

LESSON PLAN 6

Checks and Balances

By
Dr. Samantha Averett

Rationale:

Many government decisions are often debated on the floor of the United States Congress, in the House of Representatives and the Senate chambers. As future members of the United States electorate student need to be able to evaluate governmental debates and make decisions based on the information presented.

Standard(s):

C3 NCSS

1. DS Civ 4 9-12: Explain how the U.S Constitution establishes a system of government that has powers, responsibilities, and limits that have changed over time and that are still contested.

Objectives:

1. Identify the relationship between two branches of government.
2. Evaluate the actions one branch of government takes to check and balance the other branch of government
3. Develop the skills to analyze information they take in from media outlets.
4. Demonstrate knowledge and practical application of historical skills (sourcing and analysis).

Activity:

1. Students will analyze the documents.
2. Students will corroborate sources and make historical connections.
3. Students will inference causes and effects.
4. Source the authors or creator of each item.
5. Students will respond to examination prompts.

Guiding Questions:

1. What system of government do we have and why?
2. How does a federalism system mandate the interactions of the different branches?
3. How is our government influenced by political parties?
4. What actions, if any, are taken by the individuals to support or hinder the checks and balance system of government?
5. Who does the actions affect?
6. What is the context or motivation for the actions?

Sources:

Document Set #1

1. Documents

- a. Excerpts from John Arthur Garraty “Henry Cabot Lodge” Alfred Knopf 1953
- b. Excerpts from Karl Schriftgiesser “The Gentleman from Massachusetts” 1945
- c. Excerpt from Robert C. Byrd, *The Senate, 1789-1989: Classic Speeches, 1830-1993*, Government Publication, 1994
https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/Speeches_Lodge1919.htm
- d. Transcripts of Senator Lodge speech 1919, Lodge, Henry Cabot. Speak, Nation’s Forum Collection, and A.F.R. Lawrence Collection. *League of Nations*. [Bridgeport, Conn.: Made by the Columbia Graphophone Manufacturing Company, 1919] <https://www.loc.gov/item/2004650542/>

Document Set #2

1. Documents

- a. Excerpt from Robert Maddox “William Borah and American Foreign Policy” Louisiana State University Press, 1969
- b. Excerpt from William Borah “Bedrock” National Home Library Foundation, 1936
- c. Excerpt of Speech by Senator Borah November 10, 1919
- d. Excerpt from Thomas Bailey “Wilson and the Great Betrayal”

Document Set #3

1. Documents

- a. Statement by President Wilson, March 15, 1919
- b. Excerpt from President Wilson’s White House Press Conference, July 10, 1919
- c. President Wilson’s speech after the Paris Peace Conference
- d. Cable from President Wilson, June 28, 1919

Suggested Lesson Structure:

1. Warm Up – Watch the videos below and invite the students to discuss the branches of government and how those branches check and balance each other along with an overview of the League of Nations.
 - a. League of Nations video - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MWc5-thIkEQ&t=261s>
 - b. Checks and Balances video-
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0bf3CwYCxXw&t=2s>

2. Sourcing and Document Analysis
 - a. Have students read the document sets in a group of at least four students to complete the assignment.
 - b. Students will work to determine who wrote the documents in each case study.
 - i. How can students analyze the documents and use the information in the documents to determine the author?
 - c. Students will work in a group to determine the ideas and position of the person in each case study.
 - d. Students will determine which case study is most persuasive and why.
 - i. What did the author say and what methods did the author use to persuade the audience?
3. Evaluate
 - a. Students will answer the questions related to the debate and relationship between two branches of government.

Suggested Grade Level:

This lesson is suggested for middle and high school students.

Suggested Lesson Pace:

Schedule Type	Rationale
80 minute Double Block Schedule	This lesson structure may take one class period. Students should be able to source, analyze and evaluate in one class setting.
45 minute Single Block Schedule	This lesson structure may take two class periods. This will allow sourcing and analysis during the first class period and re-examining and evaluating in the second class period.

