

5699. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Sandberg and 30 other signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5700. Also, petition of Mrs. Emil Slahey and 29 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5701. Also, petition of Mrs. Earl Sebree and 11 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5702. Also, petition of Mrs. Howard W. Gordon and 10 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war, and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5703. Also, petition of Florence Hankins and nine other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war, and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5704. Also, petition of Mrs. James C. Valley and 14 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., protesting against revising the Neutrality Act; to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5705. Also, petition of Ethel Heister and 2,700 members of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, urging Congress to keep our country at peace, and vote against arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5706. Also, petition of S. M. Merrill and 14 other citizens of Carthage, Ill., protesting against repeal of the Neutrality Act as a whole or in part; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5707. Also, petition of E. M. McDaniel and 24 other citizens of Plymouth, Ill., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5708. Also, petition of R. B. Lourie and 104 employees of John Deere Plow Co., of Moline, Ill., opposing our entry into any foreign war under any pretext, also suggesting that our Government take delivery of military supplies now under order of United States firms and should not be delivered to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5709. Also, petition of Albert A. Teske and 45 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., urging the retaining of the arms embargo and to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5710. Also, petition of Elizabeth Holmes and 25 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5711. Also, petition of Ralph De Porter and 51 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5712. Also, petition of Bess Gill and six other citizens of Macomb, Ill., to keep America out of war and to retain the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5713. Also, petition of R. Evans and 55 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5714. Also, petition of C. B. Parmelee and 31 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5715. Also, petition of Louis P. Reddig and six other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5716. Also, petition of Cleone Wadman and 12 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5717. Also, petition of G. E. Rigg and 82 other citizens of Macomb, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5718. Also, petition of Frank Haws and 120 employees of the Western Stoneware Co., of Monmouth, Ill., urging retaining of present Neutrality Act as written, without amendments or repeal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5719. Also, petition of Mrs. Franklin Johnson and 19 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of

war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5720. Also, petition of D. P. Nolan and nine other citizens of Galesburg, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5721. Also, petition of Mrs. R. J. McKee and 18 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5722. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 200 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5723. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the Wyandotte Council of Clubs, representing over 5,000 members, favoring the repeal of the arms embargo to permit sales on a cash-and-carry basis in accordance with the President's plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5724. Also, petition of Telesfor Sokolowski and other citizens of Wyandotte, Mich., urging the lifting of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5725. Also, petition of Dr. F. A. Pawlowski and other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District, Detroit, Mich., urging the repeal of the embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5726. Also, petition of the Polish-American Citizens Club, requesting support of President Roosevelt's plan to lifting the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5727. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of residents of Bradford County, Pa., protesting against the repeal or revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5728. Also, petition of sundry residents of Wayne County, Pa., protesting against the repeal or revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5729. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Gertrude K. Kirsch, secretary, and Mrs. Paul Gregory, grand regent, Catholic Daughters of America, Court Carroll, No. 299, Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5730. Also, petition of Mrs. John Besso and other citizens of Triadelphia, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5731. Also, petition of Verne Monroe, chairman, committee of the Cameron First Methodist Church, of Cameron, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5732. Also, petition of Donato Dittarelli, of Follansbee, W. Va., and 110 other citizens, urging that we keep the arms embargo, oppose the cash-and-carry, and keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5733. Also, Petition of Donald Habig and 50 citizens of Wheeling, W. V., urging that we use our influence and employ all means at our disposal to keep America out of war and free from foreign entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend Noble Cilley Powell, dean of the Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Father Almighty, of whose righteous will all things are and were created: Thou hast gathered the peoples of this land into a great nation and set before them a noble heritage. Do Thou deepen and strengthen the roots of our life in everlasting righteousness. Make us equal to the solemn trusts committed to our hands, reverent and grateful in the enjoyment and exercise of our freedom, just in the use of our power, wise and generous in our every relation one with another.

May Thy especial blessing rest upon these, Thy servants, laboring for the welfare of Thy people in days of restlessness and self-will. May no cloud of passion dim the light of Thy truth before their eyes. May no prejudice close their minds to Thy wisdom, and may knowledge of Thee be the stability of their consultations. Grant that, their trust being fixed in Thee, they may be guided by Thy strong hand to lead this Nation into the way of that peace which passeth all understanding. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 11, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Tobey
Burke	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Van Nys
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2984. A bill authorizing the transfer of title of the Hayward Indian School to the State of Wisconsin; and

S. 2985. A bill authorizing the transfer of title of the Tomah Indian School to the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KING ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. PITTMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Embargo Provisions of the Act of 1937 Should be Repealed," delivered by Senator King on October 11, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BAILEY ON EFFECT OF PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION ON THE MERCHANT MARINE

[Mr. PITTMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement as to the effect of the pending neutrality legislation on the merchant marine, prepared by Senator BAILEY, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT ON MERCHANT MARINE OF PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of October 12, 1939, by Mark Sullivan, entitled "Death Blow to Merchant Marine Seen in Proposed Neutrality Bill," and also an editorial from the same newspaper under the heading

"Sacrificing American Shipping," which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORTS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY AND MARITIME COMMISSION ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD reports of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Maritime Commission on pending neutrality legislation, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY REV. EDWARD L. CURRAN ON THE CRUSADE FOR PEACE

[Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the Crusade for Peace, delivered by Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D., on October 7, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY ON NEUTRALITY PROBLEMS

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Nebraska Conference for Social Work at Omaha, Nebr., October 10, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY OF WAR WOODRING AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY JOHNSON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal of the issue of September 30, 1939, with regard to differences of opinion between Secretary of War Woodring and Assistant Secretary of War Johnson, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR AIKEN, OF VERMONT, AT FAIRFIELD, ILL.

[Mr. GIBSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. George E. Aiken, Governor of Vermont, before the Lincoln Club of Wayne County at Fairfield, Ill., October 6, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM MANCHESTER GUARDIAN WEEKLY ON THE FORCES AGAINST HITLER

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester (England) Guardian Weekly of September 15, 1939, entitled "The Forces Against Hitler," which appears in the Appendix.]

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement, and shall not detain the Senate very long. I wish to give my reasons for the vote I intend to cast on the pending measure. My reasons may be a little different from those of others; at least, some of them I have not heard expressed by other Members of the Senate.

When this extraordinary session of the Congress was called, the country understood that it was called for the purpose of passing a neutrality bill, a bill that pointed the way to peace; that would enable us to keep out of foreign entanglements, and out of war. That was the purpose which the country understood. Personally, let me say, I abhor war, and I would have this country make almost any sacrifices that would keep us out of war; at least, such sacrifices as would not involve the principles of this Republic, and the things that have made it a great Nation. I will never vote for a declaration of war except in defense of our national welfare, or to repel invasion against the sovereignty of this country, so that we may run our own affairs as we see fit. I will never vote to send another American boy to a foreign battlefield to settle disputes between other nations, in which our national sovereignty is not concerned.

Also, let me say that, personally, I am opposed to this country dealing in war materials. I am opposed to this country selling materials which can be used only for war purposes to any other nation on the face of the earth, either in wartime or in peace, either on a cash-and-carry basis, or any other kind of a basis. I am opposed to having Uncle Sam engaged in peddling powder and guns to be used by mad people for the purpose of destroying human lives. I cannot subscribe to the theory advanced by those who contend that a repeal of the arms embargo will protect the peace of this

country better than if the embargo is not repealed. I cannot agree to the thought that our selling powder and guns to a war-mad world will keep us out of war better than if we do not do so. The theory proposed by the proponents of this joint resolution is that it will do so.

Our differences here upon the floor of the Senate resolve themselves down to a fairly simple proposition. Are our chances of staying out of war better if we sell instruments of warfare to warring nations, or are our chances better if we refuse to sell powder and guns to war-mad fighting peoples? Boiled down, that is about all there is to our differences; and, as I see the matter, if we really want to stay out of war there is but one answer. If two of my neighbors get into a fist fight, and both of them are mad, if I want to sit on the fence and not get into that fight I am not going to take any chances of involvement in their contest by slipping either of them a dagger. It seems to me the same rule that applies to scraps between neighbors applies to nations, but on a larger scale.

UNITED STATES MUST STAY "OUR"

When this session first convened there was expressed almost universally a desire to keep this country out of war; and I think that is the desire of every Member of this body. We have no controversy upon that matter. Our only differences are as to the method we shall employ to bring about that result. Early in the debate that was the expression from everyone—that we had a high purpose to keep the country out of war. As the debate has proceeded, especially yesterday and the day before, that purpose has broadened out to some extent, and it will broaden out at the debate continues. It will be contended, no doubt, that the best thing we can do for our own protection is to repeal the arms embargo and furnish war equipment to the so-called Allies so that the conflict in Europe may be speedily terminated.

When we were called into session it was the idea of the people of the country, at any rate, that it would be our purpose to remain strictly neutral, to take no sides in the conflict, but to pay attention to our protection and the preservation of our great Republic. Now, as we drift onward in the debate it seems to me we are broadening that purpose; and I am wondering, after all, if the main reason why we want to repeal the arms embargo is not so much that we want to remain neutral, but we see an opportunity to make a profit for some of our citizens if we repeal the embargo.

HAS "PROFIT MOTIVE" CHANGED SOME MINDS?

We are not an aggressor nation. We are not a nation that is striving for more power; but we want to get in on the profit. It is contended by some that, as arms are going to be sold to the warring nations, we might as well get in and reap our share of the profit. Some contend that if we do not do so our munitions factories may move to Canada and we may lose them here.

If we can justify our selling guns to mad fighting men because someone else is going to do it if we do not, we can justify every crime under the sun. Somebody is going to rob a bank today; and, because somebody is going to do that, let us get in on it and get our share! Somebody is going to commit murder today, and because somebody else is going to do that, let us commit murder, too!

I am afraid that not all the reasons for the repeal of the Embargo Act are to keep us out of war, but that one of the main and compelling reasons for the repeal of the arms embargo is to fix matters so that we can make a profit out of war. We want to get in on the game. While other people are fighting for power and aggression, we want to get in on the profits. Let us be honest with ourselves and say that we are going to sell powder and guns, not in order to keep us out of the war but in order to make a profit. We condemn a war for aggression; we condemn a war for power; but we want to get in on the scrap so that we can make a profit. Banish the element of profit, and there would not be much of an effort in this country to repeal the arms embargo.

Who passed the Arms Embargo Act? We did. I voted for it. When it was passed we boasted about it, and pointed to

it with pardonable pride as a great achievement of the New Deal. We boasted that the New Deal had passed a law that pointed the way to peace in the world. We were not going to sell any more powder and bullets and guns to mad, fighting people. We were going to do our part to end war. Were we sincere, and did we mean what we said, when we said we were not going to sell any more guns to fighting nations while the fight was going on? Or did we pass that act just to camouflage our true position, when now, at the first opportunity we have to make profits out of war, we do not want to be handicapped by that act, and want to repeal it? We want our profit by trafficking in instruments that can be used only to deal death and destruction to other human beings. We want to sell guns to make a profit, even if it bathes the earth in mothers' tears. We want to sell guns to make our profit, even if it causes the rivers of Europe to flow crimson to the sea, tinted in human blood. The making of profit is our game.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Does the Senator from South Dakota mean to say that it is his belief that some, or all, of his colleagues on the floor of the Senate who are strongly in favor of repeal of the arms embargo are actuated by the motive of permitting some Americans engaged in the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to make a profit, or is it others outside of the Senate who take the position to which he is referring?

Mr. BULOW. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that in the remarks I make it is not my intention to cast any reflection upon the motives of any Senator. I reach my own conclusions on these problems, and I extend the right to every other Senator to reach his conclusions in such a method as to him may seem best. I think that I stated it was contended by some—and it is contended by some—that we should get our share of the trade, world trade, and all of that.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one further question or statement?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I have not heard any Member of this body who is in favor of repeal of the arms embargo express at any time anything to indicate that it was his desire to have the arms embargo repealed in order that those who are engaged in the manufacture of munitions may make a profit, and I wondered whether the Senator from South Dakota had information about the attitude of any of our colleagues which had not been called to my attention, because I have been very firmly convinced that every Senator opposed to the arms embargo and favoring repeal had other reasons for taking his position than the desire to have profits made by anyone in this country.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, probably the Senator from Nebraska has not talked with all of the Senators. I have conferred with some of them, and some of them have advanced that thought to me; but I shall not give the Senator from Nebraska any information as to the conversations I have had with any other Senator. After all, as it seems to me, whether or not any Senators take such a position, there are some people in this country—I have received letters expressing the thought from citizens of my State—who believe that we ought to get our share of the trade; that inasmuch as the war is going on anyway we should not abandon our trade with the warring nations. That is common talk among the people. I venture to state—not referring to any Senator here or any Senator who is not here—that there are people in this country who are interested in reaping a profit out of war trade. It is idle to close our eyes to that fact.

There are others who urge the repeal of the embargo because they think, and honestly so, no doubt, that we should take sides and help France and England, and if it were repealed we could furnish aid to those two nations. The proposition I desire to submit is that if we decide to do that,

well and good; but that is not neutrality. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska argued at length yesterday about the horrors of Hitlerism, and it was his contention, if I remember correctly, that we should furnish war materials to France and England so that Hitlerism might be destroyed. Perhaps that is what we ought to do; but that is not neutrality.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. In order that my position may be correctly stated, as it was essentially by the Senator but not with entire accuracy, let me say that my position is that the present Neutrality Act is not an act of neutrality; that it is distinctly and wholly and immeasurably in favor of Hitler and the things for which he stands, and that our plain duty is to repeal the arms embargo conferring those very great and unneutral benefits. But I did proceed to say that when we repeal it and make the sale of arms and munitions for cash, and to be carried in foreign vessels, available to who will come and buy them, I look at the realities and say that, of course, we know that there is a difference in the nations as to their ability to come in their own vessels and pay for the goods; and therefore the substitute is not neutral either.

If I may say a word further, I respect the Senator's opinion that we ought to have neutrality legislation. We cannot have under the present situation. If we do nothing, an unneutral act remains which benefits one side. If we make the suggested change, that is also unneutral, because it makes benefits available to the other side. In my judgment, the Senator is discussing an ideal condition which will not exist whether we do nothing or do what it is proposed that we do.

IS IT "UNNEUTRAL" TO REFUSE TO SELL ARMS TO ANYONE

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska says that our present act is unneutral, and that if we repealed it our action would be unneutral. I agree with him in that statement. Perhaps the present law is unneutral; but is it any more unneutral for us to refuse to sell arms to any warring people than it is to sell to all of them? Of course, it would be impossible by any legislation we might enact to bring about an ideal situation such as the Senator from Nebraska and I both want. That is humanly impossible.

Mr. President, the question is resolved down to this: The people of the United States want to remain neutral; they do not desire to get into the war now raging in Europe; they are going to remain neutral; there is no doubt about that in my mind. So the question is, Can we better keep out of the war if we sell arms and other materials which will enable the warring nations to continue the war, or can we better stay out of it if we refuse to sell?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Nebraska yesterday and again today spoke of idealism, as did also the Senator from South Dakota. Perhaps I am too idealistic, but I cannot conceive that the American people, in their idealism, desire to put guns and powder and bombs into the hands of any people with which to kill others. That is the issue so far as I am concerned. Yesterday the Senator from Nebraska spoke of what grand people the German people are, and said that they are among the finest citizens. Their boys are just as lovely, just as fine, as are American boys. They have been among our best citizens. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe that the American people have sunk so low in their idealism that they want to have bombs placed in the hands of any people with which to kill others; they do not want to have their boys "hang their wash on the Siegfried line," and they do not want to see the bodies of their boys hung on the Siegfried line.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for that contribution. He expresses my own ideas exactly, though in much better language than I could employ. It seems to me we would protect the peace of this country better if we refused to deal in arms and munitions of war-

fare. It seems to me there can be no argument upon that point.

