

KELLOGG
*as secretary of state
in 1925*



Frank B. Kellogg's VIEW of HISTORY and PROGRESS

CHARLES G. CLEAVER

MR. CLEAVER'S article is here presented to commemorate the centennial of Kellogg's birth on December 22, 1856, at Potsdam, New York. As a boy Kellogg went west with his parents, settling in Olmsted County, Minnesota, in 1865. He became a lawyer, removed to St. Paul in 1887, and went on to the distinguished career in international affairs discussed below. The author is a member of the English faculty in Grinnell College. This article is based on a longer study of the attitudes and assumptions that influenced Kellogg's foreign policy decisions prepared by Mr. Cleaver as a doctoral thesis in American studies at the University of Minnesota.

ANY HISTORY of international relations should take into account the mental processes of statesmen like Frank B. Kellogg, whose decisions and opinions had a signif-

¹For biographical information on Kellogg, see David Bryn-Jones, *Frank B. Kellogg* (New York, 1937).

icant impact on the diplomacy of the 1920s. The Olmsted County farm boy who first gained national prominence as a trust-busting lawyer represented Minnesota in the United States Senate from 1917 to 1923 and was a leading "mild reservationist" in Senate debates over the League of Nations. He acted as spokesman for the Republican majority on the important Senate foreign relations committee when it considered the treaties to limit armaments drafted at the Washington conference in 1921 and 1922. As ambassador to England from 1923 to 1925, he played an important role in the negotiation of the Dawes plan of economic reparations. From 1925 to 1929, as secretary of state under Coolidge, Kellogg passed on the merits of many questions of international significance, including disputes with China and various Latin American countries. And, of course, he played a major role in drafting the famous Pact of Paris, the so-called Kellogg-Briand pact to outlaw war, signed on August 27, 1928.¹

Good and sufficient explanations may be found in Kellogg's background and experience for most of the opinions he expressed. His career is a classic example of the American rags-to-riches story. His early years on a Minnesota farm were arduous, his formal schooling was sparse, and his law training had been received by part-time study in the office of a Rochester lawyer. Perhaps more than most men in public life, Kellogg obviously derived his values from the mold of his own experience. Thus, some elements that entered into his thinking may be readily explained. Economically, he was a prosperous man warmly attached to the system on which his prosperity was based. Politically, he was a Republican who in his later years moved some distance temperamentally from the views he had held during his early trust-busting days. Socially, he had risen from obscure beginnings on a farm near Rochester to a position of some intimacy with the partners in the Morgan banking firm and with such patriarchs of politics as Elihu Root, William Howard Taft, and Charles Evans Hughes. But explanations of Kellogg's views based upon his economic, political, and social affinities are not completely satisfying. For a fuller understanding of them, we must look also to the habits of mind, the philosophical presuppositions, and the articles of faith which underlay and circumscribed Kellogg's thought.

ONE SUCH pattern of perceptions, conceptions, and beliefs that seems to have influenced Kellogg's thinking was his view of history—his idea of the direction in which events had moved in the past and should therefore move in the future. When Kellogg pondered a problem, he applied to it a complex of ideas and assumptions which included not only his view of history, but also his faith in progress, and his theory about the gradual enlightenment of public opinion. To this calculation, performed more or less intuitively, he referred all his problems in international relations,

and he often used it as his ultimate argument for or against a given course of action, beyond which there was no appeal.

Kellogg's description of history, as we piece it together, corresponded to what can perhaps be called the American folk concept of the past. Briefly, Kellogg saw history as a process with a predestined goal, beginning with the fall of the Roman empire, enduring through the Dark Ages, and achieving climaxes in the establishment of the government of the United States, in the conquest of the western frontier, and in the economics and technology of the America of his day. Certainly, Kellogg was aware of the development of nonwestern civilizations, but he rarely made use of such knowledge in his arguments.