Speakers

1. President Wilson
2. Senator Lodge
3. Senator Borah

Notes on President Wilson

1. He was born in Virginia in 1856
2. His father was a Presbyterian minister, and he was also a religious man
3. He went to Princeton University and studied law
4. He was married twice
5. He married his second wife when his first died shortly after his became President of the United States
6. He has three daughters
7. He taught at Princeton and then became President of the University.
8. He was also governor of New Jersey in 1910 and President of the United States in 1912
9. He reformed the federal banking system, reduced some tariffs, abolished child labor and fought the trusts.
10. He often sticks to his policies and ideologies even when citizens protest and petition him to change,

Notes on Senator Henry Cabot Lodge

1. He was born in Massachusetts in 1850.
2. He is an only child
3. He went to Harvard University and studied law
4. He worked as a writer and editor before political office.
5. He entered the United States Senate in 1893
6. He supported some reforms such as the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1919 and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, but against Women Suffrage.
7. He often worked to persuade other in the United States Senate

Notes on Senator William Borah

1. He was born in Idaho in 1865
2. His father was a Presbyterian minister, and he was also a religious man
3. He went to Kansas State University and studied law
4. He entered the United States Senate in 1907
5. He supported some reforms such as states rights and the limited role of the federal government
6. He often worked to persuade others in the United States Senate.

Document Set #1

Document 1

The Senator's bitter partisanship had frequently pushed him into controversies with his opponents. He had never been noted for an ability to separate personal and political dislikes. But after his fight his feeling against Wilson was overwhelming.

Late in February, Theodore Roosevelt, with whom he was in close contact during the shipping bill battle, and who had helped line up Progressive opposition, wrote him: "Lord, I am feeling warlike with the Administration!" He replied: "I do not wonder that you feel warlike with the Administration. I never expected to hate anyone in politics with the hatred I feel towards Wilson. I was opposed to our good friend Grover Cleveland, but never in any such way as this."

By the spring of 1915, He was convinced that with the possible exception of James Buchanan, Woodrow Wilson was the worst President in American history. His indictment, had he been called upon to state it, would have looked something like this:

Woodrow Wilson is a self-seeking, unprincipled egotistical, timid, and narrow-minded politician. He has a talent for felicitous expression and for the mouthing of high-sounding principles, but he had no policy other than his own aggrandizement. In domestic matters he is a demagogue, in foreign affairs a coward. He cannot get along with men who are his intellectual equals, consequently he surrounds himself with sycophants and second raters, and drives them ruthlessly to do his bidding. Essentially, he is a man of words and not a man of action. He is stubborn.

Vocabulary –

Unprincipled – a person who displays behavior that is not aligned with understood or acceptable moral principles.

Egotistical – a person who is conceited or self absorbed.

Aggrandizement – to increase or make greater

Demagogue – a political leader who appeals to prejudices instead of rational understanding

Sycophants – self seeking flatter

Document 2

Taking first things first, Senator _____ took up the preamble of the Covenant and compared it unfavorable with the preamble to the Peace of Paris, whence had stemmed the Holy Alliance. One after another he assailed the various Articles of the Covenant. As usual he poured forth his strongest words in assault upon Article 10. Grim was the picture which he painted of what would happen if, at any time, the United States failed to live up to the letter and spirit of the Covenant. We would be dishonored! Nothing would be left but a legacy of wars!

“You may call me selfish, if you will, conservative or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply,” he cried, but an American I was born, and American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this, I am thinking of what is best for the world. For if the United States fails, the best hopes for mankind fail with it. I have never had but one allegiance I cannot divide it now. I have never loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a league.

“Are ideals confined to this deformed experiment upon a noble purpose, tainted, as it is, which bargains and tied to a peace treaty which might have been disposed of long ago to the great benefit of the world if it had not been compelled to carry this rider on its back?”

We all share these aspirations and desire but some of us see no hope, but rather defeat, for them in this murky covenant. For we, too have our ideals, even if we differ from those who have tried to establish a monopoly on idealism. Our ideal is our country.....

Two days after his long denunciation of the League, He asked President Wilson for a public conference, and received an immediate acceptance. The date was set for 10 am on Tuesday, August 10, in the East room of the White House.

