against German aggression.

And all over this country, my fellow citizens, it is becoming more and more evident that those who were the partisans of Germany are the ones who are principally pleased by some of the aspects of the debate that is now going on. The world outside of America is asking itself the question, "Is America going to stand by us now, or is it at this moment of final crisis going to draw apart and desert us?"

[1] Cecil Bernard Fitzgerald, Mayor of Seattle.

[2] Robert Richard von Scheller-Steinwartz, a former diplomat. He spoke in Berlin on September 6. *New York Times*, Sept. 8, 1919.

beloved country to another that
o be an American. It was not, in-
:an, because I was born in it, and
ny credit to myself for being an
)foundest pleasure in sharing the
e privilege for a few short years of
f this free nation, to which all the
ıidance.
t I had—I won't say the dominat-
ıg knowledge that I have. For I
ater that all the world was looking
'ill not deny it to them.

ıt of the Seattle National Bank and of the

hes in Seattle, see Vol. 23, pp. 76-80.

ena

[[September 13, 1919]]

ıtrymen, I esteem it a great privi-
d before this great audience and
question that is now holding the
ntion of the world.
nsciousness today of the way in
. in America has attracted the at-
ay's papers the comments of one
nected with the Imperial Govern-
ne aspects of this debate seemed
a great dawn. He saw in it the
y with Germany. He saw in it an
from the governments and peo-
d in the war against German ag-

low citizens, it is becoming more
were the partisans of Germany
)leased by some of the aspects of
The world outside of America is
ıerica going to stand by us now,
is going to draw apart and desert

e.
a former diplomat. He spoke in Berlin on

I can answer that question here and now. It is not going to draw apart, and it is not going to desert the nations of the world. (applause) America responds to nothing so quickly or unanimously as a great moral challenge. It is today more ready to carry through new lines before it than it was even to carry through what it had before it when we took up arms in behalf of the freedom of the world. America is unaccustomed to military tasks, but America is accustomed to fulfilling its pledges and following its visions. (applause) The only thing that causes me uneasiness, my fellow countrymen, is not the ultimate outcome, but the impressions that may be created in the meantime by the perplexed delay. The rest of the world believes absolutely in America and is ready to follow it anywhere, and it is now a little chilled. It now asks: "Is America hesitating to lead? We are ready to give ourselves to her leadership here. Will she not accept the gift?"

And so, my fellow citizens, I think that it is my duty, as I go about the country, not to make speeches in the ordinary acceptance of that word, not to appeal either to the imagination or to the emotions of my fellow citizens, but to undertake everywhere what I want to undertake tonight, and I must ask you to be patient while I undertake it. I want to analyze for you what it is that it is proposed that we should do. Generalities will not penetrate to the heart of this great question. It is not enough to speak of the general purposes of the peace. (applause outside of building) This applause was acceptable but inopportune. Perhaps I might devise some signal when they should cheer on the outside, but if you won't mind the sounds without, I think we can make some progress toward the heart of the great matter that I want to discuss with you.

I want you to realize just what the Covenant of the League of Nations means. I find that everywhere I go it is desirable that I should dwell upon this great theme, because in so many parts of the country men are drawing attention to little details in a way that destroys the great perspective of the great plan in a way that concentrates attention upon certain particulars which are incidental and not central. And I am going to take the liberty of reading you a list of the things which the nations adhering to the Covenant of the League of Nations undertake. I want to say by way of preface that it seems to me, and I am sure it will seem to you, not only an extraordinarily impressive list, but a list which was never proposed for the councils of the world before.

In the first place, every nation that joins the League, and that in prospect means every great fighting nation in the world, agrees to submit all controversies which are likely to lead to war either to arbitration or to thorough discussion by an authoritative body—the

Council of the League of Nations. These great nations, all the most ambitious nations in the world except Germany, all the most powerful nations in the world, as well as the weak ones, all the nations which we have supposed had imperialistic designs, say that they will do either one or the other of two things in case a controversy arises that cannot be settled by ordinary diplomatic correspondence. They will either frankly submit it to arbitration and absolutely abide by the arbitral verdict, or they will submit all the facts, all the documents, and the Council of the League of Nations will be given six months in which to discuss the whole matter and leave to publish the whole matter. And, at the end of six months, will still refrain for three months more from going to war, whether they like the opinion of the Council or not.

In other words, they agree to do a thing which would have made the recent war with Germany absolutely impossible. If there had been a League of Nations in 1914, whether Germany belonged to it or not, Germany would never have dared to attempt the aggressions which she did attempt, because she would have been called to the bar of the opinion of mankind and would have known that, if she did not satisfy that opinion, mankind would unite against her. You had only to expose the German case to public discussion to make it certain that the German case would fail; Germany would not dare attempt to act upon it. It was the universal opinion on the other side of the water when I was over there that, that if Germany had thought that England would have aided France and Russia, she never would have gone in. And if she had dreamed that America would throw her mighty weight into the scale, it would have been inconceivable. The only thing that reassured the deluded German people after we entered the war was the lying statement of her public men that we could not get our troops across the sea, because Germany knew if America ever got within striking distance, the story was done. (great applause and shouts) And here all the nations of the world, except Germany, for the time being at any rate, give notice that they will unite against any nation that has a bad case, and they agree that in their own case they will submit to prolonged discussion.

And there is nothing so chilling as discussion to a hot temper. (laughter and applause) If you are fighting mad and yet I can induce you to talk it over for half an hour, you won't be fighting mad at the end of the half hour. I know a very wise schoolmaster in North Carolina[3] who said that, if any boy in that school fought another, except according to the rules, he would be expelled. There

[3] Robert Bingham, headmaster of the Bingham School, at this time located in Asheville.

would not be any great investigation; the fact that he had fought would be enough; he would go home; but that if he was so mad that he had to fight, all he had to do was to come to the headmaster and tell him that he wanted to fight. The headmaster would arrange the ring, would see that the fight was conducted according to the Marquess of Queensberry's rules, with an umpire and a referee, and that the thing was fought to a finish. And the consequence was that there were no fights in that school. (laughter and applause) The whole arrangement was too cold-blooded. By the time all the arrangements had been made, all the fighting audacity had gone out of the contestants.

And that little thing illustrates a great thing. Discussion is destructive when wrong is intended, and all the nations of the world agree to put their case before the judgment of mankind. Why, my fellow citizens, that has been the dream of thoughtful reformers for generation after generation. (applause) Somebody seems to have conceived the notion that I originated the idea of a league of nations. I wish I had. I would be a very proud man if I had. But I did not. I was expressing the avowed aspirations of the American people, avowed by nobody so loudly, so intelligently, or so constantly as the greater leaders of the Republican party. (great applause) When the Republicans take that road, I take off my hat and follow; I don't care whether I lead or not. I want the great result which I know is at the heart of the people that I am trying to serve.

In the second place, all of these great nations agree to boycott any nation that does not submit a perilous question either to arbitration or to discussion, and to support each other in the boycott. There is no "if" or "but" about that in the Covenant. It is agreed that, just so soon as any member state, or any outside state, for that matter, refuses to submit its case to the public opinion of the world, its doors shall be locked; that no country shall trade with it, no telegraphic message shall leave it or enter it, no letter shall cross its borders either way; there shall be no transactions of any kind between the citizens of the members of the League and the Covenant-breaking state. (applause)

That is the remedy that thoughtful men have advocated for several generations. They have thought, and thought truly, that war was barbarous and that a nation that resorted to war when its cause was unjust was unworthy of being consorted with by free people anywhere. And the boycott is an infinitely more terrible instrument than war. (applause) Excepting our own singularly fortunate country, I cannot think of any other country that can live upon its own resources. And the minute you lock the door, then the pinch of the thing becomes intolerable—not only the physical

pinch, not only the fact that you cannot get raw materials and must stop your factories, not only the fact that you cannot get food and your people must begin to starve, not only the fact that your credit is stopped, that your assets are useless—but the still greater pinch that comes when a nation knows that it is sent to Coventry and despised.

The most terrible punishment that ever happened to a condemned man is not that he is put in jail. But if he knows that he was justly condemned, what penetrates his heart is the look in other men's eyes. It is the soul that is wounded much more poignantly than the body. And one of the things that the German nation has not been able to comprehend is that it has lost for the time being the respect of mankind. And, as Germans, when the doors of truth were opened to them after the war had begun, they began to look aghast at the probable fortunes of Germany. For if the world does not trust them, if the world does not respect them, if the world does not want Germans to come as immigrants any more, what is Germany to do? Germany's worst punishment, my fellow citizens, is not in the treaty. It is in her relations with the rest of mankind for the next generation. (applause)

And the boycott is what is substituted for war.

In the third place, all the members of this great association pledge themselves to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other member states. That is the famous Article X that you hear so much about. And Article X, my fellow citizens, whether you want to assume the responsibility of it or not, is the heart of the pledge that we have made to the other nations of the world. Only by Article X can we be said to have underwritten civilization. (applause)

The wars that threaten mankind begin by that kind of aggression. For every other nation than Germany, in 1914, treaties stood as solemn and respected covenants. For Germany they were scraps of paper, and when she entered, when her first soldiers were upon the soil of Belgium, her honor was forfeited. That act of aggression, that failure to respect the territorial integrity of a nation whose territory she was especially bound to respect, pointed the hand along that road that is strewn with graves since the beginning of history, that road made red and ugly with the strife of men—the strife behind which lies savage cupidity, the strife behind which lies a disregard for the rights of others, and the thought concentrated upon what we want and mean to get. That is the history of war, and, unless you accept Article X, you do not cut the heart of war out of civilization.

which we have gone. And I have been struck by the moderateness of those who have represented national claims. I can testify that I have nowhere seen the gleam of passion. I have seen earnestness, I have seen tears come to the eyes of men who plead for downtrodden people whom they were privileged to speak for, but they were not tears of anger, they were tears of ardent hope; and I do not see how any man can fail to have been subdued by these pleas, subdued to this feeling that he was not there to assert an individual judgment of his own but to try to assist the cause of humanity.

And in the midst of it all every interest seeks out first of all when it reaches Paris the representatives of the United States. Why? Because—and I think I am stating the most wonderful fact in history—because there is no nation in Europe that suspects the motives of the United States. Was there ever so wonderful a thing seen before? Was there ever so moving a thing? Was there ever any fact that so bound the Nation that had won that esteem forever to deserve it? I would not have you understand that the great men who represent the other nations there in conference are disesteemed by those who know them. Quite the contrary. But you understand that the nations of Europe have again and again clashed with one another in competitive interest. It is impossible for men to forget these sharp issues that were drawn between them in times past. It is impossible for men to believe that all ambitions have all of a sudden been foregone. They remember territory that was coveted, they remember rights it was attempted to extort, remember political ambitions which it was attempted to realize, and while they believe men have come into different temper they cannot forget these things, and so they do not resort to one another for dispassionate view of matters in controversy.

They resort to that Nation which has won enviable distinction, being regarded as the friend of mankind. Whenever it is desired to send a small force of soldiers

to occupy a piece of territory where it is thought nobody else will be welcome, they ask for American soldiers. And where other soldiers would be looked upon with suspicion and perhaps met with resistance, the American soldier is welcomed with acclaim. I have had so many grounds for pride on the other side of the water that I am very thankful that they are not grounds for personal pride, but for national pride.

If they were grounds for personal pride, I would be the most stuck-up man in the world. And it has been an infinite pleasure to me to see these gallant soldiers of ours, of whom the Constitution of the United States made me the proud commander. Everybody praises the American soldier with the feeling that in praising him he is subtracting from the credit of no one else. I have been searching for the fundamental fact that converted Europe to believe in us. Before this war Europe did not believe in us as she does now. She did not believe in us throughout the first three years of the war. She seems really to have believed that we were holding off because we thought we could make more by staying out than by going in. And all of a sudden, in short eighteen months, the whole verdict is reversed. There can be but one explanation for it. They saw what we did, that without making a single claim we put all our men and all our means at the disposal of those who were fighting for their homes in the first instance, but for the cause—the cause of human right and justice—and that we went in, not to support their national claims, but to support the great cause which they held in common. And when they saw that America not only held the ideals but acted the ideals, they were converted to America and became firm partisans of those ideals.

I met a group of scholars when I was in Paris. Some gentlemen from one of the Greek universities who had come to see me and in whose presence, or rather in the presence of the traditions of learning, I felt very young, indeed. And I told them that I had had one of the

delightful revenges that sometimes come to men. All my life I have heard men speak with a sort of condescension of ideals and of idealists, and particularly of those separated, encloistered persons whom they choose to term academic, who were in the habit of uttering ideals in a free atmosphere when they clash with nobody in particular. And I said I have had this sweet revenge. Speaking with perfect frankness in the name of the people of the United States I have uttered as the objects of this great war ideals, and nothing but ideals, and the war has been won by that inspiration.

Men were fighting with tense muscle and lowered head until they came to realize those things, feeling they were fighting for their lives and their country, and when these accents of what it was all about reached them from America they lifted their heads, they raised their eyes to heaven, then they saw men in khaki coming across the sea in the spirit of crusaders, and they found these were strange men, reckless of danger not only, but reckless because they seemed to see something that made that danger worth while. Men have testified to me in Europe that our men were possessed by something that they could only call religious fervor. They were not like any of the other soldiers. They had vision; they had dream, and they were fighting in dream; and fighting in dream they turned the whole tide of battle, and it never came back. And now do you realize that this confidence we have established throughout the world imposes a burden upon us—if you choose to call it a burden. It is one of those burdens which any nation ought to be proud to carry. Any man who resists the present tides that run in the world will find himself thrown upon a shore so high and barren that it will seem as if he had been separated from his human kind forever.

Europe that I left the other day was full of something that it had never felt fill its heart so full before. It was full of hope. The Europe of the second year of the

war—the Europe of the third year of the war—was sinking to a sort of stubborn desperation. They did not see any great thing to be achieved even when the war should be won. They hoped there would be some salvage; they hoped they could clear their territories of invading armies; they hoped they could set up their homes and start their industries afresh. But they thought it would simply be a resumption of the old life that Europe had led—led in fear; led in anxiety; led in constant suspicion and watchfulness. They never dreamed that it would be a Europe of settled peace and justified hope. And now these ideals have wrought this new magic that all the peoples of Europe are buoyed up and confident in the spirit of hope, because they believe that we are at the eve of a new age in the world, when nations will understand one another; when nations will support one another in every just cause; when nations will unite every moral and every physical strength to see that right shall prevail. If America were at this juncture to fail the world, what would come of it?

