

THE HOOVER LIBRARY ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE
AND HOOVER RESEARCH INSTITUTE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA



H. H. FISHER, *Chairman*
Professor of History

NINA ALMOND, *Librarian and*
Consultant in Research

26 May 1945

Dear Commander Stassen,

DIRECTORS

J. S. DAVIS
Director of Food
Research Institute

HERBERT HOOVER, *Founder*

RALPH H. LUTZ
Professor of History and
Dean of Graduate Study

E. G. MEARS
Professor of Geography
and International Trade

EDGAR RICKARD
Chairman, Belgian American
Educational Foundation

E. E. ROBINSON
Margaret Byrne Professor
of American History

GRAHAM STUART
Professor of Political Science

ROBERT E. SWAIN
Professor of Chemistry,
Emeritus

ALONZO E. TAYLOR
Director of Food Research
Institute, Emeritus

DONALD B. TRESIDDER
President of Stanford University

NATHAN VAN PATTEN
Director of University Libraries

RAY LYMAN WILBUR
Chancellor of Stanford University

Herewith are some notes on the ratification of the amendments to the constitution. If these do not give you all the information you need, please let me know.

I looked in to the matter of the amendments that have failed of ratification. The only one of the five cases that is interesting or significant is the pending child labor amendment. In this case three of the five large states (Ill., Penna., Ohio) have ratified and two (N.Y., Texas) have not.

From this cursory survey it seems that size, that is population, wealth etc., is not the determining factor in the vote of the state. Size was important in the drafting of the constitution and in some measure in ratification, but in the other cases the vote appears to have been determined by the social composition and economic interests of the people of the states. I think that it is likely to be the same with national states. Big states won't vote the same way because they are big or small ones because they are small.

Some big states and some little ones, as in our own case, will be on the same side on certain issues but opposed on other issues. Only on security and procedural questions are the big and little ones likely to be divided ~~any~~ according to their size.

Sincerely,

H. H. Fisher

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Summoned not to draw up a constitution but for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation.

These revisions or amendments were to be submitted in the Continental Congress and to the states for approval.

And the letter and spirit of the Articles were to be observed.

Taking this summons at its face value, some of the states expressly limited the mandates of their delegates to a revision of the Articles.

A total of 62 delegates were appointed in the Convention. Of these 55 attended the sessions fairly regularly. But only 39 signed the final draft.

The small states in general favored adherence to the letter of the summons since they feared that if anything more than a revision of the Articles were made, the small states would lose their position of equality. They were voted down. The Articles were not amended; they were set aside and a new instrument of government was drafted.

The Constitutional Convention did not merely submit the draft in the Continental Congress and the states, but appealed over the heads of both, directly to the voters for ratification.

The Articles of Confederation required unanimous approval for every amendment. The Constitutional Convention disregarded this and proposed that the new instrument should go into effect when ratified by 9 of the 13 states.

In the matter of representation, it is interesting to recall that in order to avoid a revival of what was really a "council of ambassadors" under the Articles of Confederation, the framers of the Constitution provided that the Senators and Representatives should be paid by the national treasury, not by the states, that they should vote as individuals, not as a delegation, that they could not be recalled or bound by instructions from the states. This arrangement, as Madison later pointed out, was based on the belief that in politics one has to deal with effective powers and not with that mythical entity known as "indivisible sovereignty".

Jefferson, then in Paris, at first did not think very highly of the new constitution but he came to take the view that "the example of changing a constitution by assembling the wise men of the state, instead of assembling armies, will be worth as much to the world as the former examples we have given them."

RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

The first states to ratify were small ones -- Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey and Georgia. Two other small states, Maryland and South Carolina and one large one, Pennsylvania, followed. Two large states, New York and Massachusetts, and one small, New Hampshire, showed majorities against ratification but the delegates voted for ratification by small majorities. The other large state, Virginia, reluctantly ratified after the ninth state had assured adoption. Two small states, Rhode Island and North Carolina, refused to ratify until after the Constitution had gone into effect.