History, insofar as Kellogg spoke of it, began with the fall of Rome. Pieced together his version would read something like this. Rome fell because of its decadence and the "destruction of the yeomanry, the hardy farmers of Italy." Thereafter followed the Dark Ages, characterized by their barbarism, brutality, and superstition—"incense burning," as Kellogg called it. Governments during this period were tyrannies with a lust for power. To satisfy it, they precipitated wars with pitiless regularity, engaged in sinister plots, and signed military alliances which they then violated with reckless abandon. The people suffered for the wickedness of their dynastic rulers.²

The rescue of the world from this state of affairs was initiated, Kellogg said, by the Anglo-Saxons. The English (for it was the English of whom Kellogg was speaking when he used the term "Anglo-Saxons") wrested from tyranny the guaranties which were eventually embodied in the American Bill of Rights. In a Senate debate on June 21, 1922, the Minnesotan said, "From the day of King John at Runnymede, 600 years before the adoption of our Constitution,

² For examples of Kellogg's statements, see *Congressional Record*, 66 Congress, 1 session, 6990; 65 Congress, 2 session, 4068, 7569; 3 session, 78.

KELLOGG
with President and
Mrs. Coolidge



the struggle had gone on." Kellogg acknowledged gratefully the English parentage of the American legal institutions he admired so deeply. But he made it clear that the process begun in England did not reach fulfillment until after the American Revolution. Speaking to a Republican party rally at St. Paul in 1919, he remarked, "Drawing from England the principles of self government, which she had evolved through the struggle of centuries, we took a step in advance and laid the foundation of this republic, to be a lasting representative democracy. . . . We established the first great constitutional democracy in the world."³

In Kellogg's judgment, the historical process begun at Runnymede was consummated in the American Constitution. The work of the founding fathers was final and complete, "sanctified by the blood of martyrs," and "forged out of the fiery furnace of the eighteenth century." He regarded their work as "the last great struggle of our

ancestors to cement and make permanent" the guaranties codified in the first ten amendments to the American Constitution. The religious overtones of Kellogg's pronouncements on the Constitution are unmistakable, and the heat with which he met all challenges to the document as he understood it testifies that his language in fact reflected religious emotions. On no other subject did Kellogg speak so fervently; when he felt his security threatened by events—war, depression, or the apparent rise of socialism, which he dreaded so fearfully—he evoked the name of the Constitution as if it were magic.⁴

SAFEGUARDING the Constitution, Kellogg believed, was the institution of judicial review, and to it he tendered something of the same devotion that he gave the Constitution. "More than a century and a quarter ago," he once told the Senate when he fancied that one of his colleagues had attacked the right of the courts to set aside legislation, "our forefathers, with the experience of ages before them, formulated for the government of this people a written Constitution containing therein guaranties for the protection of life and liberty and the protection of our institutions, and wisely they divided that

³ *Congressional Record*, 67 Congress, 2 session, 9074; speech at St. Paul, March 7, 1919, Kellogg Papers, owned by the Minnesota Historical Society. Unless otherwise indicated, all citations in this article are to this group of papers.

⁴ Quotations may be found in *Congressional Record*, 67 Congress, 2 session, 9073, 9074; Kellogg speech to Republican party rally, March 7, 1919.

government into three parts—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial; the highest court of the land,” he continued, “was established to see that the citizen was protected in his constitutional rights against the encroachments of the executive or the encroachments of the legislative, because unlimited power in all times has developed tyranny.” Then Kellogg concluded in ringing tones, “Sir, I believe it was a departure in the form of government. The light of this Government was lifted into the western skies, and it has illuminated the world.”⁵ In this speech, with its homilies from Jefferson and Marshall, Kellogg says, in effect, that what illuminates the world is the Constitution of the United States and the process of judicial review, considered inseparably.