I fully realize that the sympathies of the American people are with the Allies. That, no doubt, is true. But we are considering a neutrality act. That is what we call it, but the fact of the matter is, when we get right down to rock bottom facts, when we get right down to a gnat's heel, that we want to pass a neutrality bill that will help France and England. Now, it is all very well for us as individuals to express our sympathies, but when our Government speaks, it must speak, "if we want to remain neutral," in neutral tones, and if it does not so speak, then this is not a neutral measure. The views of the Government cannot be camouflaged. You and I, Mr. President, may "kid" ourselves by saying that we want to keep our good right hand neutral and keep it where everyone can see it, and use our powerful left in the fight to help out France and England and not let our right hand know what our left is doing, but we, as a government, cannot go half-and-half. As a government, we must be one way or the other. We can stay out of this war if we want to, or we can get in if we want to, but there is no middle ground; there is no half way haven. We must go whole hog or none.

The people of this country want to stay out, and they are going to stay out. The voice of the American people is the voice of this Republic, and their voice is never employed in camouflage or in deceptive words to conceal real thought. The composite mind of American citizenship is always right. When the American people reach a conclusion based upon proper information, that conclusion is never wrong. The American people are never again going to fight upon a European battlefield in a cause that is not their own, and they are not going to respond to the idle dreams of men who may feel that they have a call to adjust the politics of the world. The voice of the American people is the voice of neutrality, absolute neutrality. It speaks for America and frowns upon any ambitions for world power. The American people expect us to pass a neutrality bill that will not link us to either side in the European conflict, though I realize that there are a few of our people who feel and actually believe that, for the safety of our country, we should immediately join England and France and go over and help them defeat Hitler before they themselves are defeated, which might, it is said, compel us to fight Hitler alone.

HITLER WILL NOT MENACE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, I have no fear that Hitler will ever attack us if we do not attack him. He has said he would not do so. He has said that he had no desire for world conquest. He has said that his only ambition was to restore the German people under the German Reich. He has said that he desired only that territory whose citizenship was predominantly German and taken away from the Reich during the World War. Oh, but some Senators may say: "His word is no good. We cannot rely upon him. We cannot trust him." Perhaps that is so; perhaps we cannot trust him; but what are we going to do about it now?

What is the best thing for us to do about it now? Two roads are open to us. One is to take a chance on his word being good, and prepare ourselves to meet him when he comes over here if his promise is not good, and the other is to throw this neutrality legislation into the waste basket, join France and England and go over there and help them track Hitler down and hang him to a sour apple tree. It may be that Hitler ought to be hung.

In my State in an early day we used to hang horse thieves, but our old timers tell me that they had to catch a horse thief before they could hang him; they had to get their hands on him; and we have not got our hands on Hitler. We would have to kill off several million Germans before we could get our hands on him. As it looks now, we probably would also have to kill about 10,000,000 Russians before they would let us hang him. We would not do that job in 1 day or in 2. Before we would get our hands on Hitler to hang him we would sacrifice several million of our own good American boys, who are worth more to us than all of Europe, and then when we got all of that done we might find that Hitler

had died a natural death; after we went to all that trouble we might be deprived of the pleasure of hanging him to a sour apple tree. I myself am not going over there and attempt to do that, and I am not going to vote for any legislation that will start any American boy down the road that I myself would not travel. I would rather take a chance on Hitler's word—bad though it is—than to take a chance on sacrificing a million American boys for the pleasure of hanging Mr. Hitler on any kind of a tree.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to take this opportunity to say that I have listened with a great deal of interest particularly to two points that have been made by the able Senator from South Dakota. He has just brought to the attention of the Members of this body the suggestion that some would have us hang Hitler to a "sour apple tree," and in so doing necessarily we would have to go to war and no doubt bring about the destruction of the lives of millions of sons of American mothers. I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota that before we attempt to destroy Hitler and Stalin, and nazi-ism and communism, over there we had better destroy nazi-ism and fascism and communism in the United States of America. That is our duty. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to admonish the occupants of the galleries that under the rules of the Senate no demonstrations are permissible. If persisted in it will be the duty of the Sergeant at Arms and his assistants to remove from the galleries those persons who offend against the rules.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has just very properly and most forcibly stated that what the great American people want is neutrality. I wish to make the observation that the American people want the kind of neutrality that I want. What sort of neutrality is that? I will define it. The only kind of neutrality I want is a neutrality that will benefit the American people, and I do not care a tinker's damn whether it benefits anybody else in the world. I want a neutrality that is going to benefit the United States of America, let the chips fall where they may. If they injure or help someone, I care not. I am interested only in voting to provide that sort of neutrality that will be of benefit and protection to the American people with a view to keeping us out of war. I thank the Senator. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BULOW. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his valuable contribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair again admonishes the galleries that it is impossible to hear the speakers when there is noise or demonstrations in the galleries, and that demonstrations of approval or disapproval are prohibited by the rules.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, let me ask Senators not to interrupt me further. Let me make my own speech in my own way. Senators will all have a chance to speak. I like to hear my friend the Senator from North Carolina talk, but I do not want him to do so in my time. I am not going to detain the Senate very long.

I was discussing the realism which we would be facing if we joined hands with France and England. Hitler is not going to live forever. As I have said, after we had sacrificed the lives of perhaps 10,000,000 men, and when we finally caught up with and got our hands on Hitler, we might find that he had died a natural death, and that we had had all our trouble for nothing, and, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] joins in, nobody to hang.

What is the use of becoming excited and trying to do a thing which, in the due course of time, will happen of itself and will solve the question?

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] talks about communism and the danger that we may face from it. So far as I am concerned, if the people of Russia want to live under a Communistic form of government, let them do so;

that is their business. If the people of Italy want to live under a Fascist government, that is their business. If the people of Germany want to live under Hitler, let them do so until they get tired of it. In due course of time that great people will revolt and throw off the yoke of Hitlerism. Any way, that is their business—not ours.

Let us not take any chances of wrecking the peace of our own good land by joining war-mad nations in an attempt to destroy something which will destroy itself if left alone. The cannons of war will soon cease booming if we refuse to furnish the cannons. If we furnish the cannons and powder to carry on the fight, those cannons will soon have to be fired by our men. Let us not take the chance. Mr. President, war is hell; let us not furnish the fuel for that hell. Let us not repeal the embargo on arms now when half the world is war mad, and by so doing hasten our own Armageddon.

There are other things in the newly proposed neutrality legislation which should be given serious consideration before being enacted into law. In the proposed legislation we are giving up one of the boasted traditions of our country—the freedom of the seas. Many persons think we ought not to do that but should maintain our rights and preserve our traditions. I am perfectly willing to stay off of the sea when a storm is raging. I have driven an automobile many times when I had the right-of-way and knew I had the right-of-way, but I yielded to the other fellow to keep myself from going to the graveyard. For myself, I would rather be a live coward on land than to be a dead hero in Davy Jones' locker.

NO CREDIT—"CASH ON THE BARREL HEAD"

There is another provision in the proposed law which is subject to controversy. When the special session was called the press flooded the country with the news that Congress was going to be asked to pass a new neutrality bill embodying the cash-and-carry principle. Many of our people are for cash and carry. I myself am strongly for cash and carry if material that can be used only for war purposes is eliminated. But the measure reported from the committee and apparently sponsored by the administration is not a cash-and-carry measure at all. It provides that title shall pass from the seller to the purchaser before the goods are loaded for shipment and that the seller shall have no further interest in the goods, but that the purchasers may have 90 days in which to pay. That is not cash at all. The country understands that cash and carry means cash "on the barrel head," to be paid in advance before title passes and before the purchaser can carry away the goods. It is argued that 90 days is the customary trade credit and is the same as cash; but if we sell goods to the warring nations on a 90-day credit, pass title to them, and they take the goods away and forget to pay us at the end of 90 days, how are we going to get our cash? We are going to confront the same situation which faced us during the last war. We then loaned foreign nations money to buy our goods and then sold them goods on credit. They got our money, they got our goods, and then forgot about the credit. When we asked them to pay they called our dear old Uncle Sam a Shylock and thumbed their noses at us. What they did before they will do again if we are foolish enough to give them another chance. However, let me say that if the repeal of the arms embargo is eliminated, I will go along with almost any kind of a neutrality measure upon which a majority can agree; but I am unalterably opposed to committing my country to the peddling of implements of war which can be used only for the purpose of enabling other people to kill one another. It has been said that in the World War we placed the dollar sign upon the flag and that it ought to be removed; but we are keeping it there by repeal of the arms embargo to further our desire to make a profit. Why do the proponents of the measure object to a separation and a separate vote upon the different neutrality proposals? If the administration would permit a separation of the cash and carry, the other provisions could be disposed of in short order and we could then take ample time to debate the repeal of the arms embargo, the only feature of the neutrality proposal which is in real controversy. The arms embargo is not tied in with the cash-and-carry proposal and is not tied in

with the freedom-of-the-sea proposal. They are separate and distinct; and it is not at all necessary for us to repeal the Arms Embargo Act in order to pass a cash-and-carry act.

OUR SOLDIERS WOULD WIN WAR—OUR STATESMEN LOSE TREATY

Some question the motive of the President. I assume that his motives are what he says they are. I assume that when he calls Congress into special session to repeal the Arms Embargo Act he believes that he can better protect the peace of the country in that way than under the handicap of an arms embargo. I do not question his motives; but I am fearful that he will make the same mistake other men have made—that he will not be able to confine his ambitions to the peace of this country. I am fearful that if given the absolute power to shape the destiny of this Nation as he sees fit, without legislative restrictions, he may also feel that he has a call to settle the peace of Europe. I am fearful of the effort he might make in an enthusiastic idealistic ambition to enter the turmoil in Europe and again commit our country to the attempt to go over there, enter into their quarrels, and try to settle their borderline disputes, over which nations and peoples have battled for centuries. We all remember that a former great President of this country made a noble effort to patch up a just and lasting peace in that war-rocked continent. From that former experience we should have learned a valuable lesson. Within the memory of all of us here our armies marched under the European sky and fought a great war in an effort to end all war and perpetuate democracy. We thought by our sacrifice in money and men and human suffering that we had accomplished something along that line. We thought that we had played our part in establishing peace in Europe for many years; and yet today the first generation that was born after Armistice Day is facing its Armageddon. We cannot settle the wars of Europe, and I am not in favor of voting any power to any President, no matter who he may be, to undertake that impossible task. I realize that there are those who feel that in order to protect our own Republic we should go to the aid of the so-called democracies now and stop Hitler before he attacks us. I do not entertain that fear. But I do entertain a fear that if we should go over there and help England and France kill off Hitler and Hitlerism, we should make it possible for them to write another peace treaty at the sacrifice of another million men of our country. Even though our President should again go over there with the best of intentions and sit in at the council tables, the so-called democracies of Europe would write the treaty; and they are not our kind of democracy. They would write another Treaty of Versailles, which 20 years from now would give birth to another Hitler, and history would repeat itself. If we should go in, our soldiers would win the war, but our statesmen would lose the treaty.

EVENTUALLY POLISH YOUTH WILL RESTORE POLAND

Some persons say that we ought to go over there and help France and England restore Poland. No marching armies of all the world are going to restore Poland—not the Poland that was born at Versailles. All the vengeance that the armies of the world could wreak upon Hitler would never restore Warsaw to its former glory. Poland is crushed; Poland for the time being is gone; but this is not the first time that Poland has been wiped off the face of the map and, in due course of time, Poland will rise from its defeat as she has risen many times before. The Republic of Poland will not be restored by the lords of England or the generals of France. Poland will be rebuilt by the youth of Poland—by men and women through whose veins courses the blood of noble sires who have written a glorious history for the Polish people during the centuries. Warsaw, their beloved city, is in ruins. That city will not be rebuilt by either France or England. Polish youth, true to the traditions of their people, will see to it that the memory of those who fell at Warsaw be not forgotten. Polish youth will see to it that the deeds of heroism and valor of their people during the inferno, the 20 days of hell, will be perpetuated in story and in song to generations yet unborn. Yes, Warsaw is in ruins. The marching armies

of all the world will never restore those ruins. But that city will be rebuilt. In due course of time, Polish youth, upon the ashes of its ruins, upon the sacred dust of their dead, will build a more beautiful Warsaw, and from the citadels of the rebuilt city there will again float the Polish flag. The Polish flag will float over Warsaw and its people long after Hitler shall have perished from the earth.

What I am interested in is that there shall not be further such tragedies as that of Poland because of our giving encouragement to any of the warring nations. If we repeal the arms embargo and say to France and England, "You can buy from us all the guns and ammunition you want," it is my opinion that we shall be rendering a distinct disservice to the people of England and France. I firmly believe that if the embargo were not repealed and if we should now say to France and England, "We will not help you in this war," that would end the war. France and England would patch up a peace with Hitler. In my humble opinion, France and England, in a way, are responsible for the destruction of Poland.

Had it not been for the assurances that they gave to Poland, Poland would have patched up a peace with Hitler; the people of Danzig, who were German and formerly belonged to the German Reich, would have gone back to Germany and the remainder of Poland would be on the map today. At least that is my opinion. Because Warsaw has been destroyed, because Poland has been destroyed, is that any reason why we should give aid and comfort in bringing about the same kind of tragedies for other countries and for other peoples? The destruction of Poland is tragic, but let us not aid in the extension of that kind of tragedy. Let us not furnish guns and ammunition to aid anyone to bring about like tragedies. The war in Europe will soon end if we refuse to furnish war equipment to either side and assure the world of our absolute neutrality. If England and France understand that to be our position, a peace will soon be negotiated and a world-wide involvement in war will be avoided. No man knows what the end of another World War would bring. Let us avoid it as long as we can. The element of time is a great fixer of things.

KEEP OUT OF EUROPE'S "POWER POLITICS"

The war in Europe is not being fought to sustain any principles in which we are interested. It is not a war for human liberties. It is not a war such as we would fight to sustain the American citizenship of this country. Wars in Europe are wars for power, wars of aggression.

It is said that Hitler ought not to do the things he is doing. I agree to that. But he is doing them; and what are we going to do about it? As I see it, if we did not promise aid, help, and comfort to France and England, they would patch up the best kind of peace they could and then, in a little while Hitler and Stalin would have each other by the throat. However, they are going to remain in the same bed so long as they have a common enemy to fight.

As I see it, England and France will make a serious mistake if they do not accept Hitler's peace proposal as the basis of an armistice and work out with him the best treaty they can. A poor treaty is better than a good war. It may not be to their liking, but let them do the best they can and save millions of human lives from destruction. No matter how long the war goes on, eventually armistice day will come. Some day a treaty will be written; and there is no sense in having hell upon earth for years, causing untold misery, want, and suffering, and sacrificing 10,000,000 men upon the altar of war, for the sole purpose of determining who is to write the treaty. The chances are that, no matter who writes it, it would be about the same kind of a treaty, fixing border lines and exacting tribute. Aggression and power politics will be the cardinal principles written into that treaty whether it is written now or 10 years from now. It will patch up a peace for a time, and then there will be new aggressions, further grasping for power, hell will again break loose, and history will repeat itself. Let us not take any steps that will lead us into such a maelstrom.

Oh, some Senators may say that England cannot now pay any attention to Hitler's proposals without losing prestige and

humiliating its leaders. If I were an Englishman I would rather have the leaders of my country humiliated than to have my country destroyed. I would rather have my leaders "eat crow," and loads of it, than to bring war misery to my people and sacrifice the lives of millions of the best men in England in an effort to back up the bluff of my leaders. Let a few leaders "eat crow"; it will not hurt them. New leaders can easily be obtained, but after a relentless war machine has destroyed the manhood and womanhood of a country they can never be restored. Such a country will then have no need of leaders.

If I were an Englishman I would bend every effort to save the Empire of England and its people from death and destruction, even if my leaders had to "eat crow."