In general in the ratification of the Constitution the smaller states showed the greater willingness to ratify and the large states the greater reluctance. The issue is not clear cut, however, because Pennsylvania, a large state (and also the most progressive at the time) ratified promptly and the small Rhode Island and North Carolina held out.

RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENTS

I-X. Bill of Rights. (1791)

The First Congress had a great many amendments put before it. Of these it adopted ten which became the "Bill of Rights." Eleven of the fourteen states ratified. One large state (Mass.) did not ratify until 1939.

If unanimity of the large states had been necessary, the adoption of the Bill of Rights might not have failed permanently but it would have been delayed.

For ratification

Failed to ratify

N.J. N.H. R.I.
Md. Del. Vt.
N.C. Pa. ✓ Va.
S.C. N.Y. ✓

Mass.
Ga.
Conn.

XI. Judicial powers contrued. (Proposed 1794, ratified 1798)

One large state (Pa.) and one small (N.J.) failed to ratify.
Unanimity of large states would have delayed ratification.

XII. Method of electing President and Vice-President (Proposed 1803, ratified 1804)

One large (Mass.) and three small (Conn., Del., N.H.) failed to ratify.
Again unanimity of large states would have delayed.

(Note: In respect to the XIII-XV Amendments, the southern states cannot be considered as before and Virginia is not counted as a large state.)

XIII. Abolition of slavery. (Proposed and ratified 1865)

Ratified by 31 of 36 states. Rejected by Del. and Ky. and not acted on by Texas. Size was not a factor here.

Unanimity of large states would not have delayed ratification.

XIV. Citizenship and due process. (Proposed 1866, ratified 1868)

Ratified by 23 northern states; rejected by Del., Ky., Md. and 10 southern states. Cal. did not act. Ten southern states later ratified under pressure.

Unanimity of large states would not have delayed ratification.

XV. Equal rights. (Proposed 1869, ratified 1870)

Ratified by 30 states including the large ones; rejected by Cal., Del., Ky., Md., N.J., Ore. Not acted on by Tenn.

Unanimity of large states would not have delayed ratification.

RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENTS (2)

XVI. Income taxes. (Proposed 1909, ratified 1913)

Note: At this time the five large states are N.Y., Pa., Ill., Ohio, Tex. (or Mass.)

Ratified by all except Conn., Fla., Pa., R.I., Utah, Va. (One large, Pa.)

Unanimity by five large states would have prevented or delayed ratification.

XVII. Election of U.S. Senators. (Proposed 1912, ratified 1913)

Ratified by all except Ala., Del., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Md., Miss., R.I., S.C., Utah, Va., No large states included. All but two have large negro population.

Unanimity ~~was~~ of large states would not have delayed.

XVIII. Prohibition. (Proposed 1917, ratified 1920)

All states except Conn. and R.I.

Unanimity of large states would not have delayed.

XIX. Women's suffrage. (Proposed 1919, ratified 1920)

Nine states rejected: Del., Md., Va., N.C., S.C., Ga., Ala., Miss., La.; no large one, mostly southern.

Unanimity of large states would not have delayed.

XX. Lame Duck (Proposed 1932, ratified 1933)

All states ratified.

XXI. Prohibition repeal. (Proposed 1933, ratified 1933)

Ratified by all but two states, S.C. and N.C.

PAMPHLETS ON THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES, Published
During Its Discussion by the
People 1787-1788
Paul Leicester Ford, Editor,
N.Y., 1888

p. 288

"Letters of the Federal Farmer" (Richard Harry Lee)
Letter I

". . . Independent of the opinions of many great authors, that a free elective government cannot be extended over large territories, a few reflections must evince, that one government and general legislation alone never can extend equal benefits to all parts of the United States: Different laws, customs, and opinions exist in the different states, which by a uniform system of laws would be unreasonably invaded. . . ."