Perhaps Kellogg should be quoted as he explained in a calmer mood what, exactly, he meant when he said that the United States had taken a “step in advance” of England’s institutions. He felt that the founding fathers had developed more highly the doctrine of the separation of powers than had the English. And they had also established other necessary safeguards to individual liberty. Writing to a student in 1924, Kellogg stated, “It is fair to say that the British constitution has gradually evolved a democracy readily responsive to the popular will, but it is a question in my mind whether in the long run such a constitution is adequate for the protection of individual property rights. . . . I could point out to you,” he wrote, “a large number of cases in which State legislatures and Congress have passed laws clearly in violation of individual rights of the citizen, which the Court must protect or the Constitution is of no value whatever.”⁶

“Under the British Government,” Kellogg continued, “there is no written Constitution and no guarantees of individual liberty.” Thus he felt that in “times of excitement and political agitation there is nothing whatever to prevent the Parliament from taking away these rights which

long practice has demonstrated are necessary to individual freedom. . . .

“I believe that the perpetuity of republican government, of the principles of human liberty which are necessary to such government, and to the advancement of civilization,” the ambassador concluded, “can best be obtained under a written Constitution which can only be amended when there is an overwhelming sentiment properly expressed through the Congress and the requisite number of States.”

In short, as he put it on a later occasion, Kellogg affirmed that “no people have ever been blessed with a more righteous, liberal, benevolent Government than ours, none more conducive to individual happiness, enterprise and prosperity.” Speaking in the Senate on June 6, 1918, the Minnesotan said flatly that he had been “brought up to revere the Constitution,” and it is clear that he meant it.⁷

Kellogg’s description of the establishment of the government of the United States is an element in what might be called a mythical view of history, and myths usually have heroes. In this case, they were the founding fathers—misty, abstract figures whom Kellogg frequently mentioned but did not often name. Occasionally he singled out Hamilton as “probably the greatest statesman of his time.” Otherwise he usually recalled the names in lists which seemed themselves a part of the liturgy. Kellogg felt that these men had been astonishingly courageous and enlightened to have established at one stroke the government which was the “lasting representative democracy.” But beyond that Kellogg usually characterized them only by their works.⁸

⁵ *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 2 session, 7434.

⁶ Material in this and succeeding paragraphs may be found in a letter from Kellogg to Ray E. Harris, October 15, 1924.

⁷ Speech at Philadelphia on Washington’s birthday in *New York Times*, February 23, 1926, p. 4; *Congressional Record*, 67 Congress, 2 session, 7434.

⁸ See, for example, *Congressional Record*, 67 Congress, 2 session, 9074.

THE ST. PAUL lawyer's concept of history down to the founding of the United States was obviously fragmentary, and it focused too narrowly on his homeland. Further, it tended to influence him against change. With the fruits of progress frozen into the Constitution and its corollary legal institutions, little or no need for improvement existed. Although he was almost certainly unaware of the formal existence of such a theory, Kellogg entertained in essence what has been called the "germ theory" of American history—the doctrine that America's greatness rested heavily upon the love of freedom, the respect for law, and the energy and enterprise which people of Teutonic descent brought from Europe to plant in the welcoming soil of America. Such a view of history emphasizes the importance of legal institutions which guarantee civil and economic liberties; once those liberties are established, the essential work of a nation is finished. Consequently, such a theory tends to concentrate on the past rather than the future. One might suppose that Kellogg, the lawyer, would find such a reading of history particularly congenial. But he matched his rhetoric about the Constitution with another kind of poetry when he described material progress and the conquest of the frontier—America's growth "from a little fringe of civilization along the eastern coast to a mighty Nation."⁹

In 1934 Kellogg talked to the people of his native Rochester about their city when he first saw it in 1865, "beckoning to the ambitious youth and promising golden returns . . . an unknown village on the fringe of a far-flung empire reaching to the Pacific—a wilderness empire destined to become the great, rich country traversed by lines of railroads and dotted with opulent cities and productive farms."¹⁰

⁹ *Congressional Record*, 67 Congress, 4 session, 3861.

¹⁰ Speech, August 7, 1934.

¹¹ Speech to Burlington Railroad officials, April 16, 1935.

