

## Chapter 1 : Neutral country - Wikipedia

*As World War I erupts in Europe, President Woodrow Wilson formally proclaims the neutrality of the United States, a position that a vast majority of Americans favored, on August 4,*

**Spenden The Benefits of Cause-Neutrality** We want to reduce as much suffering as possible, regardless of who is experiencing that suffering. But we cannot realistically help everyone, so how do we choose who to help? Cause prioritization is a kind of triage that we can use to match our limited resources to the problems where they will reduce the most suffering. While it is easy to develop personal attachments to a particular cause, we will prioritize our resource allocation best if we adopt an attitude of cause-neutrality and, like the doctors, make our altruistic decisions strictly on the basis of how much suffering we expect them to eliminate. Variation among causes Cause areas can differ dramatically in scale. There are many more farmed animals than humans in poverty, many more wild animals than farmed animals, and the number of individuals suffering in the future could be far greater still – humanity could exist for many thousands more years, and could even expand beyond Earth. Partly because of this variation in scale, the effectiveness of different interventions to reduce suffering can vary by several orders of magnitude. For example, the same resources required by a shelter to rescue 2 or 3 animals could instead spare over 11, animals from factory farms. Different causes and interventions also vary significantly in how tractable and neglected they are, two other important factors we need to consider when assessing what to do with our time and money. This variation means that choosing what cause or causes to prioritize can make a massive difference in the amount of suffering we can expect to affect. Adapting to new evidence Future social, political, and technological developments may have significant effects on which cause needs our resources the most. As activists explore more interventions across different cause areas, we will also gain an improved understanding of how tractable those interventions are. Taking a cause-neutral approach enables us to update our views based on new evidence – evidence that could have significant implications for how we can most effectively reduce suffering. For example, we think farmed animal advocacy is a very promising cause right now, but we remain open to the possibility that something else may eclipse its priority. For instance, if technologies emerge that enable us to help wild animals on a large scale, ensuring their application may become a better use of our resources. If there is more we can do to reduce suffering, we need to be open to learning about it and willing to redirect our efforts towards it. Overcoming our biases In choosing what cause to work on now, we should keep in mind how some cognitive biases may influence us. We should also recognize our tendency to interpret information in a way that confirms our current beliefs. This is called confirmation bias. We also have a more general bias towards maintaining our status quo. An activist working on a human-focused cause, who is surrounded by friends and family who eat animals, may think that their own work is so important that they should not bother with even the minor transitional cost of an impactful behavioral change, like adopting a vegetarian or vegan diet. We should be suspicious of such apparent good fortune that enables us to stay our present course in the face of new considerations. Epistemic modesty is also valuable, especially given how alarmingly easy it is to miss crucial considerations. For instance, someone may direct their resources only where they can see the impact they are making, even if they could reduce far more suffering by helping individuals they have not considered – like those who have not been born yet but whose suffering could be substantially impacted by actions taken today. Similarly, an animal advocate may not think about how animals suffer in nature, or someone who wants to colonize space may not consider the wild animal suffering that terraforming other planets could cause. How to reduce suffering while maintaining a cause-neutral approach Cause-neutral movement building Just as individuals may be biased and unable to update their views, an entire movement may find it difficult to re-prioritize based on new evidence. Movements focused on too narrow a cause or set of interventions may fall short of their potential because their capital is too specialized and inflexible. This flexibility is why Sentience Politics advocates for a cause-neutral movement for the reduction of suffering in all sentient beings. By working on a spectrum of promising causes and interventions, we can grow support for those movements, cultivate a more cause-neutral attitude in the activists we work alongside,