A POLITICAL AND CIVIL HISTORY OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA by
Timothy Pitkin (N.H., 1828)
Vol. II, pp. 272-3

Patrick Henry

"Mr. Henry declared the new system produced 'a resolution as radical as that which separated us from Great Britain. It is as radical', he added, 'if in this transition, our rights and privileges are endangered, and the sovereignty of the states be relinquished; and cannot we plainly see that this is actually the case? The rights of conscience, trial by jury, liberty of the press, all your immunities and franchises, all pretensions to human rights and privileges are rendered insecure if not lost by this change, so loudly talked of by some, and inconsiderately by others. Is this tame relinquishment of rights worthy of freemen? Is it worthy of that manly fortitude that ought to characterize republicans? It is said that eight states have adopted this plan. I declare that if twelve states and a half had adopted it I would with manly firmness, and spite of an erring world, reject it.'"

The Constitution was

"a dark plot to establish a centralized despotism and
reduce the states to provinces."

"the President would become a monarch, perhaps worse
than George III."

"A device by which the rich and powerful would govern
the country and oppress the plain people with armies,
taxes and debts."

PAMPHLETS ON THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES, PUBLISHED
During Its Discussion By the
People 1787-1788
Paul Leicester Ford, Editor,
N.Y., 1888

p. 293

"Letters of the Federal Farmer" (Richard Harry Lee)
Letter II

". . . There is more reason to believe, that the general government, far removed from the people, and none of its members elected oftener than once in two years, will be forgot(15) or neglected, and its laws in many cases disregarded, unless a multitude of officers and military force be continually kept in view, and employed to enforce the execution of the laws, and to make the government feared and respected. No position can be truer than this. That in this country either neglected laws, or a military execution of them, must lead to a revolution, and to the destruction of freedom. Neglected laws must first lead to anarchy and confusion; and a military execution of laws is only a shorter way to the same point---despotic government."

PAMPHLETS ON THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES, Published
During Its Discussion By the
People 1787-1788
Paul Leicester Ford, Editor,
N.Y., 1888

p. 318

"Letters of the Federal Farmer" (Richard Harry Lee)
Letter IV

" . . . I am sensible, thousands of men in the United States, are disposed to adopt the proposed constitution, though they perceive it to be essentially defective, under an idea that amendments of it, may be obtained when necessary. This is a pernicious idea, it argues a servility of character totally unfit for the support of free government; it is very repugnant to that perpetual jealousy respecting liberty, so absolutely necessary in all free states, spoken of by Mr. Dickinson. . . ."

PAMPHLETS ON THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES, Published
During Its Discussion By the
People 1787-1788
Paul Leicester Ford, Editor,
N.Y., 1888

p. 332

"Objections of the Hon. George Mason"

". . . This government will commence in a moderate aristocracy;
it is at present impossible to foresee whether it will, in its
operation, produce a monarchy, or a corrupt oppressive aristocracy;
it will most probably vibrate some years between the two, and then
terminate in the one or the other."

Letter of Robert Yates and John Lansing to the Governor of New York 1787

"...We beg leave, briefly, to state some cogent reasons, which, among others, influenced us to decide against a consolidation of the states. These are reducible into two heads: --

1st, The limited and well-defined powers under which we acted, and which could not, on any possible construction, embrace an idea of such magnitude as to assent to a general constitution, in subversion of that of the state.

2nd. A conviction of the impracticability of establishing a general government, pervading every part of the United States, and extending essential benefits to all.

Our powers were explicit, and confined to the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation, and reporting such alterations and provisions therein, as should render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of government, and the preservation of the Union. . . .