President Wilson, who already had held private conferences with several Republican Senators and had learned from them that, by acceptance of reservations, he might save his League, was in a stern, uncompromising mood when the Senators marched in. Already he had been thinking of taking his fight to the people. He was not, even then, a well man.

Document 3

On February 28, 1919, the Senator of Massachusetts began an assault on President Woodrow Wilson's proposal to establish a League of Nations that ultimately culminated in the Senate's rejection of the Treaty of Versailles. Long after Congress agreed to a joint resolution declaring the end of the First World War in July 1921, politicians and scholars have asked whether, by joining and supporting the League of Nations, the United States could have prevented the outbreak of the Second World War.

In 1919, the Senator was at the height of a long and distinguished career. He had served a quarter century in the Senate when he became the Republican floor leader and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee after the Democrats lost control of the body in 1918. Possessed of an "ardent, somewhat effervescent temperament," he argued his nationalist sentiments with forceful conviction.....

Partisan differences and personal rivalry had long strained Wilson's relationship with the powerful and opinionated Massachusetts senator, but the intensely nationalistic Senator and most of his fellow Republicans had supported the president throughout the war. Even before the November 11, 1918, armistice, however, differences over America's role in the postwar world began to emerge as Republican demands for Germany's unconditional surrender contrasted sharply with Wilson's idealistic vision of a "peace without victory." Although senators of both parties had generally supported Wilson's wartime call for the establishment of an international tribunal to prevent future conflicts, they were gravely concerned at his determination to conduct foreign policy without the advice and consent of the Senate. Wilson's usual reluctance to consult the Senate became even more pronounced once the Republicans were in the majority after 1918.

Wilson departed for the January 1919 Versailles peace conference without seeking the advice of senators from either party; once there, he insisted that his proposals for a League of Nations be incorporated into the peace settlement. He returned to the United States in February to report on the progress at Versailles, cabling ahead to invite the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to a working dinner at the White House to discuss the treaty provisions relating to the League of Nations. He honored the president's request that the committee refrain from public comment on the matter and was outraged to learn that Wilson intended to deliver a public address in Boston to muster public support for the League immediately upon his arrival.....

Turning to the specific provisions of the proposed draft, He argued that the provision guaranteeing the independence and territorial integrity of all members was particularly troubling. He warned that, to ensure that guarantee, the United States "must be in possession of fleets and armies capable of enforcing them at a moment's notice." He was equally concerned that the draft seemed to give the League jurisdiction over immigration matters. "Are we ready to give to other nations the power to say who shall come into the United States and become citizens of the Republic?" he asked. "If we do this," he cautioned, "we are prepared to part with the most precious of sovereign rights."

In the days that followed, several other senators proclaimed their opposition to the League on the Senate floor. Less than a week later, He offered a resolution signed by thirty-nine Republican senators, more than the one-third of the Senate necessary to defeat the treaty, declaring that the League—unacceptable "in the form 'now proposed'"—should be considered separately from the peace settlement and only after the conclusion of the treaty. Wilson returned to France to continue his work on the treaty, which he presented to the Senate on July 10, 1919. The final draft addressed many of the concerns that He had raised in his February 28 address, but the Massachusetts Republican was implacable. He succeeded in adding fourteen reservations to the treaty. The president, gravely ill after an exhausting tour to promote the League precipitated a crippling stroke, refused to compromise. At his urging, Senate Democrats refused to support the treaty and joined forces with the "irreconcilables"—who opposed the treaty in any form—to defeat it on November 19, 1919. Wilson submitted the treaty to the Senate a second time in 1920 but failed to obtain the two-thirds vote needed for approval.

Congress ultimately declared the end of the war in a joint resolution adopted on July 2, 1921. Lodge and Wilson remained bitter enemies until Wilson's death on February 3, 1924.

Document 4

The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. Look at the United States today. We have made mistakes in the past. We have had shortcomings. We shall make mistakes in the future and fall short of our own best hopes. But none the less is there any country today on the face of the earth which can compare with this in ordered liberty, in peace, and in the largest freedom?