attract press, gain influence, and maintain enough neutrality to refocus our own efforts as our priorities change. Prioritization research How much suffering an intervention reduces is an empirical question, so we need to continue investigating specific interventions. The stakes are astronomical, and little research has gone into these questions. This research has been and may continue to be immensely valuable. A single crucial insight can dramatically increase the effectiveness of our work, such as the realization that affecting the far future could be a serious moral priority. Attitude change Currently, wild animal suffering and the diverse possible forms of astronomical suffering that could happen in the future are strong candidates for causes to prioritize, but before we can make progress on these advanced issues, society needs to care much more about them. Developing technologies we can use to intervene will not make a difference if we are unwilling to use them. But once we decide that promoting particular values is important, we still need to find the best ways to do so, which is a complex and difficult problem. Spreading messages advocating for animals “ for example, through undercover investigations , leafleting , or political advocacy ” could be a good place to start. While animal advocacy messages currently focus mostly on human-caused animal suffering, these messages could be broadened to encompass all suffering animals and emphasize antispeciesism. Even though farmed animals are a massive group and society is only just beginning to consider their suffering, in the interest of expanding our moral circle to embrace them as well as wild animals and other existing and future sentient nonhuman beings, explicitly promoting antispeciesism and a general concern for animal suffering “ with concrete goals like ending animal farming ” may be a more effective use of our resources than strictly promoting concern for farmed animals. One might assume that plant and cultured meat substitutes can only change behavior and will have no effect on attitudes. However, if we are not eating animals, we have less of a need to rationalize eating them , so cultured and plant-based meat substitutes make it psychologically easier for us to care about them. Then again, some technological changes are more likely to happen without us than the social change they assist, so our own resources may help more elsewhere. Conclusion Cause-neutrality helps us eliminate the most suffering we can by ensuring that we are able to update our views when we encounter new evidence. We can manage uncertainty about what causes and interventions we should prioritize by pursuing cause-neutral movement building, prioritization research, and broad attitude change. While these ideas may seem calculating and abstract, the suffering of sentient beings is both real and enormous. In order to eliminate as much of it as possible, we have to think critically about our altruistic efforts. To learn about more advanced considerations, visit our sister project, the Foundational Research Institute.

## Chapter 2 : U.S. proclaims neutrality in World War I - HISTORY

*Start studying policy of neutrality. Learn vocabulary, terms, and more with flashcards, games, and other study tools.*

