

Now this Council is controlled by the inter-allied powers. It consists of ten members, of which four are the permanent representatives of the four great powers—France, Britain, Italy, and Japan—and six are non-permanent, elected by the Assembly. Of the four great powers, three are involved in the coalition—Great Britain alone may be regarded as entirely free from French influence. The six non-permanent seats on the Council are today held by Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Spain and Brazil, (all members of the interlocking alliance) and Sweden and Uruguay, independent states. Thus seven of the ten seats of the Council are today held by members of the interlocking alliance within the League.

Now we understand that the Council cannot act save by the unanimous vote of its members; but weak, independent members of the Council, such as Uruguay and Sweden, cannot hope to hold out against the combined moral force of the powerful members of the alliance. Greece and China, when members of the Council, refused to co-operate; they were replaced by nations who could be counted on to offer no resistance to the allied plans. Great Britain herself, the only independent nation of consequence holding a seat in the Council, has not once seen fit to resist these Allied Powers in any matter of importance. Consequently, the policies of the Council have invariably been determined by the members of the interlocking alliance, and the Council has, from the first, been entirely dominated by the allied group.

Now, controlling the Council, the real governing body of the League of Nations, the inter-allied powers unquestionably govern the League. The council dominated by the alliance acts for the league exactly as the allied nations direct. The league today is governed absolutely by the powerful members of the interlocking alliance.

Moreover, the members of this alliance are making use of the league to advance their own selfish interests. Consider, for instance, the matter of territorial aggressions. Your attention has been called by the first speaker for the affirmative, to the eight outstanding cases of territorial aggression, invasion and war—the Polish invasion of Russia; the Serbian occupation of Albania; the Italian seizure of Fiume; the Polish seizure of Vilna; the Turkish war in Greece; the French occupation of the Ruhr; the Lithuanian seizure of Memel; and finally the Italian bombardment of Corfu.

It is interesting to note that of the eight cases of invasion six were committed by definite members of the inter-alliance which controls the League, Italy having been twice the aggressor, Poland twice and France and Jugo-Slavia once each. In the seventh case of aggression, the offending state was Lithuania, not a direct member of the alliance, but bound to France by debts. And in the eighth case of aggression, Turkey, the offending state, was not a formal member of the coalition but was the traditional ally of France. So in every one of the eight outstanding cases of covenant violation, the aggressor state was directly or indirectly involved in the alliance. Now did the League fulfill its obligation to prevent the aggression, and punish the invading states? Not in a single instance. The Council, controlled by the inner alliance, refused to take action against members of that alliance in any one of the eight cases of aggression. The League refused to act, for by this refusal, the interests of the inter-allied powers within the League were advanced.

Now let us consider those cases in which the League has acted. In every single case of league action, the same thing is true—the action in some manner or other directly benefitted the great powers which control the League, or injured the foes of these powers. In the Aaland Island settlement, the League awarded the disputed islands to Finland as against the claims of Sweden. It is interesting to note that Sweden was not connected with any of the great powers of the alliance in any way—while Finland was created by the powers, and has been from the begin-



ning financed by French capital. Again, in the dispute over Vilna, involving Poland and Lithuania, Poland, a member of the inner alliance, was awarded the city, though it was the ancient capital of Lithuania, at that time a non-participant in the alliance. Lithuania, however, was later involved in the group by means of a loan from the French government.

In the third case of League adjustment, Upper Silicia was awarded to Poland, a member of the inner alliance, though a plebiscite was actually taken by the League, and resulted in an overwhelming vote in favor of Germany. In the fourth instance, that of the Greek-Albanian boundary dispute, Northern Epirus was awarded to Albania, another member of the interlocking alliance, though the inhabitants are Greek in both language and sentiment. Again, the Council permitted and ratified the seizure by Lithuania of the German city of Memel. Lithuania at that time being bound up in the interests of the alliance by a French loan. Again, when the Poles invaded Russia, the Council was urged to interfere; but refused to take action—Poland was a member of the alliance.

And finally, in the Corfu incident, Italy, the aggressor state, but one of the members of the inner alliance, received practically every demand made against Greece; and in spite of the fact that it was Italy, not Greece, which had violated the League Covenant, the League confirmed the settlement. In the light of these facts, there can be no doubt whatever but that the League has always acted when it has been to the interests of the inner alliance of powers to act—but has remained passive when such inaction was desired by the powers.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the light of these facts, there can certainly be no question but that the League of Nations is today controlled by a combination of countries, who have not accepted in the slightest degree the League's principles of idealism, but are governed by selfishness, greed and nationalistic ambition; and who have repeatedly used the league machinery to aid in the attainment of their own selfish desires. Such a league, ladies and gentlemen, the United States should not enter.