Exclusive of our objections originating from the want of power, we entertained an opinion that a general government, however guarded by declarations of rights, or cautionary provisions, must unavoidably, in a short time, be productive of the destruction of the civil liberty of such citizens who could be effectually coerced by it, by reason of the extensive territory of the United States, the dispersed situation of its inhabitants, and the insuperable difficulty of controlling or counteracting the views of a set of men (however unconstitutional and oppressive their acts might be) possessed of all the powers of government, and who, from their remoteness from their constituents, and necessary permanency of office, could not be supposed to be uniformly actuated by an attention to their welfare and happiness: that, however wise and energetic the principles of the general government might be, the extremities of the United States could not be kept in due submission and obedience to its laws, at the distance of many hundred miles from the seat of government: that, if the general legislature was composed of so numerous a body of men as to represent the interests of all the inhabitants of the United States, in the usual and true ideas of representation, the expense of supporting it would become intolerably burdensome; and that, if a few only were vested with a power of legislation the interests of a great majority of the inhabitants of the United States must necessarily be unknown; or if known, even in the first stages of the operations of the new government, unattended to...."

In Massachusetts the opponents of the Constitution were as violent as elsewhere. For example, Barrell, a delegate to the ratification convention and Wait, ^{of Maine} an editor,:

"Barrell explained to Thatcher: "I see it (the Constitution) pregnant with the fate of our libertys ... I see it entails wretchedness on my posterity -- Slavery on my children; ... twill not be so much for our advantage to have our taxes imposed & levied at the pleasure of Congress as (by) the method now pursued ... a Continental Collector at the head of a standing army will not be so likely to do us justice in collecting the taxes ... I think such a Government impracticable among men with such high notions of liberty as we americans."

"To Thomas B. Wait it "was like the Thunder of Sinai -- its lightnings were irresistible" to him. He deplored the "darkness, duplicity and studied ambiguity ... running thro' the whole Constitution," which, to his mind, made it certain that "as it now stands but very few individuals do or ever will understand it The vast Continent of America cannot long be subjected to a Democracy if consolidated into one Government -- you might as well attempt to rule Hell by Prayer."

Fear of government separated from the people. George Mason of Virginia, one of the convention opponents expressed this fear:

".....Mason saw the most frightful dangers from the unlimited power of Congress over the ten miles square provided for the National Capital.

"This ten miles square," cried Mason, "may set at defiance the laws of the surrounding states, and may, like the custom of the superstitious days of our ancestors, become the sanctuary of the blackest crimes. Here the Federal Courts are to sit ... What sort of a jury shall we have within the ten miles square?" asked Mason and himself answered, "The immediate creatures of the government. What chance will poor men get? ... If an attempt should be made to establish tyranny over the people, here are ten miles square where the greatest offender may meet protection. If any of the officers or creatures (of the National Government) should attempt to oppress the people or should actually perpetrate the blackest deed, he has nothing to do but to get into the ten miles square."

Objections

A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES
Andrew C. McLaughlin (N.Y., 1935) p. 212.

"The single most serious objection, with the possible exception of the one just mentioned, (absence of a bill of rights) was the overthrow of the Confederation and the alleged complete 'consolidation' of the union. But there were many others: the reeligibility of the president and the danger of monarchy; the vast power of the president, who was neither checked nor assisted by a council; the treaty-making power of the president and the Senate, especially dwelt upon in Virginia and North Carolina; the power of the Senate and the length of the senatorial term; the authority of Congress over the seat of government; the power of Congress to regulate the time, place, and manner of electing representatives, a power which would be used to vex and enslave the people; the two-year term for representatives; the small number of representatives; the regulation of commerce; and the absence of provision for jury trial in civil cases. Even the vice-presidency -- though not receiving much attention-- was spoken of as a useless office. Patrick Henry, proclaiming the common detestation of slavery, but asserting the ruinous consequences of manumission, held up to view the awful thought that Congress, legislating for the common defense and general welfare, might call for the emancipation of the slaves."

Irony

"The enemies of the proposed plan for a National Government took the ground that it was being rushed through by the "aristocrats"; and the "Independent Gazetteer" published "The humble address of the low born of the United States of America, to their fellow slaves scattered throughout the world," which sarcastically pledged that "we, the low born, that is, all the people of the United States, except 600 or thereabouts, well born," would "allow and admit the said 600 well born immediately to establish and confirm this most noble, most excellent, and truly divine constitution."

pp. 328 and 329

William Pierce of Georgia said: "Some will oppose it from pride, some from self-interest, some from ignorance, but the greater number will be of that class who will oppose it from a dread of its swallowing up the individuality of the States."