I do not mean any disrespect to any other great people when I say that America is the hope of the world. And if she does not justify that hope results are unthinkable. Men will be thrown back upon bitterness of disappointment not only but bitterness of despair. All nations will be set up as hostile camps again; men at the peace conference will go home with their heads upon their breasts, knowing they have failed—for they were bidden not to come home from there until they did something more than sign the treaty of peace. Suppose we sign the treaty of peace and that it is the most satisfactory treaty of peace that the confusing elements of the modern world will afford and go home and think about our labors we will know that we have left written upon the historic table at Versailles, upon which Vergennes and Benjamin Franklin wrote their names, nothing but a modern scrap of paper, no nations united to defend it,

no great forces combined to make it good, no assurance given to the downtrodden and fearful people of the world that they shall be safe. Any man who thinks that America will take part in giving the world any such rebuff and disappointment as that does not know America. I invite him to test the sentiments of the Nation.

We set this Nation up to make men free and we did not confine our conception and purpose to America, and now we will make men free. If we did not do that all the fame of America would be gone and all her power would be dissipated. She would then have to keep her power for those narrow, selfish, provincial purposes which seem so dear to some minds that have no sweep beyond the nearest horizon. I should welcome no sweeter challenge than that. I have fighting blood in me and it is sometimes a delight to let it have scope, but if it is challenged on this occasion it will be an indulgence. Think of the picture, think of the utter blackness that would fall on the world. America has failed. America made a little essay at generosity and then withdrew. America said, "We are your friends," but it was only for to-day, not for to-morrow. America said, "Here is our power to vindicate right," and then next day said, "Let right take care of itself and we will take care of ourselves." America said, "We set up light to lead men along the paths of liberty, but we have lowered it—it is intended only to light our own path."

We set up a great ideal of liberty, and then we said, "Liberty is a thing that you must win for yourself." Do not call upon us and think of the world that we would leave. Do you realize how many new nations are going to be set up in the presence of old and powerful nations in Europe and left there, if left by us, without a disinterested friend? Do you believe in the Polish cause as I do? Are you going to set up Poland, immature, inexperienced, as yet unorganized, and leave her with a circle of armies around her? Do you believe in the aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks and

Jugo-Slavs as I do? Do you know how many powers would be quick to pounce upon them if there were not guarantees of the world behind their liberty? Have you thought of the sufferings of Armenia? You poured out your money to help succor Armenians after they suffered. Now set up your strength so that they shall never suffer again.

Arrangements of the present peace cannot stand a generation unless they are guaranteed by the united forces of the civilized world. And if we do not guarantee them can you not see the picture? Your hearts have instructed you where the burden of this war fell. It did not fall upon national treasuries; it did not fall upon the instruments of administration; it did not fall upon the resources of nations. It fell upon the voiceless homes everywhere, where women were toiling in hope that their men would come back. When I think of the homes upon which dull despair would settle if this great hope is disappointed, I should wish for my part never to have had America play any part whatever in this attempt to emancipate the world.

But I talk as if there were any question. I have no more doubt of the verdict of America in this matter than I have doubt of the blood that is in me. And so, my fellow citizens, I have come back to report progress, and I do not believe that progress is going to stop short of the goal. The nations of the world have set their heads now to do a great thing, and they are not going to slacken their purpose. And when I speak of the nations of the world I do not speak of the governments of the world. I speak of peoples who constitute the nations of the world. They are in the saddle, and they are going to see to it that if their present governments do not do their will some other governments shall. The secret is out, and present governments know it. There is a great deal of harmony to be got out of common knowledge.

There is a great deal of sympathy to be got of living

Belgium did not hesitate to underwrite civilization. (applause) Belgium could have had safety on her own terms if only she had not resisted the German arms—little Belgium, helpless Belgium, ravaged Belgium. Ah, my fellow citizens, I have seen some of the fields of Belgium. I rode with her fine, democratic King over some of those fields. He would say to me, "This is the village of so and so," and there was no village there—just scattered stones all over the plain, and the plain dug deep every few feet with the holes made by exploding shells. You could not tell whether it was the earth thrown up or the house thrown down from the debris that covered the desert which the war had made.

And then we rode farther in, farther to the east, where there had been no fighting, no active campaigning, and there we saw beautiful green slopes, fields that had once been cultivated, and towns with their factories standing, but standing empty; not empty of workers merely, but empty of machinery. Every piece of machinery in Belgium that they could put on freight cars, they had taken away, and what they could not carry with them they had destroyed, under the devilishly intelligent direction of experts—great bodies of heavy machinery that never could be used again, because somebody had known where the heart of the machine lay, where to put the dynamite. The Belgians there, their buildings there, but nothing to work with, nothing to start life with again. And in the face of all that, Belgium did not flinch for a moment to underwrite the interests of mankind by saying to Germany, "We will not be bought." (applause)

Italy could have had more by compounding with Austria in the later stages of the war than she is going to get out of the peace settlement now, but she would not compound. She, also, was a trustee for civilization, and she would not sell the birthright of mankind for any sort of material advantage. She underwrote civilization. (applause) And Serbia, the first of the helpless nations to be struck down, her armies driven from her own soil, maintained her armies on other soils, and the armies of Serbia were never dispersed. Whether they could be on their own soil or not, they were fighting for their rights and, through their rights, for the rights of civilized man. (applause) And I believe that America is going to be more willing than any other nation in the world, when it gets its voice heard, to do this same thing that those little nations did.

Why, my fellow citizens, we have been talking constantly about the rights of little nations. There is only one way to maintain the rights of little nations, and that is by the strength of great nations. (applause) And, having begun this great task, we are no quitters; we are going to see it through. (applause and cheers) The red that

this German counselor of state saw upon the horizon was not the red of any dawn that will reassure the people who checked the wrong that Germany did. It was the first red glare of the fire that is going to consume the wrong in the world. (applause) And as that moral fire comes creeping on, it is going to purify every field of blood upon which men sacrificed their lives. It is going to redeem France; it is going to redeem Belgium; it is going to redeem devastated Serbia; it is going to redeem the fair land to the north of Italy, and set men on their feet again, to look fate in the face and have again that hope which is the only thing that leads men forward. So this covenant is the heart of the League.

In the next place, every nation agrees to join in advising what shall be done in case one of the members fails to keep that promise. There is where you have been misled, my fellow countrymen. You have been led to believe that the Council of the League of Nations could say to the Congress of the United States, "Here is a war, and here is where you come in." Nothing of the sort is true. The Council of the League of Nations is to advise what is to be done, and I have not been able to find in the dictionary any meaning of the word "advise," except "advise." (laughter and applause) But let us suppose that it means something else; let us suppose there is some legal compulsion upon the advice. The advice can't be given except by a unanimous vote of the Council and an affirmative vote of the United States. We are a permanent member, or will be a permanent member, of the Council of the League of Nations, and no such advice is ever going to be given unless the United States votes "aye," with one exception. If we are parties to the dispute, we cannot vote. But, my fellow citizens, I want to remind you, if we are parties to the dispute, we are in the war anyhow—forced into war by the vote of the Council. We are forced into war by our quarrel with the other party, as we would be in any case.

There is no sacrifice in the slightest degree of the independent choice of the Congress of the United States whether it will declare war or not. (applause)

There is a peculiar impression on the part of some persons in this country that the United States is more jealous of its sovereignty than other countries. That provision was not put in there because it was necessary to safeguard the sovereignty of the United States. All the other nations wanted it, were just as keen for their veto as we were keen for ours. So there is not the slightest danger that they will misunderstand that article of the Covenant. There is only danger that some of us who are too credulous will be led to misunderstand it. (applause)

All the nations agree to join in devising a plan for disarmament,

SEATTLE

pon the horizon was not the
ne people who checked the
rst red glare of the fire that
/orld. (applause) And as that
ping to purify every field of
: lives. It is going to redeem
; it is going to redeem dev-
he fair land to the north of
to look fate in the face and
y thing that leads men for-
he League.
es to join in advising what
rs fails to keep that promise.
my fellow countrymen. You
cil of the League of Nations
l States, "Here is a war, and
: the sort is true. The Coun-
e what is to be done, and I
ionary any meaning of the
er and applause) But let us
et us suppose there is some
advice can't be given except
d an affirmative vote of the
ember, or will be a perma-
League of Nations, and no
unless the United States
re parties to the dispute, we
want to remind you, if we
e war anyhow—forced into
orced into war by our quar-
in any case.
degree of the independent
ates whether it will declare

ie part of some persons in
more jealous of its sover-
ision was not put in there
d the sovereignty of the
nted it, were just as keen
So there is not the slightest
at article of the Covenant.
o are too credulous will be

ig a plan for disarmament,

general disarmament. You have heard that this Covenant was a plan for bringing on war, but it is going to bring on war by means of disarmament, by establishing a permanent court of international justice. (applause) When I voted for that, I was obeying the mandate of the Congress of the United States. In a very unexpected place, namely, in a naval appropriation bill passed in 1916, it was provided—it was declared—to be the policy of the United States to bring about a general disarmament by common agreement. And the President of the United States was requested to call a conference not later than the close of the then present war for the purpose of consulting and agreeing upon a plan for a permanent court of international justice. And he was authorized, in case such an agreement should be reached, to stop the building program provided for by that naval appropriation bill. So that the Congress of the United States deliberately accepted, not only accepted but directed the President to promote an agreement of this sort for disarmament and a permanent court of international justice. You know what a permanent court of international justice is. You cannot set up a court without respecting its decrees. You cannot make a toy of it. You cannot make a mockery of it. If, indeed, you want a court, then you must abide by the judgments of the court. And we have declared already that we are willing to abide by the judgments of a court of international justice.

All the nations agree to register their treaties and agree that no treaty that is not registered and published shall be valid. Private agreements and secret treaties are swept from the table, and one of the most dangerous instruments of international intrigue and disturbance is abolished.

They agree to join in the supervision of the government of helpless and dependent people. They agree that no nation shall hereafter have the right to annex any territory merely because people that live on it cannot prevent it, and that, instead of annexation, there shall be trusteeship; under which these territories shall be administered under the supervision of the associated nations of the world. They lay down rules for the protection of dependent persons of that sort, so that they shall not have enforced labor put upon them, so that their women and children shall be protected from unwholesome and destructive forms of labor, that they shall be kept away from the opium traffic and the traffic in arms, and agree that they will never levy armies there. They agree, in other words, to do what no nation ever agreed to do before—to treat subject nations like human beings. (applause)

They agree also to accord and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, both in their own

countries and in all other countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend. And, for that purpose, they agree to join in establishing and maintaining the necessary international organization. This great treaty, which we are hesitating to ratify, contains the organization by which the united councils of mankind shall attempt to lift the levels of labor and to see that men who are working with their hands are everywhere treated as they ought to be treated—upon principles of justice and equality. How many laboring men dreamed, when this war began, that four years later it would be possible for all the great nations of the world to enter into a covenant like that?

They agree to entrust the League with the general supervision of all international agreements with regard to traffic in women and children, traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs. They agree to entrust the League with general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest. They agree to join in obtaining and maintaining freedom of communications and transit and equitable treatment for commerce in respect of all the members of the League. They agree to cooperate in an endeavor to take steps for the control and the prevention of disease. They agree to encourage and promote the establishment and cooperation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations for the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

I ask you, my fellow citizens, is that not a great peace document and a great humane document? (applause) Is it conceivable that America, the most progressive and humane nation in the world, should refuse to take the same responsibility upon herself that all the other great nations take in supporting this great Covenant?

You say: "It isn't likely that the treaty will be rejected. It is only likely that there will be certain reservations." Very well, I want very frankly to tell you what I think about that. If the reservations do not change the treaty, then it is not necessary to make them part of the resolution of ratification. If all that you desire is to say what you understand the treaty to mean, no harm can be done by saying it. But if you want to change the treaty, if you want to alter the phraseology so that the meaning is altered, if you want to put in reservations which give the United States a position of special privilege or a special exemption from responsibility among the members of the League, then it will be necessary to take the treaty back to the conference table.

And, my fellow citizens, the world is not in a temper to discuss this treaty over again. (applause) The world is just now more pro-

foundly disturbed by social and economic conditions than it ever was before. And the world demands that we shall come to some sort of settlement which will let us get down to business and purify and rectify our affairs. (applause) This is not only the best treaty that can be obtained, but I want to say—because I played only a small part in framing it—that it is a sound and good treaty. (applause) And America, above all nations, should not be the nation that puts obstacles in the way of the peace of nations and the peace of mind of the world.

The world hasn't anywhere at this moment, my fellow countrymen, peace of mind. Nothing has struck me so much in recent months as the unaccustomed anxiety on the faces of the people. I am aware that men do not know what is going to happen, and that they know that it is just as important to them what happens in the rest of the world, almost, as what happens in America. America not only has connections with all the rest of the world, but she has necessary dealings with all the rest of the world. And no man is fatuous enough to suppose that if the rest of the world is disturbed and disordered, the disturbance and disorder are not going to extend to the United States.

The center of our anxiety, my fellow citizens, is in that pitiful country to which our hearts go out—that great mass of mankind whom we call the Russians. (applause) I never had the good fortune to be in Russia, but I know many persons who know that lovable people intimately. They all tell me that there is not a people in the world more generous, more simple, more kind, more naturally addicted to friendship, more passionately attached to peace than the Russian people. And yet, because the grip of terror that the autocratic power of the Czar had upon them, they were unable to bear it and threw it off. And they have come under a terror even greater than that. They have come under the terror of the power of men whom nobody knows how to find. One or two names everybody knows, but the rest—intrigue, terror, informing, spying, military power, the seizure of all the food obtainable in order that the fighting men may be fed and the rest go starved. And these men have been appealed to again and again by the civilized governments of the world to call a constituent assembly and let the Russian people say what sort of government they want to have, and they will not, they dare not, do it.

And that picture is before the eyes of every nation. Shall we get into the clutch of another sort of minority? My fellow citizens, I am going to devote every influence I have and all the authority I have from this time on to see to it that no minority commands the United States. (long and continuous applause and shouts)

It heartens me, but it does not surprise me, to know that that is the verdict of every man and woman here. But, my fellow citizens, there is no use passing that verdict unless we are going to take part, and a great part, a leading part, in steadying the councils of the world. (applause) Not that we are afraid of anything except the spread of moral defection, and moral defection cannot come except where men have lost faith, lost hope, have lost confidence. And, having seen the attitude of the other peoples of the world towards America, I know that the whole world will lose heart unless America consents to show the way.

It was pitiful, on the other side of the sea, to have delegation after delegation from peoples all over the world come to the house I was living in in Paris and seek conference with me to beg that America would show the way. It was touching. It made me very proud, but it made me very sad—proud that I was the representative of a nation so regarded, but very sad to feel how little of all the things that they had dreamed we could accomplish for them. But we can pledge this, my fellow citizens: we can, having taken a pledge to be faithful to them, redeem the pledge. (applause) And we shall redeem the pledge. (applause)

I look forward to the day when all this debate will seem in our recollection like a strange mist that came over the minds of men here and there in the nation, like a groping in the fog, having lost the way, the plain way, the beaten way, that America had made for itself for generations together. And we shall then know that of a sudden, upon the assertion of the real spirit of the American people, we came to the edge of the mist, and outside lay the sunny country where every question of duty lay plain and clear and where the great tramp, tramp of the American people sounded in the ears of the whole world, and they knew that the armies of God were on their way. (applause)

Printed in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, Sept. 14, 1919.

