



the
WAR MYTH
in
UNITED STATES
history

by C. H. Hamlin

Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.

Second Printing, 1948

COPYRIGHT, 1946, BY C. H. HAMLIN.

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Patriotism and Peace	5
II. The Revolutionary War	10
III. The War of 1812	21
IV. The War With Mexico	29
V. The War Between the States	33
VI. The War With Spain	40
VII. World War I	49
VIII. World War II	58



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

CHAPTER I

PATRIOTISM AND PEACE

From 1775 to 1923 the United States Army was engaged in 110 conflicts comprising about 8,600 battles with a casualty list of approximately 1,280,000 men. The casualty list for World War II was approximately 1,000,000 men of whom over 300,000 were killed.

America's war costs since the adoption of the Constitution total more than the nation's entire accumulation of wealth since that time. Since 1789, approximately 85 per cent of all federal expenditures have gone for purposes connected with war. Wars have cost America \$414,000,000,000, in comparison with a total evaluation of property and wealth in this country of \$300,000,000,000. World War II cost America nearly six times as much as all her previous wars combined. The Revolution cost \$500,000,000; the Civil War, for both sides, cost \$14,000,000,000; and World War I cost \$33,000,000,000. The Mexican War, Indian Wars, and Spanish-American War brought the total direct war cost by 1921 to \$52,000,000,000. World War II cost \$320,000,000,000.

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century the study of history was a study of the Greeks and the Romans. It was a study of the ancients only. Early in the nineteenth century, with the rise of nationalism especially intensified by the French Revolution, all nations began introducing the study of their national history in their elementary schools. The object of this was to teach patriotism. All texts and instruction exalted the nation to show its superiority to others. Patriotism meant national propaganda. With the rise of democracy patriotism began to shift to mean the support of the group, pro-group rather than pro-king. This was the cause and the result of the national mind-set. Patriotism came to mean international hatred, measured in terms of military service. This attitude toward history caused the teaching and writing of history to be largely national propaganda. All nations pictured their side as defensive. Accordingly, when a conflict arose,

these opponents of war usually yielded to the pressure because they thought their nation was being attacked by an aggressor. But a careful study of history does not warrant such an idea. The following study is an attempt to show that in our wars there has not been the "sole innocence" of the United States as opposed to the "sole guilt" of our opponents. **THAT ITS WARS ARE DEFENSIVE AGAINST AN OFFENSIVE ENEMY, IS THE WAR MYTH OF EVERY COUNTRY.** This national bias makes it easy for the military party to predominate and to precipitate war. Yet warfare is not popular if measured in terms of voluntary support of the citizenship in time of war. No major war of modern times could have been fought without the draft and high pressure propaganda.

All wars are accompanied with a mass production of similar patriotic catch phrases. These phrases have an emotional appeal that arouses the emotions without informing the intellect. Often the terms "loyalty", "bravery", "courage", "cooperation", and "patriotism" are treated as if they are absolute virtues. Loyalty to society is not a question of agreeing with persons temporarily in office. Bravery and courage not properly directed can be a great vice. One can be brave and courageous in a bad cause. The hero is all too often a species of assassin. Patriotism is not a question of agreeing with majorities. The historian David S. Muzzey, wrote:

All history proves that the great majority of people have always been wrong in their social prejudices and that the world's advancement has been due to the very small minority who have had the courage to combat these prejudices.

Those killed in battle are often pictured as giving their lives for their country. They did not give their lives, but instead, they were boys usually driven to battle by their respective governments and in their attempt, under compulsion, to kill their opponents they were themselves killed. Boys make the best soldiers as they are the most helpless and gullible. Napoleon once said:

Give me boys in my army rather than men. They are more daring they ask no questions, and will go anywhere and undertake anything, whereas older men will not be adventurous.

Note the similarity in the following patriotic sentiments expressed in various wars and on opposite sides:

A solemn crisis is at length upon us. The issue is not merely of war or peace,—. It is one far more momentous and alarming than all of these—the very existence of liberty itself—the continuance or the disastrous overthrow of the great principles of popular rights constitutional authority and genuine liberty for which our fathers bled on the battlefield, and has been the pride and glory of all American hearts. . . . We repeat, the real and vital issue before our country is the existence or annihilation of freedom. (*Chicago Daily Journal*, April 17, 1861.)

H. C. Perkins, *Northern Editorials on Secession*, gives a quantity of such material while Dwight L. Dumond, *Southern Editorials on Secession*, gives the same picture in reverse.

The synod of North Carolina on November 1, 1861, adopted the following resolution in support of the Southern Confederacy:

That the synod regards the present war on our part as a war of defense commending itself to our people's efforts, prayer and hearts as a hallowed though stern contest for sacred rights involving our homes and altars, liberty and religion, and to it we solemnly, prayerfully commit our persons and efforts, our energies and property, our sons and lives.

The Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States declared in 1861: "The struggle is not alone for civil rights and property and home, but for religion, for the church, and the Gospel." The faculty minutes of Centenary College of Louisiana for October 7, 1861, reads: "Students have all gone to war. College suspended, and God help the right."

President Thurman D. Kitchin of Wake Forest College said to the graduating class of 1942: "Rejoice in the assurance of victory in the spirit of Jesus."

Hitler on December 31, 1941, said: "The year 1942—and we pray to God, all of us, that it may—should bring the decision which will save our people and with them our allied nations."

Again on December 1, 1942, Hitler said:

Only if we exert all of our strength can we beg the Lord to afford us His aid, as He has done hitherto. We had harmed neither Britain nor France nor the United States; we had made no demands which might have caused enemies to declare war on us.

William Allen White in 1902 stated:

It is the Anglo-Saxon manifest destiny to go forth in the world as a world conqueror. He will take possession of all the islands of the sea. He will exterminate the people he cannot subjugate. That is what fate holds for the chosen people.

General Douglas MacArthur writing in the *Infantry Journal* for March, 1927, stated:

A warlike spirit, which alone can create and civilize a state, is absolutely essential to national defense and to national perpetuity. . . . In a free country like our own . . . every male brought into existence should be taught from infancy that the military service of the republic carries with it honor and distinction, and his very life should be permeated with the ideal that even death itself may become a boon when a man dies that a nation may live and fulfill its destiny.

Such a list could be extended indefinitely.

One often hears that war is a manifestation of human nature and will be eliminated only through a long evolutionary process. But the same thing has been said of slavery, duelling, witchcraft, and many other evils now eliminated. Warfare is not dependent upon human nature, but upon the human point of view, and this point of view can be altered by education—education which is honest, which can sift the true from the false, which does not close its eyes to the powerful role played by economic and social forces in the wars of the nation.

Whether there was another way out in these conflicts, whether the results aimed at were achieved, whether the

ruin and destruction which went hand in hand with these conflicts could ever be balanced by material acquisitions, —these are questions the reader must decide for himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bernard, L. L., *War and Its Causes*.
Hayes, C. J. H., *Essays on Nationalism*.
Heering, G. J., *The Fall of Christianity*.
Scott, J. F., *The Menace of Nationalism in Education*.
Vagts, Alfred, *The History of Militarism*.
Wright, Quincy, *The Study of War*.

THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

The common opinion in the United States regarding the American Revolution is that it was a war waged against Great Britain in which the American people as a whole rose up against the mother country in order to protect themselves against unjustifiable and unbearable oppression. This is the position taken in the Declaration of Independence. The thirteen colonies declared themselves free and independent on July 2, 1776, and then on July 4, 1776, adopted the Declaration of Independence proclaiming to the world their reasons for declaring themselves free. Thus the Declaration of Independence was not a declaration of independence, but a publication to the world of the causes which led the colonies to the point of such a declaration. It was an effort to put their side before the world and justify it. It was written by Thomas Jefferson in the heat of a great emotion. Twenty-seven grievances were held against Great Britain to justify the course taken by the colonies.

The outstanding causes of the Revolutionary War were the following: the expulsion of the French from Canada in 1763, the attempt on the part of Great Britain to enforce the navigation acts, the British western land policy, the British financial legislation regarding the colonies, the stamp act of 1765, the Townshend act of 1767, the Boston tea party of 1773, the five punitive acts of 1776, the general economic depression during the 70's, and religious conflicts. Let us examine briefly these ten causes.

(1) After the French were defeated by Great Britain in 1763 and driven from Canada, the colonies did not feel the same need for protection by the mother country as formerly. The French on the north were defeated. The Indians gave some trouble but were not a great power to be dreaded. As a result, the colonies felt themselves to be self supporting. Georgia was an exception because as the youngest of the thirteen colonies it was then dependent on

England for subsidies. Because the people of Georgia recognized their dependence on Great Britain for help, the movement for independence made slower headway in Georgia.

(2) By far the most important cause of the American Revolution was the effort on the part of George III to enforce the navigation laws of Great Britain. It was customary then for every mother-country to regard its colonies as trading posts. The colonies were considered necessary as the source of raw materials for the home manufacturers and also as a market for the surplus manufactured goods of the home country. In harmony with this theory, Great Britain as early as 1651 began passing navigation acts requiring her colonies to trade only with British merchants. All the export trade of the colonies had to be sent to Great Britain. In addition, the ships transporting these goods had to be owned by British subjects. The colonies were British subjects so their ship owners were protected as well as the ship owners of England.

This law, however, was openly violated by the colonial merchants. They traded with the Dutch or with any other foreign nations. British officials in America were bribed and cooperated in this illegal trade. The leading people of New England at this time were merchants, and it has been estimated that most of these merchants handled smuggled goods. John Hancock, who was to become president of the First Continental Congress in 1774, was a smuggler on a great scale, and at one time was sued for \$500,000 as penalties for smuggling. John Adams was his counsel.¹ It was these merchants of New England and especially of Boston, who were among the leaders in the Revolution. After the close of the French and Indian War in 1763, English merchants and English business in general had to be heavily taxed in order to pay the enormous national debt. Accordingly, pressure was brought to bear on the British government to have the navigation laws enforced, which would give the English the colonial trade,

¹A. M. Simons, *Social Forces in American History*, pp. 61-62.

thus enabling them to meet more easily the financial demands of taxation. Efforts were then made by Great Britain to enforce these navigation laws which had been openly violated for more than a century. Their legality had never been questioned. It was the usual policy of all countries of that age in dealing with their colonies. These navigation laws were no doubt unwise interferences with trade but their legality was not questioned. Besides, these laws did not disregard the interests of the colonies. Great Britain gave them a monopoly of tobacco raising, prohibiting Ireland from growing it. Bounties or sums of money were often paid by the British Government to the colonial producers to encourage industry. These bounties were paid on indigo, tar, pitch, hemp, and many other industries which Great Britain was attempting to establish in the colonies in order to keep the empire from finding it necessary to buy them from a foreign nation. These navigation laws aroused New England rather than the South, for that was the commercial section of the country.

(3) Another cause of friction between the colonies and the mother country was the British land policy proclaimed in 1763. This policy ordered the colonial governors to grant no more land to settlers beyond a certain western border extending south from the New England States along the western part of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. This line extended down just east of the mountains leaving to the Indians the territory west of it. This western land was then to be purchased from the Indians by the British. After that the Indians were to be sent further west and their original territory was to be opened to settlers as soon as it was purchased. This arrangement was made by Great Britain to avoid conflict between the Indians and the frontier settlers. The frontier settlers, however, objected, preferring to drive the Indians back by more ruthless methods even if it caused trouble. The western land speculators also did not like this policy because they could not sell their land until Great Britain had first pushed the Indians back. The royal government immediately began

making treaties with the Indians for the purchase of their territory. The policy was wise and humane but the settlers and speculators were too impatient to abide by it. The Washington family, Patrick Henry, and many others were prominent in these western land speculations. A land lobby was kept in London by these speculators in their efforts to get large grants of western lands from the crown and then to sell it off as the country became more and more settled. Many colonial fortunes were made in this manner.

(4) The next principal cause of trouble was the British financial legislation regarding the colonies. The colonies had issued fiat money or colonial bills of credit, which were a form of paper money. These could not be redeemed and soon began to depreciate in value. Yet they were made legal tender by the colonial legislatures. Often the colonies would buy goods from the English merchants and pay them with this colonial money. The southern planters were especially active in using it to pay their debts to their British creditors. The merchants of London soon complained of this practice. Finally, in 1764, Great Britain prohibited all the colonies from issuing as legal tender these bills of credit or fiat money as such a procedure was considered unfair to their creditors. This, of course, aroused great opposition from those profiting by this currency when paying their debts. These debts owed by the planters to British merchants were largely wiped out by the revolt of 1776.

According to Professor Abernethy:

It may be permissible to remark at this point that our historians are practically unanimous in ascribing purely economic motives to Virginia when they attempt to account for the revolutionary activities of this Anglican, aristocratic colony. . . . There was the matter of debts owed by Virginia planters to British merchants, which were largely wiped out by the revolt of '76.²

²Thomas Perkins Abernethy, *Western Lands and the American Revolution*, p. 364.

(5) The popular conception today is that the Stamp Act of 1765 was the principal if not the sole cause of the American Revolution. This cause is greatly exaggerated as it is the easiest to understand. It has been given the chief place among the many causes of the conflict. The Stamp Act was an act passed by Great Britain requiring the placing on all legal documents of stamps to be sold to the colonies by Great Britain. The usual impression is that this revenue was to go to the mother country for the sole benefit of the crown. This impression is entirely false, however. The revenue from these stamps was to be used to pay one-third of the expense of a colonial army of about 10,000 men to be kept here for the defense of the colonies. Not one penny was to go to Great Britain. Elementary texts speak of taxing the colonies leaving the impression that the money was to go to Great Britain, whereas actually it was all to be spent for the protection of the colonies against possible trouble with the Indians and the French. This colonial army had been proposed before by the colonies. In 1739 colonial leaders under the leadership of the governor of Pennsylvania had proposed such an army supported by such a tax. But at that time they had felt the danger of the French in Canada. After the defeat of the French in 1763 this danger was no longer so threatening. When this Stamp Act was passed in 1765 its operation was delayed for one year in order to give the colonies an opportunity to agree among themselves upon some other method of raising the money if they objected to the Stamp Act. The act was repealed in 1766 because of the bitter opposition of the colonies, who disliked a tax of any sort. "No Taxation Without Representation" has been greatly over-emphasized. It is only half true, for it implies that taxation with representation would have been accepted by the colonies.