"(Patrick) Henry's dislike of the whole document was so intense, if one may justly gather his opinion from the debates, that one has difficulty in seeing how he could give his adherence to ratification under any condition; but toward the end his chief demand was for the adoption of amendments before the acceptance of the Constitution."

Fear - Treaty making powers

A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES
Andrew C. McLaughlin (N.Y., 1935) p. 205.

"One subject of dispute -- the extent of the treaty-making power-- was particularly important in Virginia and added to the difficulty of securing ratification; the western part of the state feared that free navigation of the Mississippi would be surrendered or that some humiliating agreement with Spain would be entered into."

CORRESPONDENCE AND PUBLIC PAPERS OF
JOHN JAY, Vol. III, pp. 353-355
(Edited by Henry P. Johnston, 1891)

CIRCULAR LETTER FROM THE CONVENTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, TO THE EXECUTIVES
OF THE DIFFERENT STATES, TO BE LAID BEFORE THEIR RESPECTIVE LEGISLATURES
By John Jay

"Sir:

We, the members of the convention of this State, have deliberately and maturely considered the Constitution proposed for the United States.

Several articles in it appear so exceptionable to a majority of us, that nothing but the fullest confidence of obtaining a revision of them by a general convention, and an invincible reluctance to separating from our sister States, could have prevailed upon a sufficient number to ratify it, without stipulating for previous amendments.

We all unite in opinion that such a revision will be necessary to recommend it to the approbation and support of a numerous body of our constituents.

We observe that amendments have been proposed, and are anxiously desired by several of the States as well as by this, and we think it of great importance that effectual measures be immediately taken for calling a convention to meet at a period not far remote; for we are convinced, that the apprehensions and discontents which those articles occasion cannot be removed or allowed, unless an act to provide for it be among the first that shall be passed by the new Congress. . . .

Our attachment to our sister States, and the confidence we repose in them, cannot be more forcibly demonstrated than by acceding to a government which many of us think imperfect, and devolving the power of determining whether that government shall be rendered perpetual in its present form, or altered agreeable to our wishes or a minority of the States with whom we unite.....

By the unanimous order of the convention,

Geo. Clinton, President."

PAMPHLETS ON THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES, Published
During Its Discussion By the
People 1787-1788
Paul Leicester Ford, Editor, N.Y.
1888

p.6

"Observations By a Columbian Patriot" (Elbridge Gerry)

" . . . a Constitution, which, by the undefined meaning of some parts,
and the ambiguities of expression in others, is dangerously adapted to
the purposes of an immediate aristocratic tyranny; that from the diffi-
culty, if not impracticability of its operation, must soon terminate in
the most uncontrouled despotism. . . ."

Interpretation

The opponents of the Constitution interpreted many of the articles as designed to permit or accomplish the destruction of the people's liberties. For example the minority of the Pennsylvania Convention opposed to ratification drew up an "Address."

"The address recounts the violence by which the State Convention was called, "not many hours" after the "New Plan" had "issued forth from the womb of suspicious secrecy"; and reaffirms the people's ignorance of the Constitution, the trifling vote, the indecorous, hasty, "insulting" debate.....

"The powers given Congress would produce "one consolidated government, which, from the nature of things, will be an iron handed despotism"; the State Governments would be annihilated; the general welfare clause would justify anything which "the will and pleasure of congress" dictated; that National body, "with complete and unlimited power over the purse and the sword," could by taxation "command the whole or any part of the property of the people" — imposts, land taxes, poll taxes, excises, duties — every kind of tax on every possible species of property and written instrument could be laid by the "monster" of National power. By the Judiciary provided in the Constitution "the rich and wealthy suitors would eagerly lay hold of the infinite mazes, perplexities and delays ... and the poor man being plunged in the bottomless pit of legal discussion" could not get justice."