## SECOND NEGATIVE SPEAKER

MR. J. D. WOODRUFF  
OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have had to admire the variety with which the American audience passes a pleasing evening. Particularly in connection with another subject, prohibition—we were told if we wished to see variety, to wait until we got to Kansas. I assure you that we have this evening a very different atmosphere than one which might be expected in a university whose football team has just won a crucial battle.

Generally, as I have said, we are talking on more intimate subjects, and we have had it flung in our faces that we are a wicked, selfish people. That is the charge against which we have to defend. And that is the very charge which we are able to bring tonight against the American nation; that the policy which the American people have followed has been a policy which rather lets down the other countries of the world.

Thus far tonight I expect you have noticed that all of the speeches have been very eloquently designed to bring out the idea that things in Europe are in an exceedingly bad way; that the statesmen and people of Europe are exceedingly given to selfish ends, and I think any idea that the Americans are simpletons can be safely banished by the calculating suspicion and convert way in which the cards are stacked against us. And before leaving that subject I will say that I am exceedingly embarrassed as a result of seven days' labor\*—only one day longer than it took

\*Referring to time available for preparation to Kansas debaters.



to make the world, and I now know what is meant by "American hustle."

While I am the last person to come to this continent and say that America is to blame, it is perfectly true that for some reason or other, international politics is more or less of a jumble. I think that my friends are perfectly right in suspecting all the nations of the world, for when a man comes and says that he wants to bury the hatchet, it probably means that he has an axe to grind. Such a natural handicap is intensified in the case of my own country by the fact that Lloyd George who has directed our policies, had a large part in it; but if it is true that things were done in the making of peace which were to all fair minded people reprehensible, we think we should forget them. They say that it is a wise child that knows its own father, but the Lloyd George gentleman has disappeared, and Mr. George may take rank as a man of mystery; and when we talk of the League of Nations in the future we will hope it may lead a very useful life, although at the time it must be admitted that it betrays certain weaknesses—that is to say, all these weaknesses have been very prominent in the past and probably will be in the future. All these governments, however, will have their statesmen, and maybe you had better deal with them openly in Geneva than in conferences behind closed doors.

Rather more criticism is directed against the determined attitude of the French. Well, the French are suffering from a very severe attack of nerves. Their population is getting smaller and smaller, while that of their hereditary enemies is getting larger and larger, and they hope to make up by an abundance of caution their lack of men.

That is the very thing we tried to get the Americans to say with us. We wanted a grand consolidation of the nations of Europe, but we got a few gentle digs in the ribs as a reminder that there were certain sums of money still outstanding.

After all, the League of Nations is what it calls itself—a League of Nations. That is to say, it is nothing new. It is just a way of behaving which is only valuable as it is used, and is only valuable in proportion as it is used by those nations which can speak with authority. It is an idle dream to think that Europe is a place where you can visit, whose incompetent, inefficient people cannot make their own lives worth living. I should be the last to destroy the case that the other side has built up, but there is not much more basis to the argument than the fact that Europeans are an unhappy people, unable to get on with the main business of life and the protection and enjoyment of wealth. All that is upheld by their failure to get straight politically. It is the mere poverty that is produced by a failure to do business. Although we were not thinking of pity when we came here, we think there is need for pity on your side for the conditions which will continue from generation to generation unless some solution is discovered for the political ills of Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, after the Chairman had made what I thought was a rather unfortunate remark that the speakers here were not content to speak for a lesser period than an hour each, I want to keep check on myself. (Speaker consults his watch). I neglected to look at this when I began. In the course of my remarks I am only going to make one last point, and that is this: We could spend this evening quibbling over the particular decisions which the League has made; many of them, as we think, extremely valuable; others doubtful. We could follow that, but it would not be of very much benefit without a map of Europe, and this (referring to back-drop) is a rather idealized picture of the map of Europe at this time. I will admit that things are in a terrible condition, and there is a great deal of chicanery and greed going on in Europe; but the reason for this trouble is that Europe is largely an armed camp



because the peace was largely a failure, and for that failure the American people cannot escape a large portion of the responsibility.

You abandoned the Monroe Doctrine when you came into the War, and your present attitude is to drop out of European affairs when it is impossible for your idealistic impressions to take sovereign sway.

The oldest trouble in Europe is the trouble between France and Germany, and that will be only settled in proportion as the new spirit, that of the League of Nations comes to prevail over the old spirit. Half of the trouble is that the old spirit has prevailed over the new spirit of publicity and open-handed talk at Geneva. Publicity is a great thing; but they simply haven't got the faith to come open handed into a full assembly of all nations of the world. The third speaker on our side will go into these details, but I will repeat that the main reason is a change, and a simple one.