I feel that I can say this without being accused of undue boastfulness, for it is the simple fact, and in making this treaty and taking on these obligations all that we do is in a spirit of unselfishness and in a desire for the good of mankind. But it is well to remember that we are dealing with nations every one of which has a direct individual interest to serve, and there is grave danger in an unshared idealism.

Contrast the United States with any country on the face of the earth today and ask yourself whether the situation of the United States is not the best to be found. I will go as far as anyone in world service, but the first step to world service is the maintenance of the United States.

You may call me selfish if you will, conservative or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply, but an American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this I am thinking of what is best for the world, for if the United States fails, the best hopes of mankind fail with it.

I have never had but one allegiance – I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a league. Internationalism, illustrated by the Bolshevik and by the men to whom all countries are alike provided they can make money out of them, is to me repulsive.

National I must remain, and in that way I like all other Americans can render the amplest service to the world. The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone.

Strong, generous, and confident, she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle with your marvelous inheritance, this great land of ordered liberty, for if we stumble and fall freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.

Document Set #2

Document 1

He especially feared Great Britain and France, who would surely take leading roles in the proposed organization. Participation in the League meant to him, therefore, that the United States would commit itself in advance to policies over which it would exercise minimal control. The Senator had no doubts as to where these policies would lead.

League supporters stressed its potential for preventing a recurrence of a global war. Borah believed nothing of the sort. Any violations of what the great nations deemed their vital interests would result in withdrawal and counter – alliance.

He anticipated that the League would be used as a cloak of respectability to protect the status quo everywhere. Denouncing efforts to “underwrite the world” as impossible and undesirable, Borah predicted that what had happened in Russia, Mexico, and China would occur, sooner or later, all over the globe. He regarded emergent nationalism as the irresistible force of the twentieth century and despised the idea of placing the United States on the side he thought fated to lose.

He once phrased his own feelings perfectly when he said he would oppose American entry into a league structured along the lines of “an old ladies’ quilting society.” Even the most guarded first step signaled to him the beginning of a journey which would “finally lead us into all kinds of entangling obligations and conditions with European affairs.” Called by whatever name, He Thought, the League would try to make the world safe, not for democracy, but for European imperialism.

The Senator found the treaty itself as repugnant as he did the League. Its terms shocked him. With the exception of a world organization, The Idahoan had strongly backed Wilson’s Fourteen Points; he had said immediately after the war ended that Germany’s new republican government should be given every chance for success. Instead, the Treaty of Versailles seemed to him to be the distillation of vindictiveness. Acknowledging Wilson’s efforts to obtain a generous peace, he thought the European powers had demonstrated beyond cavil their contempt for a new era. He failed to see how any peaceful reconstruction of the continent could take place when Germany and Russia were excluded.

Continuing his anti-League speechmaking and correspondence, in his spare time he began baiting members of his own party. Several times threatening to break his agreement with Lodge, the Idahoan sporadically interfered with and derided the latter’s progress in constructing the array of reservations which was to be used against Wilson’s League. In July, for instance, he flatly denounced the formulation of reservations as a fraud designed to get votes. He said he agreed with the Democrats that reservations were superfluous; all that matter was acceptance or rejection. He was as usual, burdensome to the party leadership.

Document 2

My Dear Sir:

I thank you for your letter. I shall endeavor to answer the question which you propound, and I shall endeavor to do so with clearness and candor. I have no reason to conceal my position and I had not supposed that it was in doubt. I regret exceedingly if, after three months' debate, I have been unable to make myself clear.

You say in your letter referring to the threatened massacre of the Armenians by the Turks, "It is simply a question whether the United States shall agree to act with England and France and the other nations which stand for righteousness and civilization to protect the weak nations and the innocent people of the world," etc.

I should like to ameliorate the conditions of the oppressed everywhere. I trust I sympathize with like yourself, would serve those who have been unfortunate in the struggle of life or who are oppressed by other people. But you have here a League of Nations composed of the great and dominant powers of the earth some of whom are now engaged in oppressing and decimating weak nations and innocent peoples, and with those people you ask me to form a permanent combination and bring this Republic down to the low level of debauchery and shame!