Different interpretations

Madison, Hamilton, Oliver Ellsworth and others argued that the Constitution gave the Supreme Court the right of judicial review of legislation. Machinery to put this into effect was set up in the Judiciary Act of 1789. But Justice Chase in *Hylton v. United States* in 1796 implies that it is not clear whether the Supreme Court has the power to declare an Act of Congress unconstitutional. He said he would not use that power except in the most obvious case.

Morison & Commager, p. 130

Interpretation

The Contest over the Ratification of
the Federal Constitution in
Massachusetts.
S. B. Harding (N. Y. 1896)
pp 37-39

Thomas Wait insisted that since no one could or ever would understand what the Constitution meant--- "Congress will be its own interpreter." For instance, take the article on taxation and representation: This, he maintained, was a 'puzzling cap.' If by all other persons it meant slaves, who in the name of God but the majority of that hon. body would ever have thought of expressing like ideas in like words!"

Interpretation

A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES
Andrew C. McLaughlin (N.Y., 1935)
231-33

On the question of establishing a national bank in 1791, there was a sharp division of opinion as to the constitutionality of the Bank.

Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, using a liberal interpretation of the Constitution, maintained that there was constitutional justification for establishing a Bank.

Jefferson, his chief political opponent, said that the Constitution should be interpreted strictly and that there was no clause in the Constitution warranting the establishment of the Bank.

The arguments were as follows:

Jefferson

The 10th Amendment restricts the powers of Congress to those which have been delegated, and there is no power delegated in the Constitution to Congress to establish a Bank.

It could not be included under the general welfare clause as this give Congress power to impose taxes for the general welfare and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the enumerated powers.

Necessary and proper clause does not include establishing a Bank because all enumerated powers could be carried out without establishing a Bank.

Hamilton

He maintained that "every power vested in a government is in its nature sovereign and includes, by force of the term, a right to employ all the means requisite and fairly applicable to the attainment of the ends of such power, and which are not precluded by restrictions and exceptions specified in the Constitution, or not immoral, or not contrary to the essentials ends of political society."

Sovereign power certainly includes power to erect corporations.

"necessary" often means no more than needful, requisite, incidental, useful, or conducive to...."

THE HOOVER LIBRARY ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE
AND HOOVER RESEARCH INSTITUTE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA



H. H. FISHER, *Chairman*
Professor of History

NINA ALMOND, *Librarian and*
Consultant in Research

May 30, 1945

DIRECTORS

J. S. DAVIS
Director of Food
Research Institute

HERBERT HOOVER, *Founder*

RALPH H. LUTZ
Professor of History and
Dean of Graduate Study

E. G. MEARS
Professor of Geography
and International Trade

EDGAR RICKARD
Chairman, Belgian American
Educational Foundation

E. E. ROBINSON
Margaret Byrne Professor
of American History

GRAHAM STUART
Professor of Political Science

ROBERT E. SWAIN
Professor of Chemistry,
Emeritus

ALONZO E. TAYLOR
Director of Food Research
Institute, Emeritus

DONALD B. TRESIDDER
President of Stanford University

NATHAN VAN PATTEN
Director of University Libraries

RAY LYMAN WILBUR
Chancellor of Stanford University

TO: Commander Stassen

FROM: H. H. Fisher

Criticism of the Paris Peace Conference 1919

There were several types of criticism of the Paris Conference.

1. There was criticism of the way in which the treaty was negotiated. It was not according to Wilson's "open covenants openly arrived at." It was worked out secretly by the Big Four, not democratically, etc.

2. Isolationists said it was another example of European power politics, dividing the spoils, and so forth. Some of this group concentrated on the handing over to Japan of the German holdings in the Shantung Peninsula.

3. Some liberals claimed that Wilson had given up his ideals, made compromises with power politicians, etc., that the treaty was unjust and that it imposed such burdens on Germany that it would be unworkable.