Mr. President, as I have said, the overwhelming majority of our people want to stay out of the European conflict. There are only a few who want to get us in, and who contend that we cannot live alone. We are only a young nation. A century and a half spans our national life. During that brief space of time our people have built the greatest republic on the face of the earth. Our citizenship is a composite citizenship of all the world. Our people come from everywhere. Our citizenship is built from the muscle, the bone, the sinew, and the blood of every nationality, of every race and creed, all harmonized into one. We have accomplished our splendid achievement by attending strictly to our own affairs and minding our own business in our attempt to make citizenship in this Republic the most prized under the shining sun. We succeeded in that attempt without getting into any foreign entanglements. During all of our national life the nations of Europe have conducted almost constant warfare, not wars to establish principles laid down in our Declaration of Independence, which gave birth to this Republic, but wars of aggression for more ruling power, the same kind of wars in which they are engaged today. Until about a quarter of a century ago nobody in this country ever advanced the doctrine that we had grown so big that we could no longer survive unless we dabbled into the politics and wars of Europe. Twenty-five years ago we broke away from the traditions that had made us a great and mighty people and followed the advice of those who had visions of expanding our power to other lands, visions of imperialism, visions of power, visions of telling other nations what to do, visions of telling other people how to live, visions of making the United States a world power in the galaxy of nations. We drafted more than 2,000,000 men, and had more than a million volunteers. We raised a mighty army and sent more than a million men across the sea to fight on foreign soil in disputes which were not of our concern. Many thousands of the best men of America died fighting on foreign soil, and sleep forever in a land that is not their home, not to perpetuate any of the things that made America great, not in defense of the rights and liberties of American citizenship, but because someone had a dream of world power, a dream that America must become responsible for world destiny and assume guardianship of other people. A World War was fought. Armistice Day came; a peace was written, and everything was settled by those who dreamed of world power. Now 20 years after everything was settled, the same old war in which the people of Europe have been engaged off and on for more than a thousand years is raging again with renewed fury. We did not settle anything in the World War. Many thousand American boys sacrificed their lives in vain. Let us avoid making the same mistake twice. Let us never again send the boys who wore the khaki, or their sons, to defend our flag in places where it has no business—in European border disputes. If the people of Europe want to fight, let them fight to their hearts content, but let us not encourage that fight by selling them powder and guns with which to carry on the fight.

Some of my Democratic friends have taken me to task for not going along with my President in his effort to repeal the arms embargo. I have not supported all the New Deal proposals, but I have supported most of them.

I ask again, Who passed the Arms Embargo Act? The Congress did. I voted for it, as I have said as did most other

Senators. I think it was one of the outstanding achievements of the New Deal. I remember in the campaign of 1936 I made many speeches in my State boasting about the accomplishments of the New Deal. The greatest of all those boasts was that the New Deal had placed an embargo upon death-dealing instruments and had pointed the road to peace in the world.

I repeat, I voted for that Arms Embargo Act. I was for it then; I am for it today; I will be for it tomorrow; I will be for it the next day. I have not deserted my administration; my administration has deserted me. I have not changed my mind, and I am not persuaded by the eloquent reply that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN] made the other day to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] when he stated he had changed his mind. Upon mature study and investigation he had found that the embargo would not work, that it had not prevented the war in Europe nor in China; therefore it was no good. That statement recalled to my mind the story of the Chinaman who had reached the conclusion that a foghorn on a boat was no good. He said, "Bells jingle, whistle blow, foghorn toot; fog still come. Foghorn no good." [Laughter.] We in this country have imposed an embargo on our citizens against carrying concealed weapons. Some men violate it every day. Every State in the Union has an embargo against murder; yet murders are committed every day. Would the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in charge of the passage of the repeal of the arms embargo, because it does not work and has not prevented war, contend that the law against carrying concealed weapons and the laws against murder should be repealed as of no value because they have not prevented pistol toting and have not prevented murder? There never was a law written that is not sometimes violated. Violations of the law do not make the law bad. Our arms embargo did not cause the war in China nor the war in Europe. Those wars were started in spite of our arms embargo. A repeal of the arms embargo will not stop either of those wars, but will add to their intensity if we furnish belligerents with powder and bullets to carry on the fight. The question is, Will we serve the people of the world better by selling powder and bullets to fighting peoples, or will we serve that peace better by refusing to peddle arms?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator from South Dakota has referred to a statement made by the Senator from Nevada in a colloquy. I think the Senator from South Dakota will admit that I stated time and again that I spoke for and voted for the embargo because I expected it would accomplish a great deal of good, but I came to the conclusion that it was not a deterrent to war; I came to the conclusion that it affected a very small part of the instruments through which mass murder is committed in war. I know well enough that the Senator would not vote to put all implements and materials useful in waging war on the embargo list; at least if he would he would have very few supporters. Indeed, I have discovered that the law not only is a failure but that it is a fraud.

A further reason for my position is that the law is intended to apply equally to all belligerents; no one will deny that; yet today no one can successfully contend that it keeps arms and ammunition away from Great Britain because England is an island and has no adjacent friends that are neutral, while, on the other hand, arms and ammunition produced in the United States can reach Germany through Russia, Rumania, and Italy, for the law does not apply to those countries that are supposed to be neutral. The act is absolutely unneutral as it stands, and if we shall wipe it off the books we will not have an unneutral law.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I am not going to get into any colloquy with the Senator from Nevada. All I can say is that I was with him when he was for the present Neutrality Act when he was younger than he now is. I think he used better judgment in his youth than he does when he reaches old age. [Laughter.]

PEDDLING POWDER IS UN-AMERICAN AND WRONG

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am always glad to have the opinion of the Senator, but I am inclined to think that only 24 out of the 96 of this body agree with him.

Mr. BULOW. That will be all right. If I shall be standing alone, I will stand upon the proposition I have submitted. I believe that when Uncle Sam goes into the business of selling powder and guns to mad, fighting peoples, when he becomes a peddler of arms, he is engaging in a business that is un-American and a business that is wrong. That is where I stand, if I stand alone; and I do not care whether there are 26 or 40 or any other number whose views may coincide with mine.

To preserve the peace of our country, my administration contends that we should now repeal the arms embargo and sell guns and ammunition to fighting nations to be used for human destruction. It is contended that if we become a peddler of bullets, powder, and guns to other people, by so doing it will make America safe for peace. I cannot subscribe to that doctrine. The Congress enacted the Arms Embargo Act, which was signed by the President, committing this country to a policy of neutrality. It became the law of this land that when other nations went to war we would take no sides in their conflict, and would prevent Uncle Sam from peddling instruments of warfare to either side. It is now proposed that we must repeal that act and permit Uncle Sam to peddle powder and guns to bloodthirsty people in order that we may remain at peace. It is contended that we must repeal the arms embargo and return to international law in order to safeguard our destiny of peace.

What is this international law to which we are to return? No one knows, except that it is founded upon the doctrine that might makes right. It is supposed to have been evolved during the march of the ages as empires, monarchies, kingdoms, republics, and dictatorships have played their part in civilization's march from Eden to the present day. During all of that time the hand of might is the only hand that has ever penned international law, and the hand of might has never hesitated to erase existing international law when the exigency required and it had the power so to do. No international law has ever established liberty or safeguarded the peace and liberty of any people during the ruthless march of a mighty war machine. War obeys no law but the law of might, and only conquerors interpret and dictate international compacts.

We have said in our arms embargo that we will furnish no instruments of warfare to anyone engaged in a fight. Our people are committed to the policy of neutrality. Most of our people believe that we should attend strictly to our own business and not take sides or mix into the quarrels between other nations. Our people do not believe in the settlement of disputes by killing one another. Our people believe that all disputes can be adjusted around the council table, and we believe in living up to every obligation that we make. Why should we become involved in either side of a quarrel between nations who have no respect for treaty obligations? We are now asked to discard our good intentions of staying out of other peoples' quarrels. We are now asked to throw the Arms Embargo Act into the waste basket. We are now asked to make commitments for our people from a neutral to an unneutral position. We are now told that the peace of our people will be best safeguarded if we erase from our statute books these laws which we have written and commit the destiny of our people to the so-called safeguards of international law which only conquerors and dictators write.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO IS FIRST STEP TO WAR

Mr. President, if we repeal the Embargo Act it is our first step to war, and will be followed by other steps in quick succession that inevitably lead to participation on European battlefields. Within the memory of every one of us here we have had one sad and costly experience in our attempt to settle European boundary disputes and have learned to our sorrow that that cannot be done. Let us not take any steps that will lead to our making the same mistake twice. For more than a thousand years the people of Europe have been fighting over boundary lines and probably in another thousand years

will be carrying on the same kind of battles, and there is not anything that we can do about it. Let the people of Europe handle their own affairs. It is their fight. If they want to continue to scrap, let them do so, but let us stay out. Let us remain neutral. Let us take the safe course and not furnish fighting material to either side.

I do not know who it was that said our first line of defense is in Europe, but I do not subscribe to that doctrine. Let us mind our own business; let us attend to our own affairs. Let us remain neutral and not mix in other peoples' quarrels. Let us not furnish either side with shot and shell and agitate the fight. If we just take care of our own household, we are going to be reasonably safe; at least we have better assurances than if we again attempt to make the entire world safe for democracy.

I have stated why I am opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo. I have spoken much longer than I intended to and I apologize to the Senate. I desire to conclude.

There is being spread over the country some propaganda which may cause some excitement and fear.

Let us not become unduly alarmed by seeing too many imaginary things that may disturb the night and sometimes even the day. I hope that our people will not become disturbed, become jittery and frightened by rumors and reports that are flooding the country, even though the reports emanate from high places. Let us remember the rumors and reports that preceded the World War, most of which were not true. Let us also remember that one of the frailties of humankind is that we sometimes see things that are not there; sometimes under certain conditions we see white elephants and sometimes they are pink. Sometimes on land we see a mighty mirrored picture that we know is not there and sometimes at sea we see a great sea monster that is not there. Sometimes we see submarines where no submarine has ever been before. What submarine was it? Why that we did not notice.

Yesterday upon the stair
I saw a man who was not there.
He was not there again today;
I wish to God he'd go away.

[Laughter.]

Let us not take for granted everything that we hear, or everything we think we see, until assured of facts.

Let us not get jittery and alarmed for fear that Hitler is coming over here and haul down the Stars and Stripes, the emblem of a free people, and raise in its stead the swastika flag. That time will never come. Let us not cross that Rubicon until the time comes; and if perchance it should come, let us be prepared to fight that battle in our own defense and in our own right, but let us not speed that day nor invite that conflict by pulling someone else's chestnuts out of the fire. Our first duty, our supreme duty, is to our own country—to perpetuate upon the face of this earth the scheme of human government first enunciated to humankind in that immortal document that gave birth to this Nation. That document was formed and shaped and fashioned by the culmination of ideas and ideals brought to the American Continent by refugees from almost every country on the face of the earth—refugees who sought shelter in an unknown wilderness in order to escape from the same kind of tyrannies that exist in European countries today. Our foremost duty is to protect and preserve our American heritage, the ideals of human government which the founding fathers sought to perpetuate for all time in our constitutional form of government, having for its cardinal keystone not aggression, not world power, not dictatorship, but freedom of thought, expression, and action. Liberty for its citizenship in the United States is a greater heritage than that possessed by any other citizen in all the world. The ideals of American citizenship will never be conquered by any kind of marching armies under the flag of any kind of isms incompatible with the ideals of our citizenship.

Let us learn a lesson from the pages of history. During the march of the human race many men have appeared upon the scene of action and for a brief time have terrorized the world. Just a little more than 100 years ago Napoleon Bonaparte was the Hitler of his day, and he held the whole world

in fear. Yet in due course of time Napoleon Bonaparte died a natural death on a lonely island, without supporters and without friends. No one man or no race of men ever conquered the earth and kept it conquered. Let us not become excited about Hitlerism or about Hitler coming to this country. He will never come. I am not disturbed about that.

LET'S KEEP OUR NOSE OUT OF EUROPE'S AFFAIRS

I do not know what the fate of Hitler will be, but I do know that he will not live forever. I know that nazi-ism will not conquer the earth. I know that if we "keep our shirts on," keep our feet on the ground, keep our nose out of Europe's business, take no sides in their quarrel, let them live under such isms as they desire, let them adjust their boundary lines as they see fit, get the hankering for world power out of our systems, forget about our desires to assume guardianship of other peoples, take care of the business of America, and let Europe run its own affairs; if we do that, I know that Hitler will never hoist the swastika flag on the dome of our Capitol, or over our people.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bill	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gufey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Tobey
Burke	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, for some time the Senate has been discussing House Joint Resolution 306. It is my belief that the debates on the pending legislation will go down in history as most important. No more fateful question has ever been discussed in these historic Halls. The country has been impressed with the patriotism and sincerity of purpose of the Senate. I have been an attentive listener since the inception of the discussion, and am fully convinced that it is the desire, the ardent desire of each and every Member of this body to keep this country out of war and to remain at peace with other nations.

The pending legislation is very portentous. The results of what we do may have beneficial effects or may bring dire consequences to the Nation. So, Mr. President, in my opinion, the question should and must receive ample discussion—thorough discussion—impartial discussion—before the Senate passes judgment on such a serious matter.

With the adjournment of politics came the realization that on an issue so momentous as war or peace this deliberative body could not afford to rush its legislation, especially in view of the limited opportunity in the House for analysis or debate.

It is my purpose today to discuss only the phase of the debate on which the whole country and this body are agreed, and that is peace. At a later date I shall go more in detail

into the different phases of the bill, including the repeal of the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry clauses.

Among the people of our country, as in the Houses of Congress, there is a definite feeling that the United States must remain at peace. While my colleagues differ as to the means whereby this is to be accomplished, I have heard no expression contrary to the seemingly overwhelming desire to keep the United States out of war. Certainly the experiences gleaned from the last European episode would reinforce the determination of our fellow citizens to remain aloof from the burdens and expense resulting from participation in a struggle which we have neither created nor fostered.

At the very outset it is necessary that we define the concept of peace. So many people have professed a firm desire for peace that I believe it essential to state what we actually have in mind when we use that expression, which certainly has a well-nigh universal appeal. Peace in its broadest sense means the avoidance of armed conflict—conflict resulting in death, destruction, and the tremendous increase in expenditure that today confronts Europe.

To pursue the policy of peace necessitates the elimination from this question of a number of imponderables, as for example, hatreds, sympathies, emotions, and the mingled feelings which complicate and obscure clear thinking on the matter. Regardless of the forces at work, such as sentiment, power politics, ism-hatreds, ours must be the realization that we live and hope to continue to live in the Western Hemisphere at peace, whether with Europe or Asia.

I have heard the argument advanced that we are no longer able to live in an atmosphere of detachment from Europe's problems. Yet, what does history teach us in this regard? For some 400 years England, separated from the continent of Europe by the English Channel, a body of water only 22 miles wide, has been able to withdraw at will from the internal affairs of the mainland, remaining secure in her insularity from exterior invasion or aggression. Of course, the British Fleet contributed much to this aloofness, but there is nothing to prevent this country from having a navy second to none. I for one feel annoyed at times when I hear the expression that we have to depend upon the British Navy for our peace. How much more fortunate are we in our geographical situation when it is considered that not a mere 22 miles of water, but an ocean of 3,000 miles, helps us to maintain a strategical impregnability.

In comparison with the matter of keeping the United States out of war and the good will of all in maintaining peace, the matter of our neutrality assumes only a relative significance. Let us trace briefly the background of our traditional neutrality. From the very moment when the United States emerged as an independent State in the community of nations, neutrality has been a traditional part of our national policy, and I understood when this extraordinary session was called that we were to consider a neutrality measure. To create and maintain a system of effective and absolute neutrality toward all belligerents has been one of the great contributions of the United States to the body of relatively indefinite rules and regulations described as "international law." Not only has this been a policy, but a tradition, grounded in usage and supported by the weight of opinion of our greatest statesmen, beginning with the Father of his Country and continuing throughout our entire national existence. In the 13-year period from the proclamation of the Declaration of Independence to the establishment of our Government under the Constitution, the United States entered into some 14 treaties; in each case the basic purpose was to lessen the tragic results of war and to establish our status as a neutral. This is especially true of the treaties with France, Great Britain, Morocco, the Netherlands, Prussia, and Sweden.

When our Republic was first established, the most immediate problem of external order was the determination of a policy to be followed in the event of a general European war. This problem was fully as significant as many of the difficulties confronting the United States at home. For more than 1,000 years Europe has been a battleground where the major powers ceased fighting only long enough to create new,

and sometimes startling, alliances based on considerations, not of humanity, not of respect for the rights of the lesser powers, but on force—described by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] as “power politics.” Europe’s past is not reassuring as to any real likelihood of the reversal of practices motivated by forces which are fundamentally no different.