In other words, as I view it, instead of going into a combination where in the weak and oppressed people have protection or wherein the principle of self determination could be applied, you are asking us to join a combination of which will result in their permanent oppression and in holding them as subject nations and sub-peoples for all time to come.

There is not a word, or a phrase, or a clause, in your League of Nations by and under which those subject peoples can EVER be heard.

To be entirely sincere, as you ask me to be, and without reflection on others, I think it is nothing without reflection on others, I think it is nothing less than treason to this Republic and the people of the United States. I haven't any more patience with a man who will ask me to join Japan and connive at the destruction of Korea and the ruin of China, than I have for a man who would ask me to do any other wholly unrighteous and unpatriotic act. I am utterly opposed to our joining in any permanent alliance or any league with those powers whatever. Their standards and conception of civilization and their theory of government are wholly at war with ours.

If it seems strange to you that I should entertain such views, I beg to suggest that it was the view of George Washington, of Thomas Jefferson, of Abraham Lincoln, of William McKinley, of Theodore Roosevelt, and of Woodrow Wilson, until a very short time ago.

You may think me lonesome, but I am sure you will think my company respectable. I trust I have made myself clear.

Very respectfully, United States Senator from Idaho.

Document 3

Mr. President, after Mr. Lincoln had been elected President, before he assumed the duties of the office and at a time when all indications were to the effect that we would soon be in the midst of civil strife, a friend from the city of Washington wrote him for instructions. Mr. Lincoln wrote back in a single line, "Entertain no compromise; have none of it." That states the position I occupy at this time and which I have, in an humble way occupied at this time and which I have in an humble way, occupied from the first contention in regard to this proposal of entering the League of Nations.

Have we not been told day by day for the last nine months that the Senate of the United States, a coordinate part of the treaty making power, should accept this league as it was written because the wise men sitting at Versailles had so written it, and has not every possible influence and every source of power in public opinion been organized and directed against the Senate to compel it to do that thing? How much stronger will be the moral compulsion upon the Congress of the United States when we ourselves have indorsed the proposition of sending our accredited representatives there to vote for us? A but you say that there must be unanimous consent, and that there is vast protection in unanimous consent.

Mr. President, if you have enough territory, if you have enough material, if you have enough subject peoples to trade upon and divide, there will be no difficulty about unanimous consent.....

However you view the questions of unanimous consent, it does not protect us. What is the result of all this? We are in the midst of all of the affairs of Europe. We have joined in alliance with all European concerns. We have joined in alliance with all the European nations which have thus far joined the league, and all nations which may be admitted to the league. We are sitting there dabbling in their affairs and intermeddling in their concerns. In other words, Mr. President and this comes to the question which is fundamental with me we have forfeited and surrendered once and for all, the great policy of no entangling alliance upon which the strength of this Republic has been founded for 150 years.

There is another and even a more commanding reason why I shall record my vote against this treaty. It imperils what I conceive to be the underlying, the very first principles of the is Republic. It is in conflict with the right or our people to govern themselves free from all restraint, legal or moral, of foreign powers..... I will not, I cannot give up my belief that America must not alone for the happiness of her own people but for the moral guidance and greater contentment of the world be permitted to live her own life. Next to the tie which binds a man to his God is the tie which binds a man to his country, and all schemes, all plans, however ambitious and fascinating they seem in their proposal but which embarrass or entangle and impede or shackle her sovereign will which would compromised her freedom of action I unhesitatingly put behind me.....

You cannot yoke a government whose fundamental maxim is that of liberty to a government whose first law is that of force and hope to preserve the former. These things are enternal war and one must ultimately destroy the other.....

Document 4

He was the soul of the irreconcilables. Tall of frame massive of face and head bushy of hair and almost eccentric in appearance, the Idaho lion was generally regarded as the most eloquent and inspiring speaker of the Senate, if not of his generation. Admirers compared him with godlike Daniel Webster. The murmured announcement that He had the floor was enough during a critical debate to depopulate the House floor and galleries. This was a compliment paid to few if any other orators of his generation. His eloquence was sincere simple lofty moving. One did not have agree with his isolationist convictions in order to admire his oratory. At one time during the Senate struggle, the bored presiding officer, Vice President Marshall, scribbled a note for him May a mummy say that you almost galvanized him to life?