Terminology[ edit ] A neutral country in a particular war , is a sovereign state which officially declares itself to be neutral towards the belligerents. The rights and duties of a neutral power are defined in Sections 5 [1] and 13 [2] of the Hague Convention of A permanently neutral power is a sovereign state which is bound by international treaty to be neutral towards the belligerents of all future wars. An example of a permanently neutral power is Switzerland. The concept of neutrality in war is narrowly defined and puts specific constraints on the neutral party in return for the internationally recognised right to remain neutral. Neutralism or a "neutralist policy" is a foreign policy position wherein a state intends to remain neutral in future wars. A sovereign state that reserves the right to become a belligerent if attacked by a party to the war is in a condition of armed neutrality. A non-belligerent state does not need to be neutral; the policy of non-interventionism is distinct from neutrality, but related, in that it seeks to avoid alliances or intervening militarily in other countries. For example, Austria has its neutrality guaranteed by its four former occupying powers, Switzerland by the signatories of the Congress of Vienna and Finland by the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The form of recognition varies, often by bilateral treaty Finland , multilateral treaty Austria or a UN declaration Turkmenistan. Austria and Japan codify their neutrality in their constitutions, but they do so with different levels of detail. Some details of neutrality are left to be interpreted by the government while others are explicitly stated, for example Austria may not host any foreign bases and Japan cannot participate in foreign wars. Yet Sweden, lacking formal codification, was more flexible during the Second World War in allowing troops to pass through its territory. Military preparedness without commitment, especially as the expressed policy of a neutral nation in wartime; readiness to counter with force an invasion of rights by any belligerent power. It is the condition of a neutral power, during said war, to hold itself ready to resist by force, any aggression of either belligerent. Such states assert that they will defend themselves against resulting incursions from all parties. Sweden and Switzerland are, independent of each other, famed for their armed neutrality, which they maintained throughout both World War I and World War II. It pursues, however, an active foreign policy and is frequently involved in peace-building processes around the world. But not having a military does not result in neutrality as many countries, such as Iceland , replaced a standing military with a military guarantee from a stronger power. Leagues of Armed Neutrality[ edit ] The phrase "armed neutrality" sometimes refers specifically to one of the "Leagues of Armed Neutrality". This league had a lasting impact of Russian-American relations, and the relations of those two powers and Britain. It was also the basis for international maritime law , which is still in effect. Carl Kulsrud argue that the concept of armed neutrality was introduced even earlier. Within 90 years before the First League of Armed Neutrality was established, neutral powers had joined forces no less than three times. As early as , Lubeck and Holland joined powers to continue their maritime exploration without the commitment of being involved in wartime struggles on the sea. It occurred during and The idea of this second league was to protect neutral shipping from the British Royal Navy. However, Britain took this as the alliance taking up sides with France, thus attacking Denmark. The alliance was forced to withdraw from the league. For many states, such as Ireland and Sweden, neutrality does not mean the absence of any foreign interventionism. Peacekeeping missions for the United Nations are seen as intertwined with it. Despite this, 23 Swiss observers and police have been deployed around the world in UN projects. European Union[ edit ] There are five members of the European Union that still describe themselves as a neutral country in some form: Austria , Ireland , Finland , Malta and Sweden. I must correct him on that: Finland is a member of the EU. We were at one time a politically neutral country, during the time of the Iron Curtain. Now we are a member of the Union, part of this community of values, which has a common policy and, moreover, a common foreign policy. The policy was designed to be inclusive and allows for states to opt in or out of specific forms of military cooperation. That has allowed most of the neutral states to participate, but opinions still vary. It was passed with the government arguing that its opt-in nature allowed Ireland to "join elements of PESCO that were beneficial such as counter-terrorism, cyber security and peace

keeping The Maltese government argued that it was going to wait and see how PESCO develops to see whether it would compromise Maltese neutrality. According to Ion Marandici, Moldova has chosen neutrality in order to avoid Russian security schemes and Russian military presence on its territory.

### Chapter 3 : The Neutrality Acts | calendrierdelascience.com

*On 19 August U.S. President Woodrow Wilson addressed Congress and made public the U.S. policy of neutrality. During his address he warned U.S. citizens against taking sides in the war for fear of endangering the wider U.S. policy.*

DUE Neutrality requires that each article or other page in the mainspace fairly represents all significant viewpoints that have been published by reliable sources, in proportion to the prominence of each viewpoint in the published, reliable sources. Generally, the views of tiny minorities should not be included at all, except perhaps in a "see also" to an article about those specific views. For example, the article on the Earth does not directly mention modern support for the flat Earth concept, the view of a distinct and miniscule minority; to do so would give undue weight to it. Undue weight can be given in several ways, including but not limited to depth of detail, quantity of text, prominence of placement, juxtaposition of statements and imagery. In articles specifically relating to a minority viewpoint, such views may receive more attention and space. However, these pages should still make appropriate reference to the majority viewpoint wherever relevant and must not represent content strictly from the perspective of the minority view. Specifically, it should always be clear which parts of the text describe the minority view. In addition, the majority view should be explained in sufficient detail that the reader can understand how the minority view differs from it, and controversies regarding aspects of the minority view should be clearly identified and explained. How much detail is required depends on the subject. For instance, articles on historical views such as Flat Earth, with few or no modern proponents, may briefly state the modern position, and then go on to discuss the history of the idea in great detail, neutrally presenting the history of a now-discredited belief. Other minority views may require much more extensive description of the majority view to avoid misleading the reader. Wikipedia should not present a dispute as if a view held by a small minority deserves as much attention overall as the majority view. Views that are held by a tiny minority should not be represented except in articles devoted to those views such as Flat Earth. To give undue weight to the view of a significant minority, or to include that of a tiny minority, might be misleading as to the shape of the dispute. Wikipedia aims to present competing views in proportion to their representation in reliable sources on the subject. This applies not only to article text, but to images, wikilinks, external links, categories, and all other material as well. If a viewpoint is in the majority, then it should be easy to substantiate it with reference to commonly accepted reference texts; If a viewpoint is held by a significant minority, then it should be easy to name prominent adherents; If a viewpoint is held by an extremely small minority, it does not belong on Wikipedia, regardless of whether it is true or you can prove it, except perhaps in some ancillary article. If you can prove a theory that few or none currently believe, Wikipedia is not the place to present such a proof. Once it has been presented and discussed in reliable sources, it may be appropriately included. See " No original research " and " Verifiability ".