Respites in this long-protracted conflict in Europe generally served merely to prepare, by making new alliances, building armaments, equipping and training military forces for the next war. In these contests for political and economic supremacy our newly founded Republic had and still has little actual interest, in spite of the fact that many of its inhabitants were but lately removed from the warring countries. There was, however, a real determination to maintain peace at home, for the realization existed that intervention was bound to have disastrous effects upon the ship of state. Fortunately at that time the man at the wheel, a farsighted helmsman, thoroughly understood the nature of the perils of intervention—the Scylla and Charybdis of ancient origin of the European balance of power. Even greater were the difficulties confronting the pilot then steering his intricate course than those which exist now. But he had the will to peace and he did succeed. And we should be thankful that the chief of state today entertains similar desires for peace. In his speech to the Congress at the opening of this historic debate he said that the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and the members of the executive branch of the Government, including himself and his associates “personally and officially, are equally and without reservation in favor of such measures as will protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country, and at the same time keep us out of war.”

Although individual citizens of the United States had a personal interest, and possibly a sympathetic attachment growing out of their national origins, the Government had a firm desire to work out the political and economic destinies of this country in an atmosphere of peace—the only way in which that work could be successful. The goal of our founders was complete neutrality—an attitude of strict and scrupulous impartiality toward all belligerents.

Hardly had the new Government undertaken its essential functions when its most strenuous efforts had to be exerted in the maintenance of this neutrality. Powerful pressure came from all sides to impair official impartiality. Revolution in France had led to war. Naturally, when faced with a coalition of Austria, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Prussia, and Sardinia, France turned to the United States, the country with which it had made a treaty of alliance on February 6, 1778, the only one of its kind we have ever made. We all must remember the activities of citizen Edmond Genêt in behalf of France, but I hope my colleagues will also remember the stern determination of George Washington and his advisers to refrain from engaging in a conflict which might readily have made Valley Forge a useless sacrifice. Although the American people sympathized deeply with the liberal character of the French Revolution and greeted Genêt enthusiastically, our Government maintained its strict determination to remain impartial. It was known that Genêt planned to commission American merchantmen as privateers against the British vessels, and that it was intended to establish prize courts in American ports in order to condemn captured British merchantmen. But our Government moved quickly and efficiently. There was no time for ambiguities and dubious pronouncements. Washington acted, and acted with quick decision. On April 22, 1793, the now classic proclamation, the very foundation of our neutrality, announced that the United States should, “with sincerity and good faith, adopt a continued friendly and impartial attitude toward the belligerent powers.”

In spite of the powerful pro-French feeling of a majority of the American people, and a rather natural animosity toward Britain, in view of the recent and bitter revolution, the American Government made every effort, even to the extent of infuriating the French, who, quite logically, had expected our assistance, in view of our treaty obligations of

1778, to preserve a strict and uncompromising neutrality. Thomas Jefferson, personally pro-French, nevertheless developed a practical theory of the obligations of neutrality which has served as a model of impartiality. Two cardinal concepts formed the basis of this official impartiality:

(1) The complete sovereignty of the Nation within its own territorial domain (including the 3-mile limit of the marginal seas); (2) the obligation of impartiality towards all belligerents.

That is internal sovereignty and external impartiality.

Since it was—

the right of every nation to prohibit acts of sovereignty—

It was also—

the duty of a neutral nation to prohibit such as would assist one of the warring powers. No succor should be given to either, unless stipulated by treaty, in arms, or anything else directly serving for war.

This position was taken by the United States, and was so vigorously supported that W. E. Hall, the well-known British authority on international law, states:

The policy of the United States in 1793 sets an epoch in the development of the usages of neutrality.

I must emphasize the fact that this position was taken in the face of the sympathies of most Americans, who were entirely in accord with what they believed to be the supreme effort of the French people to introduce the blessing of American liberty and democracy to a decadent, king-infested reactionary Europe.

The Neutrality Act adopted by Congress in 1794 made effective this high concept of neutrality. Although originally of limited duration, the act was extended and somewhat modified in 1817—to meet the requirements of the wars of independence engaged in by the American colonies of Spain—and then restated by the statute of 1818. A year later the British Government saw fit to enact similar legislation, and other states soon followed suit. Thus a fixed concept of neutrality arose in the community of nations—internal sovereignty and external impartiality.

From the close of the Napoleonic wars, finally terminated by the Treaty of Vienna of November 20, 1815, to the outbreak of the World War, there were no major conflicts involving large-scale maritime operations—except the Civil War, wherein, of course, neutrality was the status adopted by the European powers, and the Russo-Japanese conflict. Therefore, few serious problems of neutrality confronted the United States during the nineteenth century, but at all times our country adhered to its policy of absolute neutrality as a precautionary measure to safeguard—what? Not someone else’s concept of our international prestige, but our own domestic tranquility. International conferences dealing with problems of international law conducted during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw the United States consistently striving to incorporate the system of neutrality in the multilateral treaties that emerged therefrom.

Let us evaluate the result of our departures from this traditional policy of neutrality. When, in 1914, the customary power politics in Europe broke the bonds of peace, and Europe was again converted into a shambles, our people were firmly resolved to remain aloof. Throughout 1914, Mr. Wilson still insisted on maintaining neutrality. The year 1915 saw no definite relaxation of this policy. What was the scene at the Democratic National Convention in 1916? I address myself to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle for the purpose of this question. The greatest ovations were given to speakers who stressed “peace” as the real objective of our Government and its administration. Among my distinguished colleagues, I see the following who attended that classic, never-to-be-forgotten occasion, and I obtained this list from the official report of the proceedings of the Democratic National Convention: Senator ALVA B. ADAMS, of Colorado; Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi; Senator PETER G. GERRY, of Rhode Island; Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia; Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island; Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada; and Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts. I am sure they have not forgotten. During the campaign that followed I rode 40 miles on horseback,

partly through a blinding snowstorm, to a small hamlet in New Mexico to tell the people that "he kept us out of war."

Clinching the argument that our people were opposed to war, we observe the effect of this proclamation in swinging a closely contested election to Mr. Wilson.

Meanwhile, behind the scenes, pressure politics and propaganda were working with quiet but efficient consistency. Profits and propaganda, the twin brothers of greed, and a wanton disregard of the rights of the forgotten man, did their work effectively, silently, but surely. Mr. Wilson, with all of his sympathy and earnestness of purpose to "keep us out of war," could not stem the tide. Five months after the election, in spite of what the people thought or wanted, we were at war. Mr. Bryan, with his lofty idealism, his providential gift of oratory, resigned rather than be a party to the slaughter.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator mentioned the fact that I was at the convention in 1916, and all he said about the slogan at the convention, as I remember, is true. I rise only to say that I beg leave to disagree with the Senator in regard to the causes that led us into the war. I do not think the munitions makers had anything to do with it. I do not think debts had anything to do with it. I know they did not influence me in my vote. In my opening address in the Senate on the present debate I quoted extensively from a long speech made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who has no particular sympathy for munitions makers, in which he stated that we did not enter the war for any selfish purposes, but solely by reason of the illegal destruction of the lives of our citizens on the high seas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senator from Nevada means every word he says, but I will follow my plan of thought. I know there are many thousands of people in this country who actually believe down in their hearts that there are insidious agencies which are trying to get us into war.

My colleagues, I have but one purpose—that is to warn you of what, despite the best of good intentions, may come to us, unless we be eternally vigilant and on our guard against the forces that would undo us. Is there any reason to believe that these forces of pressure politics and propaganda are not again at their insidious work? Do we not realize that channels for the dissemination of propaganda are hard at work fostering, furthering, and supporting the cause—not of the United States and our peace, but of foreign governments and their war? The President has well said that we must be on our guard. Do our fellow countrymen realize the grave exigencies of the situation? I doubt it. We are told to remain neutral and to remain at peace. But are we permitted to remain neutral in the face of propaganda blasts that cause the wisest of men to be discouraged and the most determined of men to be shaken?

What were the steps that brought us into the last war? To review these is to acknowledge the fact that an analysis of the past is a prerequisite to a sound view of the future, for history is but a mirror of past events in which the future is seen reflected by those who are willing to see. What, then, has been our experience with departures from neutrality? In every instance we have seen ourselves plunged headlong into a conflict that could have been avoided.

Our foreign adventure in 1812 served no possibly useful purpose other than to give us our national anthem and forever to drive away a foreign power from continental United States. The war itself was immediately attributable to a departure from our theretofore consistent policy of scrupulous impartiality.

In 1898 we undertook a "crusade" to liberate the "oppressed" populations of the Spanish West Indies and other far-flung possessions of the Spanish Empire. Prior to the war came the crusade; after the war, the bitter realization that journalistic propaganda in a veritable circulation race founded on fiction of the most lurid, imaginative variety and the interests of skilled manipulators was the real cause. What has been our past experience? Crusade first; then count the reckoning amidst the sobering influences of that

dawn called peace. The readiness of many statesmen to take a hand and the crusading spirit which is so universally present in all people makes double the effectiveness of skillful propaganda and, to these clever propagandists, the crusading instinct is the basis of all successful effort. Certainly no one can accuse us of aught but generous impulses, sometimes carried to the point of prodigality. And what an awakening we had after the last war.

There, too, I must dwell a moment. Senators, our last crusade was in the interests of democracy, a principle we cherish and hold dear, but did we achieve it? Had we, perhaps then the cost might have been justified to the American taxpayer who paid and still pays. We wanted no tangible advantages; we fought only to reestablish peace on a firm and enduring democratic basis. Was it achieved? The answer lies before us—3,000 miles away, the eternally recurring conflict again rears its ugly head amidst the ruins of what some of my distinguished colleagues have been pleased to call "democracy." Have we any assurance that similar steps are not now being projected by the perfidious forces working behind the scenes, lurking in the shadows and denounced by President Wilson when he pronounced himself in favor of "open covenants openly arrived at"? Must our people be kept in the dark? Or, worse still, propagandized into a state of national hysteria? That path, trodden once before, does not lead to peace. Are we to follow it again? Must we repeat our former mistakes, or can we learn a lesson from our most recent history? How long must we endure the impact of an unconscionable desire for gain and the swiftly mounting tide of filthy, vicious, anti-American propaganda?

Let us remember that we are Americans first and last, thank God. Our forefathers, in establishing this country and its democracy, shook from their feet the blood-trampled dust of Europe—primarily to escape from racial hatreds, the undying animosities, the ever-recurring conflicts, and the utter inability of peace to survive on that continent. And now we, their descendants—should we betray their trust and return to that graveyard where lie buried the ashes of hope, ambition, and idealism? "No" is the answer that I hear echoing from the voices of our fellow citizens. We have all received ample evidence of this widespread conviction.

Must I emphasize the horrendous costs of our last venture—some excursion into the maze of European politics? A brief moment will suffice. In lives lost, we were relatively fortunate in comparison with the European countries. We lost a total of 100,000, of whom 50,000 were killed in action and an additional 50,000 died of service-connected wounds and disabilities, but the European powers lost a total of 8,000,000 men after more than 4 years of fighting. It will be remembered that our participation lasted but 19 months, and that at the end of a war which had virtually exhausted the enemy. Suppose that we were to enter upon a protracted period of hostilities—would we escape so lightly? The history of the last war tells us otherwise. Twenty-five percent of those who participated were either killed or, even worse, hopelessly maimed or crippled. If our participation involved 10,000,000 men for a possible period of 4 years, could we not expect to lose two and a half million of our citizens? I can visualize the anguish and the pain that these losses will bring to the mothers, the widows, and the orphans left by these deaths. Is this preposterous? Of late we have been told by such an eminent authority as my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] that this Congress would never consider the appropriation of funds for the purpose of sending our boys overseas. We were told much the same thing prior to our entry into the last war. Did our resolution hold firm? The record speaks for itself. In 19 short months more than 2,000,000 of the same boys who were not to have been sent went over.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. PITTMAN. I do not think we were told that in that way. I think President Woodrow Wilson was constantly stating that he was going to do all he could to keep us out of war, and I think he did. If it had not been for the proclamation by Germany in February 1917 of unlimited

submarine activities, followed by the destruction of 6 vessels in 3 weeks with the loss of 63 lives, I do not think we would have gotten into the war. However, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator—and I think he will agree with me—to the fact that at that time we were existing exclusively under international law, and we insisted on certain rights of our vessels on the high seas. We contended that those rights were violated; and all the debates on the adoption of the war resolution are along the same line, namely, that our patience at the violation of international law, resulting in loss of life of our citizens, was exhausted.

Does not the Senator see a difference in our present attitude? In 1935 we passed simply the embargo. In 1937 we adopted the cash-and-carry amendment, and we placed restrictions on credit. We now have a law to restrain our citizens. I think we have gone further than we have ever gone before; in fact, further than any country has ever gone before.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator. I think the embargo law is a good one.

Mr. PITTMAN. We are now saying that no American vessel may carry anything to a belligerent nation. I understand there is some complaint in the atmosphere about that proposal, but that is the underlying principle. That is the reason why I do not think the example of having been led into war before—and we were led into it by standing for international law—is going to govern us. I am just as confident as is the Senator that no destruction or loss of property can ever drive this Congress to appropriate money to send soldiers abroad.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel sure the Senator feels the way he speaks.

Have we reason to believe that history will not repeat itself? Perhaps we have forgotten that we were preparing to send many more to follow those who remained permanently in Flanders graves. I say this in view of the fact that 24,021,000 men were registered under the Draft Act. Of these, almost 5,000,000 were actually in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. Had the war continued, it is safe to say that many more of our troops would have seen service at the front.

What were our material costs? Our wartime expenditures were \$2,000,000,000 a month. In actual cash outlay this meant \$38,000,000,000 for the 19 months of our participation. This does not include the vexing question of the war debts, now apparently overlooked—and, I may add, conveniently so—nor the indirect costs immediately attributable to such factors as the increasing cost of living, enhanced freight and insurance rates, and the extraordinary depletion of our natural resources. Of course, I have said nothing about the depression, the seemingly inevitable consequence of every one of our wars, foreign or domestic. Were we to total all of these direct and indirect costs to our taxpayers, the sum total would indeed reach staggering proportions of astronomical magnitude.

Again, turning to future possibilities, is it unreasonable to suppose that a comparable expenditure will be necessitated in the event that our hopes of peace are shattered by the incautious and imprudent counsels of those who are blind to the eventualities—by those who refuse to heed?

Mr. President, my discourse is founded on the belief that we must have peace. To reinforce that thesis I have been compelled to discuss the consequences and cost of war. Lives lost, moneys spent, economic and moral values destroyed—that is not the entire picture. Should a protracted struggle ensue, and should we be drawn in, will our political system weather another shock of such colossal magnitude? Have other governments in other times and other climes been uniformly successful in maintaining their stability at the conclusion of a war, albeit victorious? It is not inconceivable that the national debt, now close to \$50,000,000,000, may become so enormous that no government confronted with the inevitable depression following a war and the destruction of moral values, the widespread unemployment, and the incapable problem of rehabilitating millions of ex-soldiers,

could survive the impact of this shock to our economic system.

Let those who scoff at my words remember well the prophetic insight of my distinguished colleague, whom we all love and admire, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who, while we were tottering on the precipice of international catastrophe, said on April 4, 1917:

We are taking a step today that is fraught with untold danger. We are going into war upon the command of gold. We are going to run the risk of sacrificing millions of our countrymen's lives in order that other countrymen may coin their lifeblood into money. And even if we do not cross the Atlantic and go into the trenches, we are going to pile up a debt that the toiling masses that shall come many generations after us will have to pay. Unborn millions will bend their backs in toil in order to pay for the terrible step we are now about to take. We are about to do the bidding of wealth's terrible mandate. By our act we will make millions of our countrymen suffer, and the consequences of it may well be that millions of our brethren must shed their lifeblood, millions of brokenhearted women must weep, millions of children must suffer with cold, and millions of babes must die from hunger, and all because we want to preserve the commercial right of American citizens to deliver munitions of war to belligerent nations.

I think that is what the Senator from Nevada was referring to as protecting our rights under international law. Many of our citizens wanted to have the United States free to sell war munitions.

Mr. PITTMAN. Of course, they were free to do so prior to our entry into the World War. Our vessels had no restraint on them. They delivered anything they could to belligerents, subject to being seized. Some of them were sunk.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that is what the Senator from Nebraska had in mind when he delivered this speech—that there was a desire "to preserve the commercial right of American citizens to deliver munitions of war to belligerent nations."

