

There are some things in this world more to be desired than peace, and one of them is the unembarrassed and unhampered and untrammelled political independence of this republic—the right and power to determine in every crisis, when that crisis comes, untrammelled by any previous commitments, the course which it is best for the people of this nation to pursue. If peace cannot be had without our surrendering that freedom of action, then I am not for peace.

Now I submit that there is a genuine ring to that statement, but it is a ring to which we have been accustomed these many years on Fourth of July. If you were to change a word or two in that paragraph, I doubt if you could really tell whether it was the ex-Kaiser addressing his troops, or Clemenceau in a fiery moment, or General Harbord speaking to the American Legion, or General Smedley Butler talking to the Marines.

With your permission may I read the paragraph again, altering merely a word?

There are some things in this world more to be desired than peace, and one of them is the unembarrassed and unhampered and untrammelled political independence of *this State of Idaho*—the right and power to determine in every crisis, when that crisis comes, untrammelled by any previous commitments, the course which it is best for the people of *this State* to pursue. If peace cannot be had without our surrendering that freedom of action, then *we of Idaho* are not for peace.

If Senator Borah had been alive in 1787 when the United States Constitution was under debate, that is precisely what he would have said. And there were plenty of people in that generation who gave expression to that exact sentiment. They did not see the necessity of moving out into a larger loyalty. They hugged to themselves the little loyalties to which they were accustomed. Always in every age there are those whose chief preoccupation is to guard the past. Always there are those who put the seal of sanctity on the social or economic arrangement with which they are familiar.