(6) When the colonies objected to the Stamp Act, calling it an "internal" tax, Great Britain repealed it and in 1767 passed the Townshend Act, which provided for a tariff on imports to the colonies. The imported goods, however, were boycotted by the colonies and Great Britain

was forced to repeal the tariff on imports in 1770. The amount of imported goods in the New England colonies alone dropped from 1,363,000 pounds in 1768 to 504,000 pounds in 1769. After the repeal in 1770 the imports in 1771 were doubled. Thus the boycott was a powerful weapon in the hands of the colonies. With it the colonies were in a position to enforce almost any demand they liked upon Great Britain. The object of this tax was to pay the salaries of the colonial governors and judges, making them independent of the colonial legislature in regard to salary.

(7) When the Townshend duties were repealed in 1770, a tax was still left on tea in order to assert the right to levy such a tax. In 1773, Great Britain allowed a tea company known as the East India Company to bring over a large quantity of tea. This company had been given a monopoly of the colonial tea market. When this tea arrived in Boston, on December 16, 1773, a group of men entered the ship and threw overboard the cargo. Why was this tea destroyed? Because the leaders in this act were tea merchants in Boston whose trade would have to compete with the newly arrived tea had it been permitted to enter the market. The act was the destruction of private property on the part of the participants. The more moderate element in Boston wanted the tea paid for and the action repudiated.

(8) As a punishment for this performance, Great Britain passed the five punitive or coercive acts of 1774. These five acts were the following: close the port of Boston until the tea should be paid, revise the charter of Massachusetts, try in English courts those accused of violating English laws, station soldiers in Massachusetts to aid in the execution of English law, and annex to Quebec the land between the Ohio River and the Great Lakes.

(9) Another cause of the Revolution often overlooked was the general economic depression both in Great Britain and the colonies following the close of the French and Indian War in 1763. This was felt in all industries. De-

pressions of this sort always create political unrest and a desire for change in government even though the authorities in power are in no way responsible for the condition. This is especially true in American political history. Presidential elections have been determined by economic conditions having no direct bearing upon the issues involved.

(10) The tenth and last cause we shall give of the American Revolution was the religious cause. There was a movement on foot to locate an Episcopal bishop in the colonies. At that time all the colonial clergy of the Episcopal Church were governed from England by the Bishop of London as there was no bishop here. In 1770 there were about two hundred and fifty Episcopal clergy in the colonies, most of whom were in Virginia. The rumor of locating a bishop here aroused resentment in the other denominations who unanimously opposed the plan. But the most effective religious cause of the Revolution came from still another source. When Great Britain extended Quebec down between the Ohio River and the Great Lakes, the Catholic Church was to be made the established church of these regions as it was in Quebec. This greatly incensed all Protestants and "no pope no king" became one of the slogans of the Revolution.³ John Adams considered this religious animosity "as much as any other a cause" of the war for independence.

If we examine the acts of Great Britain which brought on the Revolution we find that they were legal. They were all in harmony with the spirit of the age. There was simply a general breakdown of mercantilism. Patrick Henry especially talked about "rights as British subjects," but there were no such rights of which the colonies were being deprived. Had they remained in England they would have enjoyed no privileges of which they were deprived by coming to America. Talk of this sort made effective oratory, but was false when examined. "No Taxation without Representation" is not a legal matter but com-

³Mary Alice Baldwin, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution* for full accounts.

monplace political philosophy. We have many other examples of taxation without representation. The great majority of people in England were then disfranchised yet taxed. The mistake of Great Britain was not in the passage of any illegal or unusual laws for governing the colonies, but it was in trying to rule a group of people against their will. Such a policy invariably invites trouble.

Instead of thirteen units, as we usually regard the thirteen colonies, there were three units differing in economic and political ideals. The coastal plains extending from New Hampshire to Pennsylvania constituted one, which was dominated by commercial interests. The second was the tidewater section from Maryland to Georgia, which was primarily agricultural and was dominated by the planters. The third unit or section was the frontier with extreme ideas about political democracy. The first unit was commercial and interested in trade and shipbuilding. Great mercantile families had grown up there accumulating their wealth largely through smuggling with the West Indies. To them the navigation laws were especially offensive. Their chief desire was to restore the commercial conditions as before 1763. They bitterly opposed a withdrawal from the British Empire for they wanted its protection. These merchants dominated Boston, Newport, New York, and Philadelphia. They were Whig in opposing trade restrictions but Tory in opposing separation. They had no sympathy with the political radicalism of Jefferson, Henry, and such leaders. The second region was the tidewater region of the South. It was dominated by the planters, many of whom were heavily in debt to British creditors. They secured the passage of lax bankruptcy laws detrimental to non-resident creditors. These laws, however, were vetoed by the king as were the laws providing for colonial bills of credit. These planters felt themselves aristocrats. Although they opposed British financial policy, they likewise objected to the democracy of Jefferson. The third section was the frontier. This section had often been discriminated against by the older sections in matters of representation in the colonial assemblies, administration of justice, and taxation. Its

inhabitants were zealous for popular rights and had no economic interests to the contrary. In domestic politics they were out of harmony with the commercial and planter sections. Their zeal for imaginary "rights of man" gave great impetus to the movement for independence. Henry and Jefferson were the leaders of this section and their point of view prevailed when the Declaration of Independence was written, the ideas of which were shocking to the other sections.

These three sections reacted differently to various British acts. In Georgia, the frontier people were pro-British because they were dependent upon Great Britain for subsidies and protection from the Indians. The frontier people of North Carolina were also Tory because they had a sharp difference with the eastern part of the state. Had the frontier of all the colonies had a similar sharp difference with the coastal plains they would no doubt have been Tory and defeated the Revolution. The frontier of Virginia got possession of the state and furnished such leaders as Henry and Jefferson.

The Revolution was the American phase of an English civil war. It was not so much a conflict between England and the colonies as between different classes of the English people. It was a struggle between liberals and conservatives. The liberals were in control in the colonies while the conservatives were in control in England. In both countries there was a large and influential minority group. The thirteen colonies were a part of the British Empire and simply seceded as the South attempted to do in 1860.

The terms Whig and Tory are often misleading or vague when applied to this period. Many Whigs of Great Britain, such as Burke, Fox, and Pitt, were opposed to the British policy of regulating the colonies, but they were equally opposed to granting them independence. Many of the American moderates were Whig in opposing the British navigation policy, but wanted to pay for the tea de-

stroyed in Boston. Many advocated an imperial union to handle such questions in the future. The radicals were for complete home rule and got control of the First Continental Congress of 1774. There was never a general uprising of the whole colonial population in support of separation. The greatest problem of the Revolutionists was to keep the spirit of revolt alive. About 25,000 Americans enlisted in the British army.

There are many facts regarding our conduct during the Revolution which are not pleasant to relate. For example, on June 1, 1775, Congress passed a resolution disclaiming any intention of invading Canada. The report of this decision was widely circulated in Canada. About four weeks later Congress secretly made plans for the invasion of Canada that fall. The invasion took place in September, 1775, but Canada drove the invaders back. (See Lecky, *The American Revolution*, page 215.) Many people suspected of being Tories were badly treated. The New York legislature passed a resolution that Tories should be "deemed guilty of treason and should suffer death." They were often hunted by mobs, tarred and feathered, and killed. American troops at times set fire to the houses of the people to plunder and rob. In some sections the colonists looked upon the British army with as much favor as upon the American army. New York alone confiscated \$3,600,000 worth of property belonging to Tories, and all the states did likewise. During that entire period the Tories were the great sufferers.⁴ When Great Britain recognized the independence of the colonies in 1783, one provision of the treaty agreed to by both parties was that the Tories should be compensated by the states for the property confiscated during the conflict. The states, however, did nothing about that provision of the treaty.

⁴C. H. Van Tyne, *Loyalists in the American Revolution*, gives full account.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abernethy, T. P., *Western Lands and the American Revolution*.
- Baldwin, Mary Alice, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution*.
- Davidson, Philip, *Propaganda and the American Revolution*.
- Faulkner, H. U., *American Economic History*, pp. 137-139.
- Hayes, C. J. H., *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*. Vol. I, ch. 10.
- Jameson, J. F., *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*.
- Lecky, E. H., *The American Revolution*.
- Muzzey, D. S., *The United States of America Through the Civil War*. Vol. I, ch. 2.
- Schlesinger, A. M., *New Viewpoints in American History*, Ch. 7.
————— *Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution*.
- Simons, A. M., *Social Forces in American History*, Ch. 6 and 7.
- Van Tyne, C. H., *Loyalists in the American Revolution*.

CHAPTER III

THE WAR OF 1812

There were two distinct causes of the war with Great Britain in 1812, and it is necessary to examine each separately. These causes were maritime rights and land hunger.

The general European upheaval from 1789 to 1815, known as the French Revolution, soon developed into a war between Great Britain and Napoleon. All Europe was divided into two camps, with Great Britain and Napoleon as the leaders on their respective sides. Over a decade before 1812 Great Britain began issuing decrees known as Orders in Council. These Orders in Council, issued in the name of the king, attempted to prohibit neutral nations from shipping goods to France. In this manner, a blockade was proclaimed against France, and ships attempting to get through the lines were subject to capture and confiscation.

Napoleon issued similar decrees, known as the Berlin and Milan Decrees, declaring that any ships en route to Great Britain would be subject to capture, for France had also blockaded Great Britain. But as neither blockade could be fully enforced, they were both to a large degree disregarded. Both Great Britain and Napoleon were attempting to cut off each other's trade and not primarily trying to disregard the rights of neutrals. All goods attempting to run these blockades were subject to capture.

The principal losers through these captures were the New England traders, but they preferred losing occasional ships to joining in a war which would involve them with their principal customer, Great Britain. There had been no serious losses since 1807, five years before war was declared. Napoleon was then losing fast and it seemed evident that it would be only a short while before the causes of friction would be over. The flagrant disregard of the "rights" of neutral trade had taken place before 1807. In 1812, the solution or end of the problem was in sight. In 1810, our registered tonnage in foreign trade

was 981,019 tons, which high mark it was not to reach again till 1847. Our foreign trade was not injured, and the New England merchants who sustained the loss wanted nothing done as they were making large profits from the conflict in Europe. They were Federalists and would have preferred a war with France rather than a war with England, because they regarded Napoleon as the real cause of the trouble. The Federalists were pro-British, while the Democrat-Republicans were pro-French. Late in 1811 our minister, William Pinkney, left London, and thus the United States was cut off from a knowledge of the movements in England. England was attempting to avoid war with America because such a war would naturally hurt her foreign trade and domestic prosperity. By the spring of 1812 England was ready to revoke the Orders in Council as soon as it could be done with dignity. On June 23, 1812, the orders were revoked. But this was five days after the War of 1812 had been declared. England did not know war was declared when the orders were revoked, and the United States did not know till a good while later in the season that the orders had been revoked.

Another source of friction lay in the impressment of seamen and sailors. During this period Great Britain was hard pressed for men in her naval campaign against Napoleon. Many sailors deserted English ships and came to America because of the higher wages paid by the owners of American ships. Every British warship anchoring in American waters would lose a good part of its crew, who would secure positions on American ships. Great Britain demanded the return of these deserters, who would often become naturalized American citizens. Great Britain, however, at that time regarded citizenship as a contract between citizens and government which could not be broken without the consent of both the subject and his government. This European custom then universal has now disappeared and one can change citizenship at will.

When the United States refused to return these men, the British ships would search American vessels on the high seas to see if any British sailors were on board. This

policy of impressment waned, however, after 1805, because Napoleon had been defeated on the sea and Great Britain was not in such great need of sailors. Impressment was not made a cause of war until after the war had begun and President Madison had learned that the Orders in Council had been revoked. President Madison in 1812 estimated the number of impressments at 6,057, but the Massachusetts legislature appointed a committee to investigate the situation, which reported that the Madison estimate was "three or four times too large." Great Britain took the position that the United States was acting as a harbor for her deserters from the British navy and merchant ships, and that therefore the search was warranted as a defensive measure.

The British Orders in Council prohibiting the trading of neutral powers with France, and the British impressment of fugitive sailors from English ships, were the maritime controversies which resulted in the War of 1812. Both policies on the part of Great Britain were adopted as necessary measures in her conflict with Napoleon.

The New England Federalists were the people principally concerned in the United States, but they opposed the war. War was declared by a vote of 79 to 49 in the House, and 19 to 13 in the Senate. There was open discouragement of enlistment in New England. The governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut refused to honor President Madison's call for the militia. Henry Adams estimated that the New England bankers loaned more money to Great Britain than to the United States for war purposes. Of the \$17,000,000 in specie in the country in 1812, about \$10,000,000 was in the hands of the New England Federalists. They subscribed less than \$3,000,000 to the United States war loan. Thus, strangely enough, the War of 1812 was fought in spite of the protest of those for whom it was presumably fought.

But in recent years another cause of the war and the chief cause has been brought to light. This was land hunger.

The United States entered the conflict at the insistence of the south and west, despite the opposition of the north-

eastern states. The inland section overruled the opposition of the maritime section. At that time there was an ardent expansionist sentiment along the entire western and southern border looking towards the annexation of Canada and Florida with a vaguer idea of seizing all of the Spanish possessions of North America. Spain then owned Florida. Spain and Great Britain were allies against Napoleon, and a war with one was looked upon as a war with both. The belief that the United States would some day annex Canada had existed continuously since the Revolution. Benjamin Franklin had advocated the buying of Canada by the United States, since we failed to take it during the Revolution. The Continental Congress made an effort to capture Canada, but our armies were repulsed. Washington had objected to leaving Canada in British hands. In 1803, Morris of Pennsylvania wrote that at the time of the Constitutional Convention he knew "that all North America must at length be annexed to us—happy indeed if the lust of dominion stop there." This idea, however, was a vague dream till about 1810.