**Chapter 4 : Development of U.S. Neutrality Policy - World War I Document Archive**

*Second, the policy of the administration with regard to the holding up, detaining and searching of Germans and Austrians from neutral and American vessels is a reversal of the American policy established in*

A few days ago I wrote to you from New York in reply to your very kind letter of November 10th that I begged to postpone my reply until I reached my desk in Cambridge. Now after my return I indeed ask your permission to enter into some detail with regard to the neutrality question. But let me assure you beforehand that I interpret your inquiry as referring exclusively to the views which are expressed to me by American citizens who sympathize with the German cause or who are disturbed by the vehement hostility to Germany on the part of the American press. My remarks refers in no way to the views of official Germany Let me emphasize three points to which my correspondents refer most frequently. First, all cables sent by and received by wire pass uncensored, while all wireless news is censored. This reacts against Germany, because England sends all her news by cable, whereas Germany alone uses the wireless. The matter is of grave importance. Second, the policy of the administration with regard to the holding up, detaining and searching of Germans and Austrians from neutral and American vessels is a reversal of the American policy established in It has excited no end of bitterness. Third, the United States permitted the violation by England of the Hague Convention and international law in connection with conditional and unconditional contraband. The United States, for instance, has not protested against the transference of copper from the conditional to the absolute list, although on former occasions the United States has taken a spirited stand against one-sided interpretations of international agreements The United States, moreover, insisted that conditional contraband can be sent in neutral or in American bottoms even to belligerent nations, provided it was not consigned to the government, the military or naval authorities or to any contractors known to represent the belligerent government. By permitting this new interpretation the United States practically supports the starving out policy of the Allies. The nation by reversing its own policy thus seriously handicaps Germany and Austria in their fight for existence Many of the complaints refer more to the unfriendly spirit than to the actual violation of the law. Here above all belongs the unlimited sale of ammunition to the belligerents. The administration originally advised Mr. Morgan that the making of loans to the nations at war would not be looked upon with favor by the President, and Mr. Morgan cancelled the plans. This attitude has been given up; the State Department has emphasized that money and arms may be sold to the belligerents, while evidently the friends of peace had firmly hoped that the President would denounce the sale of ammunition or any other sale which would be likely to prolong the war. Indeed our friends of peace must regret this encouraging attitude with reference to the sale of agencies of destruction, but the friends of Germany cannot forget that this sympathetic attitude of the State Department under the conditions which objectively exist is not only helpful to the prolongation of the war, but helpful exclusively to the Allies against Central Europe. The favorite interpretation of the Germans is even that the government makes itself a party to the violation of neutrality by giving clearance papers to vessels loaded with war material for England and France. They say, moreover, that the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy could and did restrain the shipment of war material into Mexico. Hence he has the same power to restrain the shipment of such material to Europe Washington, January 20, Dear Mr. I have received your letter of the 8th instant, referring to frequent complaints or charges made in one form or another through the press that this Government has shown partiality to Great Britain, France, and Russia against Germany and Austria during the present war, and stating that you have received numerous letters to the same effect from sympathizers with the latter powers. You summarize the various grounds of these complaints and ask that you be furnished with whatever information the Department may have touching these points of complaint, in order that you may be informed as to what the true situation is in regard to these matters. In order that you may have such information as the Department has on the subjects referred to in your letter, I will take them up seriatim. The reason that wireless messages and cable messages require different treatment by a neutral government is as follows: Communications by wireless can not be interrupted by a belligerent. With a submarine cable it is otherwise. Since a cable is subject to hostile attack, the responsibility