By instinct and training He was a conscientious objector. His daily horseback ride in Rock Creek Park was an unfailing as the Washington Monument and one of the stock jokes of the capital was to express amazement that the senator would consent to go in the same direction as the horse. His mind naturally sought reason why something should not be done rather than why it should be done.

His official biographer claims that he was the original irreconcilable. As early as 1916 the senator was voicing vehement opposition to Wilson's proposed forsaking for the paths of isolationism. Early in 1919, when American public opinion overwhelmingly favored the League, and when the Republicans were timidly thinking that the best, they could do would be to Americanize or Republicanize the Covenant, He demanded that the whole wicked contraption be hurled back across the Atlantic into the teeth of its authors. After his speech on February 21, 1919, Lodge came to him with a word of congratulation but added with a deprecatory wave of his hands: What are you doing to do? It's hopeless. All the newspapers in my state are for the League. Other admirers of Borah chimed in: That was great that was fine we agree with you, but we have to have some sort of League; everybody is for it. The faint-hearted Senator Harding told him; I'd like to get in the fight against this League of Nations, but the people of my state are all for it I'm afraid.

It was him, probably more than any other man who stirred up and crystallized public opposition to the League, at least in the early stages. He demonstrated that with the passage of time, and with the proper strategy, an anti-League program might prove to be politically profitable.....

Document Set #3

Document 1

STATEMENT ISSUED IN PARIS, MARCH 15, 1919.

He said today that the decision made at the Peace Conference as its plenary session, January 25, 1919, to the effect that the establishment of the a League of Nations should be made an integral part of the Treaty of Peace, is of final force and that there is no basis whatever for the reports that a change in this decision was contemplated.

The resolution on the League of Nations, adopted January 25, 1919, at the plenary session of Peace Conference, was as follows:

1. It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement, which the associated nations are now met to establish, that a League of Nations be created to promote international cooperation, to ensure the fulfillment of accepted international obligations, and to provide safeguards against war.
2. This League should be treated as an integral part of the general Treaty of Peace and should be open to every civilized nation which can be relied upon to promote its objects.
3. The members of the League should periodically meet in international conference and should have a permanent organization and secretariat to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the conferences.

Document 2

PRESS CONFERENCE

?: I am very glad to see you gentlemen. The job, the main part of it, is over, and the rest of it is outlined. Before I left Paris, I think we were substantially agreed.

Question: Would you be willing to discuss the criticism of Article X of the League Covenant?

?: No, only to say that if you leave that out, it is only a debating society, and I would not be interested in a debating society. I would not be interested in a debating society. I have belonged to them and found them far from vital.

Question: It does not rob Congress of its power to declare war?

?: No. I explained that so often that I got tired that I had no power to define the causes or to make war. That is really the reason the clause was put in about advice with regard to military action. Not only the United States, but Brazil and other countries, are in the same case. We could not suspend the right of the legislature to make war.

Question: It had been suggested in the Senate that some of the objections raised would be removed by a reservation defining the right of Congress, making that clear just as you have expressed it here. Would that be regarded as an amendment, and would that prevent the ratification of the treaty itself?

?: Well, I do not think that any explanation of the power of Congress is necessary. Reservations are a complicated problem. I take it for granted that no reservations would be of effect unless it passed by a two-thirds majority, by the same majority that is necessary to ratify the treaty. And if it had to be considered as an "IF" in the adoption of the treaty then we would have to go all over the process of the treaty again. All the countries concerned would have to be consulted. For you have find out just what the reservation meant, and then they would have to decide whether they consented to it. In the meantime, we would be at war with Germany for months altogether. That is the most serious side of it.

Question: The suggestion is made that a number of these reservations that are decide are what might be called innocuous. An innocuous reservation, I take it, is one that does not go to the vitals of the treaty.

?: But who is to certify that it is innocuous? That is the difficulty of the class of reservations. The other countries would have to know just what they meant. If you had been at Paris with us, you would have found that things do not look the same to different nations, and what the United States would consider so and so, probably nobody else would. There were many curious points of view, and so I

could not be sure that what we considered innocuous would be so considered by any other country.....