America's responsibility is being enforced by its interests. Mr. Borah makes this point when he states that American industries are looking more and more to Europe for their markets. You are producing more and more goods, and for those goods you need a market, and when you think you are injuring strangers, they often prove to be your children. There were a people to whom a stranger came and made advances towards them. They came at night into his room and fell upon him in the dark; but in the daylight they discovered he was their own child, returned. The moral is, that you think your interests can be separated from those of the European people, while reason says they cannot. I thank you for your attention.

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER

MR. ROBERT E. HEDBERG

K. S. A. C.

Gentlemen of the Negative, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

So far in the debate this evening, the gentlemen from Oxford have done a great deal of jesting at the expense of our arguments against the League of Nations. We realize that America's entrance into the League is not a matter of tremendous importance to the rest of the world; but to us in America, it involves our future welfare as one of the leading powers of the world; and while our arguments seem to merit only humor from the gentlemen of the Negative, we are presenting and will continue to present the facts which we have collected, which we believe will portray the League in its true light.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, let us consider, just for a few moments, some of the arguments which have been advanced by the gentlemen from Oxford. The first speaker, Mr. Hollis, told you something of Article Five of the Covenant, which provides that in order to take any action, the League must have the unanimous assent of all its members. Now we are not basing our argument primarily on the Covenant and its weaknesses; we are basing our argument on the lack of good faith of the nations adhering to the League; but at the same time, this very clause in the League covenant which the gentleman has mentioned is a striking evidence of the League's inability to do anything that is contrary to the interests of the members of this inner alliance which we have mentioned. If the alliance can get that unanimity which is necessary for the League to take action, then the influence of the alliance is far too strong within the League for us to safely enter it; while on the other hand the necessity for unanimity on the part of the League before action can be taken would make it absolutely impossible for the League to take action against this inner alliance for



its violations of the spirit which the League is supposed at least, to represent.

The gentlemen have stated that the United States is selfish, because it has not joined the League. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that you will approve of my statements when I say that the United States has not been guilty of selfishness in international affairs; but has done her part on every occasion and in every action that helped promote the betterment of the world. Perhaps, as the gentlemen infer, we stayed out of the League in 1919 for reasons that were wholly political; but in the light of the present-day development of the League, it seems quite evident that we took the course that was best; and I believe that you will agree with me that we are glad that today we stand outside the League, and not inside.

The gentlemen have questioned the accuracy of our arguments with respect to the Serbian invasion of Albania, stating that the mere threat of League action brought about the immediate evacuation of Albanian territory by the Serbs. Possibly the gentlemen are right; but permit me to call to your attention the account of the same incident given in the League of Nations Handbook, issued by the League of Nations Non Partisan Association last year. The Association is strongly in favor of American entrance into the League, and can hardly be expected to represent the actions of the League in a light any more unfavorable than necessary. But their publication states that the Prime Minister of Albania informed the League on March 5th, 1921, that Serbian troops had occupied Albanian territory, and asked for League action. None was forthcoming. So on April 29th, Albania again notified the League that their territory was occupied by Serbian troops, and requested the League to take some action. Again, the League ignored the plea, not even replying. So for the third time, on June 15th, Albania again appealed to the League. This time the League Council notified Albania that they considered it inadvisable for the League to consider the case, but that the Council of Ambassadors might act upon it. Meantime, the Serbian troops were still occupying the Albanian territory. So after waiting for three months longer, Albania appealed to the Assembly of the League, upon its meeting in September. Remember, this was six months after the affair was first reported to the League, and the fourth time that the League had been notified. So this time, the League acted. The Assembly requested the Council to appoint a Commission; the Council appointed the Commission, on October 6th—and the following April, the commission made its report—thirteen months after Albania had first complained to the League. Ladies and gentlemen, these are the facts in the case; instead of the Serbian troops being withdrawn the next day, as the gentleman from Oxford has stated, they remained in Albanian territory for more than a year. And my statement is based on pro-League authority, hardly capable of any accusation of prejudice against the League.

Now, from the arguments so far presented, it is evident that the League of Nations is not the idealistic organization that it is represented as being. The gentlemen from Oxford have not for a minute contended that the nations of Europe which compose and control the League are not selfish and nationalistic—they admit by inference at least, the truth of our contentions. We have told you how the nations are banded together in alliances for the realization of their selfish ends; that the League is hardly an organization of nations that are seeking to benefit the world, but a group of selfish, greedy powers. And the gentlemen have not dared to state that the nations are not selfish.

Should the United States enter the League, it is clear that we would be obliged to surrender a considerable portion of our national sovereignty; that we would be compelled to accept the dictation of a group



that we know to be controlled by an interlocking alliance of selfish nations that would discriminate against America if justice to this nation conflicted with their own selfish interests. Let us consider just how great would be this surrender of American sovereignty, should America enter the League.

