

# KNOX SUGGESTS A PEACE ENTENTE

**Favors an Understanding for  
Joint Action Between America  
and European Powers.**

**WANTS NO BINDING LEAGUE**

**Supports His Resolution in  
Speech After Committee  
Delays Action on It.**

*Special to The New York Times.*

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—Insisting that the project for a League of Nations ought to be subordinated to the consideration of peace terms at the Versailles Conference, Senator Knox of Pennsylvania, in a speech today, urged what he characterized as a "new American doctrine." Under the Pennsylvania Senator's idea, there would be no definite League of Nations, formally created as such, but an understanding for "concerted action" by America and European Powers with interests in common when their "freedom and peace is menaced."

Senator Knox argued that the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine must be preserved as a fundamental principle of American diplomacy. He maintained that it made the United States "the potential ally of the defenders of liberty whenever a great menace shall arise." As a corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, he argued, there is the eventuality of European States with which the United States holds common interest being menaced, and in such a happening, he said, the United States could join with the aggrieved nations.

Mr. Knox did not argue against the project for the League of Nations being considered at the Peace Conference, but insisted that, if taken up, it should be after the Allies had imposed their terms upon the Central Powers. He expressed doubt that the American people wanted President Wilson to force the League of Nations idea upon the early deliberations of the Peace Conference.

**Vote on Resolution Postponed.**

Senator Knox's speech came after the Foreign Relations Committee, following a two hours' discussion, had agreed to put off until next Saturday a vote upon the Knox resolution expressing the sentiment of that body that the League of Nations idea be segregated from the consideration of peace terms.

The Foreign Relations Committee postponed its vote today because the members had not had sufficient time to discuss it. The Democratic members insisted that to take action at this time, before the President had declared his position at the Peace Conference, would be premature.

Senator Pittman of Nevada replied to Senator Knox, declaring that both in his address and resolution he was "confusing in the minds of the people of this country and the world the causes that led us into the war and the aspirations of a nation in making peace."

**Senator Knox's Speech.**

Senator Knox began his speech by quoting from President Wilson's statement, after the signing of the armistice, that "the object of the war is attained" and that "the arbitrary power of the military caste of Germany is discredited and destroyed."

"It is clear, then," Senator Knox said, "that our attention should now be directed to the enforcement of the remainder of our war aims, best expressed now in restitution, reparation and guarantees.

"The definite problem of formally ending the war is: by what measures as to 'restitution, reparation, and guarantees' shall we assume that the war now won shall stay won; that the menace now removed shall stay forever removed? Germane, in a broad sense, is the question by what measures of safeguard we may make the recurrence of any similar menace in the future most improbable.

"Restitution becomes an accomplished fact with the evacuation of invaded territories and the definitive return to France of Alsace-Lorraine. The principle of restitution, applied to Germany's enforced relinquishment of political and economic means of aggrandizement in Russia, Rumania, Turkey, and elsewhere, extends into the field of measures to guarantee the world against a revival of the means of Teutonic dominion.

"Reparation is a matter of arithmetic, of law and of equitable justice. In other aspects it also extends into the conception of practical, in contradistinction to paper guaranties for the future. In this view it is not improper to consider whether the imposition of excessively onerous money payments might not have the effect of either a desperation favorable to anarchy or else a necessity to allow Germany great foreign-trade facilities (if indeed she can find customers for her goods) in order that she might produce the wealth required for vast indemnities. The latter alternative might in the long run have the result of forcing economic aggrandisement upon a people who, we

**Continued on Page Two.**

# KNOX SUGGESTS A PEACE ENTENTE

Continued from Page 1, Column 4.

have seen, can not now be safely entrusted with great power in the world.

"This war must be a lesson to Germans and to all who may ever think of emulating them. It occurs to me that to demand the cancellation of the German internal bonded war debt and the allocation of that sum to the funds for the indemnities of restoration, &c., might be possibly considered. Such a scheme would appear to punish the people who financed a villainous war in a way that they would be slow to forget.

## Would Not Return Colonies.

"As to guarantees, the condition of relative impotence in the face of the preponderant power of the Allies to which Germany has been reduced by the terms of the armistice is, of course, the first of our real guarantees. The maintenance of that condition during a long period of repentance, probation, and expiation for the years of horror into which the Teutonic peoples plunged the world is the first of real guarantees against the recrudescence of any similar German menace.

"As part of this guarantee for the future, as well as for the sake of humanity and the interest of the peoples affected, it seemed entirely clear that her colonies should not be returned to Germany, but should either be divided among the chief belligerents or else jointly held by them, with their respective authority somewhat proportioned to their respective local interests and to their position as factors in victory. In either case the Allies could determine and apportion such share of raw materials from their tropical and other territories as they found convenient after supplying their own requirements—and having in view to give Germany the means of subsistence but not the means of aggrandizement.

"The United States slowly, but in the end very clearly, perceived that a menace of Europe by the dominion of aggressive military power was, in this nineteenth century, a menace also to the safety of this nation. America manifested this perception by throwing its entire power into the scales to join in the suppression of that menace of Europe by military imperialism.

## Explains New Doctrine.

"Can we not perceive emerging from these facts a new American doctrine? I will state this great new doctrine in these words: If a situation should arise in which any power or combina-

tion of power should directly or indirectly menace the freedom and peace of Europe, the United States would regard such situation with grave concern as a menace to its own freedom and peace, and would consult with other powers affected, with a view to concerted action for the removal of such menace.