Document 3

Mr. Chairman and fellow countrymen, it is with a great deal of genuine pleasure that I find myself in Pueblo, and I feel it a compliment that I should be permitted to be the first speaker in this beautiful hall.....

The chief pleasure of my trip has been that it has nothing to do with my personal fortunes, that it has nothing to do with my personal reputation, that it has nothing to do with anything except the great principles uttered by Americans of all sorts and of all parties which we are now trying to realize at this crisis of the affairs of the world. But there have been unpleasant impressions as well as pleasant impressions, my fellow citizens, as I have crossed the continent. I have perceived more and more that men have been busy creating an absolutely false impression of what the treaty of peace and the covenant of the League of Nations contain and mean. I find, more-over, that there is an organized propaganda against the League of Nations and against the treaty proceeding from exactly the same sources that the organized propaganda proceeded from which threatened this country here and there with disloyalty.....

My fellow citizens, it is only certain bodies of foreign sympathies, certain bodies of sympathy with foreign nations that are organized against this great document which the American representatives have brought back from Paris. Therefore, in order to clear away the mists, in order to remove the impressions, in order to check the falsehoods that have clustered around this great subject, I want to tell you a few very simple things about the treaty and the covenant.

Do not think of this treaty of peace as merely a settlement with Germany. It is that. It is a very severe settlement with Germany, but there is not anything in it that she did not earn. Indeed, she earned more than she can ever be able to pay for, and the punishment exacted of her is not a punishment greater than she can bear, and it is absolutely necessary in order that no other nation may ever plot such a thing against humanity and civilization. But the treaty is so much more than that. It is not merely a settlement with Germany; it is a readjustment of those great injustices which underlie the whole structure of European and Asiatic society.....

It is a people's treaty, that accomplishes by a great sweep of practical justice the liberation of men who never could have liberated themselves, and the power of the most powerful nations has been devoted not to their aggrandizement but to the liberation of people whom they could have put under their control if they had chosen to do so. Not one foot of territory is demanded by the conquerors, not one single item of submission to their authority is demanded by them. The men who sat around that table in Paris knew that the time had come when the people were no longer going to consent to live under masters but were going to live the lives that they chose themselves, to live under such governments as they chose to erect. That is the fundamental principle of this great settlement.....

Unless you get the united, concerted purpose and power of the great Governments of the world behind this settlement, it will fall down like a house of cards. There is only one power to put behind the liberation of mankind, and that is the power of mankind. It is the power of the united

moral forces of the world, and in the covenant of the league of nations, the moral forces of the world are mobilized. For what purpose? Reflect, my fellow citizens, that the membership of this great league is going to include all the great fighting nations of the world, as well as the weak ones. It is not for the present going to include Germany, but for the time being Germany is not a great fighting country. All the nations that have power that can be mobilized are going to be members of this League, including the United States. And what do they unite for? They enter into a solemn promise to one another that they will never use their power against one another for aggression; that they never will impair the territorial integrity of a neighbor; that they never will interfere with the political independence of a neighbor; that they will abide by the principle that great populations are entitled to determine their own destiny and that they will not interfere with that destiny; and that no matter what differences arise amongst them they will never resort to war without first having done one or other of two things—either submitted the matter of controversy to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the result without question, or submitted it to the consideration of the council of the league of nations, laying before that council all the documents, all the facts, agreeing that the council can publish the documents and the facts to the whole world.....

My fellow citizens, war will be in the far background, war will be pushed out of that foreground of terror in which it has kept the world for generation after generation, and men will know that there will be a calm time of deliberate counsel. The most dangerous thing for a bad cause is to expose it to the opinion of the world. The most certain way that you can prove that a man is mistaken is by letting all his neighbors know what he thinks, by letting all his neighbors discuss what he thinks, and if he is in the wrong, you will notice that he will stay at home, he will not walk on the street. He will be afraid of the eyes of his neighbors. He will be afraid of their judgment of his character. He will know that his cause is lost unless he can sustain it by the arguments of right and of justice. The same law that applies to individuals applies to nations.