From Louis Brownlow

The White House 1919 Sep 13

Brownlow asks that following be sent for information of the President.

"Certain conditions have arisen in connection with the police union matter that I deem it my duty to lay before you for your information in accordance with your suggestion as telegraphed to me by Mr Tumulty.[1] The Commissioners Thursday asked Judge Gould[2] to postpone the hearing in the case[3] until after the meeting

Guildhall
London
12/28/18

yet done, the consciousness that it now rests upon others to see that those lives were not lost in vain.

I have not yet been to the actual battlefields, but I have been with many of the men who have fought the battles, and the other day I had the pleasure of being present at a session of the French Academy when they admitted Marshal Joffre to their membership. The sturdy, serene soldier stood and uttered, not the words of triumph, but the simple words of affection for his soldiers, and the conviction which he summed up, in a sentence which I will not try accurately to quote but reproduce in its spirit, was that France must always remember that the small and the weak could never live free in the world unless the strong and the great always put their power and strength in the service of right. That is the afterthought—the thought that something must be done now not only to make the just settlements, that of course, but to see that the settlements remained and were observed and that honor and justice prevailed in the world. And as I have conversed with the soldiers, I have been more and more aware that they fought for something that not all of them had defined, but which all of them recognized the moment you stated it to them. They fought to do away with an old order and to establish a new one, and the center and characteristic of the old order was that unstable thing which we used to call the "balance of power"—a thing in which the balance was determined by the sword which was thrown in the one side or the other; a balance which was determined by the unstable equilibrium of competitive interests; a balance which was maintained by jealous watchfulness and an antagonism of interests which, though it was generally latent, was always deep-seated. The men who have fought in this war have been the men from free nations who were determined that that sort of thing should end now and forever.

It is very interesting to me to observe how from every quarter, from every sort of mind, from every concert of

"THE TRUE GLORY"
THE SURRENDER OF JAPAN

August 15, 1945

House of Commons

On August 9 the second atomic bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, and on the following day the Japanese Government offered to surrender. This was agreed on August 14, thus ending the Second World War.

This crowning deliverance from the long and anxious years of danger and carnage should rightly be celebrated by Parliament in accordance with custom and tradition. The King is the embodiment of the national will, and his public acts involve all the might and power not only of the people of this famous Island but of the whole British Commonwealth and Empire. The good cause for which His Majesty has contended commanded the ardent fidelity of all his subjects spread over one-fifth of the surface of the habitable globe. That cause has now been carried to complete success. Total war has ended in absolute victory.

Once again the British Commonwealth and Empire emerges safe, undiminished and united from a mortal struggle. Monstrous tyrannies which menaced our life have been beaten to the ground in ruin, and a brighter radiance illumines the Imperial Crown than any which our annals record. The light is brighter because it comes not only from the fierce but fading glare of military achievement such as an endless succession of conquerors have known, but because there mingle with it in mellow splendour the hopes, joys, and blessings of almost all mankind. This is the true glory, and long will it gleam upon our forward path.

THE IRON CURTAIN BEGINS TO FALL
(FINAL REVIEW OF THE WAR)

August 16, 1945

House of Commons

Our duty is to congratulate His Majesty's Government on the very great improvement in our prospects at home, which comes from the complete victory gained over Japan and the establishment of peace throughout the world. Only a month ago it was necessary to continue at full speed and at enormous cost all preparations for a long and bloody campaign in the Far East. In the first days of the Potsdam Conference President Truman and I approved the plans submitted to us by the combined Chiefs of Staff for a series of great battles and landings in Malaya, in the Netherlands East Indies, and in the homeland of Japan itself. These operations involved an effort not

surpassed in Europe, and no one could measure the cost in British and American life and treasure they would require. Still less could it be known how long the stamping-out of the resistance of Japan in the many territories she had conquered, and especially in her homeland, would take. All the while the whole process of turning the world from war to peace would be hampered and delayed. Every form of peace activity was half strangled by the overriding priorities of war. No clear-cut decisions could be taken in the presence of this harsh dominating uncertainty.

During the last three months an element of baffling dualism has complicated every problem of policy and administration. We had to plan for peace and war at the same time. Immense armies were being demobilized; another powerful army was being prepared and dispatched to the other side of the globe. All the personal stresses among millions of men eager to return to civil life, and hundreds of thousands of men who would have to be sent to new and severe campaigns in the Far East, presented themselves with growing tension. This dualism affected also every aspect of our economic and financial life. How to set people free to use their activities in reviving the life of Britain, and at the same time to meet the stern demands of the war against Japan, constituted one of the most perplexing and distressing puzzles that in a long life-time of experience I have ever faced.

I confess it was with great anxiety that I surveyed this prospect a month ago. Since then I have been relieved of the burden. At the same time that burden, heavy though it still remains, has been immeasurably lightened. On 17th July there came to us at Potsdam the eagerly-awaited news of the trial of the atomic bomb in the Mexican desert. Success beyond all dreams crowned this sombre, magnificent venture of our American Allies. The detailed reports of the Mexican desert experiment, which were brought to us a few days later by air, could leave no doubt in the minds of the very few who were informed, that we were in the presence of a new factor in human affairs, and possessed of powers which were irresistible. Great Britain had a right to be consulted in accordance with Anglo-American agreements. The decision to use the atomic bomb was taken by President Truman and myself at Potsdam, and we approved the military plans to unchain the dread, pent-up forces.

From that moment our outlook on the future was transformed. In preparation for the results of this experiment, the statements of the President and of Mr. Stimson and my own statement, which by the courtesy of the Prime Minister was subsequently read out on the broadcast, were framed in common agreement. Marshal Stalin was informed by President Truman that we contemplated using an explosive of incomparable power against Japan, and action proceeded in the way we all now know. It is to this atomic bomb more than to any other factor that we may ascribe the sudden and speedy ending of the war against Japan.

Before using it, it was necessary first of all to send a message in the form of an ultimatum to the Japanese which would apprise them of what unconditional surrender meant. This document was published on 26th July—the same day that another event, differently viewed on each side of the House, occurred. [Editor's Note: The result of the General Election and the resignation of Mr. Churchill from the Premiership.] The assurances given to Japan about her future after her unconditional surrender had been made were generous in the extreme. When we remember the cruel and treacherous nature of the utterly unprovoked attack made by the Japanese war lords upon the

United States and Great Britain, these assurances must be considered magnanimous in a high degree. In a nutshell, they implied "Japan for the Japanese," and even access to raw materials, apart from their control, was not denied to their densely-populated homeland. We felt that in view of the new and fearful agencies of war-power about to be employed, every inducement to surrender, compatible with our declared policy, should be set before them. This we owed to our consciences before using this awful weapon.

Secondly, by repeated warnings, emphasized by heavy bombing attacks, an endeavour was made to procure the general exodus of the civil population from the threatened cities. Thus everything in human power, prior to using the atomic bomb, was done to spare the civil population of Japan. There are voices which assert that the bomb should never have been used at all. I cannot associate myself with such ideas. Six years of total war have convinced most people that had the Germans or Japanese discovered this new weapon, they would have used it upon us to our complete destruction, with the utmost alacrity. I am surprised that very worthy people, but people who in most cases had no intention of proceeding to the Japanese front themselves, should adopt the position that rather than throw this bomb, we should have sacrificed a million American, and a quarter of a million British lives in the desperate battles and massacres of an invasion of Japan. Future generations will judge these dire decisions, and I believe that if they find themselves dwelling in a happier world from which war has been banished, and where freedom reigns, they will not condemn those who struggled for their benefit amid the horrors and miseries of this gruesome and ferocious epoch.

The bomb brought peace, but men alone can keep that peace, and henceforward they will keep it under penalties which threaten the survival, not only of civilization but of humanity itself. I may say that I am in entire agreement with the President that the secrets of the atomic bomb should so far as possible not be imparted at the present time to any other country in the world. This is in no design or wish for arbitrary power, but for the common safety of the world. Nothing can stop the progress of research and experiment in every country, but although research will no doubt proceed in many places, the construction of the immense plants necessary to transform theory into action cannot be improvised in any country.

For this and many other reasons the United States stand at this moment at the summit of the world. I rejoice that this should be so. Let them act up to the level of their power and their responsibility, not for themselves but for others, for all men in all lands, and then a brighter day may dawn upon human history. So far as we know, there are at least three and perhaps four years before the concrete progress made in the United States can be overtaken. In these three years we must remould the relationships of all men, wherever they dwell, in all the nations. We must remould them in such a way that these men do not wish or dare to fall upon each other for the sake of vulgar and out-dated ambitions or for passionate differences in ideology, and that international bodies of supreme authority may give peace on earth and decree justice among men. Our pilgrimage has brought us to a sublime moment in the history of the world. From the least to the greatest, all must strive to be worthy of these supreme opportunities. There is not an hour to be wasted; there is not a day to be lost.

It would in my opinion be a mistake to suggest that the Russian declaration of

war upon Japan was hastened by the use of the atomic bomb. My understanding with Marshal Stalin in the talks which I had with him had been, for a considerable time past, that Russia would declare war upon Japan within three months of the surrender of the German armies. The reason for the delay of three months was, of course, the need to move over the trans-Siberian Railway the large reinforcements necessary to convert the Russian-Manchurian army from a defensive to an offensive strength. Three months was the time mentioned, and the fact that the German armies surrendered on 8th May, and the Russians declared war on Japan on 8th August, is no mere coincidence, but another example of the fidelity and punctuality with which Marshal Stalin and his valiant armies always keep their military engagements.

I now turn to the results of the Potsdam Conference so far as they have been made public in the agreed communiqué and in President Truman's very remarkable speech of a little more than a week ago. There has been general approval of the arrangements proposed for the administration of Germany by the Allied Control Commission during the provisional period of military government. This régime is both transitional and indefinite. The character of Hitler's Nazi party was such as to destroy almost all independent elements in the German people. The struggle was fought to the bitter end. The mass of the people were forced to drain the cup of defeat to the dregs. A headless Germany has fallen into the hands of the conquerors. It may be many years before any structure of German national life will be possible, and there will be plenty of time for the victors to consider how the interests of world peace are affected thereby.

In the meanwhile, it is in my view of the utmost importance that responsibility should be effectively assumed by German local bodies for carrying on under Allied supervision all the processes of production and of administration necessary to maintain the life of a vast population. It is not possible for the Allies to bear responsibility by themselves. We cannot have the German masses lying down upon our hands and expecting to be fed, organized and educated over a period of years by the Allies. We must do our best to help to avert the tragedy of famine. But it would be in vain for us in our small Island, which still needs to import half its food, to imagine that we can make any further appreciable contribution in that respect. The rationing of this country cannot be made more severe without endangering the life and physical strength of our people, all of which will be needed for the immense tasks we have to do. I, therefore, most strongly advise the encouragement of the assumption of responsibility by trustworthy German local bodies in proportion as they can be brought into existence.

The Council which was set up at Potsdam of the Foreign Secretaries of the three, four or five Powers, meeting in various combinations as occasion served, affords a new and flexible machinery for the continuous further study of the immense problems that lie before us in Europe and Asia. I am very glad that the request that I made to the Conference that the seat of the Council's permanent Secretariat should be London, was granted. I must say that the late Foreign Secretary (Mr. Anthony Eden), who has, over a long period, gained an increasing measure of confidence from the Foreign Secretaries of Russia and the United States, and who through the European Advisory Committee which is located in London has always gained the feeling that things could

be settled in a friendly and easy way, deserves some of the credit for the fact that these great Powers willingly accorded us the seat in London of the permanent Secretariat. It is high time that the place of London, one of the controlling centres of international world affairs, should at last be recognized. It is the oldest, the largest, the most battered capital, the capital which was first in the war, and the time is certainly overdue when we should have our recognition.

I am glad also that a beginning is to be made with the evacuation of Persia by the British and Russian armed forces, in accordance with the triple treaty which we made with each other and with Persia in 1941. Although it does not appear in the communiqué, we have since seen it announced that the first stage in the process, namely the withdrawal of Russian and British troops from Teheran, has already begun or is about to begin. There are various other matters arising out of this Conference which should be noted as satisfactory. We should not, however, delude ourselves into supposing that the results of this first Conference of the victors were free from disappointment or anxiety, or that the most serious questions before us were brought to good solutions. Those which proved incapable of agreement at the Conference have been relegated to the Foreign Secretaries' Council, which, though most capable of relieving difficulties, is essentially one gifted with less far-reaching powers. Other grave questions are left for the final peace settlement, by which time many of them may have settled themselves, not necessarily in the best way.

It would be at once wrong and impossible to conceal the divergences of view which exist inevitably between the victors about the state of affairs in Eastern and Middle Europe. I do not at all blame the Prime Minister or the new Foreign Secretary, whose task it was to finish up the discussions which we had begun. I am sure they did their best. We have to realize that no one of the three leading Powers can impose its solutions upon others, and that the only solutions possible are those which are in the nature of compromise. We British have had very early and increasingly to recognize the limitations of our own power and influence, great though it be, in the gaunt world arising from the ruins of this hideous war. It is not in the power of any British Government to bring home solutions which would be regarded as perfect by the great majority of Members of this House, wherever they may sit. I must put on record my own opinion that the provisional Western Frontier agreed upon for Poland, running from Stettin on the Baltic, along the Oder and its tributary, the Western Neisse, comprising as it does one quarter of the arable land of all Germany, is not a good augury for the future map of Europe. We always had in the Coalition Government a desire that Poland should receive ample compensation in the West for the territory ceded to Russia East of the Curzon Line. But here I think a mistake has been made, in which the Provisional Government of Poland have been an ardent partner, by going far beyond what necessity or equity required. There are few virtues that the Poles do not possess—and there are few mistakes they have ever avoided.

I am particularly concerned, at this moment, with the reports reaching us of the conditions under which the expulsion and exodus of Germans from the new Poland are being carried out. Between eight and nine million persons dwelt in those regions before the war. The Polish Government say that there are still 1,500,000 of these, not yet expelled, within their new frontiers. Other millions must have taken refuge behind

the British and American lines, thus increasing the food stringency in our sector. But enormous numbers are utterly unaccounted for. Where are they gone, and what has been their fate? The same conditions may reproduce themselves in a modified form in the expulsion of great numbers of Sudeten and other Germans from Czechoslovakia. Sparse and guarded accounts of what has happened and is happening have filtered through, but it is not impossible that tragedy on a prodigious scale is unfolding itself behind the iron curtain which at the moment divides Europe in twain. I should welcome any statement which the Prime Minister can make which would relieve, or at least inform us upon this very anxious and grievous matter.