Five years ago, when the League was first established, a permanent commission on disarmament was formed for the purpose of outlining a plan for the general reduction of arms. At the fifth assembly of the League on September 24, of this year, this commission submitted a report in the form of a protocol, the purpose of which was to employ the element of compulsory arbitration in all international controversies. Article Three of this protocol declares that the signators are committed to the compulsory arbitration clause of the World Court. Either party may submit the dispute and compel the other to arbitrate. Once an award is made it is binding to both parties and in case it is not accepted the offending state is declared an aggressor and by Article Seven "sanctions provided for by the Covenant are applicable against it." Article Sixteen of the Covenant defines these sanctions as "the prohibition of all intercourse between the nationals of the League and the nationals of the Covenant-breaking state." Furthermore, "that it shall be the duty of the Council to recommend what military, naval, or air force, the members of the League shall contribute toward the enforcement of these sanctions."

Now, at the very time the League was considering the adoption of this protocol, Japanese feeling was at its height toward America's new immigration bill. Seeing her opportunity to incorporate into the protocol a measure that would possibly defeat America's purpose, Japan proposed an amendment to Article Eight. This measure states that "should one of the parties contend that the dispute arises out of a matter which by International Law is solely within the jurisdiction of the party, the arbitrators shall take the advice of the Permanent Court of International Justice." Moreover, "that the opinion of the court shall be binding upon the arbitrators." This simply means that any nation that could convince the Council that her grievance against another nation was justified, could force the offending nation to accept any terms the Court stipulated.

The amendment and the protocol were signed by forty-seven of the fifty-four League members, a majority that includes every one of the members of the alliances that control the League. As soon as the protocol is ratified it will be applicable to all members.

It naturally follows then, that any nation participating in the League today, must surrender to the League, not only those questions arising over international affairs, but the control of domestic questions as well. In other words, the proposed protocol will give to a body of scheming selfish nations power to override the provisions of international law itself.

Now let us consider the position of America, were she to enter the League, assume its responsibilities and support its protocol. Probably our most important current consideration is that raised by the provision of the Johnson Immigration Bill which excludes the Japanese from the United States. When this measure was discussed in Congress and finally passed, Japanese feeling was raised to a white heat against us as we have already stated. Japanese cities were alive with posters of denunciation. Oriental merchants boycotted American goods. Some sections even prohibited the reading of American newspapers. This feeling was shared by the Japanese government, which, while not daring to make a direct objection, carried the matter to the League in the form of their amendment. Now, if America entered the League, this amendment would make it possible for the Court to review her domestic affairs and at the



suggestion of Japan, pass judgment upon her immigration policy. Now with European states none too friendly as a result of their heavy debts to the United States, and especially with the nations of Europe closely joined to Japan in this interlocking alliance, we could hardly hope for the Council of the League to find any justification in our policy; and America would be confronted by the choice of being thrown open to a great influx of Oriental immigration, or going to war against the entire League, including every other nation in the world.

Not only would the League have power to determine our immigration policy, but its jurisdiction would extend over other domestic questions as well. The League could easily decide that our tariff system needed revision and take action that would seriously effect American Industry. International shipping could be controlled by the League if any nation wished to bring the matter up for consideration. Alien rights could be dictated and our entire domestic regulations would no longer be ours to determine.

Now with it entirely possible for the League to have such an enormous power over American domestic affairs, we must remember that the Council is controlled by selfish, ambitious alliances and that the powers that control the Council rule the League. We can only conclude that we can hope for little understanding or approval from Europe. Yet the gentlemen from England would have us enter a League which they themselves do not deny to be composed of selfish, scheming nations, and surrender our sovereignty to such an organization.

We would naturally suppose that the gentlemen of the opposition would possibly represent unofficially, the attitude of Great Britain, even as we believe we are expressing the general sentiment of the United States. It is with some surprise that we read in the current issue of the Review of Reviews that "the address of the British Premier at the opening session of the fifth Assembly of the League is especially significant in that it discloses with crystal like accuracy, the break between the British and the Continental point of view." This article was written by Feank H. Simonds who goes on to say, "Premier MacDonald's speech is little more than a restatement of the very reasons for which the American people refused to enter the League in 1919, a vigorous objection to the use of the military sanctions provided for in the protocol sanctions which must lead to war. Apparently Britain and America stand together in their views of the League of Nations. Now if this is the attitude of Great Britain, we can hardly see how the gentlemen of the opposition can advocate American entrance into a League that their own country is on the verge of denouncing.