Further quoting from the speech of the Senator from Nebraska:

I know that I am powerless to stop it. I know that this war madness has taken possession of the financial and political powers of our country. I know that nothing I can say will stay the blow that is soon to fall. I feel that we are committing a sin against humanity and against our countrymen. I would like to say to this war god, "You shall not coin into gold the lifeblood of my brethren." I would like to prevent this terrible catastrophe from falling upon my people. I would be willing to surrender my own life if I could cause this awful cup to pass. I charge no man here with a wrong motive, but it seems to me that this war craze has robbed us of our judgment.

I believe what we need in this country now is the patience and judgment which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] so well described a few moments ago.

The Senator from Nebraska continued:

I wish we might delay our action until reason could again be enthroned in the brain of man. I feel that we are about to put the dollar sign upon the American flag.

If anyone cares to read a wonderful speech, I suggest that he turn to volume 55, part 1, page 214, of the proceedings of the Sixty-fifth Congress and read the speech delivered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

I do not suggest that at this time we are hovering on the brink of intervention. No; it is for that very reason that I raise my voice in protest against any and all action that might bring upon us a war we do not want, a war we do not need, a war we can avoid.

The latter part of my distinguished colleague's speech gives him the right to stand with Cassandra, the prophetess of ancient Troy, who predicted with tragic accuracy the fatal consequences of a blind refusal to adhere to her advice; for certainly, in the light of the events that followed our participation in the World War, we cannot doubt the utter accuracy of my distinguished colleague's predictions. Let us this time guard ourselves against a repetition of the steps that lead to catastrophe. War mongers, profit seekers, and propagandists surround us, even as in 1914. Must we again fall an easy prey to the sweet strains of Circe, to the lure of false prophets, in matters so interminably devastating in their ultimate consequences? Is this the democratic way? Or do we subscribe honestly and fearlessly to the principle that the greatest good for the greatest number is the underlying principle of the American democracy?

I feel that every vote cast, whether for or against the pending joint resolution, will be motivated by only one desire—that of peace for our fellow citizens, a steadfast adherence to the determination to keep us out of war, a war we do not want and do not need, a war we can avoid.

As for me Mr. President, solemnly and with reverence, I shall cast my vote for what I think will keep us out of war and against the repeal of the embargo. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Former President Hoover made an interesting suggestion this week regarding the pending embargo problem. He proposes that the category of arms, ammunition, and implements of war be split and that we cease forever to furnish any nation with those implements which are used to destroy civilian populations. If the present embargo is to be struck down, and if war munitions are to be sold on a cash basis, it may be well for us to explore the humane question whether we do not wish, at least, to forego an American bargain counter which sells the implements of mass death for the women and children of the earth.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In response to requests for advice upon the neutrality bill from several Senators, Congressmen, and others, I have today sent them the following memorandum:

The debate on the arms embargo shows the deep conviction of most able men on the opposing sides that either repeal or no repeal leads to most serious dangers of involving us in this war.

It seems to me there is an alternative course which has moorings in established American policies, in American principles, and in American morals. Such alternative course appears to me to lessen the dangers which the present alternatives of repeal or no repeal present.

Ever since the World War an increasing part of the method of war is to intimidate or to attack the civil population from the air. This is indeed the greatest advance of aggressive methods against the independence of nations in the last century. After war itself this threat of destruction of open cities and this killing of women and children is the greatest step to barbarism of a thousand years. And this is no emotional expression. We have seen it in horrible action in China, Spain, Ethiopia, and Poland.

The American Government and the American people have frequently sought to stop these practices. In June 1932 I laid before the World Disarmament Conference, among other recommendations, the proposal that the weapons which can be and are used to attack civil populations should be abolished. That included bombing planes, their ammunition, poison gas, and submarines. That idea was approved by 41 nations and declined by 8 others.

In May 1933 President Roosevelt included the abolition of these weapons among other proposals made on that occasion.

There is a moral question here that reaches to the heart of American instinct for decency. Bombing planes, their ammunition, and poison gas cannot be seriously claimed to be weapons by which nations defend themselves or their independence. They are weapons of aggression and barbarism. It will be said that they are defense weapons when used to destroy the enemy's sources of supplies. But it is nonsense to say that is their sole purpose. Their major purpose in fact is also to terrify or kill civilians. That is what happened in the past 5 years, and the black-outs and the evacuation of children from cities all over Europe is indication of this future purpose and this terrorization.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the United States should ever sell this kind of weapon to anybody at any time anywhere, whether they be neutrals or countries at war. I have no sympathy with the killing of women and children of any race, no matter what the ultimate objective may be.

And I do not like to think of the day when bombing planes, engaged in the killing of women and children, on both or either side in this war, will be identified as the product of American manufacture. Whichever country it may be, the news will be transmitted to the American people that this killing has been done with the products of American industry.

Equally important, and from exactly the same reasoning, I am convinced that we should permit nations to buy from us the instruments by which they can defend themselves from such barbarities. We should therefore permit the sale of pursuit airplanes, light observation planes, antiaircraft guns, and any other instruments of defense against attacks on civilians.

Equally I do not like to think of the time when civilian populations will have been attacked and we have deprived them of the weapons by which they could have defended their women and children from such barbarities. Should aerial catastrophe come to either side, we will see a national regret that we had either contributed to it or failed to aid in its prevention. And that is exactly the kind of explosive emotion that might lead us to enter into war.

This proposal is specifically on the one hand to prohibit the sale to anybody at any time, whether neutrals or combatants, of these weapons of attack on civilians, that is bombing planes, their ammunition, poison gas, and submarines, and on the other hand to make free the sale of pursuit planes, light observation planes, antiaircraft guns, and their ammunition, and any other instruments of defense against attacks on civilians.

I know someone will split hairs on this differentiation between arms, but it is less difficult than many borderlines in the present bill.

This basis of action seems to me to meet many of the difficulties and dangers enunciated by both the opponents and supporters of the embargo. Its application can be tested by exploration of the major arguments put forward on each side.

The advocates of retention of the embargo are convinced that shipment of arms in war supports war itself; that in repealing the embargo at this time we are taking sides in this war; that we are joining in European power politics; that it is one more step in a program the sum of which leads us toward war; that we are contributing the weapons of mass murder; that it would inflate American industry, with consequences in profiteering and the creation of industrial and financial pressure groups interested in going deeper into war; that the after-war collapse and unemployment would be increased by this inflated industry.

The advocates of repeal are convinced that the embargo in war favors aggressive nations who have armed in advance; that it today arbitrarily favors Germany by depriving Great Britain and France; that it even allows Germany supplies from us through neutrals; that the jeopardy to Great Britain and France by Nazi ascendancy in Europe will be increased by the embargo; that this jeopardy may be reflected to us; that we lose in preparedness by depriving ourselves of this expansion of our arms manufacturing capacity; that our unemployed will be deprived of jobs they would otherwise have.

It is not my purpose in reciting these views to argue with these beliefs, but only to point out the deep conviction of most able men that dangers do exist either way which lead us nearer to war.

I do not claim that this alternative proposal answers every argument on either side of this question. It does avoid the extreme objections and dangers of either repeal or no repeal.

We would not be participating in mass murder. On the contrary, we would be contributing to prevent it.

We would not be building up an excessive munitions industry, with its profiting from war and with its inevitable collapse in dislocation and increased unemployment. We would not be building up out of weapons themselves a consequential manufacturing or finance interest in our country, which could be an added nucleus for agitation that we go deeper and deeper into the war.

The proposal largely meets the distrust that the repeal of the embargo is but another step in the program of joining the United States in this war. We would not be throwing the weight of our arms manufacture into European power politics; we would be throwing it toward greater humanity in the world and less destructive war. We would not be showing partiality to either side. The practical results of the program are of service to the British and French people. It contributes to the protection of their women and children and civilians generally. It contributes to saving the destruction of their cities and their sources of supplies from the air. That is today their greatest danger. And, likewise, it protects German women and children and their sources of supplies and cities from bombing by planes of our manufacture. If it is not the intention of either the Allies or the Germans to so use these weapons against civilians and homes, then neither of them can complain of our refusing to sell them and neither side can complain of our sale of defensive arms against them.

It seems to me for the foregoing reasons the plan eliminates the claims of unneutral action made against either withholding or selling arms. Furthermore, it is consonant with long declared national policies of the United States in respect to this sort of arms. It is not based on action for or against nations who may be at war, as it would apply at all times against neutrals as well as combatants, before and after war occurs.

By such action America would be again raising a standard against barbaric action. By prohibiting the sale of these weapons of attack on civilians and permitting the sale of these weapons of defense of civilians we are not stepping deeper into this war but stepping away from pitfalls that may lead into it.

The proposal keeps both our conscience and our neutrality right. With its foundations in morals and humanity, it is surer ground for America than foundations in international politics.

With some tightening of provisions as to cash and the danger zones, the other parts of the bill are in my view constructive.

Mr. NYE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundein	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Tobey
Burke	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MR. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I regard the issues presented in this legislation as of vital importance to the future of this Republic. I intend to discuss these issues at some length, but I shall first state them briefly:

Repeal of the embargo, in the present circumstances, and the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war is a significant step toward participation in the European war.

The several discretionary loopholes in the pending joint resolution are sufficient to allow for incidents which may lead us into war.

It is not in the best interest of American democracy to gamble everything of value which we possess in return for some temporary profits together with a permanent participation in a post-war chaos most certain to be revolutionary in character.

The proposed repeal of the arms embargo is not being undertaken in a vacuum. It is being proposed amid a set of circumstances, foreign and domestic, which cannot be ignored. The repeal itself cannot be considered as a naked issue removed from those circumstances. It must be examined in their glaring light. Truth has many faces.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN ARMS AND RAW MATERIALS

Before discussing some of these aspects I wish to speak of the distinction between sending abroad manufactured arms and sending the raw materials which may be there manufactured into arms. It is an important distinction, although far from being the real point at issue in this debate. The distinction itself is important because the country whose people are killed and wounded by our weapons will hate us. They will justly suspect us of a greedy motive in their death and maiming. The identification of their misery with the airplanes which bomb them or with the shot and shell made in America will be quick and lasting.

Just as during our Civil War the soldiers of the North and their families did not soon forgive or trust the English who had sold cartridges and ammunition to the southern troops, so the various partisans in the Spanish War are going to hate the Germans and Italians and Russians for years to come for injuries done them by the airplanes made in those countries.

People do not seem to attach an equal hatred to supplies of raw material, however logical it might be for them to do so. During the last war, for example, English merchants sent to the Scandinavian countries many raw materials which were immediately exported to Germany, as Admiral Consett tells in his *Triumph of Unarmed Forces*. They were not hated for that or penalized in any way, even by their own people or their own military authorities.

A week before this war began English merchants, according to the New York Times of August 22, 1939, sold Germany, on spot or immediate delivery, some 10,000 tons of copper and another 10,000 tons of rubber. However, the English people, the ultimate victims of these invaluable war materials, manifested no indignation. If arms had been sold, however, just before the war broke out, or after, the sellers of the arms no doubt would have been severely punished.

During the World War the German people felt strongly and protested about our profit motive in their being killed. But they did not in any way protest the shipment of raw materials to England, except to say it seemed only fair that they also be able to buy food from us as freely as England and France.

If we are interested in being considered by all the peoples of the world as a great force for peace, this distinction between arms and raw materials is important. It is vital, too, if we wish to maintain our potential position as a future arbiter to whom they can turn—one who has not, in their minds, sullied his hands or warped his mind with the money that comes from traffic in the instrumentalities of death.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ARMS AND RAW MATERIALS IMPORTANT IN PEACE EFFORTS

The sale of arms, for peculiar psychological reasons, having to do with killing and dying and being maimed, then, is different from the sale of raw materials. It is a distinction I do not wish to overemphasize, but it is a distinction vital to any peace efforts our Government might have an opportunity in the future to make. Some Senators may not consider it an important traffic, or one having an important bearing on our official foreign policy and our unofficial foreign economic policy; nevertheless, distinguished British and American authorities disagree with them completely and utterly. But if we are not interested in being considered a great force for peace, if we are, for example, expecting sometime later to go beyond the shipment of arms to the shipment of men to use those arms, this distinction, of course, is of much less importance.

It seems to me the comment made by the President in his message on this point is quite "artificial," as pointed out by Prof. Edward B. Corwin, the head of the department of government at Princeton University.

I may digress long enough to say that I remember when another historic controversy and debate were proceeding in this Chamber over the question whether or not the administration's bill to alter and modify the numerical set-up of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Corwin was relied upon as a very distinguished and eminent authority to support those of us who were supporting that proposal. He wrote an article which appeared in the New York Times of October 2, 1939, a portion of which I shall now read. It had been my intention to have the entire article printed in the RECORD, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], in his able address of yesterday, anticipated me in that regard. Mr. Corwin stated in the article which appeared in the New York Times:

In going before Congress to urge the repeal of the arms embargo the President undertook an unaccustomed role for him—that of opponent of legal change, of champion of ancient wont and use. The novelty of the part perhaps accounts for his rather unsatisfying performance of it. Mr. Roosevelt asserts in his opening sentence that the embargo "impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations"; and he later adds his "deep and unalterable conviction * * * that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today."

In support of neither assertion nor conviction, however, does he adduce any proof of either factual or logical nature, except a reference to "years of experience as a worker in international peace," most of which must have antedated his original approval of the embargo.

He finds, to be sure, the distinction which the embargo provision sets up between completed implements of war and the materials out of which they are made as an artificial one, and he challenges "those who seek to retain the present embargo position" to "be wholly consistent and seek legislation to cut off cloth and copper and meat and wheat and a thousand other articles from all of the nations at war."

But obviously the fact that this distinction is artificial would not necessarily make it a source of danger to our relations with other countries, while the appeal to consistency is an argument which can be worked both ways.

Mr. Roosevelt himself would have to admit that it is "artificial" to distinguish between one who makes a gun and puts it into the hands of another in the certain knowledge that it will be used by that other against a third person, and on the other hand one who fires a gun himself at said third person. Yet this is precisely the distinction on which neutral status pivots. Would Mr. Roosevelt abandon this "artificial" distinction in the present instance?

The fact is, of course, that most legal distinctions are artificial, otherwise the law would not have had to intervene to set them up.

And the distinction which the President attacks is derived from the very international law which he so much praises, and to which he is so anxious to return. What is more, he himself adopts it at the end when he urges the retention of the present "license system covering import and export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war," and the present ban on the shipment of these to belligerent countries on American vessels. Of the latter he says, "This provision should not be disturbed." * * *

The distinction between unmanufactured arms and manufactured arms seems artificial and thin at present to some advocates of repeal. Later on, however, the same reasoning may easily persuade them there is little or no distinction between furnishing arms to others to use against their enemies and firing these deadly weapons, guns, and gas at the enemy. A jury of reasonable men in a murder trial finds only a degree of difference between a man who hands another man a gun with which to kill and the man who is handed the gun and shoots it to kill. The sentence may be heavier for one defendant than the other, but both will be found guilty.

Furthermore, the distinction between arms and other raw materials which has been scorned in this debate by some advocates of repeal of the arms embargo is, as Professor Corwin points out, rooted in the very international law to which the President wants us to go back. That group of conventions and customs known as international law draws at all points a distinction between the two.

ARMS TRAFFIC IMPORTANT IN LAST WAR

An examination of the diplomatic correspondence during the last war will also show that the arms traffic was the particular topic which constantly recurred in the dispatches of our own officials from London, when they were reporting on the reprisals the British Government might take against us in case we chose effectively to strengthen our neutrality. It was the cutting off of munitions orders which Ambassador Page emphasized when he reported on January 25, 1916:

I believe it is true that the British Government have been constructing extra munitions works in England and Canada, which can on short notice be manned and used to make as many munitions as the United States now supplies. * * * If necessary (I hear that), orders placed in the United States could now be stopped within a month without diminishing the total supply. If no merchantmen may carry a defensive gun into an American port (this) change may precipitate a cutting off of American orders, not from any wish to cut them off but from fear that other embarrassing acts may follow (Policy of the United States Toward Maritime Commerce, vol. II, p. 449, Doc. No. 161).

Thus the lever to be used to force us to keep a pro-Ally neutrality policy was clearly munitions.