There is another sphere of anxiety. I remember that a fortnight or so before the last war, the Kaiser's friend Herr Ballin, the great shipping magnate, told me that he had heard Bismarck say towards the end of his life, "If there is ever another war in Europe, it will come out of some damned silly thing in the Balkans." The murder of the Archduke at Sarajevo in 1914 set the signal for the first world war. I cannot conceive that the elements for a new conflict do not exist in the Balkans to-day. I am not using the language of Bismarck, but nevertheless not many Members of the new House of Commons will be content with the new situation that prevails in those mountainous, turbulent, ill-organized and warlike regions. I do not intend to particularize. I am very glad to see the new Foreign Secretary (Mr. Ernest Bevin) sitting on the Front Bench opposite. I should like to say with what gratification I learned that he had taken on this high and most profoundly difficult office, and we are sure he will do his best to preserve the great causes for which we have so long pulled together. But as I say, not many Members will be content with the situation in that region to which I have referred, for almost everywhere Communist forces have obtained, or are in process of obtaining, dictatorial powers. It does not mean that the Communist system is everywhere being established, nor does it mean that Soviet Russia seeks to reduce all those independent States to provinces of the Soviet Union. Marshal Stalin is a very wise man, and I would set no limits to the immense contributions that he and his associates have to make to the future.

In those countries, torn and convulsed by war, there may be, for some months to come, the need of authoritarian government. The alternative would be anarchy. Therefore it would be unreasonable to ask or expect that liberal government—as spelt with a small "l"—and British or United States democratic conditions, should be instituted immediately. They take their politics very seriously in those countries. A friend of mine, an officer, was in Zagreb when the results of the late General Election came in. An old lady said to him, "Poor Mr. Churchill! I suppose now he will be shot." My friend was able to reassure her. He said the sentence might be mitigated to one of the various forms of hard labour which are always open to His Majesty's subjects. Nevertheless we must know where we stand, and we must make clear where we stand, in these affairs of the Balkans and of Eastern Europe, and indeed of any country which comes into this field. Our ideal is government of the people, by the people, for the people—the people being free without duress to express, by secret ballot without intimidation, their deep-seated wish as to the form and conditions of the Government under which they are to live.

At the present time—I trust a very fleeting time—"police governments" rule over

a great number of countries. It is a case of the odious 18B, carried to a horrible excess. The family is gathered round the fireside to enjoy the scanty fruits of their toil and to recruit their exhausted strength by the little food that they have been able to gather. There they sit. Suddenly there is a knock at the door, and a heavily armed policeman appears. He is not, of course, one who resembles in any way those functionaries whom we honour and obey in the London streets. It may be that the father or son, or a friend sitting in the cottage, is called out and taken off into the dark, and no one knows whether he will ever come back again, or what his fate has been. All they know is that they had better not inquire. There are millions of humble homes in Europe at the moment, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Austria, in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in Rumania, in Bulgaria—where this fear is the main preoccupation of the family life. President Roosevelt laid down the four freedoms, and these are expressed in the Atlantic Charter which we agreed together. "Freedom from fear"—but this has been interpreted as if it were only freedom from fear of invasion from a foreign country. That is the least of the fears of the common man. His patriotism arms him to withstand invasion or go down fighting; but that is not the fear of the ordinary family in Europe to-night. Their fear is of the policeman's knock. It is not fear for the country, for all men can unite in comradeship for the defence of their native soil. It is for the life and liberty of the individual, for the fundamental rights of man, now menaced and precarious in so many lands, that peoples tremble.

Surely we can agree in this new Parliament, or the great majority of us, wherever we sit—there are naturally and rightly differences and cleavages of thought—but surely we can agree in this new Parliament, which will either fail the world or once again play a part in saving it, that it is the will of the people freely expressed by secret ballot, in universal suffrage elections, as to the form of their government and as to the laws which shall prevail, which is the first solution and safeguard. Let us then march steadily along that plain and simple line. I avow my faith in Democracy, whatever course or view it may take with individuals and parties. They may make their mistakes, and they may profit from their mistakes. Democracy is now on trial as it never was before, and in these Islands we must uphold it, as we upheld it in the dark days of 1940 and 1941, with all our hearts, with all our viligance, and with all our enduring and inexhaustible strength. While the war was on and all the Allies were fighting for victory, the word "Democracy," like many people, had to work overtime, but now that peace has come we must search for more precise definitions. Elections have been proposed in some of these Balkan countries where only one set of candidates is allowed to appear, and where, if other parties are to express their opinion, it has to be arranged beforehand that the governing party, armed with its political police and all its propaganda, is the only one which has the slightest chance. Chance, did I say? It is a certainty.

Now is the time for Britons to speak out. It is odious to us that governments should seek to maintain their rule otherwise than by free unfettered elections by the mass of the people. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, says the Constitution of the United States. This must not evaporate in swindles and lies propped up by servitude and murder. In our foreign policy let us strike continually the notes of freedom and fair play as we understand them in these

Islands. Then you will find there will be an overwhelming measure of agreement between us, and we shall in this House march forward on an honourable theme having within it all that invests human life with dignity and happiness. In saying all this, I have been trying to gather together and present in a direct form the things which, I believe, are dear to the great majority of us. I rejoiced to read them expressed in golden words by the President of the United States when he said:

"Our victory in Europe was more than a victory of arms. It was a victory of one way of life over another. It was a victory of an ideal founded on the right of the common man, on the dignity of the human being, and on the conception of the State as the servant, not the master, of its people."

I think there is not such great disagreement between us. Emphasis may be cast this way and that in particular incidents, but surely this is what the new Parliament on the whole means. This is what in our heart and conscience, in foreign affairs and world issues, we desire. Just as in the baleful glare of 1940, so now, when calmer lights shine, let us be united upon these resurgent principles and impulses of the good and generous hearts of men. Thus to all the material strength we possess and the honoured position we have acquired, we shall add those moral forces which glorify mankind and make even the weakest equals of the strong.

I now turn to the domestic sphere. I have already spoken of the enormous easement in their task which the new Government have obtained through the swift and sudden ending of the Japanese war. What thousands of millions of pounds sterling are saved from the waste of war, what scores and hundreds of thousands of lives are saved, what vast numbers of ships are set free to carry the soldiers home to all their lands, to carry about the world the food and raw materials vital to industry! What noble opportunities have the new Government inherited! Let them be worthy of their fortune, which is also the fortune of us all. To release and liberate the vital springs of British energy and inventiveness, to let the honest earnings of the nation fructify in the pockets of the people, to spread well-being and security against accident and misfortune throughout the whole nation, to plan, wherever State planning is imperative, and to guide into fertile and healthy channels the native British genius for comprehension and goodwill—all these are open to them, and all these ought to be open to all of us now. I hope we may go forward together, not only abroad but also at home, in all matters so far as we possibly can.

During the period of the "Caretaker Government," while we still had to contemplate eighteen months of strenuous war with Japan, we reviewed the plans for demobilization in such a way as to make a very great acceleration in the whole process of releasing men and women from the Armed Forces and from compulsory industrial employment. Now, all that is overtaken by the world-wide end of the war. I must say at once that the paragraph of the Gracious Speech [The King's speech outlining the new Government's policy] referring to demobilization and to the plans which were made in the autumn of 1944—with which I am in entire agreement in principle—gives a somewhat chilling impression. Now that we have had this wonderful windfall, I am surprised that any Government should imagine that language of this kind is still appropriate or equal to the new situation. I see that in the United States the President has said that all the American troops that the American ships can carry home in the

next year will be brought home and set free. Are His Majesty's Government now able to make any statement of that kind about our Armed Forces abroad? Or what statement can they make? I do not want to harass them unduly, but perhaps some time next week some statement could be made. No doubt the Prime Minister will think of that. Great hopes have been raised in the electoral campaign, and from those hopes has sprung their great political victory. Time will show whether those hopes are well founded, as we deeply trust they may be. But many decisions can be taken now, in the completely altered circumstances in which we find ourselves. The duty of the Government is to fix the minimum numbers who must be retained in the next six or twelve months' period in all the foreign theatres, and to bring the rest home with the utmost speed that our immensely expanded shipping resources will permit.

Even more is this releasing process important in the demobilization of the home establishment. I quite agree that the feeling of the Class A men must ever be the dominant factor, but short of that the most extreme efforts should be made to release people who are standing about doing nothing. I hope the Public Expenditure Committee will be at once reconstituted, and that they will travel about the country examining home establishments and reporting frequently to the House. Now that the war is over, there is no ground of military secrecy which should prevent the publication of the exact numerical ration strengths of our Army, Navy and Air Force in every theatre and at home, and we should certainly have weekly, or at least monthly figures of the progressive demobilization effected. It is an opportunity for the new Government to win distinction. At the end of the last war, when I was in charge of the Army and Air Force, I published periodically very precise information. I agree with the words used by the Foreign Secretary when he was Minister of Labour in my Administration, namely, that the tremendous winding-up process of the war must be followed by a methodical and regulated unwinding. We agree that if the process is to be pressed forward with the utmost speed it is necessary for the Government to wield exceptional powers for the time being, and so long as they use those powers to achieve the great administrative and executive tasks imposed upon them, we shall not attack them. It is only if, and in so far as, those powers are used to bring about by a side-wind a state of controlled society agreeable to Socialist doctrinaires, but which we deem odious to British freedom, that we shall be forced to resist them. So long as the exceptional powers are used as part of the war emergency, His Majesty's Government may consider us as helpers and not as opponents, as friends and not as foes.

To say this in no way relieves the Government of their duty to set the nation free as soon as possible, to bring home the soldiers in accordance with the scheme with the utmost rapidity, and to enable the mass of the people to resume their normal lives and employment in the best, easiest and speediest manner. There ought not to be a long-dragged-out period of many months when hundreds of thousands of Service men and women are kept waiting about under discipline, doing useless tasks at the public expense, and other tens of thousands, more highly paid, finding them sterile work to do. What we desire is freedom; what we need is abundance. Freedom and abundance—these must be our aims. The production of new wealth is far more beneficial, and on an incomparably larger scale, than class and party fights about the liquidation of old wealth. We must try to share blessings and not miseries.

The production of new wealth must precede common wealth, otherwise there will only be common poverty. I am sorry these simple truisms should excite the hon. Member opposite—whom I watched so often during the course of the last Parliament and whose many agreeable qualities I have often admired—as if they had some sense of novelty for him.

We do not propose to join issue immediately about the legislative proposals in the Gracious Speech. We do not know what is meant by the control of investment—but apparently it is a subject for mirth. Evidently, in war you may do one thing, and in peace perhaps another must be considered. Allowance must also be made for the transitional period through which we are passing. The Debate on the Address should probe and elicit the Government's intentions in this matter. The same is true of the proposal to nationalize the coal mines. If that is really the best way of securing a larger supply of coal at a cheaper price, and at an earlier moment than is now in view, I, for one, should approach the plan in a sympathetic spirit. It is by results that the Government will be judged, and it is by results that this policy must be judged. The national ownership of the Bank of England does not in my opinion raise any matter of principle. I give my opinion—anybody else may give his own. There are important examples in the United States and in our Dominions of central banking institutions, but what matters is the use to be made of this public ownership. On this we must await the detailed statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, I am glad to say, has pledged himself to resist inflation. Meanwhile it may be helpful for me to express the opinion, as Leader of the Opposition, that foreign countries need not be alarmed by the language of the Gracious Speech on this subject, and that British credit will be resolutely upheld.

Then there is the Trade Disputes Act. We are told that this is to be repealed. Personally, I feel that we owe an inestimable debt to the Trade Unions for all they have done for the country in the long struggle against the foreign foe. But they would surely be unwise to reinstitute the political levy on the old basis. It would also be very odd if they wished to regain full facilities for legalizing and organizing a general strike. It does not say much for the confidence with which the Trades Union Council view the brave new world, or for what they think about the progressive nationalization of our industries, that they should deem it necessary on what an hon. and gallant Gentleman called "the D-Day of the new Britain" to restore and sharpen the general strike weapon, at this particular time of all others. Apparently nationalization is not regarded by them as any security against conditions which would render a general strike imperative and justified in the interests of the workers. We are, I understand, after nationalizing the coal-mines, to deal with the railways, electricity and transport. Yet at the same time the Trade Unions feel it necessary to be heavily re-armed against State Socialism. Apparently the new age is not to be so happy for the wage-earners as we have been asked to believe. At any rate, there seems to be a fundamental incongruity in these conceptions to which the attention of the Socialist intelligentsia should speedily be directed. Perhaps it may be said that these powers will only be needed if the Tories come into office. Surely these are early days to get frightened. I will ask the Prime Minister if he will just tell us broadly what is meant by the word "repeal."

I have offered these comments to the House, and I do not wish to end on a sombre or even slightly controversial note. As to the situation which exists to-day, it is evident that not only are the two Parties in the House agreed in the main essentials of foreign policy and in our moral outlook on world affairs, but we also have an immense programme, prepared by our joint exertions during the Coalition, which requires to be brought into law and made an inherent part of the life of the people. Here and there there may be differences of emphasis and view, but in the main no Parliament ever assembled with such a mass of agreed legislation as lies before us this afternoon. I have great hopes of this Parliament, and I shall do my utmost to make its work fruitful. It may heal the wounds of war, and turn to good account the new conceptions and powers which we have gathered amid the storm. I do not underrate the difficult and intricate complications of the task which lies before us; I know too much about it to cherish vain illusions; but the morrow of such a victory as we have gained is a splendid moment both in our small lives and in our great history. It is a time not only of rejoicing but even more of resolve. When we look back on all the perils through which we have passed and at the mighty foes we have laid low and all the dark and deadly designs we have frustrated, why should we fear for our future? We have come safely through the worst.

Home is the sailor, home from sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

THE RIGHTS OF PRIVATE MEMBERS

August 16, 1945

House of Commons

I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for reminding me of some fragments of discussion which I appear to have embarked upon 14 years ago in a Select Committee. I confess that I had not got the passage in my mind, and, but for the fact that the right hon. Gentleman used it, I might have committed myself to something which was apparently inconsistent. I would certainly have advised him to make the concession which would cost the Government nothing, that is, to say, "All right, we will take it for six months and at the end of six months we can see what the position is, and, if necessary, we will take the time for the rest of the Session." That would have avoided a Division on this question of Parliamentary procedure and the rights of Private Members. If at one stroke the whole rights of Private Members are taken away for an entire Session, which will last for 14 months from now, it may well be that they will never be restored. It would be a great pity if the whole of this great armoury, which dignifies very much the position of a Private Member in the House and emphasises his rights and dignities as against the purely delegate conception, which is a very dangerous one, were to be lost, as it were, dropped down, at the beginning of this new Parliament.

education invaluable to the formation of character and to the development of those qualities by which freedom and justice are preserved in strong nations and by the strong for weak nations. They must also be given the wider view, in outline at any rate, of the treasures which mankind has gathered in its long, chequered pilgrimage across the centuries. You do well to provide, as you are doing, on this prodigious scale for the baptism of such as are of riper years.