The geographical and technological progress America had achieved captured Kellogg's imagination. If the first climax in history occurred when the government of the United States was established, the second involved another theme, the conquest of nature and the frontier. Kellogg spoke of this in 1935 when he said, "From the slow, plodding ox trains which first penetrated the silence of the wilderness to the stagecoach, the pony express, and the railroads is a marvelous transition, probably unequalled in the history of the world."¹¹

The marvels of westward expansion and material progress may have affected Kellogg's imagination all the more poignantly because he identified his own life with these aspects of his country's history. "I have had something of an interesting career," he wrote in 1929. "I came West in 1865, when this country was almost a wilderness and have seen the country between here and the Pacific Ocean develop. My early experiences in Minnesota might be of interest to young men who have their way to make



KELLOGG and Andrew Mellon, 1933

in the world.”¹² In other words, Kellogg thought of his own life as a normal American experience, an experience which contained ultimate values according to his standards.

One aspect of Kellogg’s history then—his emphasis upon American institutions—was static; another—his excitement about America’s economic and technological progress—was dynamic. The former led him to discourage change in areas where political and legal institutions had crystallized progress, while the latter area remained free and open to change.

BUT there was still another static element in Kellogg’s idea of history. Although the man who had been counsel for the United States Steel Corporation found excitement in America’s economic and technological expansion, the Senator from Minnesota enunciated eloquently, if conventionally, a philosophy bespeaking the special virtues of the independent small-holding yeoman. It is difficult to demonstrate that Kellogg’s politics were directly influenced by his agrarianism, beyond some agricultural legislation he sponsored, and beyond the reinforcement this system of values gave to *laissez faire* economics. However, the notions that occur in the following quotation from a speech Kellogg made in the Senate in 1917 are so persistent in his writing—particularly but not exclusively in his public addresses—that they must be mentioned.

In debate on a wartime measure to conserve fuel and food in June, 1918, Kellogg remarked that he realized “the supreme importance to this Nation of the highest development of agriculture. In all times the prosperity and greatness of the nations of the world have been based upon agricultural pursuits. The roots of all great civilizations spring from the soil.” He then informed his colleagues that “The degeneration which is going on in the centers of population, like our large cities, is a terrible drain upon a Nation, which is being

made good from the blood, sinew, and brain of the land.”¹³

“Nothing,” Kellogg continued, “is of greater importance than that we maintain the independence and individual proprietorship, the prosperity, and the attractiveness of farm life. . . . Show me a nation whose industries are based upon the independent, prosperous proprietor of the soil and I will show you a great nation,” the Senator said emphatically. “Show me a nation where agriculture declines and I will show you a decadent nation. It has been the history of the world since the doings of men have been recorded. The greatest civilizations have sprung from the fertile valleys and plains of the world.”

In the midst of this speech (almost certainly delivered extemporaneously from notes as was his habit and to which the roughness of the prose attests) Kellogg asked himself why farm boys were moving to the city, and his answer, probably unwittingly, was a little paean to the economic and technological values of the city, delivered in much fresher prose and perhaps with greater excitement. “The concentration of wealth, the marvelous accomplishments in science and invention, the increase in manufacture and world commerce, and the increase in communication and rapid transportation have afforded opportunities in the cities for large incomes, the amassing of great fortunes, and that, together with the attractiveness of city life,” concluded the farm boy who made good in the city, “has taken from the farm much of the best blood of the Nation.”

In a different tone, campaigning for Republican votes in 1928, Kellogg said, “Such questions as the tariff, banking and currency, transportation by railroad, or water, domestic and foreign commerce, control of

¹² Kellogg to Roger L. Sciafe, December 23, 1929.

¹³ Material in this and succeeding paragraphs may be found in the *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 1 session, 4414, 4417. These passages are typical of a number of similar speeches Kellogg delivered in the Senate and elsewhere.

corporations and the encouragement of industries . . . in these questions lie the foundations of the happiness, the prosperity of the people and the advancement of our civilization."¹⁴

The first kind of confusion in Kellogg's history — the germ theory versus the frontier theory — was not necessarily disabling; it was perfectly possible for him to argue that change might occur in one sector of American activity and not in another. But the second, between agrarian values on the one hand and technological and commercial values on the other hand, represented an important confusion of ideas about the purposes of the American society which his concept of history glorified.