falls upon the belligerent and not upon the neutral to prevent cable communication. A more important reason, however, at least from the point of view of a neutral government is that messages sent out from a wireless station in neutral territory may be received by belligerent warships on the high seas. As a wireless message can be received by all stations and vessels within a given radius, every message in cipher, whatever its intended destination, must be censored; otherwise military information may be sent to warships off the coast of a neutral. It is manifest that a submarine cable is incapable of becoming a means of direct communication with a warship on the high seas. Hence its use can not, as a rule, make neutral territory a base for the direction of naval operations. There is no Hague convention which deals with absolute or conditional contraband, and, as the Declaration of London is not in force, the rules of international law only apply. As to the articles to be regarded as contraband, there is no general agreement between nations. It is the practice for a country, either in time of peace or after the outbreak of war, to declare the articles which it will consider as absolute or conditional contraband. It is true that a neutral government is seriously affected by this declaration, as the rights of its subjects or citizens may be impaired. But the rights and interests of belligerents and neutrals are opposed in respect to contraband articles and trade and there is no tribunal to which questions of difference may be readily submitted. The record of the United States in the past is not free from criticism. When neutral, this Government has stood for a restricted list of absolute and conditional contraband. As a belligerent, we have contended for a liberal list, according to our conception of the necessities of the case. The United States has made earnest representations to Great Britain in regard to the seizure and detention by the British authorities of all American ships or cargoes bona fide destined to neutral ports, on the ground that such seizures and detentions were contrary to the existing rules of international law. It will be recalled, however, that American courts have established various rules bearing on these matters. The rule of "continuous voyage" has been not only asserted by American tribunals but extended by them. They have exercised the right to determine from the circumstances whether the ostensible was the real destination. They have held that the shipment of articles of contraband to a neutral port "to order," from which, as a matter of fact, cargoes had been transshipped to the enemy, is corroborative evidence that the cargo is really destined to the enemy instead of to the neutral port of delivery. It is thus seen that some of the doctrines which appear to bear harshly upon neutrals at the present time are analogous to or outgrowths from policies adopted by the United States when it was a belligerent. The Government therefore can not consistently protest against the application of rules which it has followed in the past, unless they have not been practiced as heretofore. The fact that the commerce of the United States is interrupted by Great Britain is consequent upon the superiority of her Navy on the high seas. History shows that whenever a country has possessed that superiority our trade has been interrupted and that few articles essential to the prosecution of the war have been allowed to reach its enemy from this country. Certain other complaints appear aimed at the loss of profit in trade, which must include, at least in part, trade in contraband with Germany; while other complaints demand the prohibition of trade in contraband, which appear to refer to trade with the Allies. As no American vessel, so far as known, has attempted to carry conditional contraband to Germany or Austria-Hungary, no ground of complaint has arisen out of the seizure or condemnation by Great Britain of an American vessel with a belligerent destination. Until a case arises and the Government has taken action upon it, criticism is premature and unwarranted. There is no power in the Executive to prevent the sale of ammunition to the belligerents. The duty of a neutral to restrict trade in munitions of war has never been imposed by international law or by municipal statute. It has never been the policy of this Government to prevent the shipment of arms or ammunition into belligerent territory, except in the case of neighboring American Republics, and then only when civil strife prevailed. Even to this extent the belligerents in the present conflict, when they were neutrals, have never, so far as the records disclose, limited the sale of munitions of war. It is only necessary to point to the enormous quantities of arms and ammunition furnished by manufacturers in Germany to the belligerents in the Russo-Japanese war and in the recent Balkan wars to establish the general recognition of the propriety of the trade by a neutral nation. It may be added that on the 15th of December last, the German Ambassador, by direction of his Government, presented a copy of a memorandum of the Imperial German Government which, among other things, set forth the attitude of that Government toward traffic in contraband of war by citizens of neutral countries. The