In the face Premier MacDonald's denunciation of the League's present policy, can the gentlemen from England possibly contend that America's place is in the League? Can they show us wherein Britain, for centuries the strongest nation in the world, has been able to turn the League from its unreasonable purpose? Can the gentleman convince us that the states of Europe have departed from their paths of greed and nationalism? Can they explain any worthy objective of the alliances within the League? Can they deny the existence of these alliances? Can they justify the element of force in the protocol of the attitude of Japan in amending it? If the protocol is defeated is there even then any hope for any different course from that followed for the last five years? Do the gentlemen dare advocate the entrance of America into a League that their own country cannot approve of?

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a great need today for some organization that can answer the world cry for peace but the League of Nations is not that organization. We have offered it to you we believe, in its true light. We have traced from the very beginning, the elements of greed and nationalism that dominate it. We have pointed out inner



alliances whose existence cannot be denied and we have enumerated forty-seven instances of the League deciding in their favor. We have explained the proposed protocol which would take from us even the right to define our own domestic affairs and would involve a surrender of our national sovereignty. If America must unite with someone for world peace, we had better consider some super alliance with Great Britain, a kindred nation who can no more approve of the League's policies than can we. But certainly these facts are sufficient to convince you that this house should approve America's refusal to join the League of Nations.

### THIRD NEGATIVE SPEAKER

#### MR. MALCOLM MACDONALD OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, my Friends of the Opposition, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

I confess that I hardly would have dared to come before you this evening, had you lost this afternoon's game. Before I went on the field I began to wonder what on earth I could tell you about the League of Nations that would console you under those distressing circumstances; but I assure you that my cares were lifted from my shoulders when I got up in the high seat. There was no doubt from the first minute who was going to win in the end.

It is very pleasant indeed to come to Manhattan personally and debate, and to see a fine game like that—and I also congratulate you on the extraordinary subsequent procedure, for had we had a victory like that at Oxford, we could not hold a debate within a week, a fortnight, or a month. I think you have shown a great deal of restraint. I wish we could have some of those cheer leaders and those two rival bands, but I would like to have seen some bagpipes, as well. I think that is a little clan of Scots over there. Under such circumstances I believe we might be able to make speeches on this side which would bring you a little more to our point of view, and the point of view of our friends and your friends in Europe.

My friend from the other side of the house has told you a great deal about the selfishness of the countries which went into the League of Nations. That is partly true; but the only thing I can say in reply is, that the greater part of the accusation is unfounded. The last speaker talked of the selfishness of the nations going into the League, and then went on to make one of the most selfish speeches on behalf of America to which it has been my privilege to listen. "We must not enter the League of Nations because the whole spirit of the League is on the side of the Japanese." That is purely a selfish construction. I am afraid my good friends have lost a little of the idealism and the faith which people in Britain and France and Germany and Italy and Belgium believed they had. These nations have not lost their faith in that idealism, or I assure you there would be no League of Nations today.

It is a little difficult, after traveling in America and receiving the whole-hearted and spontaneous hospitality that has been accorded us, not to wish that that friendly hospitality could not be interpreted along a larger way of helping us in the League of Nations.

My friend spent a great deal of time telling you how the League had been defied in the bombardment of Corfu, and other instances of that kind. I can tell you quite frankly that the greatest blow that it ever received was when the United States refused to enter it. I can assure you, as one who was in Europe at that time, that Europe was never in



such depths of despair during the War as they were when they learned that the United States was not to join.

But we are not here to reprimand you for your actions. The League of Nations was certainly an ideal, and it was perfectly plain from the beginning that there would be mistakes, and mistakes and mistakes. That doesn't mean, however, that the people who are concerned should shed their responsibility. The speaker has said that America has done a great deal since the War to help the world. I agree. America has been generous and high-minded in relief work; but those things are outside of the main issue which we are discussing,—they want to know about the bombardment of Corfu. Why didn't Britain make a protest against that? She had a seat on the Council. Was not America's attitude in staying out of the League of Nations of greater influence in not stopping the bombardment of Corfu, than Great Britain's was? Has America's staying out of the League had any effect in making possible these eight or nine instances for which the gentlemen blame the League? America's attitude has been just as vital as any action of the League of Nations.

The speeches which my friends delivered, described with a great deal of accuracy the selfishness, a certain amount of militarism and a good deal of hatred among the European nations. That is one of the great arguments for a strengthened League of Nations. The object of the League and the view in which it was received was this; that it was going to be a kind of world-organization for the maintenance of peace. My friend said it was strictly a European affair. I would remind him that its greatest strength came from American capitalists. We know quite well that the old methods of preserving peace have failed utterly. Having no world-understanding, no world machinery to which world difficulties could be brought, and as a result of that absence the allowing of the world to be ruled by alliances here and there—one military camp opposed to another military camp—resulted in the state of finances in my country today. The nation's budget comes to about eight hundred million pounds, and of that, six hundred millions go to pay for the last war and to prepare for the next one. This large expenditure for war material and war debts is a very shocking waste of human energy and activity and should make people consider seriously an unselfish League of Nations.