There had been friction in the northwest between the Americans and British. The British retained trading posts in the northwest after they had agreed to give them up by the treaty of 1783 recognizing the independence of the United States. The British held the northwest posts until 1796, when they were given up by the Jay Treaty. All the Indian trouble in that section was attributed to British propaganda inciting the Indians against the United States. The Canadian traders made friends with the Indians to get their trade while the Americans were aggressively pushing them back from their land. The result was that the Indian was more friendly to the British in Canada than to the United States.

The idea of annexing Canada was intensified after 1810 because of this belief that the Indians were being turned against the United States by the British. The south was almost unanimous in its demand for the annexation of Florida, while the southwest was taking a lively interest in Mexico. This land hunger was making its appearance

rapidly, but it was several years later that the phrase "manifest destiny" was to come into general use.

President Madison and Secretary of State James Monroe were eager to annex Florida. Thomas Jefferson was interested in the annexation of Canada, Florida, and Cuba. Jefferson considered the acquisition of Canada only a "question of marching," with Florida and Cuba easy prey from Spain. The expansionists were in favor of declaring war while the rest of the country opposed the idea.

When Congress met in 1811, Henry Clay was elected Speaker of the House. He was leader of the war group known as "war hawks." Clay was the first Speaker of the House of Representatives to recognize the great power he could exercise over legislation through his appointment of committees. He was the first "Czar" of the House. On the Foreign Relations Committee, Clay appointed Peter B. Porter, Chairman; Calhoun of South Carolina; Grundy of Tennessee; Harper of New Hampshire; and Desha of Kentucky. All of these were ardent expansionists and reliable war men. They represented the frontier section of 1812, and Clay had been chosen Speaker by the representatives from that section. In December, 1812, while on the Foreign Relations Committee, Porter said in discussing trouble with Great Britain, "We could deprive her of her extensive provinces lying along our border to the north." Grundy and Rhea, ardent expansionists from Tennessee, agreed.

R. M. Johnson of Kentucky during the same session made the statement, "I shall never die contented until I see her (Great Britain's) expulsion from North America, and her territories incorporated with the United States," and Harper of New Hampshire said in Congress: "To me, sir, it appears that the Author of Nature has marked our limits in the South by the Gulf of Mexico, and in the North by the regions of eternal frost."

These statements were representative of the sentiments of the members in Congress from the western section. The Federalist Party consisted chiefly of the mercantile

and financial interests of the coast towns. They were solidly against expansion, which would give the economic advantage to the western section of the country.

The winter of 1811-1812 saw a great expansionist wave sweep over the west, clamoring for the annexation of Canada. Contemporary newspapers were filled with editorials demanding annexation. The cry came up from the entire frontier, New Hampshire to Kentucky, to expel the British from Canada. At a Washington's birthday dinner given at Lexington, Ky., on February 22, 1812, the toast proposed was "Canada and our arms." Although the frontier claimed that the British were inciting the Indians against the United States, L. M. Hacker in "Western Land Hunger and the War of 1812"¹ shows that the Indian menace was greatly exaggerated, but that land hunger was the real motive.

Randolph of Virginia, who was opposed to the war, said in 1812 on the floor of Congress:

"Ever since the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations came into the House, we have heard but one word—like the whippoorwill with but one eternal monotonous tune—Canada! Canada! Canada!"²

The south and southwest were interested in the annexation of Florida and possibly Texas. To them, a war with Great Britain meant a war with Spain also, since the British and Spain were then in alliance.

President Madison and Secretary of State Monroe, in their eagerness to acquire Florida, had helped General George Mathews to instigate a revolution in Florida. In 1812 General Mathews took American troops to Florida with the cooperation of the War Department and also the support of Governor Mitchell of Georgia. This territory was held for a year, although Congress twice refused to authorize the President to hold it. Finally Madison was forced to repudiate the act because of the opposition of the Federalists and the northern members of his own

¹*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. X, Pp. 363-395.

²J. W. Pratt, *The Expansionists of 1812*, gives full account.

party. Senator Crawford, of Georgia, was active in his support of southern expansion; Jefferson wished to annex Cuba as a state, and Madison and Monroe were eager to annex Florida although they were not concerned with the annexation of Canada.

The interest of the southwest in Mexico was a spirited one. Aaron Burr attempted to do in 1806 what the whole southwest was dreaming of. He was conspiring against Spain in Mexico and not against the United States as is usually supposed. "Lands, water-ways, and Indians" was the cry of men desiring to drive out Spain.

In the Nashville *Clarion* of April 28, 1812, there appeared a long article advocating the annexation of all America, closing with the statement: "Where is it written in the book of fate that the American republic shall not stretch her limits from the capes of the Chesapeake to Nootka Sound, from the Isthmus of Panama to Hudson Bay?" The paper then editorially commended the article to its readers and followed it up with a series of historical and descriptive articles about Mexico.

The War of 1812 continued for two years. Troops were raised to invade Canada but interest in the venture was slight. Many of the militia refused to march out of American territory, as it was understood then that the militia could not be ordered to foreign soil. The expansionists united to declare war but their plans of expansion collapsed. The northern states opposed the annexation of Florida without Canada. The troops could not take Canada. Madison and Monroe were interested in Florida, not Canada. The British repulsed the troops from Canada. The south had no desire to acquire northern territory.

The War of 1812, in fact, was a complete failure from every angle. Our troops were defeated. General Winfield Scott declared that the army officers were "generally sunk in either sloth, ignorance, or habits of intemperate drinking," "swaggerers, dependents, decayed gentlemen utterly unfit for any military purpose whatever."

Muzzey in *The United States of America through the Civil War*. Vol. I, page 253, says "The War of 1812 was a blunder. It was unnecessary, impolitic, untimely, and

rash." It was primarily the work of Henry Clay. If the United States had been in any condition to fight, we would have been of great aid to Napoleon who at that time was being defeated by Great Britain.

In the peace treaty of 1814, which brought the war to a close, the causes of the war were not mentioned. The War of 1812 was a war of paradoxes. It was waged ostensibly in defense of maritime commercial interests, but the merchant states themselves refused to support it. The English Orders in Council, the alleged cause of the war, were repealed five days after war was declared and before news of its declaration reached England. The most important battle of the war, the Battle of New Orleans, was fought after the treaty of peace had been signed. The United States did not get any of the desired territory; was defeated in nearly every campaign; and the national capitol was burned by the English. The land was not gained and the rights on the sea were not granted. England never yielded the right of impressment, which remained a diplomatic controversy as late as 1842.

In order to save its reputation, the Administration published an "Exposition of the Causes and Character of the War," prepared by A. J. Dallas, in which it was denied that the administration had ever tried to acquire Canada. Madison was a great scholar but not a strong executive. It was the war hawks led by Clay who forced the war upon him and the nation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Henry, *John Randolph*.
Hocker, L. M., "Western Land Hunger and the War of 1812; a Con-
jecture," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. X, pp. 363-395.
Johnson, Allen, *Union and Democracy*. Chapter 11.
Lewis, H. J., "A Re-analysis of the Causes of the War of 1812," *Ameri-
can Historical Magazine*, Vol. VI, pages 306-316, 577-584.
Muzzey, D. S., *The United States of America Through the Civil War*,
Vol. I, chapter 5.
Pratt, J. W., *The Expansionists of 1812*.

CHAPTER IV

THE WAR WITH MEXICO

Early in the nineteenth century the people of the United States, and especially those of the southwest, became interested in that part of Mexico known as Texas. The Louisiana purchase was made in 1803. Settlers went immediately into that region along the Mississippi River. The expansionist movement then grew rapidly as we have seen, and was the major cause of the War of 1812. American settlers pushed into Mexico and soon got control of that section now known as Texas, where there were few Mexicans. These citizens of the United States went there on the assumption that Texas would some day become a part of the United States. Much of Texas was suited for the raising of cotton,—hence slavery was profitable.

In 1827 Mexico passed a law providing for the gradual abolition of slavery. The people of Texas interested in slavery resented this as did the pro-slavery factions in the United States. Sentiment in Texas for secession crystallized rapidly, and in 1836 Texas seceded from Mexico, later asking to be annexed to the United States. Some of the anti-slavery groups opposed this annexation which would increase the slave territory. In her constitution of 1837 Texas legalized slavery. It was not until 1845 that Texas was admitted as a state.

Polk of Tennessee, an ardent expansionist, was elected President by the Democrats in 1844. "Manifest Destiny" had then become the slogan of the Democratic party. Accordingly, President Tyler secured the annexation of Texas as a state just before his term of office closed in 1845, a few days before he was succeeded by Polk.

Texas in revolt from Mexico claimed more territory than she had possessed while a Mexican state. Her southern boundary had then been the Nueces River, but after revolting, she laid claim down to the Rio Grande. This area between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande was sparsely settled, but its inhabitants were Mexicans and included the Mexican settlements at the mouth of the Rio

Grande. Polk did not desire war but he was eager to acquire this disputed territory. He sent John Slidell, of Louisiana, as minister to Mexico to induce Mexico to accept the Rio Grande as the southern boundary of Texas rather than the Nueces River, which had been the southern boundary of Texas while a Mexican province. Slidell was also instructed to buy from Mexico the territory now comprising the states of New Mexico, California, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and part of Colorado, all of which was then a part of Mexico. Mexico, however, refused to receive Slidell or consider disposing of that territory.

When Polk could not acquire this desired territory by negotiation, he ordered General Taylor to enter the Rio Grande territory. This was done on January 13, 1846. On May 9, 1846, Polk notified the cabinet of his intention to recommend a war with Mexico within a few days, by which means he hoped to take the territory he could not buy. On the night of May 9, 1846, news came to President Polk that on April 24, 1846, the American army had a skirmish with Mexican forces. On May 11, 1846, President Polk sent a message to Congress stating Mexico had "shed American blood upon American soil. War exists, and notwithstanding all our efforts to avoid it, exists by the act of Mexico herself." And two days later, May 13, 1846, President Polk informed his cabinet that the United States must acquire New Mexico, California, and the surrounding southwest territory as a result of the war. Some of the cabinet members wanted to take all of Mexico. Secretary of State Buchanan in a public letter said: "Destiny beckons us to hold and civilize Mexico."

Americans had often tried to incite rebellions in Mexico. Many were arrested there and shot for treason. The United States, however, had never discouraged her citizens from trying to dismember Mexico.

The circumstances surrounding the outbreak of hostilities between General Taylor and the Mexicans were these: President Polk had ordered General Taylor to enter the Rio Grande region with American troops. He was arbitrarily accepting the Rio Grande and not the Nueces River as the southern boundary of Texas. The American troops

marched down to the Rio Grande opposite Matamoras, a Mexican village south of the Rio Grande. They then blockaded the town and cut off its outlet down the Rio Grande. Mexicans crossed over the Rio Grande to drive the Americans away and to make them cease their interference with this Mexican village. Fourteen Americans were killed in the skirmish. Rhodes, on page 87, Vol. I, *History of the United States*, says "Mexico was actually goaded on to the war."

Mexico had notified the United States that the annexation of Texas would be treated as a cause of war. The Mexican press made threats. Yet there were so many internal quarrels in Mexico that open hostilities could have been avoided if the United States had not taken the position of supporting Texas in her claim to the Rio Grande as her southern boundary, disregarding the Nueces River as the southern boundary of Texas while a Mexican province. Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Benton, and Tyler regarded the war as the result of poor management on the part of President Polk. The Whig party generally criticised it while the Democrats usually favored it, although, as the war continued, both groups were won over to its support. The Massachusetts legislature resolved in April, 1847, during hostilities, that the war had been "unconstitutionally commenced by the order of the President for the dismemberment of Mexico." Lincoln also criticised the war while it was in progress. He voted for a resolution offered by Mr. Ashburn in the House declaring that the war had been "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally" begun. On December 22, 1847, Mr. Lincoln offered the famous "Spot Resolution," calling upon the President to furnish Congress with information regarding the "spot" where hostilities had begun. A pamphlet was sent to Mr. Lincoln in which the author claimed that "in view of all the facts" the government of the United States had committed no aggression in Mexico. To this Mr. Lincoln replied:

"It is a fact that the United States army in marching to the Rio Grande marched into a peaceful settlement, and frightened the inhabitants away from their

houses and their growing crops. It is a fact that Fort Brown, opposite Matamoras, was built by that army within a Mexican cotton field, on which at the time the army reached it a young cotton crop was growing, which crop was totally destroyed, and the field itself greatly and permanently injured by ditches, embankments, and the like."

Although Lincoln voted for army supplies he always criticised the war. For this Lincoln's "patriotism" was questioned by Douglas in 1858 during the Lincoln-Douglas debates. General Grant in his *Memoirs*, Vol. I, page 53, said he considered the Mexican War "one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Macy, Jesse, *Political Parties in the United States, 1846-1861*. ch. 7-22.
Rhodes, James Ford, *History of the United States*. Vol. I, pages 87-92.
Smith, Justin H., *The War With Mexico*. Vols. I and II.
Tarbell, Ida, *Life of Lincoln*. Vol. II, ch. I.
Wilson, Woodrow, *Division and Reunion*, ch. 6.

CHAPTER V

THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

The Civil War was the result of sectional power politics. The major economic interests of the North and of the South each attempted to win the West to its economic system and thereby control the federal government for its advantage. In every other country of the world slavery has been abolished without war. The question of slavery had not been a party issue until after the Mexican War, but from then until the election of 1860 slavery was the leading political issue. During the war with Mexico, Wilmot of Pennsylvania offered what is known as the Wilmot Proviso, which provided that the territory acquired from Mexico should be closed to slavery. Although this bill was defeated in Congress it brought up the question of the further extension of slavery.

At the time of the Mexican War there were two national parties—the Whigs and the Democrats. These two parties embraced almost all of the people, and as both were strong in both sections of the United States, they tended to cement the union, for parties on a national basis tend to unify a nation while sectional parties lead to disunion. The anti-slavery people and the moderates gravitated towards the Whig party while the pro-slavery people gravitated towards the Democratic party.