complaint is unjustified from the fact that representations were made to the British Government that the presence of war vessels in the vicinity of New York Harbor was offensive to this Government, and a similar complaint was made to the Japanese Government as to one of its cruisers in the vicinity of the port of Honolulu. In both cases the warships were withdrawn. It will be recalled that in the Department took the position that captures made by its vessels after hovering about neutral ports would not be regarded as valid. In the Franco-Prussian war, President Grant issued a proclamation warning belligerent war ships against hovering in the vicinity of American ports for purposes of observation or hostile acts. The same policy has been maintained in the present war, and in all of the recent proclamations of neutrality the President states that such practice by belligerent warships is "unfriendly and offensive. War loans in this country were disapproved because inconsistent with the spirit of neutrality. There is a clearly defined difference between a war loan and the purchase of arms and ammunition. The policy of disapproving of war loans affects all governments alike, so that the disapproval is not an unneutral act. The case is entirely different in the matter of arms and ammunition, because prohibition of export not only might not, but in this case would not, operate equally upon the nations at war. The result would be that great numbers of the American people might become more earnest partisans, having material interest in the success of the belligerent whose bonds they hold. These purchases would not be confined to a few, but would spread generally throughout the country, so that the people would be divided into groups of partisans, which would result in intense bitterness and might cause an undesirable, if not a serious, situation. On the other hand, contracts for and sales of contraband are mere matters of trade. The manufacturer, unless peculiarly sentimental, would sell to one belligerent as readily as he would to another. No general spirit of partisanship is aroused -- no sympathies excited. The whole transaction is merely a matter of business. This Government has not been advised that any general loans have been made by foreign governments in this country since the President expressed his wish that loans of this character should not be made. If any American citizens, partisans of Germany and Austria-Hungary, feel that this administration is acting in a way injurious to the cause of those countries, this feeling results from the fact that on the high seas the German and Austro-Hungarian naval power is thus far inferior to the British. It is the business of a belligerent operating on the high seas, not the duty of a neutral, to prevent contraband from reaching an enemy. Those in this country who sympathize with Germany and Austria-Hungary appear to assume that some obligation rests upon this Government in the performance of its neutral duty to prevent all trade in contraband, and thus to equalize the difference due to the relative naval strength of the belligerents. No such obligation exists; it would be an unneutral act, an act of partiality on the part of this Government, to adopt such a policy if the Executive had the power to do so. If Germany and Austria-Hungary can not import contraband from this country, it is not, because of that fact, the duty of the United States to close its markets to the Allies. The markets of this country are open upon equal terms to all the world, to every nation, belligerent or neutral. The foregoing Categorical replies to specific complaints are sufficient answer to the charge of unfriendliness to Germany and Austria-Hungary.

**Chapter 5 : Wikipedia:Neutral point of view - Wikipedia**

*Define neutrality. neutrality synonyms, neutrality pronunciation, neutrality translation, English dictionary definition of neutrality. n. The state or policy of being neutral, especially nonparticipation in war. n 1. the state or character of being neutral, esp in a dispute, contest, etc 2.*