We are told that it has failed again and again; but no one has referred to its successes. In the first place, we are told that the League had nothing to say when Poland marched into Vilna. If the League hadn't very effectively intervened, the Poles would have marched very much further. The Poles were stopped from going further than Vilna, and finally retreated from Vilna altogether. We are told that the League was ineffective in stopping Jugo-Slavia's invasion of Albania. Mr. Lloyd George sent a telegram to the League of Nations saying, "Jugo-Slavia has invaded Albania," and calling for the use of the economic forces of the League; and within a few hours afterwards, the Jugo Slavian army was withdrawn back within its boundaries. A very good example of the prevention of war, which could not have been had there been no League of Nations, was in the question between Finland and Sweden over the Aaland Islands. In the question of Silesia, we admit that this settlement was very bad. It left dissatisfaction; and yet it was far better than the best that could have been effected by any other means. It prevented a war; it got the difficulty over with peace, and it left the people for a certain period, at any rate, during which they cooled down. You have international accord set up at a later date by the League of Nations in the settlement of a very nasty difference of opinion when the French tried to conscript British subjects in the Moorish provinces, and it averted a possible war between Great Britain and France. Those two

443



selfish nations said, "We will leave it to the League of Nations," and the League made a decision which Great Britain and France both accepted. There are examples of the successful work created by the League of Nations.

We are again told that the League of Nations is made up of nations who are selfish. I had the privilege of meeting many statesmen at the London Conference. I had the pleasure of meeting His Excellency, the American Ambassador. He would not tell you that his colleagues during that critical month were selfish people, and that France was the head of this great selfish alliance. Somewhat selfish they may be. I do not know what my people at home would say to me if I made that concession in the interests of European interests. France, whom we have heard belabored this evening, has made many sacrifices during the last six months, and if my friend will stop reading the articles of Mr. Simonds, which were quite true of conditions in the early part of 1924, he will find out that the spirit of Europe has changed very much in the last six months, and that those nations need America to come in and help them.

They are making mistakes. They are groping their way. They are trying, against the very greatest difficulties, to make this machine a success. France is coming into the Disarmament Conference next July, and I wish the American people would keep their faith and say, "All hope is not dead, nor does it sleep; wrong does fail, right prevails, peace on earth, good-will towards men."

### FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

MR. MALCOLM MAC DONALD  
OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am afraid this is a rather sudden re-appearance; but I thought I would give you just a look at something you don't see in America, and that is "a double shot of Scotch." I should like to express again my delight in coming to Manhattan this evening and meeting in debate the Manhattan students. We have been here about three weeks, and have debated a great many of your domestic and international problems, and whatever the results may have been, we have been very far from losers by reason of these discussions. We have had most interesting discussion all the way between New York and Manhattan. Our understanding has been increased tremendously, our friendship has been added to considerably, and it is a great pleasure to add to our list of American friends some people in Manhattan and in the Kansas State Agricultural College. We have enjoyed very much the kindly hospitality which has been extended to us here.

Our friends, in their speeches, have limited their criticism of the League of Nations to matters that have to do with international affairs. That kind of activity by no means exhausts the activities of the League of Nations. The League of Nations, through effective organization in Geneva, has been able to do a great deal of humane work. It has been able to bring relief to war ravages; to relieve famine in Russia. It has carried on very good work in connection with the White Slave traffic. It has done a great deal in rescuing European citizens in trouble in Eastern countries. Every day, the League of Nations has been carrying on useful work in many directions. You cannot ignore that good work which is done quietly and unpretentiously every day.

My friend suggests that America's entrance means the surrender of her sovereignty. I do not think that, when I find that Chief Justice



Taft, Ex-Senator Wright and every judge and solicitor in the country disagrees with that argument. Mr. Chief Justice Taft says that by entering the League we would not surrender one iota of our sovereignty. We don't have to go to Mr. Taft to find that out. They say America would lose her sovereignty by being compelled to take military action in matters in which she had no interest. Military action cannot be authorized by the Council until it comes by unanimous decision of the members of that Council. America's seat at the Council table is empty. You will find an empty seat at Geneva which is ready whenever America wishes to come in. Therefore, America is standing alone against economic progress. Economic progress is held up by America. It would give America increased power over that which she has wielded in the affairs of the world.

My friend says that Britain has introduced six members into the League of Nations, and that the British Empire is seeking to turn the League of Nations into an instrument for her own good. They have that argument both ways. One said that the real part of the League of Nations was the Council, and the Assembly had no power at all. I answer him with his own argument, and say that these six members are on the Assembly, which has nothing to do with it on his own statement; and that Canada has no more authority in the League of Nations than would Panama, Cuba, and so on, and the British Empire has but one representative on a par with other nations.