This is an age of machinery and specialisation but I hope, none the less—indeed all the more—that the purely vocational aspect of university study will not be allowed to dominate or monopolise all the attention of the returned Service men. Engines were made for men, not men for engines. Mr. Gladstone said many years ago that it ought to be part of a man's religion to see that his country is well governed. Knowledge of the past is the only foundation we have from which to peer into and try to measure the future. Expert knowledge, however indispensable, is no substitute for a generous and comprehending outlook upon the human story with all its sadness and with all its unquenchable hope.

May I not also advance the claims of literature and language. The great Bismarck—there were great Germans in those days—said at the close of his life, that the most important fact in the world was that the British and American peoples spoke the same language. Certainly we have a noble inheritance in literature. It would be an enormous waste and loss to us all if we did not respect, cherish, enjoy and develop this magnificent estate, which has come down to us from the past and which not only unites us as no such great communities have ever been united before, but is also a powerful instrument whereby our conception of justice, of freedom, and of fair play and good humour may make their invaluable contribution to the future progress of mankind.

IRON CURTAIN

THE SINEWS OF PEACE

March 5, 1946

Westminster College,
Fulton, Missouri

This speech may be regarded as the most important Churchill delivered as Leader of the Opposition (1945-1951). It contains certain phrases—"the special relationship," "the sinews of peace"—which at once entered into general use, and which have survived. But it is the passage on "the iron curtain" which attracted immediate international attention, and had incalculable impact upon public opinion in the United States and in Western Europe. Russian historians date the beginning of the Cold War from this speech. In its phraseology, in its intricate drawing together of several themes to an electrifying climax—this speech may be regarded as a technical classic.

I am glad to come to Westminster College this afternoon, and am complimented that you should give me a degree. The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me.

I seem to have heard of it before. Indeed, it was at Westminster that I received a very large part of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric, and one or two other things. In fact we have both been educated at the same, or similar, or, at any rate, kindred establishments.

It is also an honour, perhaps almost unique, for a private visitor to be introduced to an academic audience by the President of the United States. Amid his heavy burdens, duties, and responsibilities–unsought but not recoiled from–the President has travelled a thousand miles to dignify and magnify our meeting here to-day and to give me an opportunity of addressing this kindred nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean, and perhaps some other countries too. The President has told you that it is his wish, as I am sure it is yours, that I should have full liberty to give my true and faithful counsel in these anxious and baffling times. I shall certainly avail myself of this freedom, and feel the more right to do so because any private ambitions I may have cherished in my younger days have been satisfied beyond my wildest dreams. Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind, and that I speak only for myself. There is nothing here but what you see.

I can therefore allow my mind, with the experience of a lifetime, to play over the problems which beset us on the morrow of our absolute victory in arms, and to try to make sure with what strength I have that what has been gained with so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American Democracy. For with primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. If you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking peoples in peace as they did in war. We must, and I believe we shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their directive the words "over-all strategic concept." There is wisdom in this, as it leads to clarity of thought. What then is the over-all strategic concept which we should inscribe today? It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here I speak particularly of the myriad cottage or apartment homes where the wage-earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord, or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part.

To give security to these countless homes, they must be shielded from the two giant marauders, war and tyranny. We all know the frightful disturbances in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the bread-winner and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia glares us in the eyes. When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty States dissolve over large areas the frame

of civilised society, humble folk are confronted with difficulties with which they cannot cope. For them all is distorted, all is broken, even ground to pulp.

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualise what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called "the unestimated sum of human pain." Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

Our American military colleagues, after having proclaimed their "over-all strategic concept" and computed available resources, always proceed to the next step—namely, the method. Here again there is widespread agreement. A world organisation has already been erected for the prime purpose of preventing war, UNO, the successor of the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that that means, is already at work. We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a sham, that it is a force for action, and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true temple of peace in which the shields of many nations can some day be hung up, and not merely a cockpit in a Tower of Babel. Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock. Anyone can see with his eyes open that our path will be difficult and also long, but if we persevere together as we did in the two world wars—though not, alas, in the interval between them—I cannot doubt that we shall achieve our common purpose in the end.

I have, however, a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates may be set up but they cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The United Nations Organisation must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. In such a matter we can only go step by step, but we must begin now. I propose that each of the Powers and States should be invited to delegate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organisation. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries, but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries but with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation, but in other respects they would be directed by the world organisation. This might be started on a modest scale and would grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the first world war, and I devoutly trust it may be done forthwith.

It would nevertheless be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb, which the United States, Great Britain, and Canada now share, to the world organisation, while it is still in its infancy. It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and un-united world. No one in any country has slept less well in their beds because this knowledge and the method and the raw materials to apply it, are at present largely retained in American hands. I do not believe we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and if some Communist or neo-Fascist State monopolised for the time being these dread agencies. The fear of them alone might easily have been used to enforce totalitarian systems upon the free democratic world, with consequences appalling to human

imagination. God has willed that this shall not be and we have at least a breathing space to set our house in order before this peril has to be encountered: and even then, if no effort is spared, we should still possess so formidable a superiority as to impose effective deterrents upon its employment, or threat of employment, by others. Ultimately, when the essential brotherhood of man is truly embodied and expressed in a world organisation with all the necessary practical safeguards to make it effective, these powers would naturally be confided to that world organisation.

Now I come to the second danger of these two marauders which threatens the cottage, the home, and the ordinary people—namely, tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the liberties enjoyed by individual citizens throughout the British Empire are not valid in a considerable number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these States control is enforced upon the common people by various kinds of all-embracing police governments. The power of the State is exercised without restraint, either by dictators or by compact oligarchies operating through a privileged party and a political police. It is not our duty at this time when difficulties are so numerous to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries which we have not conquered in war. But we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus, trial by jury, and the English common law find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

All this means that the people of any country have the right, and should have the power by constitutional action, by free unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell; that freedom of speech and thought should reign; that courts of justice, independent of the executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. Here are the title deeds of freedom which should lie in every cottage home. Here is the message of the British and American peoples to mankind. Let us preach what we practise—let us practise what we preach.

I have now stated the two great dangers which menace the homes of the people: War and Tyranny. I have not yet spoken of poverty and privation which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety. But if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and co-operation can bring in the next few years to the world, certainly in the next few decades newly taught in the sharpening school of war, an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience. Now, at this sad and breathless moment, we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous struggle; but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly or sub-human crime which should deny to all the nations the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran. "There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace." So far I feel that we are in full agreement.

Now, while still pursuing the method of realising our overall strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have travelled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organisation will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. This is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise. Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society, but the continuance of the intimate relationship between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, the similarity of weapons and manuals of instructions, and to the interchange of officers and cadets at technical colleges. It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by the joint use of all Naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire Forces and it might well lead, if and as the world calms down, to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future.

The United States has already a Permanent Defence Agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. This Agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. This principle should be extended to all British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens, and thus only, shall we be secure ourselves and able to work together for the high and simple causes that are dear to us and bode no ill to any. Eventually there may come—I feel eventually there will come—the principle of common citizenship, but that we may be content to leave to destiny, whose outstretched arm many of us can already clearly see.

There is however an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our over-riding loyalties to the World Organisation? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably the only means by which that organisation will achieve its full stature and strength. There are already the special United States relations with Canada which I have just mentioned, and there are the special relations between the United States and the South American Republics. We British have our twenty years Treaty of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia. I agree with Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, that it might well be a fifty years Treaty so far as we are concerned. We aim at nothing but mutual assistance and collaboration. The British have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384, and which produced fruitful results at critical moments in the late war. None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement, or a world organisation; on the contrary they help it. "In my father's house are many mansions." Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, which harbour no design incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, far from being harmful, are beneficial and, as I believe, indispensable.

I spoke earlier of the Temple of Peace. Workmen from all countries must build that temple. If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old

friends, if their families are inter-mingled, and if they have "faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity towards each other's shortcomings"—to quote some good words I read here the other day—why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners? Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each other's working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved again unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released. The dark ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the gleaming wings of science, and what might now shower immeasurable material blessings upon mankind, may even bring about its total destruction. Beware, I say; time may be short. Do not let us take the course of allowing events to drift along until it is too late. If there is to be a fraternal association of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilising the foundations of peace. There is the path of wisdom. Prevention is better than cure.

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytising tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and goodwill in Britain—and I doubt not here also—towards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers by the removal of all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We welcome her flag upon the seas. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty however, for I am sure you would wish me to state the facts as I see them to you, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone—Greece with its immortal glories—is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed-of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are being made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government. An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of Occupied Germany by showing special favours to groups of left-wing German leaders. At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westwards, in accordance with an earlier agreement, to a depth at some points of 150 miles upon a front of nearly four hundred miles, in order to allow our Russian allies to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the Western Democracies had conquered.

If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, and will give the defeated Germans the power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the Western Democracies. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts—and facts they are—this is certainly not the Liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.

The safety of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation should be permanently outcast. It is from the quarrels of the strong parent races in Europe that the world wars we have witnessed, or which occurred in former times, have sprung. Twice in our own lifetime we have seen the United States, against their wishes and their traditions, against arguments, the force of which it is impossible not to comprehend, drawn by irresistible forces, into these wars in time to secure the victory of the good cause, but only after frightful slaughter and devastation had occurred. Twice the United States has had to send several millions of its young men across the Atlantic to find the war; but now war can find any nation, wherever it may dwell between dusk and dawn. Surely we should work with conscious purpose for a grand pacification of Europe, within the structure of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. That I feel is an open cause of policy of very great importance.

In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety. In Italy the Communist Party is seriously hampered by having to support the Communist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. Nevertheless the future of Italy hangs in the balance. Again one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, even in the darkest hours. I will not lose faith now. However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist centre. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation. These are sombre facts for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy; but we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. The

Agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favourable to Soviet Russia, but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further 18 months from the end of the German war. In this country you are all so well-informed about the Far East, and such devoted friends of China, that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there.

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the west and in the east, falls upon the world. I was a high minister at the time of the Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd-George, who was the head of the British delegation at Versailles. I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very strong impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. I do not see or feel that same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world at the present time.

On the other hand I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable; still more that it is imminent. It is because I am sure that our fortunes are still in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have the occasion and the opportunity to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here to-day while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them. They will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be removed by a policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become.

From what I have seen of our Russian friends and Allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness. For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength. If the Western Democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, their influence for furthering those principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If however they become divided or falter in their duty and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

Last time I saw it all coming and cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind. There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot, and Germany might be powerful, prosperous and honoured to-day; but no one would listen and one by one we were all sucked into the

awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good understanding on all points with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations Organisation and by the maintenance of that good understanding through many peaceful years, by the world instrument, supported by the whole strength of the English-speaking world and all its connections. There is the solution which I respectfully offer to you in this Address to which I have given the title "The Sinews of Peace."

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Because you see the 46 millions in our island harassed about their food supply, of which they only grow one half, even in war-time, or because we have difficulty in restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now, you will not see 70 or 80 millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defence of our traditions, our way of life, and of the world causes which you and we espouse. If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealths be added to that of the United States with all that such co-operation implies in the air, on the sea, all over the globe and in science and in industry, and in moral force, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary, there will be an overwhelming assurance of security. If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength seeking no one's land or treasure, seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men; if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high-roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time, but for a century to come.

THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES

March 8, 1946

General Assembly of Virginia

I was deeply moved by the glowing terms of the Joint Resolution of both branches of the Legislature inviting me here to address the General Assembly of Virginia. I take it as a high honour to be present here this morning to discharge that task. I always value being asked to address a Parliament. I have already on two occasions in the war addressed the Congress of the United States. I have addressed the Canadian Parliament. I have addressed a Joint Session of the Belgian Legislature, more recently, and there is a place of which you may have heard across the ocean called the House of Commons, to which, invited or uninvited, I have, from time to time, had things to say. I have also had invitations, couched in terms for which I am most grateful, from the State Legislatures of South Carolina, Kentucky and Mississippi. It would have given me the greatest pleasure to accept and fulfil all these. But as I have

Forces which have been moved forward into Tunisia. Thus we have a hierarchy established by international arrangement completely in accord with modern ideas of unity of command between various Allies and of the closest concert of the three Services.

I make an appeal to the House, the Press, and the country, that they will, I trust, be very careful not to criticise this arrangement. If they do so, I trust they will do it not on personal lines, or to run one general against another, to the detriment of the smooth and harmonious relations which now prevail among this band of brothers who have got their teeth into the job. In General Eisenhower, as in General Alexander, you have two men remarkable for selflessness of character and disdain of purely personal advancement. Let them alone; give them a chance; and it is quite possible that one of these fine days the bells will have to be rung again. If not, we will address ourselves to the problem, in all loyalty and comradeship, and in the light of circumstances.

I have really tried to tell the House everything that I am sure the enemy knows and to tell them nothing that the enemy ought to know. [Hon. Members: "Ought not to know."] There was a joke in that. Still, I have been able to say something. At any rate, I appeal to all patriotic men on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean to stamp their feet on mischief-makers and sowers of tares wherever they may be found, and let the great machines roll into battle under the best possible conditions for our success. That is all I have to say at the present time.

I am most grateful for the extreme kindness with which I am treated by the House. I accept, in the fullest degree, the responsibility, as Minister of Defence and as the agent of the War Cabinet, for the plans we have devised. His Majesty's Government ask no favours for themselves. We desire only to be judged by results. We await the unfolding of events with sober confidence, and we are sure that Parliament and the British nation will display in these hopeful days, which may nevertheless be clouded o'er, the same qualities of steadfastness as they did in that awful period when the life of Britain and of our Empire hung by a thread.

POSTWAR PLANNING

March 21, 1943

Broadcast, London

Let me first of all thank the very great numbers of people who have made kind inquiries about me during my recent illness. Although for a week I had a fairly stiff dose of fever, which but for modern science might have had awkward consequences, I wish to make it clear that I never for a moment had to relinquish the responsible direction of affairs. I followed attentively all the time what was happening in Parliament, and the lively discussions on our home affairs when peace comes.

It was very clear to me that a good many people were so much impressed by the favourable turn in our fortunes which has marked the last six months that they have jumped to the conclusion that the war will soon be over and that we shall soon all be able to get back to the politics and party fights of peace-time.