Again, when we were vainly trying to obtain from the English some of our supposed rights to ship to neutrals, Ambassador Page cabled that—

They quietly laugh at our effort to regulate sea warfare under new conditions by what they consider lawyers' disquisition out of textbooks. They (receive) them with courtesy, pay no further attention to them, proceed to settle our shipping disputes with an effort at generosity, and quadruple their orders from us of war materials.

It was not food that was spoken of as a lever, it was not raw materials, but war materials.

In this connection it is well to remember that between 1915 and 1917, 22.4 percent, or \$1,464,762,000, of our trade with England was in munitions, and that 14.7 percent, or \$322,379,000, was with France. By the time we got into the war we had shipped the two nations nearly \$2,000,000,000 of munitions. And this does not include the exports to Russia.

There were others beside the English who thought the munitions traffic was important. Ambassador Page's brother, Robert N. Page, a Representative in Congress from North Carolina, resigned his seat because he could not support his party's indifference to neutrality. In resigning he wrote:

Jesus Christ never uttered a more profound truth than when he declared, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." The loan of \$500,000,000 to England by American capitalists, to say nothing of the profits of the munitions manufacturers, has destroyed the semblance even of neutrality in the United States and will probably lead us into war.

Mr. President, I am also impressed by the deliberate statement of President Wilson's official biographer, Ray Stannard Baker, author of eight volumes on the wartime President, a

great admirer of his, and a man of well-known integrity himself. After studying all the official and intimate papers and documents of the period for 15 years, he wrote:

* * * by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our cause was lost.

While Britain diplomacy maneuvered with skill to involve American industry and finance in the munitions traffic, it is certain that American business needed no compulsion to take war orders. (Baker, R. S., Woodrow Wilson, Life and Letters, Neutrality 1914-15, p. 181.)

Two more items in addition to those cited prove the importance of this traffic during the last war. Our Department of Commerce was called upon in October 1916 to tell the Department of State whether it was not possible to find some weapon by which we could force the English to observe our claims as to neutral rights. They said the weapon lay in the munitions embargo. They thought munitions were important. They also said, after the war had gone on for 2 years, that the weapon had been dulled from lack of use. I quote:

We have suffered the effect of (British) embargoes and Orders in Council for a long period under protest but without retaliation. The restrictions are no more hurtful now than a year and a half ago. But the weapon then in our hands, an embargo on munitions and supplies, has been dulled (Foreign Relations, 1916 Supplement, p. 476).

ARMS TRAFFIC IMPORTANT TO BANKERS IN LAST WAR

The bankers for the British Government, the House of Morgan, considered the munitions traffic so important that to force its continuance they were apparently even willing to stop borrowing money for the Allies in the United States. They were willing to take such a drastic step, although both personally and financially they desperately wanted the Allies to win, as indicated by their testimony before a Senate committee. They saw no difference between the best interests of the Allies and the best interest of the United States (Munitions Committee Report 944, pt. 6, p. 42). In late 1916 the British tried to get out of contracts they had made with Connecticut rifle companies for \$194,000,000. The big banks had money in the companies. The companies were in arrears on delivery, and the Morgans were told to cancel \$55,000,000 worth of the orders.

Now, \$55,000,000 may be small potatoes to the statesmen who think, and have so expressed themselves in this debate, that the arms traffic is not important; but the very thought of losing \$55,000,000 in orders practically caused the Morgans to desert the British cause. All the British interference with our mails, all the blacklisting of American citizens, all the diversion of our shipments had not caused the Morgans to bring any pressure to bear on their principals, the British Government. But when this order for munitions, for rifles, was in danger of cancellation, J. P. Morgan went to see the King. He saw the Prime Minister and many others. The Morgans knew the British did not need these rifles. What they needed was machine guns. They knew the rifle companies had not fulfilled their part of the contract. But, nevertheless, in the name of "important and influential interests," the bankers told the British that they would not be able to float any more loans for them over here unless the British paid for the rifles. The bankers got the money for the rifles. Cutting off British loans would then have been a great blow to England, but the bankers were willing to turn against the King for the sake of such traffic in the instruments of death.

REPEAL MAY CRIPPLE OUR REARMAMENT PROGRAM

The record, prior to our entry into the last war, proves, however, that this traffic was considered important on all sides. The sequel of this story, with a different result, came when we went to war and wanted our own Army rifle, the Springfield. We could not get them in the proper quantity because all the Connecticut rifle companies were toolled up to make the English Lee-Enfields, which our Army people considered inferior. This experience will most likely be repeated today if the embargo is repealed. When we ourselves need

arms, our factories will be tooled to produce foreign types of arms and munitions. We may find our plane plants tooled to make airplanes a year or two old instead of the most modern type. In short, repeal of the arms embargo may mean a crippling of our own national-defense program.

Press reports state that the aircraft factories even today would be unable to fill large orders from our Government, they are so loaded with foreign orders awaiting the vote on this measure. They seem to think with assurance it will turn our factories over to them. I think the sponsors of the repeal proposal might secure for us sworn official statements as to when the planes authorized for our own national defense, during the past two sessions, will be completed.

I desire to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal of September 8, 1939, which indicates that already our own governmental airplane orders are being shunted to one side.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. Did I understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that our airplane orders are being shunted aside?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am able to answer the Senator only by the article to which I referred, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 8, and which reads:

Active interest is being shown by foreign-government purchasing agents regarding placement of additional aircraft orders in this country. It is indicated that new business substantially larger than any yet received is in prospect if the ban against export of airplanes to belligerent countries is removed.

Those American companies with uncompleted foreign orders have been asked to continue production even though shipments are not now permitted. The planes, engines, and propellers will be stored, it is understood, pending possible change in the Neutrality Act.

In addition to prospective orders from France and Great Britain, the industry also is considering possibility of increased business from two other sources, deliveries to which would not be affected by the current Neutrality Act. They are: (1) Nonbelligerent countries; and (2) the United States air forces.

Neutral foreign countries, it is pointed out, are likely customers inasmuch as they may see fit to increase their air forces as a protective measure while the European war is in progress. The Scandinavian and Latin American countries, Turkey and Holland are the most apparent customers in this category.

UNITED STATES COURSE UNCERTAIN

Course of action to be taken by the United States toward further increases in military air forces as a result of outbreak of hostilities in Europe is not yet clear. Reports in Washington, however, indicate possibility that the next session of Congress will be asked for an additional appropriation with which to increase the number of Air Corps planes up to the 6,000 authorized. Current procurement program will provide for around 5,500, it is estimated.

Speed in manufacturing and delivery is a highly essential factor in war contracts. For this reason there is basis for belief that aircraft plant facilities will of necessity be augmented in the event that substantial new orders materialize.

Backlog of unfilled orders for 13 major units in the industry now approximates \$327,700,000, which compares with estimated productive capacity of around \$470,000,000 annually with present plant facilities. To reach this maximum output, however, considerable time would be required by some companies in order to build up personnel and tool up for capacity production. It is probable that current backlog represents nearly capacity output for the industry over the next 10 or 11 months at least.

Indicated maximum productive capacity is at the rate of a little over \$39,000,000 a month. This compares with current deliveries of between \$15,000,000 and \$18,000,000 a month. By the end of this year, however, output is expected to reach \$25,000,000 a month and should continue to increase thereafter.

Current backlog is composed of, roughly, \$80,000,000 of unfilled foreign orders, small amount of commercial business, while the greater portion represents orders for the United States Army and Navy. Army contracts under the new aircraft expansion program specify delivery by June 30, 1941. It is apparent, then, that work on these orders cannot be delayed much in preference to foreign orders without endangering fulfillment of contractual delivery date and causing the liquidated-damages clause of the contract to apply. In view of these factors, it is apparent there will be need for additional productive facilities in event that prospective new business becomes an actuality.

Then follows a table breaking down the totals according to the 13 most important companies, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated backlog of 13 major companies on September 1, 1939, compare as follows:

	Backlog	Sept. 1, 1939	Jan. 1, 1939
Allison	\$17,500,000	\$500,000	
Aviation Manufacturing Corporation	8,000,000		
Bell	4,700,000	3,675,000	
Boeing	21,000,000	14,900,000	
Consolidated	17,000,000	2,798,881	
Curtiss-Wright	47,000,000	31,000,000	
Douglas	45,000,000	23,000,000	
Grumman	4,600,000	3,500,000	
Lockheed	32,000,000	30,000,000	
Martin	53,000,000	13,903,000	
North American Aviation	33,000,000	10,914,529	
Seversky	1,900,000		
United Aircraft	43,000,000	17,464,000	
Total	327,700,000	151,653,410	

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, possibly the article would warrant the Senator in making the deduction he drew or in reaching the conclusion he arrived at, although I have my doubts about it. Let me say to the Senator that last spring, when we were considering the question of foreign orders for airplanes in our country, those in charge of our airplane program, both civilians and Army officers, assured the Military Affairs Committee that our orders would not be shunted aside for foreign orders but would rather be preferred.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I recall the matter referred to by the Senator from Indiana, who at the time was a member of the Military Affairs Committee, as I was. The testimony before that committee was that the War Department protested against the sale of planes to the French and other governments on the very ground that it would delay our own military program. It is true that after the President had issued an Executive order requiring the sale of planes to the French, War Department officials did say they hoped that the increased stepping-up of production would not delay our program; but that was the very basis upon which General Craig and the Secretary of War protested against the sale of planes to France.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, we do not want to get into any argument involving our recollection about these matters. I think the record will speak for itself. However, my recollection does not bear out the recollection of the Senator from Missouri at all. My recollection is that General Craig and the other Army officers who objected to the sale of planes objected because they had adopted a certain policy which they had written out in a little pamphlet that we all saw, and the sale of planes was in contravention of the particular policy declared in their little pamphlet. It was not because they thought our airplane program was going to be delayed or hampered or hindered in the slightest. I distinctly remember myself asking the question of General Arnold as to whether or not the sale of any airplanes to France or Britain, as was proposed at that time, would hamper or delay our program at all. He said it would not but would probably expedite it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was after the protest of the War Department officials had been overruled by the President of the United States and they had been instructed to submit the planes for sale to the French.

Mr. MINTON. I do not care about that phase of it. It was still General Arnold's judgment as a professional soldier and as a man charged with the air defense of this country that the program would not be delayed or hampered or in any manner postponed by the sale of these planes; but, on the contrary, he said the program probably would be expedited.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall take only a moment.

Regardless of what happened last spring with reference to the sale of airplanes to France, or the controversy that we

thrashed out here in the spring on that subject, as I understand, the question now is, Whether or not the manufacture of our own airplanes, or the preparation of our own country under our program, is being put aside because of orders which have been given by France or England. The Senator quotes an article from the Wall Street Journal of September 8, I believe, to prove his point.

Does not the Senator think the best evidence of whether or not the statement in the Wall Street Journal is true would be information obtained from the War Department or the Navy Department? I wonder if the Senator has consulted the War Department or the Navy Department to determine whether or not the statement in the Wall Street Journal is accurate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have not officially consulted anyone in the War Department or the Navy Department. However, I think the question I have raised is very important. Furthermore, it seems perfectly obvious to me that one of two things must happen if we repeal the arms embargo. Either Great Britain and France, for whom repeal is being put through the Congress, will be unable to secure the airplanes and the arms, ammunition, and other implements of war which our Ambassadors at the Court of St. James and in Paris have said are so essential to their success, or our plants will be tooled up and backlogged with their orders to the detriment of our rearmament program.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not in position to quote anybody officially; but I think I can say, Mr. President, without the breach of any confidence, that the complacency with which some Senators on the Military Affairs Committee view the effect upon our own rearmament program of the repeal of the arms embargo is not shared by all those who have the responsibility for its execution.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the question boil down to this: If our factories make munitions and sell them to Europe, then Europe has the munitions; whereas if they make the munitions and we keep them, then we have the munitions? No expert opinion is necessary to clarify that point.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That point seems to me perfectly clear. It also seems to me clear that either our present plant capacity will be tremendously expanded and tooled up to produce foreign types of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or our present productive capacity will be retooled in order to supply them, assuming that they are to obtain any effective amount of materials.

Mr. MINTON and Mr. LUCAS addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Wisconsin think the latter suggestion and the latter response to the inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts is what is likely to happen; that is, that our plants will become tooled up and will be going well and will be in a position to produce a great quantity of munitions?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; we shall be in just the same situation in which we were previously in connection with rifles. The factories will be tooled up for the Lee-Enfield, or the present foreign model of the Lee-Enfield. They will be tooled up for specified types of machine guns, or whatever else foreign buyers may purchase. They buy on their own specifications.

Mr. MINTON. The question of tooling or retooling a plant is not a matter involving a very long process.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is absolutely mistaken on that point. The testimony shows that in the last war it was a matter of great embarrassment to our own armament program.

Mr. MINTON. Factories will have their organizations well built up; and that is the important thing. They will have trained men to operate the machines. Whether they operate machine A or machine B is not so important. They will have an organization which can operate either one; and that is tremendously important.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the testimony does not bear out the Senator in that regard.

Mr. MINTON. What testimony?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The testimony before the Munitions Committee.

Mr. MINTON. The testimony before the Military Affairs Committee bears me out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Wisconsin to be that the administration is for the repeal of the arms embargo in order that we may weaken our national defense to the extent we benefit England and France?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I made no such statement as that. The Record will show that I made no such statement. I should much prefer to make my own considered and deliberate statements than to have the Senator from Illinois attempt to rephrase them for me. I said that the arms embargo was being put through the Congress for the purpose of making arms, ammunition, and implements of war available to France and Britain; and I stand by that statement. I am now about to discuss the question further, if the Senator from Illinois can find it possible to restrain himself.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be delighted to restrain myself, if the Senator from Wisconsin will go further and explain the statement he made a moment ago, as I understood him, that in his opinion the repeal of the arms embargo would weaken our national defense.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I made no such statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I raised the question, Mr. President, as to the effect of the repeal of the arms embargo upon our own rearmament and national-defense program. I could go no further in my statement than I have already gone; but on my own responsibility as a Senator I make the statement that I am not the only person who is concerned about it, and that there are others better qualified on this subject than I am who are concerned about it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very sorry I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I was wondering whether or not the able Senator from Wisconsin, in expressing the fear to which he has given utterance, had taken into consideration the safeguards against the sort of thing he fears which are contained in the provisions of the joint resolution, beginning on page 26, providing for the control of the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war through and by a National Munitions Control Board.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, Mr. President; I have taken that matter into consideration.

Mr. PEPPER. If I may finish the question, I shall have only one further question to ask the Senator. I was wondering particularly whether or not the Senator was aware that the Munitions Control Board may promulgate such rules and regulations relative to the enforcement of the law as it deems proper; that licenses must be procured by those who would export arms, ammunition, and implements of war, which would, of course, include airplanes; and, furthermore, that in subparagraph (h) of the National Munitions Control Board provision of the joint resolution there is the requirement that the Munitions Control Board shall report to the Congress on January 1 and July 1 of each year, giving, as the joint resolution itself provides on page 29, "such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war." If all those data must be submitted to the Congress every 6 months by the Board, in addition to the rules and regulations which the Board itself may promulgate, does not the Senator think that

Congress and the Board together could adequately protect the resources of this country?

MR. LA FOLLETTE. I hope so, Mr. President, but I still raise the question. I think it is one that may well be considered. I have no detailed information regarding it, and I do not want to overemphasize it. I merely mention it as one of the considerations which I think past experience would warrant us in fully exploring.

ARMED EMBARGO A SYMBOL

Mr. President, I am impressed by the fact that many people in official life in Washington justify the repeal of the arms embargo privately on the ground that our national interest requires a policy which will assure victory for Great Britain and France in this European war. This is the only real justification they give for repeal of the arms embargo. They do not argue that repeal makes for better neutrality, or that repeal is demanded by the principles of international law. They argue that we must take sides, to see one group of belligerents win. But once we take sides since war is declared, knowing we are taking sides, repeal can only be interpreted at home and abroad as an official act taken by our Government for the purpose of partial participation in the European war.

The arms embargo, therefore, has, to people who know what is involved, become a symbol. It will be a symbol to the munitions manufacturers, and to many other suppliers of war materials. They will grow from a small group to a great vested interest in an aggressive belligerent foreign policy, in very short order. The repeal of the embargo is a symbol of a definite move toward intervention in the European conflict which is now raging.