For more information, please see the full notice. American Isolationism in the s During the s, the combination of the Great Depression and the memory of tragic losses in World War I contributed to pushing American public opinion and policy toward isolationism. Isolationists advocated non-involvement in European and Asian conflicts and non-entanglement in international politics. Although the United States took measures to avoid political and military conflicts across the oceans, it continued to expand economically and protect its interests in Latin America. The leaders of the isolationist movement drew upon history to bolster their position. Nevertheless, the American experience in that war served to bolster the arguments of isolationists; they argued that marginal U. Nye, a Republican from North Dakota, fed this belief by claiming that American bankers and arms manufacturers had pushed for U. The publication of the book *Merchants of Death* by H. Butler both served to increase popular suspicions of wartime profiteering and influence public opinion in the direction of neutrality. Many Americans became determined not to be tricked by banks and industries into making such great sacrifices again. The reality of a worldwide economic depression and the need for increased attention to domestic problems only served to bolster the idea that the United States should isolate itself from troubling events in Europe. During the interwar period, the U. Government repeatedly chose non-entanglement over participation or intervention as the appropriate response to international questions. Some members of Congress opposed membership in the League out of concern that it would draw the United States into European conflicts, although ultimately the collective security clause sank the possibility of U. During the s, the League proved ineffectual in the face of growing militarism, partly due to the U. Senator Gerald Nye The Japanese invasion of Manchuria and subsequent push to gain control over larger expanses of Northeast China in led President Herbert Hoover and his Secretary of State, Henry Stimson, to establish the Stimson Doctrine , which stated that the United States would not recognize the territory gained by aggression and in violation of international agreements. With the Stimson Doctrine, the United States expressed concern over the aggressive action without committing itself to any direct involvement or intervention. Other conflicts, including the Italian invasion of Ethiopia and the Spanish Civil War, also resulted in virtually no official commitment or action from the United States Government. Upon taking office, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt tended to see a necessity for the United States to participate more actively in international affairs, but his ability to apply his personal outlook to foreign policy was limited by the strength of isolationist sentiment in the U. In , President Roosevelt proposed a Congressional measure that would have granted him the right to consult with other nations to place pressure on aggressors in international conflicts. The bill ran into strong opposition from the leading isolationists in Congress, including progressive politicians such as Senators Hiram Johnson of California, William Borah of Idaho, and Robert La Follette of Wisconsin. In , controversy over U. Roosevelt lamented the restrictive nature of the acts, but because he still required Congressional support for his domestic New Deal policies, he reluctantly acquiesced. The isolationists were a diverse group, including progressives and conservatives, business owners and peace activists, but because they faced no consistent, organized opposition from internationalists, their ideology triumphed time and again. Roosevelt appeared to accept the strength of the isolationist elements in Congress until Even the outbreak of war in Europe in did not suddenly diffuse popular desire to avoid international entanglements. Instead, public opinion shifted from favoring complete neutrality to supporting limited U. The surprise Japanese attack on the U. Navy at Pearl Harbor in December of served to convince the majority of Americans that the United States should enter the war on the side of the Allies.

**Chapter 6 : Neutrality | Define Neutrality at calendrierdelascience.com**

## DOWNLOAD PDF A POLICY OF NEUTRALITY

*President Wilson sought to distance the US from WWI by issuing a proclamation of neutrality, Wilson's policy of neutrality was consistent with America's traditional policy of avoiding European entanglements, Wilson insisted that all belligerents respect American neutral rights on the high seas.*

### Chapter 7 : policy of neutrality | WordReference Forums

*noun. the state of being neutral.; the policy or status of a nation that does not participate in a war between other nations: the continuous neutrality of Switzerland. neutral status, as of a seaport during a war.*

### Chapter 8 : George Washington - Proclamation of Neutrality - April 22,

*Neutrality definition is - the quality or state of being neutral; especially: refusal to take part in a war between other powers. How to use neutrality in a sentence. the quality or state of being neutral; especially: refusal to take part in a war between other powers.*

### Chapter 9 : Milestones: " - Office of the Historian

*George Washington's Proclamation of Neutrality was designed to keep America out of further wars. In the early 's Europe was at war. In the early 's Europe was at war. The sides consisted of Great Britain and its allies on one hand and France on the other.*