I am not able to share these sanguine hopes, and my earnest advice to you is to concentrate even more zealously upon the war effort, and if possible not to take your eye off the ball even for a moment. If to-night, contrary to that advice, I turn aside from the course of the war and deal with some post-war and domestic issues, that is only because I hope that by so doing I may simplify and mollify political divergences, and enable all our political forces to march forward to the main objective in unity and, so far as possible, in step.

First of all we must beware of attempts to over-persuade or even to coerce His Majesty's Government to bind themselves or their unknown successors, in conditions which no one can foresee and which may be years ahead, to impose great new expenditure on the State without any relation to the circumstances which might prevail at that time, and to make them pledge themselves to particular schemes without relation to other extremely important aspects of our post-war needs.

The business of proposing expenditure rests ultimately with the responsible Government of the day, and it is their duty, and their duty alone, to propose to Parliament any new charges upon the public, and also to propose in the annual Budgets the means of raising the necessary funds.

The world is coming increasingly to admire our British parliamentary system and ideas. It is contrary to those ideas that Ministers or members should become pledge-bound delegates. They are a band of men who undertake certain honourable duties, and they would be dishonoured if they allowed their right and duty to serve the public as well as possible on any given occasion to be prejudiced by the enforced, premature contraction of obligations. Nothing would be easier for me than to make any number of promises and to get the immediate response of cheap cheers and glowing leading articles. I am not in any need to go about making promises in order to win political support or to be allowed to continue in office.

It was on a grim and bleak basis that I undertook my present task, and on that basis I have been given loyalty and support such as no Prime Minister has ever received. I cannot express my feeling of gratitude to the nation for their kindness to me and for the trust and confidence they have placed in me during long, dark, and disappointing periods. I am absolutely determined not to falsify or mock that confidence by making promises without regard to whether they can be performed or not. At my time of life I have no personal ambitions, no future to provide for. And I feel I can truthfully say that I only wish to do my duty by the whole mass of the nation and of the British Empire as long as I am thought to be of any use for that.

Therefore I tell you round your firesides to-night that I am resolved not to give or to make all kinds of promises and tell all kinds of fairy tales to you who have trusted me and gone with me so far, and marched through the valley of the shadow, till we have reached the upland regions on which we now stand with firmly planted feet.

However, it is our duty to peer through the mists of the future to the end of the war, and to try our utmost to be prepared by ceaseless effort and forethought for the kind of situations which are likely to occur. Speaking under every reserve and not attempting to prophesy, I can imagine that some time next year—but it may well be the year after—we might beat Hitler, by which I mean beat him and his powers of evil into death, dust, and ashes.

Then we shall immediately proceed to transport all the necessary additional forces and apparatus to the other side of the world to punish the greedy, cruel Empire of Japan, to rescue China from her long torment, to free our territory and that of our Dutch Allies, and to drive the Japanese menace forever from Australian, New Zealand, and Indian shores.

That will be our first and supreme task, and nothing must lure us from it. Nevertheless, in my opinion the moment when Hitler is beaten and Germany and Italy are prostrate will mark the grand climax of the war, and that will be the time to make a new declaration upon the task before us. We and our Allies shall have accomplished one great task. Nazi tyranny and Prussian militarism, which threatened to engulf the whole world, and against which we stood alone for a fateful year—these curses will have been swept from the face of the earth.

If I should be spared to see that day, and should be needed at the helm at that time, I shall then, with the assent of the Cabinet, propose a new task to the British nation. The war against Japan will demand a very different arrangement of our forces from what exists at present.

There will certainly be large numbers of British, and also no doubt United States, soldiers whom it will not be physically possible to employ across the vast distances and poor communications of the Japanese war. There will certainly be large numbers of men, not only abroad but at home, who will have to be brought back to their families and to their jobs or to other equally good jobs. For all these, after full provision has been made for the garrisoning of the guilty countries, return to something like home and freedom will be their hearts' desire. However vigorously the war against Japan is prosecuted, there will certainly be a partial demobilisation following on the defeat of Hitler, and this will raise most difficult and intricate problems, and we are taking care in our arrangements to avoid the mistakes which were so freely committed last time.

Of course these ideas may be completely falsified by events. It may be that Japan will collapse before Hitler, in which case quite another lay-out will be necessary. As, however, many people wish ardently to discuss the future, I adopt for this purpose tonight what seems to me the most likely supposition.

On this assumption it would be our hope that the United Nations, headed by the three great victorious Powers, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States, and Soviet Russia, should immediately begin to confer upon the future world organisation which is to be our safeguard against further wars by effectually disarming and keeping disarmed the guilty States, by bringing to justice the grand criminals and their accomplices, and by securing the return to the devastated and subjugated countries of the mechanical resources and artistic treasures of which they have been pillaged.

We shall also have a heavy task in trying to avert widespread famine in some at least of the ruined regions. We must hope and pray that the unity of the three leading victorious Powers will be worthy of their supreme responsibility, and that they will think not only of their own welfare but of the welfare and future of all.

One can imagine that a world institution embodying or representing the United Nations, and some day all nations, there should come into being a Council of Europe and a Council of Asia. As, according to the forecast I am outlining, the war against

Japan will still be raging, it is upon the creation of the Council of Europe and the settlement of Europe that the first practical task will be centred. Now this is a stupendous business. In Europe lie most of the causes which have led to these two world wars. In Europe dwell the historic parent races from whom our western civilisation has been so largely derived. I believe myself to be what is called a good European, and deem it a noble task to take part in reviving the fertile genius and in restoring the true greatness of Europe.

I hope we shall not lightly cast aside all the immense work which was accomplished by the creation of the League of Nations. Certainly we must take as our foundation the lofty conception of freedom, law and morality which was the spirit of the League. We must try—I am speaking of course only for ourselves—to make the Council of Europe, or whatever it may be called, into a really effective League, with all the strongest forces concerned woven into its texture, with a High Court to adjust disputes, and with forces, armed forces, national or international or both, held ready to impose these decisions and prevent renewed aggression and the preparation of future wars.

Anyone can see that this Council when created must eventually embrace the whole of Europe, and that all the main branches of the European family must some day be partners in it. What is to happen to the large number of small nations whose rights and interests must be safeguarded? Here let me ask what would be thought of an army that consisted only of battalions and brigades, and which never formed any of the larger and higher organisations like army corps. It would soon get mopped up. It would therefore seem, to me at any rate, worthy of patient study that side by side with the Great Powers there should be a number of groupings of States or Confederations which would express themselves through their own chosen representatives, the whole making a Council of great States and groups of States.

It is my earnest hope, though I can hardly expect to see it fulfilled in my lifetime, that we shall achieve the largest common measure of the integrated life of Europe that is possible without destroying the individual characteristics and traditions of its many ancient and historic races. All this will I believe be found to harmonise with the high permanent interests of Britain, the United States, and Russia. It certainly cannot be accomplished without their cordial and concerted agreement and participation. Thus and thus only will the glory of Europe rise again.

I only mention these matters to you to show you the magnitude of the task that will lie before us in Europe alone. Nothing could be more foolish at this stage than to plunge into details and try to prescribe the exact groupings of States or lay down precise machinery for their co-operation, or still more to argue about frontiers now while the war even in the West has not yet reached its full height, while the struggle with the U-boats is raging, and when the war in the Far East is only in its first phase. This does not mean that many tentative discussions are not taking place between the great nations concerned, or that the whole vast problem of European destiny—for that is what I am speaking of now—is not the subject of ceaseless heart-searchings.

We must remember, however, that we in Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations, although almost a world in ourselves, shall have to reach agreements with great and friendly equals, and also to respect and have a care for the rights of weaker and smaller States, and that it will not be given to any one nation to achieve the full

satisfaction of its individual wishes. I have said enough, however, I am sure, to show you, at least in outline, the mystery, the peril, and, I will add, the splendour of this vast sphere of practical action into which we shall have to leap once the hideous spell of Nazi tyranny has been broken.

Coming nearer home, we shall have to consider at the same time how the inhabitants of this island are going to get their living at this stage in the world story, and how they are going to maintain and progressively improve their previous standards of life and labour. I am very much attracted to the idea that we should make and proclaim what might be called a Four Years' Plan. Four years seems to me to be the right length for the period of transition and reconstruction which will follow the downfall of Hitler. We have five-year Parliaments, and a Four Years' Plan would give time for the preparation of a second plan. This Four Years' Plan would cover five or six large measures of a practical character which must all have been the subject of prolonged, careful, energetic preparation beforehand, and which fit together into a general scheme.

When this plan has been shaped, it will have to be presented to the country, either by a National Government formally representative, as this one is, of the three parties in the State, or by a National Government comprising the best men in all parties who are willing to serve. I cannot tell how these matters will settle themselves. But in 1944 our present Parliament will have lived nine years, and by 1945 ten years, and as soon as the defeat of Germany has removed the danger now at our throats, and the register can be compiled and other necessary arrangements made, a new House of Commons must be freely chosen by the whole electorate, including, of course, the armed forces wherever they may be. Thus whoever is burdened with the responsibility of conducting affairs will have a clear policy, and will be able to speak and act at least in the name of an effective and resolute majority.

From what I have said already you will realise how very difficult and anxious this period will be, and how much will depend not only on our own action but on the action of other very powerful countries. This applies not only to the carrying to a conclusion of the war against Japan, but also to the disarming of the guilty and to the settlement of Europe; not only to the arrangements for the prevention of further wars, but also to the whole economic process and relationship of nations, in order that employment and production may be at a high level, and that goods and services may be interchanged between man and man, and between one nation and another, under the best conditions and on the largest scale.

The difficulties which will confront us will take all our highest qualities to overcome. Let me, however, say straight away that my faith in the vigour, ingenuity, and resilience of the British race is invincible. Difficulties mastered are opportunities won. The day of Hitler's downfall will be a bright one for our country and for all mankind. The bells will clash their peals of victory and hope, and we shall march forward together encouraged, invigorated, and still, I trust, generally united upon our further journey.

I personally am very keen that a scheme for the amalgamation and extension of our present incomparable insurance system should have a leading place in our Four Years' Plan. I have been prominently connected with all these schemes of national compulsory organised thrift from the time when I brought my friend Sir William

Beveridge into the public service 35 years ago, when I was creating the labour exchanges, on which he was a great authority, and when, with Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, I framed the first unemployment insurance scheme. The prime parent of all national insurance schemes is Mr. Lloyd George. I was his lieutenant in those distant days, and afterwards it fell to me, as Chancellor of the Exchequer 18 years ago, to lower the pensions age to 65 and to bring in the widows and orphans.

The time is now ripe for another great advance, and anyone can see what large savings there will be in the administration once the whole process of insurance has become unified, compulsory, and national. Here is a real opportunity for what I once called "bringing the magic of averages to the rescue of the millions." Therefore, you must rank me and my colleagues as strong partisans of national compulsory insurance for all classes for all purposes from the cradle to the grave. Every preparation, including, if necessary, preliminary legislative preparation, will be made with the utmost energy, and the necessary negotiations to deal with worthy existing interests are being actively pursued, so that when the moment comes everything will be ready.

Here let me remark that the best way to insure against unemployment is to have no unemployment. There is another point. Unemployables, rich or poor, will have to be toned up. We cannot afford to have idle people. Idlers at the top make idlers at the bottom. No one must stand aside in his working prime to pursue a life of selfish pleasure. There are wasters in all classes. Happily they are only a small minority of every class. But anyhow we cannot have a band of drones in our midst, whether they come from the ancient aristocracy or the modern plutocracy or the ordinary type of pub-crawler.

There are other large matters which will also have to be dealt with in our Four Years' Plan, upon which thought, study, and discussion are advancing rapidly. Let me take first of all the question of British agriculture. We have, of course, to purchase a large proportion of our food and vital raw materials oversea. Our foreign investments have been expended in the common cause. The British nation that has now once again saved the freedom of the world has grown great on cheap and abundant food. Had it not been for the free trade policy of Victorian days, our population would never have risen to the level of a Great Power, and we might have gone down the drain with many other minor States, to the disaster of the whole world.

Abundant food has brought our 47,000,000 Britons into the world. Here they are, and they must find their living. It is absolutely certain we shall have to grow a larger proportion of our food at home. During the war immense advances have been made by the agricultural industry. The position of the farmers has been improved, the position of the labourers immeasurably improved. The efficient agricultural landlord has an important part to play. I hope to see a vigorous revival of healthy village life on the basis of these higher wages and of improved housing, and, what with the modern methods of locomotion and the modern amusements of the cinemas and the wireless, to which will soon be added television, life in the country and on the land ought to compete in attractiveness with life in the great cities.

But all this would cost money. When the various handicaps of war conditions are at an end, I expect that better national house-keeping will be possible, and that, as the result of technical improvements in British agriculture, the strain upon the State will be relieved. At the same time the fact remains that if the expansion and improvement

of British agriculture is to be maintained, as it must be maintained, and a reasonable level of prices is to be maintained, as it must be maintained, there are likely to be substantial charges which the State must be prepared to shoulder. That has to be borne in mind.

Next there is the spacious domain of public health. I was brought up on the maxim of Lord Beaconsfield which my father was always repeating:—"Health and the laws of health." We must establish on broad and solid foundations a National Health Service. Here let me say that there is no finer investment for any community than putting milk into babies. Healthy citizens are the greatest asset any country can have.

One of the most sombre anxieties which beset those who look 30 or 40 or 50 years ahead, and in this field one can see ahead only too clearly, is the dwindling birth-rate. In 30 years, unless present trends alter, a smaller working and fighting population will have to support and protect nearly twice as many old people: in 50 years the position will be worse still. If this country is to keep its high place in the leadership of the world, and to survive as a great Power that can hold its own against external pressures, our people must be encouraged by every means to have larger families.

For this reason, well-thought-out plans for helping parents to contribute this life-spring to the community are of prime importance. The care of the young and the establishment of sound hygienic conditions of motherhood have a bearing upon the whole future of the race which is absolutely vital. Side by side with that is the war upon disease, which, let me remind you, so far as it is successful, will directly aid the national insurance scheme. Upon all this, planning is vigorously proceeding.

Following upon health and welfare is the question of education. The future of the world is to the highly-educated races who alone can handle the scientific apparatus necessary for pre-eminence in peace or survival in war. I hope our education will become broader and more liberal. All wisdom is not new wisdom, and the past should be studied if the future is to be successfully encountered. To quote Disraeli again in one of his most pregnant sayings: "Nations are governed by force or by tradition." In moving steadily and steadfastly from a class to a national foundation in the politics and economics of our society and civilisation, we must not forget the glories of the past, nor how many battles we have fought for the rights of the individual and for human freedom.