The Whigs elected General Zachary Taylor President in 1848. Although he was a large slave holder of Louisiana, he was a moderate and satisfactory to all groups and sections. He had the support of Lincoln as well as of the southern Whigs. Soon after Taylor became President, Henry Clay proposed the famous Compromise of 1850, the important features of which were: admit California as a free state, organize the remainder of the territory taken from Mexico without regard to slavery, abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and pass a fugitive slave law to be enforced by the federal government. This compromise, although a Whig measure, was instrumental in killing the Whig party. No party or section was satisfied

with it. President Taylor opposed it but his death before its passage brought to the presidency Vice-President Fillmore, who allowed it to become a law without his signature. The provision that broke the Whig party was the strict fugitive slave law. The anti-slavery Whigs repudiated their party. The idea of returning fugitive slaves was shocking to the best moral judgment of the time. The leaders of moral sentiment—ministers, poets, and reformers of every type—advised disobedience. It was a dead letter because the moral sentiment of the age was against it. On the other hand, the pro-slavery people did not like it because it was not enforced. Thus the law was treated with contempt by both parties.

The Whig party, opposed to expansion and the extension of slavery, was disrupted. The Democrats carried all except four states in 1852. They remained in power until 1860, dominated by the powerful pro-slavery sentiment throughout this period.

After the fall of the Whig party the Republican party was organized in 1856. It took the name Republican from the followers of Thomas Jefferson and claimed to be a revival of the party of Jefferson. It was opposed to the extension of slavery. It was organized and, until after the Civil War, dominated by the liberal element in the United States. The Democratic party also claimed themselves to be followers of Jefferson. Jefferson was opposed to slavery and special privilege in every form. He advocated state rights or a decentralized government because he believed the states were and would remain more democratic than the federal government. But by 1860 that situation was reversed. The states—especially the southern states—had become dominated by the privileged group, who talked in terms of state rights to perpetuate this privilege. Jefferson talked in terms of state rights because he feared the domination of the federal government by the reactionary element. The Democratic party of the pre-Civil War period had repudiated Jefferson. The Republican party did not become reactionary until after the War Between the States.

When the Republican party was organized in 1854, it was regarded as radical in the eyes of the South, for its main purpose in organizing was the keeping of slavery out of the West. Its campaign literature in 1856 was composed largely of the anti-slavery utterances of Jefferson.

In the election of 1860 Lincoln polled only 26,430 votes in the entire South and those were from the upper section. Douglas, the moderate Democrat, received 163,525 votes in the South; Bell, of the Unionist party, received 515,973 votes in the same section, while Breckenridge, the extreme pro-slavery candidate, received 570,871 votes in the entire South. Breckenridge carried the lower South by a plurality while Lincoln carried the West and North by a plurality. The Douglas and the Bell voters of the South were opposed to secession; the secession vote went to Breckenridge. A majority in the South opposed secession but the Southern states fell into the hands of the secessionists by a plurality.

Why did the South secede? Lincoln was elected on a platform defying the Dred Scott decision of 1857. According to this decision the Constitution recognized slavery and therefore Congress could not prohibit it in the western territories. This election of Lincoln on a platform to prohibit the expansion of slavery in the West caused the lower South to secede, as a gesture to uphold the courts and the Constitution. Lincoln coerced them in order to uphold the Constitution as he had been legally elected president and his office required his execution of federal laws.

By 1860 slavery in the greater part of the civilized world was a dead or a dying institution. Great Britain in 1833 abolished slavery with compensation in all her possessions. Mexico provided for the gradual abolition of slavery as early as 1827. Brazil followed in 1888 and Spain abolished slavery in Cuba in 1878. In all these cases it was done without conflict with no slave psychology remaining to be a source of friction. All the northern states of the union had become free and the western states and territories were repudiating slavery as well. When Cali-

ifornia drew up her constitution and asked for admission in 1850, the clause prohibiting slavery was adopted by a unanimous vote of her constitutional convention. In the referendum held in Kansas in 1858, 11,300 out of a total vote of 13,088 were opposed to slavery. Only a few slaves had been carried there and they could never have been permanently held as slaves. New Mexico was organized as a territory in 1850 without regard to slavery. Nevada, Colorado, and Dakota were organized as territories before 1860 but had no slaves. In Missouri slavery was on the decrease, if judged by its percentage of the entire population—in 1830, 17.8% of the Missouri population were slaves; in 1840, 15.5%; in 1850, 12.8%; and in 1860, only 9.8%. Slavery would have existed in Missouri only for a few more years, for the anti-slavery population was increasing rapidly by settlers from the free states and by great numbers of people from Germany who settled in the neighborhood of St. Louis.

By 1860, slavery was non-existent in all sections of the union except the tobacco, cotton, and sugar cane belts. In upholding the institution of slavery, the South was opposed to the spirit of the age. Slavery was doomed by moral and economic pressure.

Many people before 1860 saw the folly of this controversy regarding the status of slavery in the West. Governor Robert J. Walker of Mississippi recognized that the West would never be open to slavery, so did Stanton of Tennessee and Senator Toombs of Georgia. The status of slavery in the West had been settled by the laws of nature. The two sections, however, cherished perverted ideas of each other. It was reported, and actually believed in the North, that Senator Robert Toombs of Georgia had boastfully declared that he would call the roll of his slaves in Massachusetts.

The following incidents given in Macy's *Political Parties in the United States*, pages 209 to 211, are illustrative of the state of public excitement preceding the Civil War. In an effort to dictate the slave policy of the West, Charlie B. Lines, a deacon of a New Haven congregation, had en-

listed a company of seventy-nine emigrants for the war. A meeting was held in the church shortly before their departure, for the purpose of raising funds, at which meeting many clergymen and members of the Yale College faculty were present. The leaders of the party announced that they were needed for self-defense. After an earnest address from Henry Ward Beecher, the subscription began. Professor Silliman started the subscription with one Sharpe's rifle; the pastor of the church gave the second. Fifty was the number wanted. Then Beecher announced that if twenty-five were pledged on the spot Plymouth Church would furnish the rest. Churches in both sections had by that time become agencies for propagating hatred. Another incident is a southern one. Colonel Bufort of Alabama sold a number of his slaves valued at \$20,000, and invested the money to equip a troop of three hundred soldiers to fight for southern rights in Kansas. A contemporary account states :

“The day that Bufort's battalion started from Montgomery they marched to the Baptist Church. The Methodist minister solemnly invoked the divine blessing on the enterprise; the Baptist pastor gave Bufort a finely bound Bible, and said that a subscription had been raised to present each emigrant with a copy of the Holy Scripture.”

This battalion left for the west armed with Bibles and Sharpe's rifles. The existence of such a condition of excitement made it an easy matter to precipitate war. The South met this opposition by demanding that all anti-slavery publications be excluded from the mails. Books, papers, and all publications suspected of containing anti-slavery propaganda were taken from the mails and publicly burned at Charleston, S. C. There were many manifestations of disregard for the sanctity of the mails. The North judged the South by these extreme actions, and these efforts of the South to suppress anti-slavery agitation resulted only in greater propaganda for the abolitionists.

The public is quick to demand war but not so willing to accept its hardships. During the conflict it was necessary

for both the North and the South to suspend civil liberties, including freedom of the press and speech. Expressions that might weaken war morale were punished—both sections suspended the writ of habeas corpus and arbitrarily imprisoned their citizens. About 38,000 people were imprisoned in the North while the number imprisoned in the South is unknown. Both sections resorted to the draft to recruit soldiers. Yet, with all these weapons at their disposal, the northern army succeeded in enlisting only about 1,325,000 of its native white population out of a total of 23,000,000. Besides approximately 1,325,000 native whites, the northern army consisted of 300,000 whites from the South, 186,000 Negroes, and 500,000 foreigners. Left to the voluntary support of its citizens neither section could have carried on the war. No major war of modern times could have been fought with voluntary support. The draft acts of both sections allowed for the employment of substitutes, which, of course, was hard on the poorer classes who could not employ substitutes. Desertion was frequent on both sides. Rhodes estimates the number of deserters in the South at 100,000 in 1864.¹

Much has been heard of the heroism and sacrifice displayed during the conflict but little of the crimes committed by both sections. Only the pleasant phases of the war have survived. When Joseph Holt and Robert Dale Owen were appointed by Secretary of War Stanton to adjust claims for materials supplied to the War Department, they found fraud at every turn, and before making their final report in July, 1862, secured deductions of nearly \$17,000,000 from claims amounting to \$50,000,000. One claim alone was reduced \$1,000,000 and another was reduced \$580,000. One senator received \$10,000 for securing an order from the War Department for a client. Colonel Henry S. Olcott, who was appointed special commissioner to investigate frauds, after a thorough examination of the facts announced that from 20% to 25% of the expenditures of the Federal treasury during the War

¹Ella Lonn, *Desertion During the Civil War*, gives full treatment of desertion.

Between the States was tainted with fraud, and, according to his estimate, approximately \$700,000,000 was paid through fraud.²

In commenting upon the moral conditions during the conflict, the *Springfield Republican* said editorially:

“It is a sad, a shocking picture of life in Washington, which our correspondents are giving us;—a Bureau of the Treasury Department made a home of seduction and prostitution; the necessities of poor and pretty women made the means of their debauchery by high government officials; members of Congress putting their mistresses into clerkships in the departments; whiskey drinking ad libitum.”³

The conflict abolished the institution of slavery but not the psychology of slavery. This psychology on the part of the white population is now a major source of friction in problems pertaining to race.

²James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States 1850-1877*, Vol. V, p. 220.

³*Ibid.* P. 212

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dodd, W. E., *The Cotton Kingdom*.

Lonn, Ella, *Desertion During the Civil War*.

Macy, Jesse, *The Anti-Slavery Crusade*.

Macy, Jesse, *Political Parties in the United States*. ch. 7-22.

Rhodes, James Ford, *History of the United States, 1850-1877*. Vols. I-V.

Stephenson, N. W., *The Day of the Confederacy*.

Stephenson, N. W., *Abraham Lincoln and the Union*.

Wright, E. N., *Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War*.

CHAPTER VI

THE WAR WITH SPAIN

For almost a century the Spanish possession of Cuba had been regarded with disfavor by certain elements in the United States. Reasons for this attitude varied from those of acquisition on grounds of "manifest destiny," to those of the highest altruism. When the Spanish-American republics won their independence during the early years of the nineteenth century, Puerto Rico and Cuba remained in the possession of Spain.

Thomas Jefferson advocated the acquisition of Cuba and its annexation as a state, chiefly for fear that it would be acquired by England. Later, pro-slavery leaders wanted to take the island in order to extend slave territory, as had been done in the case of Florida and Texas. Cuba's annexation was a part of the "manifest destiny" program which was rampant in the years preceding the Civil War. Many filibustering expeditions were sent there with annexation in view. The Cubans themselves often came to the United States, became naturalized citizens of this country, and would return to Cuba with an unfriendly attitude toward Spanish authority, counting for protection on their American citizenship, in case of trouble.

There had often been spasmodic outbreaks in Cuba before 1895. In 1868, there broke out what is known as the "Ten Years' War" which lasted until 1878. The causes of these conflicts were never clearly understood by the participants on either side. Sugar cane was the principal source of Cuban wealth. According to the customary policy of trade barriers, Spain imposed duties on goods coming from the United States and the United States imposed high duties on Cuban sugar. These duties severely hurt Cuban economic life, and as economic depressions as well as prosperity are always attributed to the party in power regardless of the real causes, the Cubans, no exception to this rule, blamed the political power then in authority.

During this "Ten Years' War" many expeditions were secretly fitted out in the United States by and for the Cu-

bans. In 1873, a ship, the *Virginus*, sailing under American colors, carrying men and supplies to the Cuban insurgents was captured by a Spanish gunboat. The crew and passengers were given a trial which resulted in the execution of fifty-three, of whom eight claimed to be American citizens. Immediately, the war cry went up in the United States. But due to the wise policy of President Grant it never gained headway.

Finally, in 1878, Spain agreed to forget the past, abolish slavery in Cuba, and admit delegates from Cuba to the Spanish Cortes or Parliament. The Cubans agreed and hostilities ceased. All men in Cuba were given the ballot if they paid taxes to the amount of \$25.00 annually, which still excluded the poorer classes. Of the representatives sent by the island to the Spanish Parliament in Madrid, about one-fifth were Cuban-born. This arrangement lasted as long as the economic life of Cuba was normal.

But in February, 1895, a new war for independence broke out. This was caused by a severe depression of the sugar industry resulting from the repeal in 1894 of the McKinley Tariff which had permitted the free entry of Cuban sugar into the United States, giving the Cuban sugar industry access to the United States market. The closing of the United States to Cuban sugar was a great blow to Cuba's sugar industry. Spanish authority in Cuba was held responsible and warfare was soon established between the insurgents and Spanish authorities. A humane governor-general tried to suppress the insurrection peaceably but without satisfactory results. Accordingly, General Weyler became Governor-General of Cuba, on February 16, 1896. He inaugurated the concentration policy by which the inhabitants of Cuba were assembled or crowded within certain military camps for it was impossible to distinguish the loyalists from the insurgents. As a result of this, there was great suffering and destruction.

Gomez was leader of the insurgents. He destroyed all the property he possibly could in an endeavor to compel the United States to intervene. By attempting to destroy

Spanish authority Gomez hoped to secure the help of the United States. The insurgents were often led by Cubans who had come to America, obtained United States citizenship, and returned to the island claiming the privilege of their acquired citizenship. Between February 24, 1895, and January 22, 1897, seventy-four persons claiming to be citizens of the United States were arrested by Spanish authority, because of their activities as insurgents. But fully three-fourths of those arrested were Cubans or sons of Cubans who had been naturalized in the United States. Often the insurgents developed their plans on American soil and secured military aid here. The federal government took precautions to prevent this but many expeditions were made in spite of action taken to prevent them.