A THIRD static element in Kellogg's view of history was his assumption that the nation-state was a final, complete, irreducible, and absolute political arrangement. The nation, as Kellogg conceived of it, was more than a phenomenon occurring in time and related to other finite historical events. "All history admonishes us that there is a nationalism, there are principles of self-government, which cannot be merged, in a conglomerated union of all nations," said the Senator in 1919. Kellogg associated internationalism with socialism, which he regarded as an "impossible" and "impracticable scheme that . . . yet rests in the brain of the dreamer." Particularly during the League of Nations debate in 1918, he inveighed against any "framework" of super-government . . . the dream of some intellectuals."¹⁵

Kellogg's assumption regarding nationalism almost necessarily supported all his thinking about international relations; it was buried in the very language with which

he discussed his work. His attitude manifested itself, for example, in his advocacy of national self-determinism, an issue on which he pointedly outdid Wilson, for he hoped that "each of the great peoples of the world may have an opportunity to develop their nationality."¹⁶

Furthermore, although he was an enthusiastic collector of arbitration and conciliation treaties, he insisted that they never violate a nation's sovereignty. In 1930 he expressed to a newspaper reporter his conviction that "Conciliation commissions and general arbitration are available . . . whenever nations are willing to submit their sovereign rights to arbitration. But . . . questions of political or economic policy," he stated flatly, "are within the sovereign jurisdiction of every independent state." On an earlier occasion, writing to Henry P. Fletcher, United States ambassador to Italy, Secretary of State Kellogg said more specifically, "I do not relish the idea of any foreign country demanding that we arbitrate the question of our control in Haiti, of Santo Domingo, or arbitrate the question of any foreign country attempting to take possession of the customs of Central American countries in order to enforce debts, or to try to force us to arbitrate anything pertaining to the Panama Canal."¹⁷

Although he was an advocate of American adhesion to the World Court, on which he served as a judge from 1930 to 1935, Kellogg insisted that the court limit its jurisdiction to legal problems and refuse to discuss political and economic questions. Kellogg felt that any reasonable human being could tell where domestic questions ended and international questions began. Similarly he felt that the edges of a nation's irreducible sovereignty were so clearly discernible that anyone could see that certain questions were "political" and within the limits of a nation's sovereignty, and that other questions were "legal," and appropriate subjects for an international court's deliberations. Understanding this

¹⁴ Undated speech, autumn, 1928.

¹⁵ Speech to a Republican rally, St. Paul, March 7, 1919; *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 3 session, 74, 734.

¹⁶ *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 3 session, 73.

¹⁷ *New York Times*, December 21, 1930, section IX, p. 1; Kellogg to Fletcher, June 11, 1925.

sharp and patent differentiation, no nation had the right to infringe upon the domestic policies of another.

An "inherent and inalienable" right of all sovereign nations was that of self-defense, said Kellogg. As secretary of state he made it clear that in his view "The right of self-defense is not limited to territory in the continental United States. . . . It means," he continued, "that this Government has a right to take such measures as it believes necessary to the defense of the country, or to prevent things that might endanger the country; but the United States must be the judge of that. . . . Self-defense," he added, "covers all our possessions, all our rights." It was "incomprehensible" to Kellogg that anybody should maintain that the right of self-defense should somehow be modified by the Pact of Paris.¹⁸

SUCH, briefly, was the curve of history as Kellogg saw it, a curve beginning, in effect, with the fall of the Roman empire and gradually rising to climaxes when Americans established their government and conquered their technological and geographical frontiers. History had established certain gains permanently and finally: notably the nation-state and the legal institutions embodied in the American Constitution. Kellogg, the lawyer trained to search for precedent to justify present actions, leaned on the past in argument perhaps more than most men. As for the future, he ritualistically enunciated the orthodox American faith in progress. "All history," he declared, "points to continual progress." Normally, when he described the course of progress, he gave it the smooth, gradual curve of his view of history. Progress does not occur, he said, "in a day or by a single act"; rather, beneficial changes occur "step by step in earnest and thoughtful progress." On another occasion he stated his belief that "Human nature will not change over night."¹⁹