“The one effective move for obtaining peace is by an agreement among all the great powers in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal but to back its decisions by force. The great civilized nations should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness; a court should be established. A changed and amplified Hague court would meet the requirements, composed of representatives from each nation, whose representatives are sworn to act as judges in each case and not in a representative capacity.” Now, there is article 10. He goes on and says this: “The nations should agree on certain rights that should not be questioned, such as territorial integrity, their right to deal with their domestic affairs, and with such matters as whom they should admit to citizenship. All such guarantee each of their number in possession of these rights.”

The arrangements of justice do not stand of themselves, my fellow citizens. The arrangements of this treaty are just, but they need the support of the combined power of the great nations of the world. And they will have that support. Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and, through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before.

Vocabulary –
Propaganda – bias often misleading information that use to persuade the audience
Aggrandizement – to increase or make greater

Document 4

CABLEGRAM, THROUGH MR. TUMULTY, TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

June 28, 1919

From the Congressional Record Vol. 58 pp. 1952-1953

The treaty of peace had been signed. If it is ratified and acted upon in full and sincere execution of its terms, it will furnish the charter for a new order of affairs in the world. It is a severe treaty in the duties and penalties it imposes on Germany, but it is severe only because great wrongs done by Germany are to be righted and repaired; it imposed nothing that Germany cannot do; and she can regain her rightful standing in the world by the prompt and honorable fulfillment of its terms. And it is much more than a treaty of peace with Germany. It liberates great peoples who have never before been able to find the way to liberty. It ends once for all, an old and intolerable order under which small groups of selfish men could use the peoples of great empires to serve their own ambition for power and dominion. It associates the free Governments of the world in a permanent league in which they are pledged to use their united power to maintain peace by maintaining right and justice. It makes international law a reality supported by imperative sanctions. It does away with the right of conquest and rejects the policy of annexation and substitutes a new order under which backward nations populations which have not yet come to political consciousness and peoples who are ready for independences but not yet quite prepared to dispense with protection and guidance shall no more be subjected to the domination and exploitation of a stronger nation, but shall be put under the friendly direction and afforded the helpful assistance of governments which undertake to be responsible to the opinion of mankind in the execution of their task by accepting the direction of the League of Nations. It recognizes the inalienable rights of nationality, the rights of minorities and the sanctity of religious belief and practice.

Name: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: As you watch the two video answer the questions on the chart based on the information in the videos.

Questions	Answers/ Notes
What is the League of Nations? And what was its purpose?	
Why might some consider the League of Nations a failure or success? <i>Be sure to answer BOTH parts of the questions.</i>	
What are the separate powers of the Executive and Legislative Branch?	

Questions	Answers/ Notes
How are the separate powers interrelated?	
Give some relative examples of how the Legislative and Executive Branch check and balance each other powers?	

Evaluation Questions

Answer the question below based on the information discussed in class and the presented sources.

Document Set #1

1. Who is the person that serves as the author or the topic of the document set?
2. What evidence from the document set supports your author selection?
3. What does the person in this document set want?
4. Is the argument persuasive? What are the most persuasive statements or evidence used in the document set?

Document Set #2

1. Who is the person that serves as the author or the topic of the document set?

Checks and Balances
Dr. Samantha Averett

2. What evidence from the document set supports your author selection?
3. What does the person in this case study want?
4. Is the argument persuasive? What are the most persuasive statements or evidence used in the document set?

Document Set #3

1. Who is the person that serves as the author or the topic of the document set?
2. What evidence from the document set supports your author selection?
3. What does the person in this case study want?
4. Is the argument persuasive? What are the most persuasive statements or evidence used in the document set?

Working together as a class, rank the case studies in order of persuasive or effectiveness and justify your rankings.

Order	Case Study	Justification
1.		

2.		
3.		

Brief Constructive Response

Ultimately Senator Lodge and Borah along with other members of Congress would galvanize enough support to vote down the United States support of the League of Nations. How is this action of opposing the League of Nation by members of Congress an example of the process of checks and balances at work based on the design of the U.S. Constitution?