We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges. I say "trying to build," because of all races in the world our people would be the last to consent to be governed by a bureaucracy. Freedom is their life-blood. These two great wars, scourging and harrowing men's souls, have made the British nation master in its own house. The people have been rendered conscious that they are coming into their inheritance. The treasures of the past, the toil of the centuries, the long-built-up conceptions of decent government and fair play, the tolerance which comes from the free working of Parliamentary and electoral institutions, and the great Colonial possessions for which we are trustees in every part of the globe—all these constitute parts of this inheritance, and the nation must be fitted for its responsibilities and high duty.

Human beings are endowed with infinitely varying qualities and dispositions, and

each one is different from the others. We cannot make them all the same. It would be a pretty dull world if we did. It is in our power, however, to secure equal opportunities for all. The facilities for advanced education must be evened out and multiplied. No one who can take advantage of a higher education should be denied this chance. You cannot conduct a modern community except with an adequate supply of persons upon whose education, whether humane, technical, or scientific, much time and money have been spent.

There is another element which should never be banished from our system of education. Here we have freedom of thought as well as freedom of conscience. Here we have been the pioneers of religious toleration. But side by side with all this has been the fact that religion has been a rock in the life and character of the British people upon which they have built their hopes and cast their cares. This fundamental element must never be taken from our schools, and I rejoice to learn of the enormous progress that is being made among all religious bodies in freeing themselves from sectarian jealousies and feuds, while preserving fervently the tenets of their own faith.

The secular schooling of the great mass of our scholars must be progressively prolonged, and for this we must both improve our schools and train our teachers in good time. After schooltime ends, we must not throw our youth uncared-for and unsupervised on to the labour market, with its "blind alley" occupations which start so fair and often end so foul. We must make plans for part-time release from industry, so that our young people may have the chance to carry on their general education, and also to obtain a specialised education which will fit them better for their work.

Under our ancient monarchy, that bulwark of British liberties, that barrier against dictatorships of all kinds, we intend to move forward in a great family, preserving the comradeships of the war, free for ever from the class prejudice and other forms of snobbery from which in modern times we have suffered less than most other nations, and from which we are now shaking ourselves entirely free. Britain is a fertile mother, and natural genius springs from the whole people.

We have made great progress, but we must make far greater progress. We must make sure that the path to the higher functions throughout our society and Empire is really open to the children of every family. Whether they can tread that path will depend upon their qualities tested by fair competition. All cannot reach the same level, but all must have their chance. I look forward to a Britain so big that she will need to draw her leaders from every type of school and wearing every kind of tie. Tradition may play its part, but broader systems must now rule.

We have one large immediate task in the replanning and rebuilding of our cities and towns. This will make a very great call on all our resources in material and labour, but it is also an immense opportunity, not only for the improvement of our housing, but for the employment of our people in the years immediately after the war.

In the far-reaching scheme for reorganising the building industry, prepared by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Works, will be found another means of protecting our insurance fund from the drain of unemployment relief. Mr. Bevin is attacked from time to time, now from one side, now from another. When I think of the tremendous changes which have been effected under the strain of war in the lives of the whole people, of both sexes and of every class, with so little friction, and when I consider the practical absence of strikes in this war compared to what happened in the last, I think he will be able to take it all right.

You will see from what I have said that there is no lack of material for a Four Years' Plan for the transition period from war to peace, and for another plan after that. For the present during the war our rule should be, no promises but every preparation, including where required preliminary legislative preparation.

Before I conclude I have to strike two notes, one of sober caution and the other of confidence. You shall have the caution first. All our improvements and expansion must be related to a sound and modernised finance.

A friend of mine said the other day in the House of Commons that "pounds, shillings, and pence were meaningless symbols." This made me open my eyes. What then are we to say about the savings of the people? We have just begun a "Wings for Victory" War Savings campaign, to which all classes have subscribed. Vast numbers of people have been encouraged to purchase war savings certificates. Income-tax is collected from the wage-earners of a certain level and carried to a nest-egg for them at the end of the war, the Government having the use of the money meanwhile. A nest-egg similar in character will be given to the armed forces. Those whose houses have been destroyed by air raid damage and who have in many cases paid insurance are entitled to compensation. All these obligations were contracted in pounds, shillings, and pence.

At the end of this war there will be seven or eight million people in the country with £200 or £300 apiece, a thing unknown in our history. These savings of the nation, arising from the thrift, skill, or devotion of individauls, are sacred. The State is built around them, and it is the duty of the State to redeem its faith in an equal degree of value. I am not one of those who are wedded to undue rigidity in the management of the currency system, but this I say: That over a period of 10 or 15 years there ought to be a fair, steady continuity of values if there is to be any faith between man and man or between the individual and the State. We have successfully stabilised prices during the war. We intend to continue this policy after the war to the utmost of our ability.

This brings me to the subject of the burden and incidence of taxation. Direct taxation on all classes stands at unprecedented and sterilising levels. Besides this there is indirect taxation raised to a remarkable height.

In war-time our people are willing and even proud to pay all these taxes. But such conditions could not continue in peace. We must expect taxation after the war to be heavier than it was before the war, but we do not intend to shape our plans or levy taxation in a way which, by removing personal incentive, would destroy initiative and enterprise.

If you take any single year of peace and take a slice through the industry and enterprise of the nation—see how important is the spirit of enterprise and ingenuity—you will find work which is being done at the moment, work that is being planned for the next year, and projects for the third, fourth, and even the fifth year ahead which are all maturing. War cuts down all this forward planning, and everything is subordinated to the struggle for national existence. Thus, when peace came suddenly, as it did last time, there were no long carefully prepared plans for the future. That was one of the main reasons why at the end of the last war, after a momentary recovery, we fell into a dreadful trough of unemployment. We must not be caught again that way.

It is therefore necessary to make sure that we have projects for the future employment of the people and the forward movement of our industries carefully

foreseen, and, secondly, that private enterprise and State enterprise are both able to play their parts to the utmost.

A number of measures are being and will be prepared which will enable the Government to exercise a balancing influence upon development which can be turned on or off as circumstances require. There is a broadening field for State ownership and enterprise, especially in relation to monopolies of all kinds. The modern State will increasingly concern itself with the economic well-being of the nation, but it is all the more vital to revive at the earliest moment a widespread healthy and vigorous private enterprise without which we shall never be able to provide, in the years when it is needed, the employment for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen to which they are entitled after their duty has been done.

In this brief survey I have tried to set before you both hopes and fears: I have given both caution and encouragement. But if I have to strike a balance, as I must do before the end, let me proclaim myself a faithful follower of the larger hope. I will proceed to back this hope with some solid facts. Anyone can see the difficulties of placing our exports profitably in a world so filled with ruined countries. Foreign trade to be of value must be fertile. There is no use in doing business at a loss. Nevertheless I am advised that in view of the general state of the world after the defeat of Hitler, there will be considerable opportunities for re-establishing our exports. Immediately after the war there will be an intense demand, both for home and export, for what are called consumable goods, such as clothes, furniture, and textiles.

I have spoken of the immense building programme, and we all know the stimulus which that is to a large number of trades, including the electrical and metal industries. We have learnt much about production under the stress of war. Our methods have vastly improved. The lay-out of our factories presents an entirely new and novel picture to the eye. Mass production has been forced upon us. The electrification of industry has been increased 50 per cent. There are some significant new industries offering scope for the inventiveness and vigour which made this country great. When the fetters of wartime are struck off and we turn free hands to the industrial tasks of peace, we may be astonished at the progress in efficiency we shall suddenly find displayed. I can only mention a few instances of fields of activity.

The ceaseless improvements in wireless and the wonders of radio-location, applied to the arts of peace, will employ the radio industry. Striking advances are open for both gas and electricity as the servants of industry, agriculture, and the cottage home. There is civil aviation. There is forestry. There is transportation in all its forms. We were the earliest in the world with railways; we must bring them up to date in every respect. Here, in these few examples, are gigantic opportunities which, if used, will in turn increase our power to serve other countries with the goods they want.

Our own effort must be supported by international arrangements and agreements more neighbourlike and more sensible than before. We must strive to secure our fair share of an augmented world trade. Our fortunes will be greatly influenced by the policies of the United States and the British Dominions, and we are doing our utmost to keep in ever closer contact with them. We have lately put before them and our other friends and allies some tentative suggestions for the future management of the exchanges and of international currency, which will shortly be published. But this is a first instalment only.

I have heard a great deal on both sides of these questions during the forty years I have served in the House of Commons and the twenty years or more I have served in Cabinets. I have tried to learn from events, and also from my own mistakes, and I will tell you my solemn belief, which is that if we act with comradeship and loyalty to our country and to one another, and if we can make State enterprise and free enterprise both serve national interests and pull the national wagon side by side, then there is no need for us to run into that horrible, devastating slump or into that squalid epoch of bickering and confusion which mocked and squandered the hard-won victory we gained a quarter of a century ago.

I end where I began. Let us get back to our job. I must warn every one who hears me of a certain, shall I say, unseemliness and also of a danger of its appearing to the world that we here in Britain are diverting our attention to peace, which is still remote, and to the fruits of victory, which have yet to be won, while our Russian allies are fighting for dear life and dearer honour in the dire, deadly, daily struggle against all the might of the German military machine, and while our thoughts should be with our armies and with our American and French comrades now engaged in decisive battle in Tunisia. I have just received a message from General Montgomery that the Eighth Army are on the move and that he is satisfied with their progress.

Let us wish them Godspeed in their struggle, and let us bend all our efforts to the war and to the ever more vigorous prosecution of our supreme task.

TUNISIAN CAMPAIGN

March 24, 1943

House of Commons

It is my duty to let the House and the country know that this great battle now proceeding in Tunisia has by no means reached its climax, and that very much hard fighting now lies before the British and the United States Forces. The latest information from the Mareth Front—later, that is, than that published in this morning's newspapers—shows that the Germans, by counter-attacks, have regained the greater part of the bridgehead which had been stormed, and that their main line of defence in that quarter is largely restored. I take occasion to make that statement, as I do not wish hopes of an easy decision to be encouraged. On the other hand, I have good confidence in the final result.

TUNISIAN OPERATIONS

March 30, 1943

House of Commons

Since I informed the House last week of the check sustained on the Mareth front, the situation has turned very much in our favour. General Montgomery's decision to throw his weight on to the turning movement instead of persisting in the

re-echoed, not only by future generations in this Island and in the Empire and Commonwealth ranged about it, but that our men and their deeds will be respected wherever the cause of freedom is held in honour throughout the world.

"THE VOICE OF YOUTH"

October 31, 1945

Harrow School

[Extract] . . . As a youth, I always wanted to play the kettledrum, and when that could not be arranged I thought I would like to be leader of the school orchestra. That could not be arranged either, but eventually, and after a great deal of perseverance I rose to be the conductor of quite a considerable band. It was a very large band and played very strange and formidable instruments. The roar and thunder of its music resounded throughout the world. We played all sorts of tunes, and we finished up the concert with "Rule, Britannia!" and "God save the King." . . . (Cheers.)

This is a time when the voice of youth will be welcomed in the world. We have come out of this struggle in many ways impoverished and with many burdens and the future is by no means clear. Always remember you are citizens of a country which holds its own in the very foremost ranks of the nations of the world and is entitled to receive from all of them a tribute of respect, because it was on our country that the whole brunt of the burden fell for more than a year of saving civilization and the world. We did not flinch, we did not fail.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE

November 7, 1945

House of Commons

The departure of the Prime Minister for the United States in all the present circumstances is so important, that we thought it right there should be a Debate in this House beforehand. Although we are divided in domestic affairs by a considerable and widening gulf, we earnestly desire that in our foreign relations we shall still speak as the great united British nation, the British Commonwealth and Empire, which strove through all the perils and havoc of the war, unconquered and unconquerable. It is our wish, on this side of the House, so far as we can give effect to it, and as long as we can give effect to it, that the Prime Minister shall represent abroad, not only the Socialist majority in the present, and we trust, transient House of Commons, but all parties in the State. What I am anxious to submit to the House this afternoon has no other object than that.

From the conversations I have had with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, I have formed the opinion that His Majesty's Government would think it inopportune today for our Debate to range over the whole European scene, or to deviate either into the tangled problems of particular European countries, or into the troubles of the Middle East, for example, Greece, Syria, Palestine, Egypt. It would seem wise to concentrate, therefore, as much as possible, on the eve of a mission of this character, upon the supreme matter of our relations with the United States, and, in particular, as it seems to me, upon the momentous declaration to the world made by President Truman in his Navy Day address in New York on Saturday, 27th October.

It would not, however, be possible to speak on this subject of the United States without referring to the other great partner in our victory over the terrible foe. To proceed otherwise would be to derange the balance which must always be preserved, if the harmony and poise of world affairs is to be maintained. I must, therefore, begin by expressing what I am sure is in everybody's heart, namely, the deep sense of gratitude we owe to the noble Russian people and valiant Soviet Armies, who, when they were attacked by Hitler, poured out their blood and suffered immeasurable torments until absolute victory was gained. Therefore, I say that it is the profound desire of this House—and the House speaks in the name of the British nation—that these feelings of comradeship and friendship, which have developed between the British and Russian peoples, should be not only preserved but rapidly expanded. Here I wish to say how glad we all are to know and feel that Generalissimo Stalin is still strongly holding the helm and steering his tremendous ship. Personally, I cannot feel anything but the most lively admiration for this truly great man, the father of his country, the ruler of its destinies in times of peace, and the victorious defender of its life in time of war.

Even if as, alas, is possible—or not impossible—we should develop strong differences on many aspects of policy, political, social, even, as we think, moral, with the Soviet Government, no state of mind must be allowed to occur in this country which ruptures or withers those great associations between our two peoples which were our glory and our safety, in the late frightful convulsion. I am already trespassing a little beyond those limits within which I have agreed with the Government it would be useful that this Debate should lie, but I feel it necessary to pay this tribute to Soviet Russia with all her tragic load of suffering, all her awful losses and devastation, all her grand, simple, enduring effort. Any idea of Britain pursuing an anti-Russian policy, or making elaborate combinations to the detriment of Russia, is utterly opposed to British thought and conscience. Nothing but a long period of very marked injuries and antagonisms, which we all hope may be averted, could develop any such mood again in this land.

I must tell the House, speaking with my own knowledge, that the world outlook is, in several respects, today less promising than it seemed after the German capitulation of 1918, or after the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. I remember well the period immediately after the last war, when I was a Minister in high office and very close to the Prime Minister of the day. Then, there were much higher hopes of the world's future than there are now. Many things, no doubt, have been done better this time, though we have not yet felt the effects of them, but certainly there is today none of

that confidence among men that they or their children will never see another world war, which there undoubtedly was in 1919. In 1919 there was the same sense of hope and belief as there is now that we were moving into a new world and that easements and ameliorations awaited the masses of our people. But added to that, there was the buoyant and comforting conviction that all the wars were ended. Personally, I did not share that conviction even at that enthusiastic moment, but one felt it all round one in a degree that is lacking today.