"If this had been the avowed and understood policy of the United States before July, 1914, it is, in my judgment, very improbable that the war would have occurred. When at length the United States had perceived and had acted upon this policy with mighty effect the war entered on its last and victorious phase. America has now perceived and manifested its perception of the principle of this policy. It has put this policy to successful test. Avowed by public official declaration, it might prove worthy, I believe, to serve, with the Monroe Doctrine, as a fundamental doctrine of American diplomacy. It entangles us in no way; but it makes us the potential ally of the defenders of liberty whenever a great menace shall arise.

"The Monroe Doctrine, with virtual European sanction and especially with British sanction, serves its purposes well. I would, I think, be sure of British support if it were menaced. But the Monroe Doctrine leaves to the United States the mandate that it carries, and it is for the United States to do what need be done to maintain safe conditions within and as between the republics of this hemisphere in connection with our predominant interest in their external durability as against an aggressive power from without.

"There is a certain analogy between this and what would be a corollary to the doctrine now suggested as it would touch the question of our obligation in the matter of new States now being raised up in Europe.

"The corollary would be that if such new States were menaced as part of a general European danger, then the United States would be concerned; but that what need be done to maintain safe conditions within or as between them, would be primarily a European concern and a European obligation in the discharge of which we need take no part. And this is as it should be. There is no need that American troops should travel thousands of miles for any other purpose than to ward off a menace to vital American interests.

"The object of my resolution is not to condemn in advance any League of Nations (and least of all the existing entente or a permanent understanding of all the English-speaking peoples) of a kind that might in time commend itself to the considered judgment of the American people. It is simply to postpone the larger and very disputable question of some comprehensive League of Nations for that separate and very deliberate consideration that its nature demands.

## Sees No Need of Haste.

"After all, why such hurry? If a League of Nations may not be a good

thing, certainly the agitated days following a great war should not be seized upon to saddle the country with a policy it has not examined and which is no necessary part of the making of peace.

"I, for one, am entirely ignorant of what the President means by a League of Nations. The American people do not know. Our judgments must today be hypothetical. Conceptions of a League of Nations range from a sort of world republic to a mere entente for certain purposes of the United States and our chief allies—something that need not necessarily cause alarm.

"The conscience and temper of the American people, as we have just seen in this war, can impose upon them a great international task even without any treaty obligations to assume that task. Unless impelled by their own conscience and judgment it is more than doubtful whether any treaty could drive this nation to a foreign war. Is it not better, then, that the obligation we assume should depend upon our own judgment and the conscience of the English-speaking peoples and our present allies, rather than upon the judgment of some vast world league?

## No Blotting Out All Wars.

"Even the most optimistic do not pretend to the blotting out of all war, even occasional civil war, but only to the lessening of international war, by international action. And even the forcible prevention or just decision of all international war, wherever and however arising, by a League of Nations of which the United States was a member, would presuppose the sending of American troops thousands of miles for some distant purpose, perhaps of no great concern to American citizens. However small the force we sent, still some one's sons would be asked to die for a far-away cause of rather academic appearance.

"I do not believe the American people would approve such an exigency. I should not wish to see this country signatory to an agreement which the American people would be likely to repudiate if put to the test. I should not vote for any treaty that subjected this nation's judgment and conscience as to its vital interests or its war-making prerogative to the will of a foreign majority."

## Pittman Attacks Resolution.

Senator Pittman declared he did not believe the Knox resolution expressed the sentiment of the Senate, and certainly not of the people of the country.

He criticized that part of the resolution in which it was asserted that the United States entered the war against the Central Powers "in order to vindicate the ancient rights of navigation as established under international law and in order to remove forever the German menace to our peace."

"I think that is a very unhappy ex-

pression of the causes for the United States entering this war," said Senator Pittman. "Did we enter into this war for the pure and sole purpose of establishing laws of navigation upon the high seas? I say we did not.

"We entered the war because war was forced on us, because our rights were trampled on, because we were insulted, because we would have deserved the ignominy of the world if we had not entered the war. Do you think for one moment that the great spirit which inspired our magnificent army to die by thousands upon the battlefields was solely for the purpose of the establishment of international law or for the purpose of righting a wrong upon our honor, the trampling on our rights!

"Compare the enunciation of the President in his war message to Congress, urging this Government to enter the conflict, and the bare, cold, brutal, technical statement urged by the Senator from Pennsylvania. We find the President defining the cause that forced us into the war not alone to be the dispute over the right of navigation on the high seas, but the right of a nation to exist, the right of a people to protect themselves.

"The Senator from Pennsylvania speaks of a League of Nations, which each country must support with its money, which each country must defend with its navy and its army. Is there anything in any expression of the President's from which that conclusion may be drawn? Is there not peaceful power behind this Government that will enable it to punish wrong? I say to you that the will, the determination, the attitude, the ostracism of the great civilized nations of the world, of any wrongful nation, of any criminal nation, would have just as much power to drive it into the right channels as would all of the armies and navies of the world.

## Demands Concerted Action.

"I am not arguing as to the character of the League of Nations which should be instituted; the question has now come down to that. Neither the President nor any other great statesman has presented any other particular form of League of Nations, but that there shall be concerted action between the great nations of the world to prevent precipitate and thoughtless war as the aim and object of all.

"The Senator from Pennsylvania does not attempt to advise the President as to whether or not there shall be a League of Nations, but he says to the President, 'Take it up last; do not take it up first.' I say there is no constitutional authority for the Senate to advise the sole negotiator of this country with regard to the method that he shall adopt or the procedure he shall adopt with regard to these negotiations. Not alone is it useless, but it is a usurpation of the authority that the people of this country have invested in the sole negotiator of treaties."