Examples of these different types of criticism are attached.

HHF)fs

1. Criticism of method, secrecy, etc.

Secrecy

"Nothing can be worse for the prospects of the coming Conference," said Lord Northcliffe, "than an atmosphere of secrecy and half truths. Yet up to the present there has been no official statement that the momentous meetings about to take place will be held in accordance with President Wilson's expressed views on the question of open diplomacy.

"The days of secret conclaves are dead and gone. Clandestine assemblies are the harbingers of intrigue, suspicion, and possible deception. It would be intolerable that the fate of whole nations, great and small, should be decided in secret.....

"We, having learned enough of the evil of secrecy during the last four and a half years, therefore are alarmed at rumours which have not yet been officially contradicted, that the doings of the Peace Conference are to be wrapped in a black cloak of silence.

"So far as the United States is concerned, I have been assured that neither the French nor American Governments will exercise any control over the cables conveying news of the proceedings in the Conference, except such amount of control as is inecessary in rationing to each newspaper and news distribution agency, made obligatory by the fact that the Atlantic cables already are loaded beyond their capacity."

New York World, December 20, 1918

Secrecy

"Neither Mr. Lloyd George nor M. Clemenceau nor Signor Orlando stands for open discussion of peace terms, nor do they appear to have been affected in the least by such protests as those of the British Labour Party, or of Labour and Socialist forces elsewhere, against the course which is being pursued. Even Mr. Wilson can no longer be counted among the supporters of open diplomacy; for while he is indeed reported to have expressed a wish for open discussion at the conference, he not only has taken no steps, so far as the public knows, to make his wish effective, but is himself holding private conferences daily with the representatives of other Governments regarding their respective claims and their attitude toward his own supposed programme....

"There is only one course that can save Mr. Wilson and his policies. That is to insist upon the immediate abandonment and repudiation of the Treaty of London and the whole baneful structure of secret negotiations and private understandings; and, failing that, to appeal to the peoples against their Governments. Unless this is done, the people who now look to Mr. Wilson will before long look to themselves."

Nation, December 28, 1918

Big Four Secret Decisions

N.Y. Times, April 5, 1919, 2.

G.H.Perris

Paris, April 3. -- Serious observers of the different types of thought and interest agree in feeling lively anxiety about the Conference. Day after day the chief statesmen continue their secret palavers....

What is the matter with the Conference? Many writers have sought to answer this question. Generally the reply has been either that the leaders have fallen into mistaken methods of work, or that they have lost touch with the fundamental necessities of the case. ~~And~~ that is to say, the case of the particular country to which the writer belongs....

...I venture to state frankly my own impression of the real trouble is that in arbitrarily turning the Conference into a junta, the three major statesmen have lost something of the force of the democratic brotherhood of alliance which alone could give life to the respective formulae they keep on repeating to each other in their private chambers....

Slowness - Bickerings

N.Y. Times, March 26, 1919, 14
Editorial

"...xxIf any fervor of appeal, any sharpness of admonition, any severity of censure, can move the Peace Conference to diligence and speed, civilized mankind will be justified in using one or all together upon its dilatory agents at Paris. Stop your bickerings and make peace, should be the command. It is encouraging to hear Mr. WILSON make an urgent plea for haste....The Paris Congress disputes and gets nowhere.... No one nation is responsible, but all those represented at this Conference...."

CRITICISM of Wilson by Conservatives.

"Among the opponents of President Wilson's action in the British press we find his consistent critic, the London Morning Post, ascribing to him "Wild-West diplomacy," while it adds caustically: Mr. Wilson's name among the Allies is like that of the rich uncle, and they have accepted his manners out of respect for his means." The London Express charges the President with "plunging the Conference into a profoundly stupid tragedy by rushing into the arena waving the red flag." His action is described as "open diplomacy gone mad," and it adds that as Premier Orlando has gone home, "we commend his example to Mr. Wilson."

2. Power politics, isolationism, etc.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org