Our Department of State protested to Spain against the concentration policy in Cuba carried out under Governor-General Weyler, but Spain contended that her methods of suppressing rebellion in Cuba were no more severe than the methods employed by our federal government during the Civil War. Attention was called by Spain to the Sherman march through the South and to Sheridan's activities in Virginia. Spain also called attention to the Cuban Junta in New York and claimed that the principal insurgent assistance came from American soil.

Congress appropriated \$50,000 for the relief of Americans in Cuba but up to the fall of 1897 only \$6,000 of the \$50,000 had been used, so little need was there for it. In this war in Cuba between insurgents or rebels and Spanish authority, both sides destroyed all the property possible.

William Randolph Hearst, who was then the leader of American yellow journalism, had at this time developed his chain of newspapers from California to Boston. Early in 1897, he began advocating intervention. Appeals were made daily. Stories, crimes, and conditions were pictured in his papers and greatly exaggerated. Mr. McKinley, opposed to intervention, became President on March 4, 1897. Mark Hanna, who had elected Mr. McKinley President, now wished to be compensated by an appointment to the United States Senate from Ohio. To create a vacan-

cy in the Senate, Mr. McKinley appointed as his Secretary of State Mr. John Sherman who was then Senator from Ohio.

Mr. Hanna was appointed by the Governor of Ohio to the United States Senate. Mr. McKinley's appointment of John Sherman as Secretary of State was a great blunder. Mr. Sherman was then very old and rapidly declining. His work was left in the hands of his assistants in the Department of State.

United States citizens owned wealth in Cuba to the amount of \$50,000,000 and our commerce with Cuba amounted to \$100,000,000 annually. These interests, of course, demanded intervention. Our Department of State in its correspondence with Spain estimated that \$16,000,000 worth of American property had been destroyed in Cuba at the close of 1897, for which property Spain was held responsible. This was a greatly exaggerated figure, for at the close of the war a claims commission was created by Congress to investigate those claims, and this commission recognized as valid claims amounting to only about \$362,252.

In October, 1897, Spain recalled Governor-General Weyler, and appointed in his place Blanco. The concentration order was revoked. Spain offered the natives a larger share of self-government with their own constitution and legislature. Autonomy was granted. If it had been offered three years before, this would, no doubt, have solved the problem. But it was difficult to reconcile the two factions in Cuba. The native Spaniards in Cuba opposed home rule, as it would give the Cubans too much power. The Cubans wanted independence, and were unwilling to cooperate with the Spaniards in home rule. A Cuban parliament was called on May 4, 1898.

The Hearst newspapers were then demanding intervention on the part of the United States and moulding public opinion in that direction. Although the election of 1896 was over and it had settled the issue of free silver, yet other social elements had entered into American politics through the election and campaign of 1896. It was in the interests of some people to make use of a "vigorous for-

eign policy" to keep public attention away from the new issues. This is an old device for obliterating home issues or differences. Lincoln had been advised to precipitate the United States into a foreign war as a means of preventing the Civil War.

On February 9, 1898, the *New York Journal*, a strong advocate of intervention, violated the sanctity of the United States mails by securing through criminal methods a private letter written by Lome, the Spanish minister at Washington, to a friend. In this letter Lome severely criticised McKinley, and spoke of him with contempt. This letter was published by the *New York Journal*. It excited public opinion, and was, of course, made use of by the jingo press.¹

In the midst of the great excitement created by the Lome letter, another incident took place of advantage to the war party. On January 24, 1898, the *Maine* was ordered to Cuba on a "friendly visit". This trip was accepted officially as a complimentary visit but privately both Spain and the United States regarding it in the opposite light. After being in Havana harbor for three weeks, the *Maine* was blown up on February 15, 1898. "Remember the Maine" now became the slogan of the war party. Spain denied any connection with its destruction and no one now believes it was blown up by Spain. The actual cause of the explosion is not known, but it is now believed to have been done by the rebels in Cuba for the purpose of securing the intervention of the United States. It may have been an accident with which Spain could in no way be connected, yet, at the time, in the eyes of the public, Spain was held responsible.

McKinley during this period opposed intervention, but the war party supported by the Hearst papers was growing rapidly. Our able minister in Spain, General Woodford, was also opposed to our intervention. Congress, however, held the opposite attitude. A senator said to Assistant Secretary of State Day: "Day, doesn't your

¹M. M. Wilkerson, *Public Opinion on the Spanish-American War*, gives full treatment of the press in precipitating the conflict.

President know where the war-declaring power is lodged? Tell him that if he doesn't do something, Congress will exercise the power." Congressman Boutell, who was opposed to the war, says that forty of fifty Republican members of Congress held a caucus and sent a committee to the President stating that unless he asked for declaration of war, they would propose a resolution for war and carry it through. Secretary of War Alger, who was a notorious spoilsman, said to a senator:

"I want you to advise the President to declare war. He is making a great mistake. He is in danger of ruining himself and the Republican party by standing in the way of the people's wishes. Congress will declare war in spite of him. He'll get run over and the party with him."

Rhodes, in *McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations*, on page 64, says:

McKinley feared a rupture in his own party, and on account of that fear, had not the nerve and power to resist the pressure for war. We may rest assured that if Mark Hanna had been President, there would have been no war with Spain.

McKinley was opposed to the war up to the last of March, 1898. Only two members of his cabinet were in favor of war. Also, the Vice-President was against it, so was Mark Hanna, the Speaker of the House, and nearly all the leading Republicans of the Senate.

On March 29, 1898, McKinley sent his ultimatum to Spain demanding the complete abandonment of the concentration policy, the granting of an armistice to Cuba, and the opening of peace negotiations through himself with the insurgents. Spain replied granting the complete abandonment of the concentration policy and did not refuse to grant the armistice, but told our minister, General Woodford, that she would gladly grant it, if the Cubans, who were the resisters, asked for it. Our minister at Madrid then cabled McKinley that the Spanish government and people wished to settle the difficulty with-

out war, and that in a few months' time, he would "get peace in Cuba, with justice to Cuba and protection to our great American interests."

On April 6, 1898, the representatives of Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria, Russia, and Italy made an appeal to McKinley to continue peaceful negotiations. The Pope also intervened for peace. He asked the Queen of Spain to comply fully with our ultimatum. Accordingly, on April 10, McKinley was notified by the Foreign Office at Madrid that Spain would grant the armistice. But on the following day, Monday, April 11, 1898, McKinley appeared before Congress and asked for a declaration of war against Spain, without informing them of the latest concessions made by Spain. It is impossible to explain McKinley's action. Through the efforts of Minister Woodford at Madrid and others a diplomatic victory had been won only to be thrown away by McKinley and Congress. The Spanish minister at Washington was notified that the President in his message to Congress on April 11, would explain the concession made by Spain, but this was not done—a reference only was made to it in his war message.

War was declared on April 18, by a vote of 324 to 19 in the House, and 67 to 21 in the Senate. On March 31, 1898, Woodford had cabled to McKinley: "I believe the ministry are ready to go as far and as fast as they can and still save the dynasty here in Spain. They know that Cuba is lost. Public opinion in Spain has moved steadily towards peace." Then on April 3, 1898, Woodford sent this message to President McKinley:

The Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs assures me that Spain will go as far and as fast as she can. I know that the Queen and her present ministry sincerely desire peace, and that the Spanish people desire peace, and if you can still give me time and reasonable liberty of action, I am sure that before October 1st, I will get peace in Cuba.

Again on April 10, the day before our declaration of war, Woodford notified our Department of State that before August 1, he could secure autonomy for Cuba, or a recognition of its independence by Spain or a cession of the

island to the United States. He then added: "I hope that nothing will be done to humiliate Spain, as I am satisfied the present government is going, and is loyally ready to go, as fast and as far as it can." It was an open secret that Spain would give up or sell Cuba as soon as she could.

One cannot read the Woodford dispatches and fail to see that the Spanish-American War was thrust upon Spain by our jingo press. President McKinley over-estimated its strength and lost his nerve fearing the disruption of his party. Spain was not surprised but "stunned" when the United States declared war.

The most important result of the war was our acquisition of the Philippine Islands. In February, 1898, about two months before war was declared, Admiral Dewey of the American fleet was ordered to Hongkong, China, and instructed to be prepared to begin operations against the Philippines in case of a declaration of war. Until after the battle of Manila, the American people had never heard of the Philippine Islands. These islands were taken, however, and at the peace conference, Mr. McKinley instructed our commissioners not to be satisfied with anything less than the entire group of islands because of the "commercial opportunity,"—they were secured as a trading base in the Orient. At that time, it seemed that China would be dismembered by the European powers and that unless we secured the Philippines, the United States would have no share in the Orient. This was our first step in a policy of Asiatic imperialism, clothed in mild terms.

For three years after our capture of these islands, the natives put up a guerrilla warfare to resist the United States forces. During this period, the American army resorted to barbaric torture of the natives. Among other measures, the policy of concentrating the inhabitants in camps was resorted to, which was the same policy we objected to the use of by Spain in Cuba. Prisoners of war were executed in retaliation for crimes of which they knew nothing. One of our notorious army officers known as "Hell-Roaring" Jake Smith commanded that every

building in a certain area be burned and every native over ten years of age be slain. The resistance was caused by the presence of United States soldiers in the islands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beard, Charles A., *Contemporary American History*. ch. 8.
Chadwick, F. E., *Relations of United States and Spain*.
Latane, J. H., *America as a World Power*. ch. 1-5.
Millis, Walter, *The Martial Spirit*.
Rhodes, James Ford, *The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations*.
ch. 3, 4, 5.
Schlessinger, A. M., *Political and Social History of the United States*.
ch. 14 and 15.
Storey, M., *The Conquest of the Philippines*.
Wilkerson, M. M., *Public Opinion and the Spanish-American War*.

CHAPTER VII

WORLD WAR I

We shall not undertake a long discussion of the causes of World War I but simply examine the reasons for the participation in it of the United States on the side of the Allies. For the first time in history the generation living through a great war has been able to ascertain the facts regarding its origin. These facts, however, have not yet become the common property of the masses. A great many people are still influenced by the passions and hatreds aroused by the conflict.

Briefly stated, the causes of the conflict were trade rivalry between Great Britain and Germany, the scramble for territory especially in Africa, the conflict between Russia and Germany for the domination of the Balkan Peninsula, and the old inherited animosity between Germany and France. The immediate occasion for the opening of hostilities in 1914 was the murder of Archduke Ferdinand, the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary. This murder took place while he was in Bosnia. The crime was committed by representatives of a Pan-Slavic organization working hand in hand with the Serbian government with a view to annexing Bosnia to Serbia.

Up to the nineteenth century, the Balkan Peninsula was owned by Turkey but the last century has witnessed the gradual break-up of European Turkey on the Balkan Peninsula. In connection with this disintegration, Russia tried to gain territory at the expense of Turkey. Austria-Hungary also tried to penetrate the same area. A conflict was the inevitable consequence. This Balkan problem had been a source of trouble in Europe for a century. The people of Serbia were Slavs and looked to Russia for support,—in fact, Serbia was practically governed by Russian diplomacy. Austria-Hungary looked to Germany for support. In 1908, Bosnia, which was then a Turkish province but had been administered by Austria-Hungary since 1878, was annexed by Austria-Hungary. This act offended Serbia, who wished to annex it as part of the Pan-

Slavic dream for the domination by Russia of Bosnia, Serbia, and the remainder of the Balkans. This annexation by Austria-Hungary defeated the Pan-Slavic dream and was a victory for Pan-Germany. Feeling became more and more acute when in 1914 the Archduke Ferdinand was killed. The incident was applauded by Serbia and conflict followed. The details of events in 1914 are too complicated to go into for our brief space, but popular accounts reaching the United States were from Allied sources and were correspondingly biased.¹

In 1914 all Europe was divided into two great military camps—the Allied and the Central Powers. The following is the size of the principal armies of Europe in 1914: Germany, 806,000; Austria, 370,000; Italy, 305,000; Russia, 1,284,000; France, 818,000; Belgium, 280,000. All Europe was equipped as a military machine and the murder in 1914 simply put the machinery in motion. It is an absurd fallacy to think that Germany was the only armed nation at the time, and to believe that Great Britain entered the conflict to defend Belgium is equally absurd. As early as 1911, Great Britain had made plans with France for marching an army through Belgium to Germany in the event of war with Germany. Belgium was regarded as a part of the Allied powers. Great Britain has officially acknowledged to be false her ostensible reason for entering the war—the protection of Belgium. Her reason was the struggle between rival imperialisms, which secret treaties later exposed show clearly.

However, we are concerned here only with why the United States entered the war. The three outstanding causes were interference with neutral trade, economic ties with the Allies, and Allied propaganda in the United States. These causes overlap in such a way as to make it difficult to discuss them separately.

Soon after war was declared in 1914, Great Britain placed mines in the North Sea and with the aid of her

¹A. S. Fay, *Origin of the World War*, is best full account.

navy blockaded Germany and the adjacent neutral portions of North Europe. As a result, all goods going in that direction were captured. The United States protested but Great Britain refused to yield, claiming it to be a military necessity although illegal from the point of view of international law. Great Britain blockaded Germany by mines, and cut off all foreign trade with Germany and neutral ports near Germany to prevent the entrance of goods into Germany. Germany retaliated in February, 1915, by employing the submarine to blockade Great Britain. Since the object of warfare is the physical destruction of an opponent, once you justify the war you must justify any means employed to gain the victory. In protesting to Germany, we argued that the submarines could not warn ships to take off passengers before they were sunk. American ships kept out of the mine zones, but disregarded the submarine zones. The *Lusitania*, a British ship, was sunk by a submarine on May 7, 1915, with a loss of 1195 lives, including 124 Americans. We immediately protested. But the facts revealed since the war have shown that the *Lusitania* carried a large quantity of munitions of war including 2400 cases of cartridges, 11 tons of black powder, and 173 tons of rifle ammunition.² At the time the boat was sunk a United States senator asked the Treasury Department for the bill of lading. He was told it had been turned over to the State Department. When the senator asked the State Department for a copy of the bill of lading in order to see what was on board, the State Department refused to disclose the contents on the grounds that it was to be kept for diplomatic correspondence.