When he tried to delineate exactly what

kinds of changes should be made in the name of progress, Kellogg tended to be vague, to utter generalizations about the "advancement of science, education, commerce and other activities." But if his definition of progress was fuzzy at the edges, it was specific at the center. "Each generation," he declared, "seems to have its task of human advancement. Each generation that is worth while penetrates a new frontier of human advancement." For his generation, Kellogg said, that task was nothing less than the abolition of war.²⁰

When Kellogg discussed the world's reaction against war in his time, he abandoned the gradual contours of his curve of history. Particularly in his public addresses late in life when events in China, Ethiopia, and central Europe were challenging his peace pact, Kellogg declared that war had, in fact, been outlawed, and that public opinion throughout the world was so strongly behind the pact that no nation would dare violate it.

He had been ambitious for the cause of peace, especially from the time of World War I. For that war, he felt, purged the world of its sin of militarism. He considered the war a baptism of fire, after which the world could expect a *vita nuova*. It was unreasonable to suppose that people would submit to the suffering and privation of that war without vowing to prevent the recurrence of such a thing. To a St. Paul audience in 1919, Kellogg said, "When the sun went down on that memorable August [1914] day nearly five years ago, it was to rise upon a new world. The old had passed away. The Twentieth Century civilization was to pass through the fiery furnace of war." Eleven years later in 1930 he

¹⁸ Testimony before the Senate foreign relations committee, reported in *New York Times*, December 29, 1928, p. 7.

¹⁹ Speech to the League for Political Education, March 28, 1930; interview in the *New York Times*, April 23, 1930, p. 21.

²⁰ Speech on CBS Radio, October 30, 1935, under the auspices of the League of Nations Association.

stated that during the decade following the conflict, there arose an “almost universal demand for the abolition of war . . . [a] great tidal wave of public opinion.” Writing to a career diplomat in 1935, the elderly Kellogg expressed the belief that the world of the 1920s had broken the continuity of history; the 1920s were an “enlightened and advanced age,” a “different world,” a “modern, enlightened age.” It was “simply idiotic,” Kellogg declared, “to suppose that the people of the world would allow another war to occur with the memory of the last one so fresh in their memories.”²¹

KELLOGG’S view of history and progress rested upon two further assumptions. First, he believed that the American Constitution embodied absolute truths derived from fundamental natural laws analogous to those of physics, and that all men were gifted with sufficient reason to understand the workings of such political and economic laws. Second, Kellogg was convinced that all the peoples of the world aspired to imitate the American form of government. It “comes nearer meeting the aspirations of mankind than any of those which have arisen,” said Kellogg in a campaign speech made in 1919. His hope after the war, he had told the Senate earlier that year, was that “the stricken peoples of Europe will form governments modeled after our own, where the right of the people to govern shall be perpetuated.” Kellogg held that World War I was more than merely a war to make the world safe for democracy; it was a war to establish democratic prin-



“PUTTING Him in His Proper Place”

ciples among all the nations of the earth. If America’s political and economic system approximated absolute and irrevocable truth, and if all the world recognized this fact, then America’s most important mission was to remain strong, independent, and true to its principles. The best service America could perform for the peace, freedom, and prosperity of the world was to maintain itself as a model which the world could imitate.²²

Near the close of World War I, he told the Senate that “The eyes of all nations are now turned toward this country. There never has been a time when our action would have had as much influence in shaping the destiny of nations as at present.” During the Senate debate over the Washington treaties in 1922, Kellogg declared, “The United States today, I believe, is the greatest moral force in the world.” Moreover, he added, “The United States is probably the only country which could have taken the lead in this great movement [to limit armament] with any hope of success.” He said that the “war had left Europe torn by factions. . . This Government

²¹ Speeches to a Republican rally, St. Paul, March 7, 1919; to the League for Political Education, March 28, 1930; to Society of Pilgrims, November 22, 1929; and at a Nobel anniversary banquet, New York, December 18, 1933; Kellogg to Theodore Marriner, April 5, 1935.