I still want to know, after listening for three quarters of an hour to descriptive speeches of the terrible conditions in Europe which have been continually raised in argument—and now, getting back to another World War—I want to know from the people who described that deplorable condition, what are you going to do about it unless you can get all nations to make an agreement for a machine of peace? That machine of peace cannot be effective unless it has the power and authority of the greatest nations in the world; and all we wish is that one of the greatest nations of the world would add its authority to that of the other nations—to that machine of peace, imperfect as it may be, but which is, notwithstanding, just beginning to prove its worth. To use an old English motto: "Half a loaf is better than no bread." No nation is able to shed its responsibility because its ideals are touched at the first start. We knew that the League of Nations would fail again and again unless it has the backing of the great moral powers of the world behind it. Our plea is that the League of Nations should be supported by America. The League would gain only by the adherence to it of that nation which today probably carries the greatest moral authority in the affairs of the world.

### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

MR. ROBERT E. HEDBERG  
K. S. A. C.

During the course of the debate, our opponents have very frequently accused us of making statements that we did not make. For instance, they stated that we objected to England and her dominions having six votes in the League assembly. Our argument was not in opposition to the British possessions having six votes—it was simply that England would not enter unless that concession were made here. Again, the gentlemen persist in answering objections that we are supposed to have made to the Covenant of the League. Our argument is not against the Covenant, but against the things that the League has done and those it has failed to do; and against the spirit which is controlling the nations which compose and control the League.



Now, the gentlemen tell us that many authorities on international affairs, say that America could enter the League without any surrender of sovereignty. They quote Mr. Taft to that effect. But the gentlemen are basing their statement upon the Covenant of the League alone; they are not considering the proposed protocol which was signed only last month by forty-eight members of the League—the protocol which would give the League jurisdiction over American domestic policies, should we enter the organization. Now, what is sovereignty—would entrance into the League really be possible without surrender of sovereignty? Arthur Sweetster, British member of the Secretariat of the League, says that the “control of armament and munitions is one of the essential attributes of sovereignty.” Our late President, Woodrow Wilson, states that “joining the League is a recognition and surrender of self-sovereignty;” and goes on to say, concerning the League, “It abrogates the Monroe Doctrine. You have established a governmental body, and are bound to abide by its decisions.” Can the gentlemen still tell us that entrance into the League does not involve a surrender of sovereignty?

The gentlemen from Oxford told you in their concluding speech that the nations of Europe are ready to co-operate for world peace. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we offer you in refutation of that statement, the actions of these same nations for the last five years. Poland, Italy, France, and the rest of them have acted on principles that are militaristic. They have built up powerful armies. They have banded together in alliances. They have violated the League covenant repeatedly, when it was to their interest to do so. These nations are not for peace, but for self-government; they wish to realize their selfish aims through their control of the League of Nations—the same League which the gentlemen ask us to join, though they are able to offer us no guarantee of good faith on the part of the nations of Europe when they ask us to do so.

The gentlemen from Oxford have referred to the London Conference, and to the fine spirit which characterized the representatives of the nations at that conference. Gentlemen, the London Conference was called to prepare and agree upon some plan for the re-establishment of German financial stability. It was General Dawes who originated this plan. It was an American mind which brought this council together; and now the League of Nations says, “Yes, America, we will follow your leadership.” That is an example of American influence outside of the League of Nations. But had she been a member of the League, her influence would have been very much less—she would either have been aligned with the alliance controlling the league, and forced to follow its policies, or would have been opposed to the alliance, and consequently powerless.

There has been mention, also, of the economic and social agencies of the League—the crusade against narcotics, and the work against the international white slave traffic. But gentlemen, is this work really the work of the League? Hardly; these agencies were in existence, and working with all effectiveness years and years before the League was ever dreamed of. The League simply took them over; permitted the organizations to function as before; and assumes the credit. Do you know that the League of Nations takes credit today, for the work of the Red Cross? The League can hardly claim responsibility for the fine work of these organizations—America, a non-member of the League, is an active participant in every one of them, and is doing as much as any other nation in furthering the work of these commissions for which the League is assuming the credit.

The gentlemen of the opposition assure us that the League is not wholly lifeless—that in a number of cases, it has taken action; that it



settled the dispute between Finland and Sweden; that it averted war in Upper Silicia; that it settled the boundary dispute between Albania and Greece; that it acted in the incident of Corfu. But, ladies and gentlemen, the advocates of the League seem strongly at a loss for instances of success on the part of the League; for every one of the instances they have cited have been cases which we had already called to your attention as establishing the power and control of the interlocking alliance over the League; for in every one of these cases which the gentlemen mention, the decision and action of the League was directly in behalf of the interests of one or more of the members of the interlocking alliance. And the gentlemen from England have not ventured to contradict our statements to that effect; by their silence they have indeed admitted it.