The British seized and searched the mails. United States officials below the rank of minister were searched by the British while traveling to and from the continent. Before the close of 1914, thirty-one cargoes of copper, valued at \$5,500,000 had been captured by Great Britain but the United States owners were compensated. Their

²C. H. Grattan, *Why We Fought*, p. 291.

seizure, however, was illegal. Early in 1916, Germany agreed to give up the use of the submarine, but on condition that the United States make Great Britain obey international law. We could not force Great Britain to abide by international law, and consequently Germany resumed her submarine warfare in 1917, which was our official reason for entering the war. The effective causes of our entrance were our economic ties with the Allies, and the Allied propaganda in the United States.

Modern warfare is a conflict of economic resources as well as armies. The British navy cut off all economic intercourse between Germany and the United States. In this way, the economic resources of the United States were in the hands of the Allies. American agriculture, credit, and industry soon became indispensable to the Allied cause. In 1915 an Anglo-French mission came to New York and secured a loan of \$500,000,000. This money was left with various banks in New York for the purpose of buying supplies from America. The Allied governments continued to borrow in Wall Street, and these banks loaned England and France money with which to buy materials. Soon the House of Morgan became the purchasing agent of the Allies. The Morgan firm selected Edward R. Stettinius, Sr., president of the Diamond Match Company, as the purchasing agent. Mr. Stettinius selected one hundred and seventy-five men to assist him in the task. They were soon purchasing supplies for the Allies at the rate of \$10,000,000 a day. By September, 1917, the Morgan firm had purchased \$3,000,000,000 in merchandise and munitions for the Allies in addition to the selling of Allied bonds. The day the United States declared war against Germany the British government's bank account with Morgan was heavily overdrawn.

When Kitchener became Minister of War in Great Britain in 1915 one of his first acts was to cable Charles M. Schwab of the Bethlehem Steel Company to come to England immediately. Schwab went and agreed to sell all the output of the Bethlehem Steel Company to the British government. In less than two years, he shipped about \$300,000,000 worth of war material to England. Twenty

submarines were built and sent in parts to Canada where they were assembled and sent across to England. This was done a year before the German submarine *Deutschland* came to the United States and was advertised as the first to cross the Atlantic. (See John Moody, *Masters of Capital*, pages 162-172.)

American industry had become one with the Allies. Our greatest banking and industrial institutions had become dependent upon an Allied victory and an Allied victory was dependent upon them. American industry became pro-Ally because the British blockade cut off our trade with Germany. German and Austrian agents such as Dumba, Karl Boy-Ed and Franz von Papen were expelled from the country because of their unneutral activities on behalf of the Central Powers.

"Patriotic" societies such as "The Navy League," "The American Defense Society," and the "National Security League" were all tied up financially with munition plants. These societies were propaganda bureaus for "preparedness" and later for our entrance into the conflict. The nineteen men who founded the Navy League had among their number representatives of the three manufacturers of armor plate in America,—the Midvale, Bethlehem, and Carnegie Companies. The Navy League was in practice the propaganda bureau of the three companies working together to sell armor plate.

Modern warfare has become even more than a conflict of armies and of economic resources. Propaganda to secure popular support, has become more and more necessary. Both sides in the European conflict made great efforts to present their propaganda before America, but the Central Powers failed primarily because of the British blockade. The Allies, on their side, had the cooperation of American business, and easily accomplished their purpose. Professor Hayes in his *Brief History of the Great War* says:

The British resorted to every known device of propaganda from employing secret service agents in New York to maintaining at Washington the great jour-

nalist, Lord Northcliffe, with a host of assistants, as a publicity director.

These propagandists had the cooperation of the bankers who had made loans to the Allies or had acted as purchasing agents. All this happened in 1916, but the American people never knew the source of their "war news" until the conflict was over. Mr. Rathom, of the *Providence Journal* of Providence, R. I., was notorious for his accounts of German "crimes." The Boston *Herald* of December 30, 1923, in an editorial comment, says:

It is, of course, true, as most well informed people now understand, that the Rathom disclosures which made the *Providence Journal* famous during the war were fiction—but Rathom did this for the praiseworthy purpose of arousing his countrymen to a war fury. He took one of the practical ways of doing so.

Captain Ferdinand Tuohy of the British Secret Service in *The Secret Corps* says:

All the trickery and subterfuge and war-wisdom of the ages brought up-to-date, intensified and harnessed to every modern invention and device, . . . a Machiavelli, a Talleyrand or some other master schemer of the ages come back to earth, would have thrilled at the amazing cunning and corruption of it all.

The Belgium authorities themselves have denied the truth of the crimes given out in the Bryce *Report*. Mr. Lloyd George has stated in print that careful investigations disclosed no case of Belgian children with hands cut off. Yet these are some of the crimes with which the American public were fed during 1916, 1917 and 1918. The peoples of the Central Powers were, of course, furnished similar crimes attributed to the Allies. There were many crimes committed as in all wars, but every nation was guilty of them.

It is not easy to explain the attitudes of many prominent officials of the United States during the years preceding our entrance into the war. Ambassador Walter H. Page, our representative in London, was guilty of

direct disloyalty to the American Government and people. When President Wilson protested to the British Government against her disregard of neutral rights Mr. Page did not give the messages to Sir Edward Grey of the British Foreign Office. He would read them to him and would then ask Grey to cooperate with him in making a reply to the United States. Sir Edward Grey says in his *Memoirs*:

Page came to see me at the foreign office one day and produced a long dispatch from Washington contesting our claims to act as we were doing in stopping contraband in going to neutral ports. 'I am instructed,' he said, 'to read this dispatch to you.' He read and I listened. He then said 'I have now read the dispatch but I do not agree with it. Let us consider how it should be answered.'

In all diplomacy there is no other example of such a procedure. Page was determined upon our entrance from the very beginning of the war. Many of our representatives at the principal courts of Europe were connected with the Allies personally through business or banking interests in this country.

President Wilson had become converted to the idea of intervention by the spring of 1916. Sir Edward Grey says in his *Memoirs* that Colonel House assured him in February, 1916, that Wilson would do his best to bring the United States to the aid of the Allies. In April, 1916, the President consulted Champ Clark, Speaker of the House; Claude Kitchin, Democratic Leader; H. D. Flood, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; and other Democratic leaders regarding their willingness to bring the United States into the war on the Allied side.³ This is known as the famous "Sunrise Conference." They refused, and Mr. Wilson allowed his party to use as the 1916 campaign slogan, "He kept us out of war." At the time he was afraid to advocate intervention for fear of splitting his party. There were demands on the part of certain political leaders and the press for immediate inter-

³For full account see A. M. Arnett, *Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies*.

vention but these demands were not representative of public opinion at the time. Ambassador Page brought his influence to bear on preventing the Allies from considering German proposals for peace offered in 1916 and 1917.

Allied propaganda represented Germany as lustful for world dominion. Careful examination now shows that there was no such policy except that which is common to all powers. This was part of the propaganda spread in the United States to inflame public opinion and make our entrance "defensive." Both sides resorted to trickery of every description.

Brigadier General J. C. Charteris, Chief of Intelligence of the British Army during the war, stated boastfully in New York in an address in the fall of 1925 before the National Arts Club that he had invented the report that Germany was boiling down the bodies of her dead soldiers to be used as fertilizer. He made the statement under the impression that no reporters were present. The *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, on December 6, 1925, said editorially:

A few years ago, the story of how the Kaiser was reducing human corpses to fat, aroused the citizens of this and other enlightened nations to a fury of hatred. Normally sane men doubled their fists and rushed off to the nearest recruiting sergeant. Now they are being told, in effect, that they were dupes and fools; that their own officers deliberately goaded them to the desired boiling point, using an infamous lie to arouse them, just as a grown bully whispers to one little boy that another little boy said he could lick him. * * *

In the next war, the propaganda must be more subtle and clever than the best the World War produced. These frank admissions of wholesale lying on the part of trusted governments in the last war will not soon be forgotten.

After the United States entered the war in April, 1917, we immediately created a government propaganda bureau, which was known as "The Committee on Public Information," with George Creel as chairman. Since the war, Mr. Creel has given us an account of the propaganda activities

in his book—*How We Advertised America*. No effort was made to present the truth. Allied propaganda was accepted and to it we added ours. This "Committee on Public Information" issued 75,099,023 pamphlets and books to encourage the public "morale." They hired the services of 75,000 speakers who operated in 5,200 communities. Altogether, about 755,190 speeches were made by these people known as the "Four Minute Men." Exhibits were given at fairs and war films were prepared from which the Committee on Public Information received a royalty. A total of 1,438 drawings were employed to arouse popular hatred. An official daily newspaper was issued which had a circulation of 100,000 copies. A propaganda bureau was established by the United States, in the capitals of every nation in the world except those of the Central Powers. The total expenditure by the United States for propaganda was \$6,738,223. The Espionage Act was passed making it illegal to spread "false" reports that would hinder recruiting. Every report was false which did not harmonize with the propaganda released by this Committee on Public Information.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnett, A. M., *Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies*
 Allen, William C., *War Behind the Smoke Screen*
 Abrams, R. H., *Preachers Present Arms*
 Barnes, Harry E., *The Genesis of the World War*
 Creel, George, *How We Advertised America*
 Chaffee, Zechariah, *Freedom of Speech*
 Fay, A. S., *Origin of the World War*
 Flick, A. C., *Modern World History*. ch. 34
 Grattan, C. H., *Why We Fought*
 Lasswell, H. D., *Propaganda Technique in the World War*
 Moody, John, *Masters of Capital*. ch. 9
 Squires, J. D., *British Propaganda at Home and in the United States, 1914-1917*
 Thomas, Norman, *Is Conscience A Crime?*

CHAPTER VIII

WORLD WAR II

There is always the danger of over-simplification in attempting to explain any movement in history. This is especially true of World War II. We shall attempt no explanation but merely state briefly some of the circumstances under which the United States entered the conflict.

World War I solved no problems, but raised many. Good can come only out of intelligent creative action. The German Republic was doomed from its birth in 1919.¹ Regarding the small, unbalanced economic units and the impossibility of their survival, Herbert Hoover wrote President Wilson while with him in Paris on April 11, 1919:

I have the feeling that revolution in Europe is by no means over. The social wrongs in these countries are far from solution and the tempest must blow itself out, probably with enormous violence. * * *

In my view, if the Allies can not be brought to adopt peace on the basis of the Fourteen Points, we should retire from Europe lock, stock and barrel, and we should lend to the whole world our economic and moral strength, or the world will swim in a sea of misery and disaster worse than the Dark Ages.²

In 1938 there was published in England *The Next War Series* consisting of eight volumes with Captain Liddell Hart as editor-in-chief. One volume, *Propaganda in the Next War*, written by Captain Sidney Rogerson of the British armed forces, was a treatise on the conduct of propaganda in the next war. Much of it was taken up with methods to be employed in deceiving the American public. With the outbreak of hostilities its sale to America was prohibited by the British Foreign Office. A few

¹For brief description of European conditions out of which Hitler arose see *Why Hitler?*, price 10c, War Resisters League, New York, N. Y.

²Herbert Hoover, *America's First Crusade*, Pp. 46-47.

copies had previously come to America. The copy in possession of the Congressional Library was put on the rare book shelf. The following significant excerpts from this book are interesting:

There can be no doubt that the next war will be billed as a fight between Democracy and Dictatorship. It may in fact be nothing of the sort. In the ultimate resort alliances spring from the hope of material advantage, not the possession of a common ideological belief, but in our propaganda we must make the facts fit the case as far as possible.³ * * *

In 1914 Japan was our gallant ally, the land of little children where the babies are the kings, and the country of the Mikado, the cherry blossom and the chrysanthemum. While with giant strides she was developing commercially and industrially she was a rich market for British goods. At one time even her warships were built in British yards, and as recently as the great Tokyo earthquake of 1923, she was regarded sentimentally as an ex-ally When she began to put to her own uses the machinery and equipment that our manufacturers had sold her, to shut the British trader out of Japan, to undersell him even in his home market and to develop an imperialistic and frankly annexationist policy, public opinion veered around, becoming anti-Japanese.⁴ * * *

"Most of the feeling of one ally for another is manufactured."⁵ * * *

"The greatest propaganda force that the world has ever witnessed is the American film industry."⁶

On page 148 of that volume, there occurs the following statement:

"It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the republic will again take up arms in an external quarrel."

World War II began hostilities in September, 1939. England entered presumably to restore Poland when Po-

³Sidney Rogerson, *Propaganda in the Next War*, p. 140

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 155.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 10.

land was divided between Germany and Russia in 1939. Winston Churchill was more hostile to communism than to fascism till June 22, 1941, when Russia entered the war against Germany and became an ally of Great Britain. Previous to this, Churchill had been bitter in his denunciation of Russia stating that the rulers of Russia were "A band of cosmopolitan conspirators gathered from the underworld." In 1937 Mr. Churchill stated before the House of Commons, "If I had to choose between Communism and Nazism, I would choose Nazism."

President Roosevelt denounced the Russian attack on Finland in 1939 saying it "was unprovoked aggression" by a "brutal despotism second to none on earth." This was before he became an ally of Russia in 1941 and furnished Russia material with which to bomb Finland.

Until a few years before World War II many of the leaders of the American Legion held a sympathy for fascist leaders. Mussolini himself was extremely popular with the Legion. Alvin Owsley, National Commander of the American Legion, in 1923 said:

Do not forget that the fascisti are to Italy what the American Legion is to the United States. . . . If ever needed, the American Legion stands ready to protect the country's institutions and ideals as the Fascisti dealt with obstructionists who menaced Italy.