My reaction to the thinking of many men in the administration is not a unique one. It is shared by several of the outstanding Washington observers. Mr. Ludwell Denny, writing in the Washington News on October 2, commented:

In general, those who have rallied to him (i. e., to the President) on this issue, including his political enemies, think the Allies are America's first line of defense and that we should help the Allies now with arms so we will not have to help them later with men.

But isolationists, including many New Dealers, and including those who are morally against all war, and those who see in war nothing but ultimate material disaster, economic and social, to winner and loser alike, and those who see no possible threat to this country from a war-weary Germany even if she finally defeated Britain and France, think that the President's road is the road to war, particularly under a President who advocated "quarantine the aggressor." So they fight him now. * * *

Another acute observer, Mr. Raymond Clapper, points out to the public what, I think, we all know well enough ourselves, that the major issue is that of taking sides. In the Washington Daily News of October 4 he wrote:

For reasons of state an official pretense is maintained as to the purpose of the arms-embargo repeal. But it does not seem in the public interest that private citizens should avoid looking the facts straight in the eye.

The real purpose of repealing the arms embargo is to supply finished war materials—particularly airplanes—to the British and French. That is the end which motivates the White House and the State Department and it is the unspoken objective of which every Senator is conscious.

Nothing is to be gained by deceiving American public opinion concerning this point. To say that real neutrality requires repeal of the arms embargo is pretense, for our purpose actually is to give a break to the Allied side. To control that "international law," that neat phrase which can be used to cover anything a nation wishes to do, requires repeal of the embargo is again playing with words. We can properly excuse officials and Senators, all occupying responsible positions, for insisting upon these polite fictions. Governments cannot always be frank. But the people are entitled to know what the real situation is. * * *

In the issue of the Washington Evening Star of Friday, October 6, 1939, under the title "Washington Observations," we find an article entitled "Excellent Opportunity Goes Begging for Great Speech on Real Reasons for Arms Ban Repeal." I do not know whether that would have been written had the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] spoken before it was published. The article as written by Frederic William Wile is as follows:

There have now been half a dozen eloquent Senate speeches on the neutrality bill—by PITTMAN, CONNALLY, and SCHWELLENBACH,

for; and BORAH, VANDENBERG, and NYE, against—but there seems to be a conspiracy of silence, except for occasional innuendoes from the opposition as to what all the shooting is really about. What's the use of mincing words, dodging issues, or pussyfooting at such an hour? Why doesn't some Senator, preferably a supporter of embargo repeal, rise in his place and boldly utter the underlying, unadulterated truth? What is that truth? So far as I know, it has never been so frankly, fearlessly, or fully told in any quarter as it was by my gifted colleague, Arthur Krock, Washington correspondent of the New York Times. Writing on September 6, Krock said that the object of embargo repeal is to help the Allies, that the actual reason why the administration wants the embargo removed is because it deprives, in this instance, Great Britain and France, of 10 percent of the war-making materials which would help them defeat Germany. Krock added that "there has been little official concealment that this is the real reason for the unsuccessful attempt in Congress in July to eliminate the arms ban. It is the actual, rather than the technical, reason which animates the opposition."

There is waiting in the United States Senate, at this hour, an opportunity for a speech that will ring down the ages, perhaps like Edmund Burke's address on the American Colonies in the British Parliament, or, to go modern, like William Jennings Bryan's cross-of-gold epic at Chicago. I mean a speech that will not use language as a vehicle for concealing thought, but which will tell the plain truth about this neutrality business, as Arthur Krock did, strip it of its irrational and irrelevant technicalities, and put it to the American people in terms of burning simplicity. * * *

The widespread apprehension, Mr. President, that the reasons given by many for repeal of the embargo are not the actual reasons is a factor which cannot be eliminated from the circumstances surrounding the action it is proposed our Government should take—reversing its established neutrality policy—at this critical juncture in the affairs of the human race.

There are several reasons, in my opinion, for this apprehension. The administration's domestic policies have not been wholly successful. There were many causes for the partial failure of the administration's domestic program. Some of them were beyond its control. Congress had its share in the depression which began again in 1937. But the end result, for which the voters will generally hold the administration responsible, has not been wholly successful.

There is a great temptation for people weary of the struggle against the domestic economic crisis to find escape in the war crisis in Europe. It is evident on every hand that our complex problems here at home are being relegated to the limbo of forgotten things. The press, the radio, periodicals, and statements from Government officials all reflect the universal absorption in the war abroad. Unemployment, farm prices, mortgage foreclosures, idle capital, idle plant capacity are no longer topics of chief concern to those who are charged with the responsibility of steering this great democracy through the economic crisis produced by our participation in the last World War. There are ominous suggestions that a war boom would help to solve our problems. Even the President's message on the neutrality issue was not free from this taint. In this direction—and I measure my words—lies disaster for America. In large measure the problems we face today and those that we have been struggling with since 1920 are traceable to our last mad adventure in Europe and the distortion of our entire economic life produced by the World War.

I, for one, Mr. President, repudiate the idea that we cannot solve our problems here at home without resort to the stimulus to business brought about by the wholesale slaughter of human beings in Europe.

ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY SINCE 1937

Another circumstance which cannot be sheared away from the atmosphere and debate concerning this proposal to repeal the embargo is the fairly clear course of the administration's foreign policy from the President's famous Chicago speech in the fall of 1937 to the present day.

I wish to point out that the neutrality bills introduced from 1935 to date, with administration approval and sponsorship, have been full of discretionary loopholes. They left the President a large opportunity to throw the weight of this, the most powerful nation on earth, behind favored belligerents. The Executive, not the Congress, was to be the ultimate arbiter of war. Yet, paradoxically, when the people asked for some opportunity to vote before the Nation went to war

overseas, it was the President who upheld the right of Congress as against the people. Secretary Hull reminded us that we were a representative form of government. So the people were excluded from any share in deciding whether their sons should die in Europe or in Asia.

It is hard to reconcile the loosely discretionary legislation sponsored by the administration from 1935 on, which would take power from Congress and give it to the President, and the administration's opposition to the war referendum on the ground that Congress and not the people should alone have power to declare an overseas war.

The reconciliation, however, becomes easier when we look over the Executive foreign policy from 1936 to date and see that the administration has ardently sought power to select the aggressor and to favor one belligerent as against another. This record must have its bearing on the full implications of repeal of the arms embargo. No doubt many who favor it because they favor our participation to aid one group of belligerents honestly believe this will be enough to assure them victory. Therefore they can truthfully say they think it will keep our country out of actual war. But what if arms, ammunition, and implements of war are not enough to achieve that end? Then, as certain as can be, these same people will be urging further measures to secure a victory for one group of belligerents. The logic of that chain of reasoning and events is inescapable.

It was only a short year after the Democratic platform of 1936 was endorsed by the voters, by the largest majority ever given to a platform in the history of this Republic, that the President went to Chicago and made his famous quarantine speech. The 1936 platform—if it is not out of keeping to mention the document—

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator refers to the platform of the Democratic Party, I take it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am referring to the Democratic platform—the last platform upon which the Democratic Party received any mandate from the voters of the United States. The 1936 platform promised that "we shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the disputes of others." The people were for that by the millions. Incidentally the platform committee of the Democratic Party seemed to believe then that it was actually possible for a nation to be drawn, by political commitments, international banking, or private trading, into any war which may develop anywhere. The people were against that. If these were not actual possibilities, but were ghosts, phantoms of the imagination, the platform was unworthy of the distinguished Members of Congress who sponsored it. If these were actual possibilities, how can the distinguished Members of Congress of the Democratic Party who sponsored the language in the 1936 Democratic platform try to laugh them out of existence on the floor today?

Mr. President, I desire briefly to summarize the events of this foreign policy, and the change in it between the Chautauqua speech of 1936, the "quarantine" speech in Chicago in 1937, and the present time.

In August 1937 war broke out in Asia. The administration did not obey what I think was the clear intent of the neutrality law, and embargo arms, although State Department officials had promised congressional committees that the President would not use the new discretionary language of the new act to avoid imposing embargoes. In October 1937 the President delivered his Chicago "quarantine" speech, which was featured by our interventionist press, as well as by the British and French press, as a move in support of England and France. In November 1937, this Government sent Norman Davis to Brussels to discuss joint action with England and France concerning Japan. In that month we began a policy of lining up with them publicly by parallel notes and protests to Japan, issued simultaneously. In China our gun-boats were ordered to escort tankers carrying war materials—oil—right through the battle zones. The *Panay* was bombed

in the process of escorting Standard Oil tankers into these battle zones. An attempt was made to rouse the Nation to a warlike fever over this incident.

On January 6, 1938, the administration successfully ended a week of frantic pressure on the Members of the House of Representatives to secure their disapproval of the war referendum, generally admitted to be a brake on our participation in foreign wars. In February 1938, with great world-wide fanfare, we sent three of our cruisers to Singapore, a gesture understood throughout the Orient and the world as connoting further parallel action with England. Then in January 1938 a supernavy bill was introduced after the Navy officials had testified in the preceding month that without it they were able to defend this Nation. In February 1938 we continued our parallel action with England and France in further notes to Japan. We sent the head of our Navy War Plans Division to London under an alias to discuss joint naval action with the British. As a result of this revelation, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] in February 1938 asked the State Department if we had an alliance with Great Britain. He was informed that we did not have. Secretary Hull argued in February 1938 in defense of parallel action. In February 1938 a second administration bill to put the Nation under dictatorship in time of war was introduced in the House of Representatives by Chairman MAY, of the Military Affairs Committee. In March of that year Secretary Hull again defended parallel action. He argued that his conception of international law justified his claim of a right to protect American citizens, even in war zones. In June 1938 he was denouncing isolation. In June 1938 he also tried to undo the harm done by the noninvocation of the Neutrality Act in Asia by persuading American airplane manufacturers not to sell to Japan. In August 1938 Secretary Roper deplored that some people would lose money by our being neutral.

In September 1938 we obligingly gave British and French diplomacy moral support in breaking their covenants with Czechoslovakia by special appeals to Hitler and Mussolini. In November 1938, there were more parallel notes about our trading rights on the Yangtze River. In November 1938 our Ambassador to Germany was recalled, and simultaneously a new defense program was announced. In his message of January 1939, the President advocated action against aggressors, expressing his belief that such action, although partisan, could stop short of war. The chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], joined this partisanship by announcing to the press that the American people hated the rulers of certain nations, which he named. The January 1939 crash of one of our latest airplane models with a secret French representative in it brought a conference of the Senate Military Affairs Committee with the President, and the account, widely disseminated, concerning our borders being abroad. In February 1939 the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proposed the idea that only an equal balancing of military power could prevent war from coming to our shores. In May 1939, we had more joint naval action with France and England in regard to Amoy, and Secretary Hull began to advocate repeal of the arms embargo. On June 30, 1939, the House, by a vote of 214 to 173, rejected the administration's request for repeal of the arms embargo.

At Chicago the President in effect called for collective action by all the democracies against Germany, Italy, and Japan; a speech hailed by every interventionist in the United States.

Commenting on the administration's foreign policy, Dr. Charles A. Beard, the dean of American historians, writes (Harpers, September 1939):

Now President Roosevelt's foreign policy is clear as daylight. He proposes to collaborate actively with Great Britain and France in their everlasting wrangle with Germany, Italy, and Japan. He wants to wring from Congress the power to throw the whole weight of the United States on the side of Great Britain and France in negotiations, and in war if they manage to bungle the game. That using means short of war would, it is highly probable, lead the United States into full war must be evident to all who take thought about such tactics.

He adds:

From the point of view of the interest of the United States as a continental nation in this hemisphere, the Roosevelt policy is, in my opinion, quixotic and dangerous.

I do not see how anyone can vote to repeal the arms embargo without considering the whole tenor and significance of the Executive's foreign policy during the last 2 years.

LOOPOLES IN COMMITTEE'S JOINT RESOLUTION

I have stated that the second major question before us was whether the wide-open loopholes in the present bill, taken together with the circumstances I have cited before, including the Executive's foreign policy, did not demonstrate that the repeal of the arms embargo was a step toward our involvement in the European war.

There is no restriction, for example, in the bill on the growth of a war boom. Such restrictions were included in the administration and the opposition bills of 1936, only now to be forgotten. I call your attention to an editorial on the subject in the Scripps-Howard papers of October 2. It reads:

WE'LL NEED A PARACHUTE

One thing we know is that wars always end. Another thing is that governments long engaged in war run out of money.

These things are important to remember—whether we lift the embargo and also sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or whether we keep the embargo and confine our exports to the nonlethal classifications, such as food and clothing and raw materials, and whether we operate on a basis of cash and carry or credit and carry. For, in any event, we shall be inviting a business boom based on a volume of exports which cannot be maintained—a boom which will collapse the minute peace comes or our customers exhaust their ability to buy.

Our economic system has been subjected in the last quarter century to about as many artificial booms and tragic busts as one generation of Americans should be willing to endure. A limitation of wartime exports to peacetime averages would in a measure protect our people from the economic shocks of a war that is not ours.

As embodied in an administration neutrality measure proposed to Congress in January 1936, the Hull normal-quota plan would have exempted food, clothing, and medical supplies. Perhaps for humane reasons some exceptions should be made—surely medical supplies should be exempted. But since the result desired is to prevent somebody else's war from taking our economy on another perilous loop-the-loop, the fewer the exceptions the better.

Anyway, to fail to give consideration to some such plan would be like starting out on an airplane ride without giving thought to taking along a parachute when we know we are going to need it.

If one wants an example of the way our financial interests, the interests of all who have saved a little money, are being tied up to Europe, one has only to look each day at the financial columns of the newspapers. Everyone who has put his money into bonds has suffered the drop in the bond market, if he has to convert his bonds into cash. As for the stock market, the idea of peace is now as much of a scare as the idea of more legislation was a year ago. I read the first sentence of Financial Markets in the New York Times for October 4, 1939, and the headline over it.

FINANCIAL MARKETS—NEW PEACE SCARE FURTHER WEAKENS PRICES, BUT SOME STOCKS RESIST—TREASURY HIGHER

The outlook for a continuation of the European war received its greatest setback yesterday through the medium of Prime Minister Chamberlain's address to the House of Commons, and as a result the stock market lost further ground. Although the volume of business increased slightly, prices were not shaded so much as on Monday, but the pattern of the trading on the stock exchange remained about the same. Early declines among the "war brides" there ranged up to three points, but they were reduced at the close to approximately two points.

I give notice that at the proper moment I intend, in order to protect the American economy from a war-boom distortion and perhaps a fateful collapse, to propose an amendment to the present bill to quota our trade so that we ourselves will not be drained of valuable and necessary products in return for a sterile metal which we cannot use and do not need. I want to prevent us from having segments of American industry standing on the steps of post-war Congresses with blue babies of overcapacity in their arms asking us to take wealth we will no longer have, to pump into their veins. The last war resulted in tariff subsidies to our overcapacitated industries, which through the years have run into billions. A score of major industries secured subsidies from us through tax remissions, through outright grants—as in agriculture—

or indirectly through relief grants to take care of the people they no longer could employ themselves.

It has taken us a score of years and billions of dollars, and yet our present productive capacity is in a condition of unbalance as the result of the last war.

Now, it is suggested in some quarters, some of them the highest, that we inflate that capacity now and undertake another war boom. But the only thing that can use up the excess capacity created by a war boom is still another war boom. This is madness from a business point of view. From the point of view of democracy and of loading impossible burdens on the democratic state, it may prove to be a form of suicide by degrees.

The joint resolution leaves it to the discretion of the President to pick and choose combat zones from which our own ships will be barred. By the same token, the places not designated as war zones are places where our ships will go, regardless of the unsettled condition of the rights of neutrals to trade with other neutrals, or with belligerents. Presumably we will there contend vigorously for our right to such trade.

The joint resolution does not treat armed belligerent merchantmen as the naval vessels of belligerents. It thereby opens the way for our again becoming involved in an armed merchantmen-submarine controversy as we did in the last war. That was so destructive of our peace and security then. It will be again. We came out of the last war with our officials admitting that we should have treated such armed merchantmen as naval vessels. Yet now, by leaving the discretionary provisions of section 11 in the joint resolution, we are beginning the same mistake afresh. This is a loophole large enough to let a war through all by itself.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator, Does he mean to say that the joint resolution does not contain a prohibition against arming our vessels engaging in foreign trade?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I am talking about the arming of merchantmen of other nations.