It is our first duty to supply the solid grounds on which this hope may arise again and live. I think the speech of the President of the United States on 27th October is the dominant factor in the present world situation. This was the speech of the head of a State and nation, which has proved its ability to maintain armies of millions, in constant victorious battle in both hemispheres at the same time. If I read him and understand him correctly, President Truman said, in effect, that the United States would maintain its vast military power and potentialities, and would join with any like-minded nations, not only to resist but to prevent aggression, no matter from what quarter it came, or in what form it presented itself. Further, he made it plain that in regions which have come under the control of the Allies, unfair tyrannical Governments not in accordance with the broad principles of democracy as we understand them would not receive recognition from the Government of the United States. Finally, he made it clear that the United States must prepare to abandon old-fashioned isolation and accept the duty of joining with other friendly and well-disposed nations, to prevent war, and to carry out those high purposes, if necessary, by the use of force carried to its extreme limits.

It is, of course, true that all these propositions and purposes have been set forth in the Declaration of the United Nations at San Francisco in May. None the less, this reaffirmation by the President of the United States on 27th October is of transcendent importance. If such a statement had been made in the Summer of 1914, the Kaiser would never have launched an aggressive war over a Balkan incident. All would have come to a great parley, between the most powerful Governments of those days. In the face of such a declaration, the world war of 1914 would not have occurred. Such a declaration in 1919 would have led to a real Treaty of Peace and a real armed League of Nations. Such a declaration at any time between the two wars would have prevented the second. It would have made the League of Nations, or a world League strong enough to prevent that re-arming of Germany, which has led all of us through so much tribulation and danger, and Germany herself to punishment and ruin which may well shock the soul of man. Therefore, I feel it is our duty to-day, in the most definite manner, to welcome and salute the noble declaration made by the President of the United States and to make it plain that upon the principles set forth in the 12 Articles, which follow so closely upon those of the Atlantic Charter, we stand by the United States with a conviction which overrides all other considerations. I cannot bring myself to visualise, in its frightful character, another world war, but none of us knows what would happen if such a thing occurred. It is a sombre thought that, so long as the new world organisation is so loosely formed, such possibilities and their consequences are practically beyond human control.

There is a general opinion which I have noticed, that it would be a serious

disaster if the particular minor planet which we inhabit blew itself to pieces, or if all human life were extinguished upon its surface, apart, that is to say, from fierce beings, armed with obsolescent firearms, dwelling in the caverns of the Stone Age. There is a general feeling that that would be a regrettable event. Perhaps, however, we flatter ourselves. Perhaps we are biased but everyone realises how far scientific knowledge has outstripped human virtue. We all hope that men are better, wiser, more merciful than they were 10,000 years ago. There is certainly a great atmosphere of comprehension. There is a growing factor which one may call world public opinion, most powerful, most persuasive, most valuable. We understand our unhappy lot, even if we have no power to control it.

Those same deep, uncontrollable anxieties which some of us felt in the years before the war recur, but we have also a hope that we had not got then. That hope is the strength and resolve of the United States to play a leading part in world affairs. There is this mighty State and nation, which offers power and sacrifice in order to bring mankind out of the dark valley through which we have been travelling. The valley is indeed dark, and the dangers most menacing, but we know that not so far away are the broad uplands of assured peace. Can we reach them? We must reach them. This is our sole duty.

I am sure we should now make it clear to the United States that we will march at their side in the cause that President Truman has devised, that we add our strength to their strength, and that their stern sober effort shall be matched by our own. After all, if everything else fails–which we must not assume–here is the best chance of survival. Personally, I feel that it is more than survival. It may even be safety, and, with safety, a vast expansion of prosperity. Having regard to all these facts of which many of us here are aware at the present time, we may confidently believe that with the British Empire and Commonwealth standing at the side of the United States, we shall together be strong enough to prevent another world catastrophe. As long as our peoples act in absolute faith and honour to each other, and to all other nations, they need fear none and they need fear nothing. The British and American peoples come together naturally, and without the need of policy or design. That is because they speak the same language, were brought up on the same common law, and have similar institutions and an equal love of individual liberty. There is often no need for policy or statecraft to make British and Americans agree together at an international council table. They can hardly help agreeing on three out of four things. They look at things the same way. No policies, no pacts, no secret understandings are needed between them. On many of the main issues affecting our conduct and our existence, the English-speaking peoples of the world are in general agreement.

It would be a mistake to suppose that increasingly close and friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States, imply an adverse outlook towards any other Power. Our friendship may be special, but it is not exclusive. On the contrary, every problem dealing with other Powers is simplified by Anglo-American agreement and harmony. That is a fact which I do not think the Foreign Secretary, or any one who took part in the recent Conference, would doubt. It is not as if it were necessary to work out some arrangement between British and Americans at a conference. In nearly every case where there is not some special difficulty between them, they take

the same view of the same set of circumstances, and the fact that that is so, makes it all the more hopeful that other Powers gathered at the Conference will be drawn into the circle of agreement which must precede action.

It is on this basis I come—and I do not want to detain the House very long—to the atomic bomb. According to our present understanding with the United States, neither country is entitled to disclose its secrets to a third country without the approval of the other. A great deal has already been disclosed by the United States in agreement with us. An elaborate document giving an immense amount of information on the scientific and theoretical aspects was published by the Americans several weeks ago. A great deal of information is also common property all over the world. We are told by those who advocate immediate public disclosure, that the Soviet Government are already possessed of the scientific knowledge, and that they will be able to make atomic bombs in a very short time. This, I may point out, is somewhat inconsistent with the argument that they have a grievance, and also with the argument, for what it is worth, that we and the United States have at this moment any great gift to bestow, such as would induce a complete melting of hearts and create some entirely new relationship.

What the United States do not wish to disclose is the practical production method which they have developed, at enormous expense and on a gigantic scale. This would not be an affair of scientists or diplomatists handing over envelopes containing formulæ. If effective, any such disclosure would have to take the form of a considerable number of Soviet specialists, engineers and scientists visiting the United States arsenals, for that is what the manufacturing centres of the atomic bomb really are. They would have to visit them, and they would have to dwell there amid the plant, so that it could all be explained to them at length and at leisure. These specialists would then return to their own country, carrying with them the blueprints and all the information which they had obtained, together, no doubt, with any further improvements which might have occurred to them. I trust that we are not going to put pressure on the United States to adopt such a course. I am sure that if the circumstances were reversed, and we or the Americans asked for similar access to the Russian arsenals, it would not be granted. During the war we imparted many secrets to the Russians, especially in connection with Radar, but we were not conscious of any adequate reciprocity. Even in the heat of the war both countries acted under considerable reserve.

Therefore, I hope that Great Britain, Canada and the United States will adhere to the policy proclaimed by President Truman, and will treat their knowledge and processes as a sacred trust to be guarded for the benefit of all nations and as a deterrent against aggressive war. I myself, as a British subject, cannot feel the slightest anxiety that these great powers should at the present moment be in the hands of the United States. I am sure they will not use them in any aggressive sense, or in the indulgence of territorial or commercial appetites. They, like Great Britain, have no need or desire for territorial gains. To my mind, it is a matter for rejoicing—[*Interruption.*] Is this an argument or a duet?

Mr. Logan (Liverpool, Scotland): I said that if the bomb went off there would be no working class.

Mr. Churchill: I am not sufficiently familiar with the vernacular to follow the exact purpose and intensity of that joke. I am sure they will not use those powers in any aggressive way. Like Great Britain, they have no need for territorial gain. Personally, I feel it must be in most men's minds here today that it is a matter for rejoicing that these powers of manufacture are in such good hands. The possession of these powers will help the United States and our Allies to build up the structure of world security. It may be the necessary lever which is required to build up that great structure of world security.

How long, we may ask, is it likely that this advantage will rest with the United States? In the Debate on the Address I hazarded the estimate that it would be three or four years. According to the best information I have been able to obtain, I see no reason to alter that estimate, and certainly none to diminish it, but even when that period is over, whatever it may prove to be, the progress made by the United States' scientists and, I trust, by our own, both in experiment and manufacture, may well leave us and them with the prime power and responsibility for the use of these dire superhuman weapons. I also agree with President Truman when he says that those who argue that, because of the atomic bomb, there is no need for armies, navies and air forces, are at present 100 per cent. wrong. I should be glad to hear, in whatever terms His Majesty's Ministers care to express themselves, that this is also the view of His Majesty's Government.

I cannot leave this subject without referring to another aspect which is forced upon me by speeches made in a recent Debate on the Adjournment. It was said that unless all knowledge of atomic energy, whether of theory or production, were shared among all the nations of the world, some of the British and American scientists would act independently, by which, I suppose, is meant that they would betray to foreign countries whatever secrets remained. In that case, I hope the law would be used against those men with the utmost rigour. Whatever may be decided on these matters should surely be decided by Parliaments and responsible Governments, and not by scientists, however eminent and however ardent they may be. Mr. Gladstone said that expert knowledge is limited knowledge. On many occasions in the past we have seen attempts to rule the world by experts of one kind and another. There have been theocratic Governments, military Governments and aristocratic Governments. It is now suggested that we should have scientistic—not scientific—Governments. It is the duty of scientists, like all other people, to serve the State and not to rule it because they are scientists. If they want to rule the State they must get elected to Parliament or win distinction in the Upper House and so gain access to some of the various administrations which are formed from time to time. Most people in the English-speaking world will, I believe, think it much better that great decisions should rest with Governments lawfully elected on democratic lines. I associate myself with the majority in that opinion.

The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the King's Norton Division of Birmingham (Captain Blackburn) showed the other night that some breach of trust had already occurred, when he referred to the secret agreement signed by President Roosevelt and myself at Quebec in 1943, and endeavoured to give some account of it. Let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the publication of

any document or any agreement which I have signed on this subject with the late President. Surely, however, this is a matter for both the British and United States Governments to settle together in full agreement. Neither of them has the right to publish without the consent of the other, and it would be very wrong for anyone to try to force their hands or press them unduly.

Captain Blackburn (Birmingham, King's Norton): May I point out that I did not make the suggestion that I knew of any secret agreement or that a leakage had occurred? I said that it was apparent from the Smyth Report, to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred, and from the White Paper and other circumstances, that some such agreement must, in fact, have been entered into.

Mr. Churchill: I took great pains to read carefully what the hon. and gallant Gentleman said in his very eloquent and able speech, and I think the references which I have made today, and which also were carefully considered, will be found appropriate and not unjust. I am not making any attack. I only say that it occurred to me to be quite clear from what he said that there has been somewhere a breach of confidence, which he published and brought to the notice of the House in the exercise of his responsibilities as a Member of Parliament. This, of course, was immediately telegraphed to the United States, and at the Press Conference the next day President Truman was questioned about it. A truncated report appeared in some of the newspapers here, with the answers which he gave, but not setting forth the exact question which elicited the answer. I have taken pains to verify the actual text of the answers which President Truman gave at his Press Conference on 31st October. He was asked by correspondents the following question:

> Mr. President, it was said in the House of Commons yesterday that President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill reached a secret agreement at Quebec on the peacetime use of the atom bomb. Do you—
>
> The President interposed:
> I do not think that is true.
>
> Those were the exact words, where he interposed.
>
> As nearly as I can find out, on the atom energy release programme, Great Britain, Canada and the United States are in equal partnership on its development, and Mr. Attlee is coming over here to discuss that phase of the situation with the President of the United States.
>
> Question: Well, Mr. President, are these three countries in equal possession of the knowledge of how we produce the bomb?
>
> The President: They are.
>
> Question: Great Britain knows as much about how we produced that as we do?
>
> The President: They do.

It seems to me that that is a satisfactory statement of the whole position, and it

affords an exceedingly good basis upon which the Prime Minister may begin any discussion he may wish to have with the President. Subject to anything that the Foreign Secretary may say, I strongly advise the House for the present to leave the question where it now lies.

May I in conclusion submit to the House a few simple points which, it seems to me, should gain their approval? First, we should fortify in every way our special and friendly connections with the United States, aiming always at a fraternal association for the purpose of common protection and world peace. Secondly, this association should in no way have a point against any other country, great or small, in the world, but should, on the contrary, be used to draw the leading victorious Powers ever more closely together on equal terms and in all good faith and good will. Thirdly, we should not abandon our special relationship with the United States and Canada about the atomic bomb, and we should aid the United States to guard this weapon as a sacred trust for the maintenance of peace. Fourthly, we should seek constantly to promote and strengthen the world organisation of the United Nations, so that, in due course, it may eventually be fitted to become the safe and trusted repository of these great agents. Fifthly, and this, I take it, is already agreed, we should make atomic bombs, and have them here, even if manufactured elsewhere, in suitable safe storage with the least possible delay. Finally, let me say on behalf of the whole House that we wish the Prime Minister the utmost success in his forthcoming highly important visit to Washington.

A NEW EUROPE

November 12, 1945

French Institute, Paris

[Extract] ... Everywhere I have been I have received proof of affection and hospitality that have profoundly touched me.

I can recall that a year ago I witnessed Paris in the joy of liberation.

After the terrible tests we have passed through we cannot expect everything to be settled immediately. But from what I have seen I feel that I can congratulate France on the progress made.

My hope, as you know, is that a new and happier Europe may one day raise its glory from the ruins we now see about us. And in this noble effort the genius, the culture and especially the power of France should play its true and incontestable role.

faithful discharge of our national duty by everyone of us laying aside all impediments will give the Conservative Party a chance of rendering true service to Britain, its Empire and the world. In this there lies before us an opportunity such as the centuries do not often bring.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

July 20, 1950

Bath

[Extract] . . . It is very hard on the great nations of the western world after their efforts and triumph in the last war to find, when only five years have passed, dark shadows hanging over the progress of mankind, great obstacles barring their onward march, the United Nations divided, rent, and harassed in its work, but still courageously performing its task.

I do not think myself that there is a greater war imminent. But I am sure of this, that if there were any weakness or division in the English-speaking world, if it were not for the great and courageous championship of the cause of freedom by the mighty United States, if outside the iron curtain there were not strong and loyal supporters of the maintenance of peace, then there could be no limit to the miseries which the whole world would have to undergo. I greatly welcome the action of the United States and I am sure they will find in our island and the array of Commonwealths and States gathered round it real allies and faithful friends.

If we are to save mankind from a renewal of the horrors so needlessly inflicted upon it in the past, if we could ward off this great danger, it would be by seeking peace through strength. This is the intention of all the Governments concerned. It is our duty here in this country to do everything in our power to increase the strength of the United Nations, and with the full authority of the greatest international policy yet created, determine to stand foursquare against all the winds that blow.

EUROPEAN UNITY AND THE COLD WAR

July 21, 1950

Albert Hall, London

[Extract] . . . We are sure that the new Germany can make a fruitful, powerful, and constructive contribution to the new Europe that we shall build together.