Greetings with Mussolini were exchanged at many of the Legion's annual conventions. In 1930, Mussolini was invited to speak at the annual convention in Boston. This invitation was withdrawn when organized labor protested. In 1931, National Commander Ralph T. O'Neill presented to the Fascist Ambassador in the United States resolutions of the National Executive Committee of the Legion greeting Mussolini and thanking him for assisting with Legion activities in Italy. In 1933, National Vice-Commander William Edward Eastman, Jr., visited Mussolini and conferred upon him honorary membership in the Legion. This membership was later withdrawn when it was found to violate the constitution of the American Legion.⁷

⁷"How American Is the Legion:" *New Republic*, Sept. 18, 1944.

Writing in the *News Bulletin*, published by the National Council for Prevention of War, Washington, D. C., Dr. F. J. Libby, the executive secretary, stated in the December 13, 1924, issue:

We are further from peace than we were in 1922. The French occupation of the Ruhr and the passage by Congress of the Japanese Exclusion Act were blows at the very heart of world peace. . . . The question of race equality has been made a live issue to be coupled in future years with the problem raised by white domination over people that want to be free. . . . No nation won the last war. France is less secure than in 1914; England is less prosperous.

In contrast with their governments, the people of the world were, generally speaking, anti-war throughout the twenties and far into the thirties. This powerful anti-war feeling of the country was recognized by the President.

It was in 1930-1932 that Hitler arose to power on the misery of the German people. "Aggression" results sooner or later from "oppression," whether it be economic, political, or psychological. The British government looked with complacency on the growing military power of Germany as a bulwark against Russia until 1938, when it was decided that Germany had grown too strong and reversed its policy.

The distribution of the world's raw materials suggests why Germany, Italy, and Japan were the "aggressors" in war. The 25 raw materials most needed by a modern industrial nation were distributed as follows after World War I:

	<i>Supply</i>		
	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>Partial</i>	<i>None</i>
Great Britain.....	18	2	5
United States.....	16	4	5
Japan.....	3	5	17
Germany.....	4	2	19
Italy.....	4	0	21

The Pacific fleet of the United States was attacked by Japan while stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941. About 3,000 Americans were killed and

our Pacific fleet was greatly damaged. This was the most disastrous naval tragedy in American history. According to the Gallup poll, 80% of the American people were before this opposing our entrance into World War II. This tragedy at Pearl Harbor was presented to the American public as an unprovoked and treacherous attack while the Administration was negotiating for peace with Japan. Congress declared war on Japan with only one dissenting vote.

An examination of the evidence shows that the American public was deceived at the time regarding the occasion for this attack. Japan had been buying materials of war from the United States for several years for her use in the war with China. Winston Churchill had given moral support to Japan justifying the Japanese attack on China stating it was only "the suppression of Chinese bandits and communists." He had twice closed the Burma road over which China secured material. The policy of Winston Churchill and Roosevelt was in a sense pro-Japanese until June of 1941. Before this they felt Japan would go north and attack Russia. From the outbreak of the war in 1939 till June 22, 1941, it was felt in Great Britain and in the United States that Russia might be an ally of Germany. When Germany attacked Russia in June, 1941, and Japan began to expand to the south of Asia towards British possessions the picture was entirely changed. That made Russia an ally of Great Britain. Winston Churchill reversed his former position regarding Japan and Roosevelt followed Churchill's policy. Previous to this Churchill had welcomed the rise of fascism in Italy as a bulwark against communism. He had also admired Hitler's "courage and vital force" as well as Mussolini's "gentle and simple bearings" and his "triumphant struggle against the bestial appetite and passion of Leninism."⁸

The British Empire felt its danger in Asia was from Japan. The *Christian Century* on November 19, 1941, three weeks before Pearl Harbor, wrote: "It is no secret

⁸Winston Churchill, *Great Contemporaries*, (1937).

that the whole colonial structure of the white empires is threatening to fall apart unless we intervene in Asia. Many British leaders would welcome American involvement with Japan."

According to Sidney Rogerson of the British army, to bring the United States into a European conflict on the side of England, it would:

. . . . naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany.⁹

The American policy of trading with Japan was reversed in July, 1941, after Russia became an ally of England. Previous to this President Roosevelt had permitted the sale of oil and other war materials to Japan over the protest of American public opinion. In July, 1941, President Roosevelt prohibited not only the sale of war materials to Japan but he prohibited also the sale of materials essential for her domestic economy and soon demanded that Japan recognize as a fixed policy the white empires in Asia, of which the British Empire comprised approximately 90% in both area and population owned by European powers.

The *New York Times* of October 24, 1941, stated:

Japan's raw-material shortage has been sharply aggravated and her industrial activities seriously disrupted by the cessation of her trade with important foreign countries, the Department of Commerce reported today.

Ship movements and trade between Japan and the United States, the British Empire and the Netherland Indies, it is pointed out, have become virtually non-existent.

The same paper stated on December 2, 1941, five days before the attack on Pearl Harbor, "Japan had been cut off from about 75% of her normal imports as a result of

⁹Sidney Rogerson, *Propaganda in the Next War*, p. 148.

the Allied blockade." In commenting on this situation, one prominent non-Japanese stated, "Japan had no choice but to go to war or to submit to economic slavery for her existence."

Forrest Davis and Ernest K. Lindley, friends and biographers of President Roosevelt, in giving an account of the Atlantic Conference of August, 1941, wrote:

Churchill wished to meet the issue head-on. He asked the President—as the British, Australians, and the Dutch repeatedly had besought this government before—to join an ultimative declaration to Japan.¹⁰

On September 3, 1941, the United States demanded that Japan accept the principle of "non-disturbance of the status quo in the Pacific."¹¹ This committed American lives to securing a guaranty for British and Dutch imperial interests in the Orient. President Roosevelt was fully aware of the danger of attack provoked by the administrative policies of the United States. According to the *Roberts Report on Pearl Harbor*:

"On October 16, 1941, the commanding general, Hawaiian department, and the commander-in-chief of the fleet were advised by the War and Navy Departments . . . the possibility of an attack by Japan in the Far East."

On November 26, 1941, President Roosevelt gave an ultimatum to Japan demanding in part the withdrawal of all military forces from China, renunciation of all extra-territorial rights in China, and Japan's renunciation of her treaty of alliance with the Axis forces.

In the *Saturday Evening Post* of October 10, 1942, page 9, in an article by Lieutenant Clarence E. Dickerson entitled "I Fly for Vengeance," Lieutenant Dickinson states:

On this cruise we had sailed from Pearl Harbor on November 28 under absolute war orders. Vice Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., the commander of

¹⁰Forrest Davis and E. K. Lindley, "How War Came," *Ladies' Home Journal*, July, 1943.

¹¹Department of State Bulletin, December 20, 1941, p. 538.

the aircraft force, had given instructions that the secrecy of our mission was to be protected at all costs. We were to shoot down everything we saw on the sea. In that way, there could be no leak to the Japs.

Mr. Churchill's speech in Parliament, January 28, 1942—as reported in the *New York Times* of that date, page 10,—stated:

It has been the policy of the Cabinet at almost all costs to avoid embroilment with Japan until we were sure that the United States would be engaged. . . .

On the other hand, the probability since the Atlantic Conference at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt, that the United States, even if not herself attacked, would come into the war in the Far East and thus make the final victory assured, seemed to allay some of these anxieties, and that expectation has not been falsified by the events.

This would seem to indicate that not only did President Roosevelt accede to Churchill's pressure to send an ultimatum to, and impose sanctions upon Japan but he also made a blanket commitment to bring America into the war even if Japan did not attack.

Oliver Lyttelton, British Minister of Production, in an address in London on June 20, 1944, said approvingly:

Japan was provoked into attacking Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty on history even to say that America was forced into the war. It is incorrect to say that America ever was truly neutral even before America came into the war on an all-out fighting basis.¹²

Mr. Arthur Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times* and in the forefront of those taking us into war, in an address at the North Atlantic Conference of the Red Cross on January 31, 1944 said:

. . . we did not go to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I hold rather that we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we had gone to war—.

¹²The remark made such an uproar in American diplomatic circles that he apologized the next day for the statement.

In the November 1943 issue of *Fortune*, a strong advocate of intervention, Sherry Mangan, in an article on the "State of the Nation" wrote approvingly:

The American people were eased into the war by a process of discreet gradualism and manufactured inevitability. . . . The United States pulled the American people . . . into the war by their coat-tails . . . Pearl Harbor merely legalized the accomplished fact.

Admiral Harold R. Stark stated on January 3, 1946, before the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee that American warships in the Atlantic got orders on October 11, 1941, to destroy "German and Italian naval, land, and air forces encountered" and they were then "operating at times under direction of British officers." On January 11, 1946, it was revealed to the same committee that Admiral Halsey in the Pacific was instructed several days before the Pearl Harbor attack "to sink every Japanese ship that they found."

There is no question but that the President expected an attack at just about the time when it finally happened. It was expected to occur in the Far East rather than at Pearl Harbor.¹³

In February, 1942, Churchill made the following statement in the House of Commons: "When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources and feel that they are now in it with us . . . This is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass."

On February 1, 1944, President Roosevelt gave out a statement defining the aims for which the United States was fighting the war in the Pacific, stating:

Our task in expelling the Japs from Burma, Malaya, Java and other territory is military. We recognize that our British and Dutch brothers in arms are as determined to throw the Japs out of Malaya

¹³See Roberts, *Report on Pearl Harbor*, also John T. Flynn, *The Truth About Pearl Harbor* for full account.

and the Dutch East Indies as we are determined to free the Philippines. We propose to help each other, on the roads and waters and above them, eastward to these places and beyond to Tokyo.

The *Christian Century* in commenting on that statement wrote: "Millions of Americans have feared that one reason why our armies are fighting in the Far East is to restore European imperialism there. Now they know it."¹⁴

Why did Great Britain enter the conflict? According to Winston Churchill, when war was declared in 1939, it was to restore Poland from the possession of Germany and Russia. But according to F. A. Voigt, editor of *The Nineteenth Century and After* and close to the British Foreign Office as well as representative of the ruling class in England, writing in the September, 1943, issue:

England fought to preserve the balance—for that reason and no other. . . .

The commonly accepted view that Germany made war to dominate the world is, in our opinion, mistaken. . . .

His main purpose in going to war was to subjugate the European mainland and then to open up Russia for German colonization.

This editorial also stated:

If Germany changes her political complexion as well she may at the approach of defeat, that will be no reason for modifying the prospective terms of peace. . . . The exorbitant strength of Germany must be reduced and it must be kept reduced. Better a despotically governed Germany that is not too strong than a liberal Germany that is too strong. The peace that will end the Second World War must be such that the balance of power will be restored and will be preserved for generations to come. This must be the primary war aim and peace aim of Great Britain and of the Empire.

World War II was primarily a struggle for the preservation of the balance of power in Europe and the preservation of British and Dutch colonial possessions in Asia against the expansion of Japan.

¹⁴*Christian Century* February 23, 1944, p. 228.

President Roosevelt at all times kept the American public uninformed as to his plans for entering the conflict. For example, on October 30, 1940, President Roosevelt in his campaign for the third term said in an address at Boston:

And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war.

Yet within six months of this promise Mr. Roosevelt was secretly landing an American Army on foreign soil. An advance guard of an American Army was landed secretly in Greenland on April 9, 1941, for the express purpose of relieving the British garrison there. In September, 1941, *three months before Pearl Harbor*, American forces without a declaration of war destroyed two German weather stations in Greenland killing several Germans. These stations were set up to supply Nazi submarines with weather information to help them in the war with Great Britain.¹⁵ What an outburst of rage would have come from this country had the situations been reversed and the Germans, without a declaration of war, attacked and killed Americans under similar conditions!!!

Another example of such policies on the part of President Roosevelt was revealed in the House of Commons on June 16, 1944, by John McGovern, an Independent Laborite member of the British House of Commons from Glasgow. The information he revealed, supported by subsequent investigation, may be summarized as follows:

President Roosevelt is said to have promised Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty before becoming Prime Minister in May, 1940, that America would come to the aid of Great Britain. In October, 1939, contrary to the diplomatic usage of using these codes between heads of governments only, the courtesy of the American Embassy codes was extended to Winston Churchill in or-

¹⁵O. G. Villard, "The Great Deception," *Christian Century*, June 21, 1944.

der that he might send cables to President Roosevelt. The substance of one cable was: "I am half American, and the natural person to work with you. It is evident we see eye to eye. Were I to become Prime Minister we could control the world." During the winter of 1939-1940 many cables were exchanged between them and steps were discussed for leading the United States into war.

These codes were decoded by Tyler G. Kent, a code clerk in the American Embassy in London. The father of Tyler G. Kent had been in consular service for over twenty years. The son, Tyler G. Kent, was appointed a clerk in the foreign service in 1934 at the age of 22 and assigned to the American Embassy at Moscow. He was transferred to the American Embassy at London on September 21, 1939, arriving there in October, 1939. His duties were to encode and decode diplomatic messages. On May 20, 1940, Kent was dismissed from the government service and arrested accused of revealing diplomatic conversation passing between President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, before becoming Prime Minister in May, 1940. The United States authorities waived diplomatic immunity in the case and Tyler Kent was given a secret trial in a British court and sentenced to prison for seven years for revealing the secret messages.* Among those who secured these messages was one Anna Wolkoff, a naturalized British subject, the daughter of a former Admiral in the Russian Imperial Navy, and strongly anti-Communist. She was sentenced to prison for ten years. Also a member of the House of Commons, Captain A. H. M. Ramsey, in possession of these messages and considered dangerous by Winston Churchill, was detained in prison by the Minister of Home Security, Herbert Morrison, who had charge of the regulation and imprisonment for the duration of "dangerous persons" in England. Joseph P. Kennedy, United States Ambassador to Great Britain at that time, in commenting on this case on September 6, 1944, stated that Churchill had agreed when the war began to supply "exact and com-

*He was released and returned to America in October, 1945.

plete" information on British war plans, needs, and preparations to President Roosevelt.

The above events took place several months before the Pearl Harbor attack.