The gentlemen from Oxford have very cleverly appealed to your sentiment; they have told you that if the League has been a failure it is because of America's failure to enter it; if the nations that compose the League are governed by selfish ambition, the cause is America's selfishness in remaining without; in other words, they blame the entire condition of Europe today upon America. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I feel reasonably certain that the nations of Europe are greedy, and selfish, and nationalistic, without any help or encouragement whatever from the United States; and I believe that you will agree with me that the cause of their selfishness is not America's refusal to enter, but the traditional nationalism, greed and self-seeking policies of Europe, which existed long before the League came into existence, which exist today, and which would continue to exist even were the United States so unwise as to join the League.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, throughout this entire debate, we have endeavored to impress upon you the fact that the nations which entered the League did not, upon so doing, lay aside their desire for national advancement—their selfishness and greed. The gentlemen from England make no attempt to deny this fact; they admit again and again that selfishness dominates Europe. We have offered for your consideration the network of alliances established since the formation of the League, binding together practically all of the powerful nations of Europe, and a few from other parts of the world—and the gentlemen from Oxford have not ventured to deny the existence of these alliances. We have pointed out the actions of the League, and the League's failures to act; and have called to your attention the fact that every decision of the League has benefitted one or more of these allied nations; every action of the League seems to have been in their interests; every failure to act on the part of the League was a failure which benefitted one of these allied nations. The gentlemen from England have again made no effort to deny the implication that the League is controlled by members of the alliance; that it acts in the interests of this alliance. We have pointed out the protocol, signed by forty-eight League members only last month; no reference whatever has been made to it by the Negative, though they have had ample time to do so. And finally, in my own constructive speech, I specifically called attention to the denunciation of the very idea contained in this protocol—that of the use of military sanctions—by none other than Premier MacDonald of Great Britain, himself; a denunciation which puts Great Britain officially in virtually the same position that we are in here in the United States. But the gentlemen from Oxford have studiously avoided any mention whatever of this attitude.

Ladies and gentlemen, our friends from England dare not deny the facts that we have presented. They dare not deny the spirit of selfishness which dominates Europe; the existence of the inner alliance, the control of the League by this alliance; the repeated actions of the



League in the interests of this alliance; the surrender of sovereignty that would be entrained by American entrance into the League. The facts speak for themselves. America dare not jeopardize her future by entering the League of Nations.

---

## COE MEETS OXFORD

Coe won its first international debate last night when the Crimson arguers defeated Oxford University, England, by a 437 to 95 decision. A rising vote was taken.

M. C. Hollis opened the debate for the affirmative, with J. D. Woodruff and Malcolm MacDonald following in that order. Vernon C. McIlraith '26, Warren C. Kehn '27, and George E. Simpson '26 spoke in that order for the Coe team.

The question for discussion was, "Resolved: That this house is opposed to the principles of prohibition." The speeches throughout the debate were tempered with caustic remarks and much humor, especially from the visiting trio.

The negative took the stand for the praise of strong drink and the praise of personal liberty, while the Coe team came back in its contentions that prohibition is absolutely essential to the public, that it gives a legitimate limitation to personal liberty and that it is economically sound.

### Keep Hearers Chuckling

The members of the visiting trio spoke extemporaneously, touched on points of American life as if they had lived here, and kept the audience chuckling at their stories and comments.

Abraham Lincoln, for instance, was invoked by MacDonald in proving to his hearers that the nation's great leaders were not in favor of sacrificing human liberty for the sake of prohibition. The premier's son read from a letter Lincoln once wrote in which he took occasion to pay his respects to those who issued tirades against beer drinking.

"Alcohol is a poison; it lessens the span of life," the Coe team told its hearers.

"That may be," Woodruff rejoined, "but alcohol has been used for some 7,000 years and if it is a poison you must admit it is a mighty slow one.

"Anyway it is better to live only half as long and see twice as much. Would you trade your birthright for a mess of dotage?" he jokingly taunted.

"We would do away with many of the social reformers of the day who take the joy out of life," Hollis said, in stating the position of his team.

"Give us wine which makes man just a bit more genial and friendly and happy. Sweep away these reformers who wish to make the world go round but who only give it a turn and give us liquor which literally does make the world go round," he said.

MacDonald took a rap at those who say that poverty and prohibition go hand in hand.

"You might truthfully say that wealth and liquor drinking go hand in hand, but to say that poverty and prohibition go together shows lack of moral courage to attack industrial institutions which permit poverty."

The question of where medicine stands on prohibition provoked a discussion.