²² Speech to a Republican rally, St. Paul, March 7, 1919; *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 3 session, 1927.

THE CARTOON above appeared in the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* of August 26, 1928, the day before the Kellogg-Briand pact was signed at Paris.

had held aloof from these disputes, though deeply interested in the peace of the world.”²³

If all history was directed toward the formation of the United States, if the task of his generation, dramatized by the war, was to establish peace, if all the peoples of the world recognized America's leadership in this movement, and if the movement was to be achieved without disturbing national sovereignty, then the general drift of Kellogg's foreign policy during the 1920s makes sense. As a Senator, he made it clear that he wanted nothing to do with the “pitfalls and dangers of European intrigue,” the “jealousies and entanglements that are prevalent in Europe.” As secretary of state, he warned his fellow citizens about “entangling alliances”; the policy of avoiding them, he said, was “the cornerstone of our foreign policy.” While ambassador to England in 1924, Kellogg wrote President Coolidge that the United States must be allowed its “freedom of action.” But this must not be interpreted, he said, as a sign of American indifference. On the contrary, the policy was an indication of how deeply the United States felt its moral obligations, for the “hope of the world” lay in America's peace and prosperity.²⁴

Time and again, we find Kellogg's decisions on crucial issues following the general rule: be helpful, but stay aloof, and keep the American model pure. As a Senator considering the League of Nations Covenant, Kellogg decided to be for the league because it represented progress toward peace, but against it because he felt it compromised American sovereignty. On November 19, 1919, he told the Senate, “This Republic is the hope of the world. Shall we surrender our aspirations and our Government to the dictation of foreign nations?”²⁵

Kellogg approved in principle of various proposals made during the 1920s to limit land and naval armament, for he felt that the United States had always exerted leadership in the world in that direction. On

the other hand, he insisted that the United States should not “be subject to inspection or control by foreign agencies,” stating that “Limitation must depend upon good faith.” The world, he felt, understood that the United States had no aggressive aims. “Our object in being represented” at the Geneva Preparatory Conference, he told the American ambassador to England in 1926, “is to show in every reasonable way our sympathy and to give any aid consistent within our policy.” As secretary of state his argument in 1928 against reopening the question of recognition of Soviet Russia was based very largely on the fact that he believed communism denied the truths which were so well expressed by the American Constitution.²⁶

At the end of his long public career in the late 1930s, Kellogg still fervently embraced the ideas set forth in the Pact of Paris. To him it embodied the universal aspirations toward the peaceable kingdom that had been awakened by World War I; it in no way affected the sovereignty of the United States; and it demonstrated finally and conclusively America's moral leadership in the world. Two months before his death in December, 1937, he wrote, “I believe still . . . that the hope of the world for peace depends upon the observance, by all the signatory powers, of the terms and principles of the Pact of Paris.”²⁷ Kellogg's death spared him the full revelation of how frail that hope was to be, and how shaky were its philosophical footings.

²³ Undated memo for use before the Senate foreign relations committee, about December 22, 1927; Kellogg to Robert W. Bliss, April 10, 1928; *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 2 session, 7569; 67 Congress, 2 session, 3473, 3478.

²⁴ *Congressional Record*, 65 Congress, 3 session, 77; 66 Congress, 1 session, 6990; *New York Times*, February 23, 1926, p. 4; Kellogg to Coolidge, October 7, 1924.

²⁵ *Congressional Record*, 66 Congress, 1 session, 8781.

²⁶ *New York Times*, August 19, 1926, p. 1, April 15, 1928, p. 1; Kellogg to Alanson B. Houghton, February 11, 1926.

²⁷ Kellogg to Dr. Wang, October 17, 1937.



Copyright of **Minnesota History** is the property of the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, or email articles, however, for individual use.

To request permission for educational or commercial use, [contact us](#).