While the war psychology was sweeping the nation in 1940, the policy of conscription was adopted as an emergency measure. The rise of conscription has an interesting story. France was the first country in modern history to adopt conscription as a method of raising a national army. In 1798, during the French Revolution, France adopted this method of getting men for her army after voluntary enlistment had broken down. After this revolution, other nations of Europe adopted such a policy as their method for raising a standing army. Prussia adopted such a system in 1806, Russia in 1872, and Japan in 1873. Before this adoption of conscription as a national policy by modern nations, local units of government had used it as a means of getting men for the local militia when an insufficient number volunteered. All major wars of modern history have resorted to the drafting of men. Conscription is both democratic and totalitarian—democratic as slavery is democratic in that it falls on all alike, totalitarian in that it treats the individual as a tool of the state.

The first consideration of conscription as a national policy in America was in connection with the War of 1812. Men were slow to volunteer. Plans were made to invade Canada, but there was no popular support of such plans. During that war the principal opposition to conscription was from the New England States. Josiah Quincy, the outstanding Federalist from Massachusetts in 1813, said: "This war, the measure which preceded it and the mode of carrying it on, are all undeniably southern and western policy, not the policy of the commercial states."¹⁶ This opposition was most vigorous against every effort of the government to raise troops for the American cause. Finally as a last resort, after all else had failed, the government turned to the draft as a means of securing an army

¹⁶Charles A. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*. Vol. I, p. 420.

of sufficient size. The response from the opposition was spontaneous. Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, who was then a young member of the House of Representatives, was their principal spokesman. Webster's speech was so stinging in his abuse of the proposed draft and of the administration that its publication was suppressed for almost a hundred years. An excerpt from Webster's speech reads:

The majority is trying to demonstrate that the government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more dangerous, more allied to blood and murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every form and degree of misery than has been exercised by any civilized government, with a single exception, in modern times.¹⁷

He based his protest on the fact that the conscripts were to fight battles of invasion and that the people were not of a temper to submit to conscription. He also vaguely hinted that such a policy might end in dissolving the Union. Due to this great amount of opposition, conscription was not adopted in the War of 1812.

In our war with Mexico, conscription was not considered, but desertion from the regular forces was such a problem that a reward of \$30 was offered for the arrest and delivery of a deserter. Descriptions of deserters were printed exclusively by the *National Police Gazette* by order of the Adjutant General of the United States Army, and the government subscriptions practically subsidized the magazine during that period.

The first Draft Act in the United States was passed by the Confederate Congress during the Civil War in April 1862—nearly a year before the Union Congress adopted compulsory military service. President Jefferson Davis knew from his experience as an army man and as a former Secretary of War that only by conscription could he raise an army. The law declared able-bodied white males between the ages of 18 and 35 to be subject to the draft. In 1863 with the war going against the South, the Con-

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 422.

federate Congress extended the age to 45. Those owning ten slaves—and later twenty slaves—were exempt. During the last six months of the war, due to local resistance, conscription in the Confederacy broke down entirely.

Many leaders in the Confederacy were opposed to conscription. Governor J. E. Brown of Georgia was among those in active opposition. General Stonewall Jackson was obliged to use armed forces in suppressing an uprising among the men in the valleys of the Blue Ridge Mountains. In the hill country of North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi the opposition was strong. The governor of Florida wrote Jefferson Davis that he had been unable to enforce the conscription act satisfactorily.¹⁸

President Lincoln ordered a draft law drawn up in August, 1862, but the bill did not pass both Houses of Congress until May 3, 1863. The following July, when the Federal Government attempted to enforce the draft, rioting broke out in New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and other sections of the country. Mobs set fire to the arsenal in Boston, and in New York crowds attacked the state armory, killing the 40 soldiers who guarded it. For three days and nights mobs roamed the city, burning, looting, and murdering innocent citizens, and not until troops were brought from the front were the riots suppressed. The governor of New York demanded suspension of the draft until its constitutionality could be determined by the courts. The 1863 Democratic conventions of both New York and Ohio condemned the draft as unconstitutional. Among the leaders of the opposition was Congressman Vallandigham of Ohio, who was branded a "Copperhead" by President Lincoln, tried by a military commission, imprisoned, and later banished.

The Federal Government, during the Civil War, used the draft as a club to force individual states to produce their quota of troops under the volunteer system. The states were divided into federal congressional districts and subdivided into districts according to size and popu-

¹⁸James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States, 1850-1877*, Vol. V, Chapter 28.

lation. When the President issued a call for troops and sufficient volunteers did not respond, draft officers went from house to house enlisting men of draft age, by force if necessary. A draftee could escape service by paying \$300, or hiring a substitute to take his place.

Conscription met with so much opposition that it was not considered again until this nation entered the first World War. In that first World War, "Selective Service", as the draft act was then called, was adopted about a month after a "state of war" with Germany was proclaimed by Congress. This draft became a law May 18, 1917. Of all those who supported the draft, it remained for Governor Bickett of North Carolina to proclaim that it was *divinely ordained*. To meet the opposition in his state, he undertook to prove that the draft was of divine inspiration, and that those who fought against it were fighting against God. He found that the first selective service law was given by God to Moses. Under this law, according to Governor Bickett, Moses was directed to register for military service every male person in Israel 20 years old and upwards who was physically fit to go to war.

"Of course there are some differences in details, but the principle of the present selective draft law is identical with the law given to Moses by Jehovah in the Wilderness of Sinai," proclaimed the Governor of North Carolina. With the close of World War I, the draft likewise came to a close.

The War Department has been advocating since 1918 conscription as the permanent method of raising an army. In 1920, the Senate passed such a bill only to be defeated in the House of Representatives. Senator John Sharpe Williams of Mississippi, in opposing such a policy in the Senate, said on March 29, 1918, "A nation which lives in peace time under universal military compulsory service is a nation of slaves."

With the growth of the peace sentiment in the 1920's these efforts to establish conscription as a permanent policy were not successful.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, in 1926, created a Joint Army and Navy Selective Service

Committee. This committee was composed of representatives of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and a small group of officers who had been in the Selective Service Administration during the World War I. This committee carried on a propaganda for a period of 14 years advocating a peacetime draft system. They put out various studies and publications through their office of Public Relations.

The Military Training Camps Association of the United States with headquarters in Chicago and New York, in collaboration with the War Department, sponsored the Selective Training Service Act of 1940. This organization may be considered the Public Relations Committee of the War Department.

The active drive for the conscription law was inaugurated at the Harvard Club in New York City on May 22, 1940.¹⁹ Among those present at this meeting were Julius Adler of the *New York Times*, Grenville Clark, Robert P. Patterson, Henry L. Stimson, and Elihu Root, Jr. Many of the group were for immediate entrance into the war.

On May 23, 1940, the same club passed a resolution for "aid to the allies short of war." On June 3, 1940, the club put on a campaign to raise \$250,000 for propaganda purposes to be used by the newly-formed "Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies" directed by William Allen White. Over 600 local chapters were soon established throughout the country. Branch headquarters were established at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and at Chicago.²⁰ Money was plentiful with them. One objective of some in this organization was to secure conscription for the purpose of sending another American Expeditionary Force to Europe.

On June 10, 1940, an advertisement, "Stop Hitler Now", prepared by Robert Emmet Sherwood, playwright, appeared in 18 leading newspapers at a cost of approximately \$25,000. This was paid for by the "Committee to De-

¹⁹*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Sept. 22, 1940, gives full account.

²⁰Information furnished by "The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies."

fend America by Aiding the Allies," with funds furnished by a group of financial and industrial leaders including the following recent converts to democracy: Guaranty Trust Company, with branches in Antwerp, Brussels, Liverpool, Paris and London; Kuhn, Loeb and Company, international banking; J. P. Morgan and Company, interlocking with banks in London and Paris; Lehman Brothers, international banking; Cornelius D. Whitney; Thomas W. Lamont; Mrs. Daniel Guggenheim; Mrs. H. P. Davison; Mrs. Averill Harriman; and Henry Luce.²¹ Many large contributions came from those connected with the broadcasting companies and the motion picture industry such as Douglas Fairbanks, J. D. Levy, Maxwell Anderson, Robert Sherwood, Alfred Lunt, and Paul Muni.

The first voice to speak out openly for conscription was the *New York Times* on June 7, 1940. It advocated "compulsory military training" urging that Congress "should immediately prepare and pass a bill providing for it." The chief campaigner for the idea was Colonel Julius Ochs Adler of the *New York Times*. He was civilian aide to the Secretary of War. Adler and others through the *Times* financed the campaign for the adoption of such a policy. They used the psychology of emergency to secure its adoption.

On June 18, 1940, President Roosevelt stated he would soon "recommend to Congress a comprehensive program for some form of universal compulsory government service for the country's youth." Two political opponents of the President were selected by the Military Training Camps Association to sponsor the measure prepared by Grenville Clark. On June 20, 1940, Senator Burke (lame duck anti-New Deal Democrat) of Nebraska introduced in the Senate a bill providing for "Selective compulsory military training and service." The next day, June 21, Representative J. M. Wadsworth (Republican) of New York introduced an identical bill in the House. Although neither of the major parties incorporated such a proposal in its platform of 1940, Mr. Wilkie joined President

²¹*Congressional Record*, U. S. Senate, July 11, 1940, pages 9497-9500.

Roosevelt in urging its passage and Congress abdicated to the voice of party authority. The law was signed by President Roosevelt on September 16, 1940, with the first peacetime registration held on the following October 16. Indicative of the economic group initiating this program, the bill in its original form provided for a compensation of \$5 per month for the drafted men. To get the measure more acceptable the compensation was raised to \$21.00 per month and later increased to \$50 per month to lessen the unrest among the draftees.

In the summer of 1941 the War Department sought the removal of restrictions in the Selective Service Act of 1940 limiting the army service to one year, with a maximum of 900,000 selectees in training at any given time and the restriction confining this army to service on the Western Hemisphere. President Roosevelt asked Congress to extend indefinitely the length of service of the drafted men, and to remove the 900,000 limitation as to the number of men in training. He did not ask for a removal of the Western Hemisphere limitation as that would arouse more opposition, possibly resulting in a defeat for the administration. By a vote of 45 to 30 the Senate extended the term of trainees for 18 months, and the House of Representatives on August 12, 1941, did likewise by a vote of only 203 to 202. In order to carry this measure the administration resorted to every pressure tactic known to politics, including threats to remove W. P. A. projects from districts of opposition Congressmen, and not to allow party funds in the next election to those who failed to support the measure.

The American Legion at its 1941 convention, due to pressure from Washington, went on record favoring universal compulsory military service as a permanent policy. British leaders were desirous of and advocating an American Expeditionary Force for the purpose of invading the continent of Europe.

On December 4, 1941, the *Washington Times-Herald* and the *Chicago Tribune* published Roosevelt's Secret War Plan. This plan showed that on July 9, 1941, President Roosevelt had asked Secretary of War Stimson to have

the Army and Navy Joint Board submit plans necessary for the military defeat of Germany. On September 11, 1941, this report was made to the President. It called for an American Expeditionary Force of 5,000,000 men and a total armed force of over 10,000,000 men to be used in the two oceans and three continents—Europe, Africa, and Asia.²² There was a great opposition against this throughout the country. It seemed as if public opinion would not follow President Roosevelt further. But on December 7, 1941, Japan, in reply to certain demands made by the President on November 26, attacked Pearl Harbor.²³ This incident was most fortunate for President Roosevelt as this apparently unprovoked attack united the country behind him in precipitating our full entrance into the conflict.

²²*Washington Times-Herald*, December 4, 1941, gives full account.

²³Jeannette Rankin, "Some Questions About Pearl Harbor." Copies of this document can be secured from the National Council for the Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H. Runham, "Why Hitler?"
 Cornell, Julien, *The Conscientious Objector and the Law*
 Chamberlin, William Henry, *The Enigma of Russia*
 Davis, Forrest, *How War Came*
 Davis, Forrest, "What Really Happened at Teheran," *Saturday Evening Post*, May 13 and 20, 1944
 Department of State Publication, *Peace and War, U. S. Foreign Policy, 1931-1941*
 Flynn, John T., "The Truth About Pearl Harbor"
 High, Stanley, "The Church Unmilitant", *New Republic*, June 22, 1942
 Howard, Harry Paxton, *America's Role in Asia*
 Hoover, Herbert, *America's First Crusade*
 Hitler, Adolph, *Mein Kampf*
 Johnson, Walter, *The Fight Against Isolation*
 Lin Yutang, *Between Tears and Laughter*
 Mitchell, Kate L., *India Without Fable*
 Neumann, William L., "The Genesis of Pearl Harbor"
 Rogerson, Sidney, *Propaganda in the Next War*
 Roberts, Justice Owen J. et al, *Report on Pearl Harbor*
 Rankin, Jeannette, "Some Questions About Pearl Harbor"
 Villard, O. G., "The Great Deception", *Christian Century*, June 21, 1944

A. J. MUSTE'S

Not By Might

This book addresses a moving appeal to reason and right religion as the sole way now left open to this country and the world. The thesis of the book is that the way that Jesus taught and lived is practical now for the individual and for a country. Nothing short of a straightforward avowal of Christian principles and conduct on the part of America and its individuals can break the deadlock, to popular imagination, and begin negotiations all over again on a higher level. Cloth, 227 pages. \$2.50.

RICHARD B. GREGG'S

The Power of Non-Violence

A graduate of Harvard Law School and active in labor and industrial relations work, Richard Gregg spent several years in India studying Gandhi's methods. This book, originally published by Lippincott, has run through several printings, and the present edition was revised during World War II. Gregg marshals the facts of history, psychology, and practical experience to show the effectiveness of non-violent methods everywhere and in every area of life. Cloth, 252 pages. \$1.50.

G. H. C. MACGREGOR'S

The New Testament Basis of Pacifism

An examination of the positive imperative of the Christian ethic, which commands that every valid means must be used to set wrongs right and build human relations on a new foundation, and yet forbids the use of such means as will by their very nature stultify the end in view, from which is derived the Christian pacifist position on war and violence. Dr. Macgregor, Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism at Glasgow University, is the outstanding critic of Reinhold Niebuhr's position today. Paper, 156 pages. \$.50.

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

2929 Broadway

New York 25, N. Y.