Mr. PITTMAN. Is that not provided for in the same law?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think that is any answer. The Senator continues, saying "Is not that what you did in 1937?" or "Is that not what you did in 1936?" He has found some embarrassment in trying to explain what he did in 1937 and 1935. Anyone could embarrass me by asking me how I voted on many measures since this administration came into power. [Laughter.] I have voted for propositions which I knew were inadequate to meet the situation, which I knew were doomed to failure, because I was placed in such a position that I had to choose between those propositions, imperfect though I believed them to be, and the "do nothing" policy of the reactionary Republicans.

Now, Mr. President, so far as the neutrality legislation is concerned, unfortunately, I have never been in a position where I represented a majority of the Senate and could write my own ticket; but one will examine my record in vain to find a single instance where I have not consistently, on every occasion and every vote, sought to make the neutrality legislation mandatory, and sought to build upon the solid rock of the tragic experience through which we passed from 1914 to 1918.

The Senator from Nevada has quite rightfully pointed out here on numerous occasions that he was a Member of this august body and that he went through that experience. Mr. President, I went through it too, only vicariously.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not at the moment.

Mr. President, I stood over there right opposite the chair in which Mr. Howard Foster sits now when my father rose in his place in the Senate in an effort to secure recognition in the closing hours of the filibuster against the armed-ship bill. I felt—I saw—the tenseness of that occasion. I knew the rumors which had been going through the cloakroom all night long. I knew that certain Senators on this floor were armed. I saw the rush that started toward my father when he rose in his place in this Chamber. I know, Mr. President, how tense men's emotions can become when issues that arouse the

deepest passions of mankind are stirred. Therefore, I shudder when I see the casual manner in which this subject has for the most part been debated.

I have the greatest respect for men in this Chamber or elsewhere who disagree with the position which my conviction leads me to take; but I say that now, during the course of the debate upon this measure, is the time to discuss the fundamental, the momentous decisions that are in the balance, not later on, when incidents and propaganda have aroused passions beyond the point of calm and deliberate consideration and decision.

Mr. President, returning to the question of the loopholes in the measure, I see no reason to agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada that merely because we might have made a mistake, or the majority of the Congress made a mistake, in 1937, Congress should repeal the law when it is called back in extraordinary session to consider neutrality legislation.

Mr. President, the departure of the *Aquitania* the other day, with her guns still mounted, is evidence that we may be well on the way to a repetition of the sharp controversy which contributed much to our being dragged into the last war.

The joint resolution allows our ships to be sent into the midst of one of the most raging controversies of the time, to neutral ports with contraband cargoes which can be transshipped to belligerents. The section of the bill which lapsed May 1, 1939, provided that such contraband could not be reshipped to belligerents. This measure leaves that out. Even the joint resolution of the Senator from Nevada [MR. PITTMAN] of July 5, 1939, provided against such shipment to belligerents "directly or indirectly." The pending measure leaves this wide open.

Under international law as it stood in 1909 we could not claim the right to ship to neutrals contraband which might be transshipped to a belligerent. We cannot claim it now, for after the war no nation, so far as I am aware, recognized that right. Yet in this measure, by obvious omission, we are conspicuously permitting our ships, carrying contraband for transshipment to belligerents, to go into areas where neither belligerent recognizes our rights to carry such contraband which may in turn be shipped beyond the neutral port.

Suppose we sent an American ship with copper to Spain, a neutral. Under the present status of law a German submarine would have the right to examine the ship's papers; and if it found that the cargo was intended for France, a belligerent, to sink the ship, after allowing the crew to take to the lifeboats and assuring their safety.

During the World War the English constantly captured the vessels of neutrals headed for neutral ports, with contraband goods they thought might be transshipped to Germany. Any number of such incidents could take place because of the omissions in the committee's bill.

Another loophole is the credit provision, which is intensified by the operations of the stabilization fund. There is no cash and carry when the cash is not cash but a 90-day credit. It would involve an enormous amount of real noninterventionist policing to prevent 90-day credit from becoming a renewable credit, a loan, the very thing it is claimed the bill prevents.

This weakness is seen by Senators on the other side of the embargo question. We are not the only ones who see it.

Mr. President, General Johnson in a newspaper article argues against this 90-day-credit provision as useless and dangerous. I ask unanimous consent to have General Johnson's article printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

This provision for a 90-day-credit clause, jimmied into the Pittman Act at the last minute, is a puzzle. If the argument for it is, as it seems to be, that it does not make much difference, anyway, then why put it in? The cash-and-carry plan at the outset was: "You pay cash on the barrel head. The goods are yours. You can take them across the seas in your own way but not on American ships."

As this column has repeatedly insisted, it was not a "neutrality" plan at all. It was, first, a surrender of American rights on the high

seas and in world trade in the hope that, if we don't have to defend them we won't run so much risk of getting into war. Second: It was a plan to prevent our taking any financial stake in any war by granting credits to either side.

But this 90-day-credit clause torpedoed the spirit if not the letter of the whole idea. In the first place, if we ship goods on credit—even for 90 days—what becomes of another clause in the law that all "right, title, and interest" must be out of any American citizen before such goods can go to sea? Doesn't a seller have an interest in goods sold on credit and still in transit? It may not be a right, title, or technical lien, but it certainly is some interest and that 90 days will cover the only period of real danger, the sea voyage. Another clause in the proposed bill exempts insurance on such goods from being considered a "right, title, or interest." There is a proposal that the United States itself undertake marine insurance.

If goods are sold on even short-term credit and the creditor insures property, especially if he insured it with the Government, we could have a case here where the Government itself has an interest in goods exposed to sinking at sea. What does this "90 day credit" business mean, anyway? I think it unlikely, but it might mean very large contracts negotiated now, goods to be shipped as ordered, but no payments to be made on, say, a couple of billion dollars' worth of goods until 90 days after each particular shipment; that is, during the entire time they are at sea. The purpose of the spot-cash plan was solely to prevent the building up of any large American interest of the financial stake of either side in the war. The kind of contract just suggested is also unlikely, but it shows just one among many kinds of things that might be done through the 90-day clause to frustrate the intent of the no-credit provision of the bill.

One argument for lifting the arms embargo and for this credit clause is that our sales of munitions abroad will build up a big arms industry here which we ourselves may later need. Isn't that buying a tremendous stake in the war? We should build up a sufficient arms industry for our needs and do it fast. But if we get our prosperity and a large slice of our industry geared to the needs of a big European war plus our own needs, we shall have prepared the ground for an even greater American industrial collapse when the sale of arms stops, and we shall have made our prosperity more and more dependent on the continuance of war.

Of great importance along that line is the fact that the French and British have only between two and three billions that they can convert to pay here in cash—for munitions and everything else. If we build up an industry and a business rate based on their early rates of cash spending, what are we going to do when they reach the bottom of the till?—collapse our business or grant unlimited credit? That's exactly the situation that pulled us in in 1917. (Washington Daily News, October 2, 1939.)

MR. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I call attention particularly to the last paragraph, where he argues against a war boom as well as against the credit provision.

Each one of these little holes in the dike of our neutral security may look small at the moment. But we must remember we will have an enormous pressure of war orders and war business against the dike, opening the holes wider and wider.

This measure must be built on the rock of past experience, without holes or crevasses. It must be strong enough not only to withstand the most able propaganda in the world, but all the concentrated interest in making money that this Nation can put together. We cannot build this law by guess and by gosh and with a prayer it will not break down, no matter how full of holes it may be. We have to build it as foolproof as humanly possible.

THE PEOPLE PAY THE COSTS OF WAR

A repeal vote on the embargo will be taken by the interventionists in this country as a vote of confidence in their effort to get us into the war, and it will be so interpreted in England and France as well as by the speculative element in the stock market.

So we come to the major question of whether we can really gain anything out of that war or whether we simply lose our shirt, our faith in men, our ideals, and our liberty.

I am unalterably opposed to our entering this war.

It is not Members of Congress, not speculators in "war baby" stocks who will pay for this war in the first instance. It is the plain, ordinary people of the Nation who will pay in both blood and treasure. They paid last time. The world has not changed. They will pay again.

Through 1938 the cash costs of the World War to the Federal Government was \$47,247,000,000, not including the allied war debt, which we now know will never be paid to us. This amounts with interest to date to \$12,211,838,406, making a grand total of \$59,458,838,406, which the war has cost us to date, and we are not through paying for it yet.

Yet those enormous figures do not tell half the story. We must add to them most of our bills since 1929. The after-effects of the World War, in loss of markets abroad, in the dislocation and wartime overexpansion of some of our major industries, cotton textiles, lumber, coal, agriculture, finally took their toll on the Nation's economic life. Their deflation, after causing suffering to their own workers throughout the 1920's, and bankruptcy to the men engaged in managing them, caused the collapse of the Nation's purchasing power. They, and other industries, were, after the war, the little holes in the dikes of our prosperity, which grew and grew until they were large enough to drain out our economic life, exactly, as I fear, the loopholes in the committee's measure and the repeal of the arms embargo, if it is consummated, will ultimately grow large enough to drain off our human life.

WAR KILLS DEMOCRACY AT HOME

We know that elections have been suspended both in England and France, the two supposedly democratic strongholds of Europe. There is government in those countries today by decree. Before long it may be by military decree.

War kills democracy. Men cannot speak, think, talk, or write freely. They no longer can participate freely as free citizens of a free state. They are subjects. They are objects to be handled by the war machine. There may be no free radio discussion. Newspapers which speak a kind word for peace, if they speak it vigorously, may find that they cannot get the necessary priorities in newsprint and ink; or perhaps their reporters, editors, and compositors will all suddenly be needed in active war service.

The last war did democracy in this country no good at all. It did human kindness, neighborliness, and tolerance no good. Yet the atmosphere of those war and post-war days was a different world atmosphere from what we shall have next time, I fear. Next time our effort will have to be much harder, for the war may be much longer. I believe it requires no stretch of the imagination, Mr. President, to say that if we became involved in this war we could well fear the day when Federal elections might be suspended in the United States, as elections have been suspended in France and England, "for the duration of the war."

THE MOBILIZATION BILLS

If we enter the war our own democracy will be the first casualty. Then we shall inevitably have a dictatorship such as we have never seen before. In the very nature of modern war's psychology labor will be virtually conscripted, and collective bargaining made a mockery or abrogated altogether. Workers in the next war may be confronted with a choice of starving or working where, when, and under what conditions they are ordered to work. The power which a state exercises during modern war for cutting off food and shelter from those who choose to change occupations has already been described to a congressional committee, the Committee on War Policies—see Mr. Bernard M. Baruch's testimony, hearings, page 44, cited in Munitions Report 944, part 4, pages 48-49. In Mr. Baruch's words, the lack of freedom of the worker during the war is described as follows:

The Government can say that if a man be called and found unfit for military service but fit for other work in the essential lists [of industries] he must so employ himself or be cut off from rations, transportation, fuel, and supplies.

Is there any difference between such a man and a convict in a chain gang, or a slave, or the loyal subject of a Fascist state in wartime?

Farmers would have their prices fixed. Business would be put in a strait jacket. The pressure against war profiteers would be strong. Even before the war in Europe 50 Senators put their names to a bill limiting all individual incomes to \$20,000 and all corporation profits to 5 percent. If we were to become involved in war I doubt if a single businessman in America would have more freedom than a businessman in Germany today. He would be regulated and regimented by a military bureaucracy.

In this connection I wish to call attention to one sentence from a dispatch from Amsterdam as to what neutral businessmen expect to have happen to them. These are not the

businessmen of the belligerent nations. These are neutrals. The article, from the New York Times of October 2, 1939, is as follows:

EUROPEANS SEE CONFISCATION OF PROFITS OWING TO GOVERNMENT DEMANDS ABOVE 1914

AMSTERDAM, October 1.—Neutral European markets, after an initial restricted buoyancy in shares and weakness in bonds, gradually have become aware of the fact that the war influence now is not comparable to that in 1914, because the present huge government requirements on top of already enormous indebtedness will compel the governments to confiscate most extra profits.

Moreover, although the possibility of a long war theoretically would force up armament and other shares, there is an increasing conviction that the destruction of capital goods would reach unprecedented dimensions, while British taxation measures foreshadow a terrific impoverishment leading to a heavy fall in private consumption for a long series of years.

We know what powers the President had in the last war. They are mild compared to the powers which may be given to a President in the course of a war in the future.

In the last war he had powers to commandeer factories, procure ships and war materials, assume control of the transportation system, requisition and fix the price of supplies for the Army, prescribe regulations concerning marketing, control the price of wheat and coal, reorganize the governmental machinery, and many others. Under the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917, and the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, the President was given wide powers regarding censorship of communications. Many of these powers are still on the statute books. For example, the President's declaration of September 8, 1939, of a national emergency, was done under that old Espionage Act of 1917—passed 22 years ago, during the war.

Charles Beard, discussing the growth of Presidential war powers, writes:

Even more extensive, if possible, was the high prerogative exercised by President Wilson in prosecuting the war against the Central Empires. By act after act Congress conferred upon him almost unlimited authority over the economic resources and manpower of the Nation. It prescribed general principles and left their interpretation and application to him. Even the bureaus, offices, and other civil agencies already in existence could be changed or abolished as he saw fit; subject to his discretion and leadership drastic control over the expression of opinion—the most drastic in our history—was established by the Sedition Act of 1918.

Acting on a special message sent to Congress in January 1938 the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives reported favorably a mobilization bill which had long been under discussion. In effect the bill was designed to confer upon the President in time of war or other national emergency what would amount to dictatorial powers over industry, agriculture, services, and property. * * * The circumstances of the affair indicated * * * that in case of war or other national emergency, Congress would probably confer upon the President practically unconditional power over all citizens and their property and the right to use them at his will and pleasure as long as the emergency lasted. Judging by the precedents set during the World War, the Supreme Court would not interfere on behalf of personal liberties. (Beard, Charles, American Government and Politics, 8th ed., pp. 160-161.)

Also, since the last war the President has been given a number of tremendously far-reaching powers. Under the Federal Communications Act he has the power, in war or national emergency, to close any radio station or take it over for the use of the Government. Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the Maritime Commission may requisition merchant vessels during any national emergency declared by the President. Under the section of the 1917 Trading With the Enemy Act, which was amended and incorporated in the Emergency Banking Act of March 9, 1933, the President has very wide powers over the Nation's fiscal and credit transactions "during time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President." The proposed Hill-Sheppard bill, which has not yet been enacted because of the widespread opposition to it from all over the country, would give the President virtually dictatorial powers over the Nation's industrial life in time of war.

DICTATORSHIP MAY BECOME PERMANENT

I think it is a deadly serious matter to start taking sides in the European war, because once we have acted as a Government to take sides the pressure to involve us in actual war will be terrific.

One of the reasons why I take the matter so seriously is that all the logic of war and the psychology of a people who have suffered from war lead to the conclusion that a wartime dictatorship in the United States will not evaporate into thin air after the war is over. There is grave danger that if we become involved in this war, after it is over our system of government may be drastically altered. There is every reason to fear that we may have dictatorship in America.

I see no victory coming to any one out of the European war. Democracy will not have been saved. Democracy means freedom, it means liberty under the law, for free men to speak, for citizens to differ and yet live together peacefully in spite of their differences. Every nation involved in the European war will have had dictatorship during that war. Each state will have become a superstate. Each half-ounce of refuse will have been converted to war use. The feeble arms of the aged, like the tender hands of the children, will have been pressed into some war use. No adult man or woman will be able to do anything, go anywhere, let alone say anything without the authorization of the state, without papers and stamps and passes and permits.

It seems most unlikely that states like these, totalitarian all of them, will suddenly change back to free economies, with free political systems. A free economy will not and cannot take any nation through chaos. If this war begins in earnest, England, France, Germany, will be in chaos after it is over, with their manpower decimated, their capital, their producing units in ruins, their remaining children sick from hunger. No government could suddenly say it would take no responsibility for its people in such a situation. The government which said that and looked complacently upon the subsequent disorganization would have a revolution on its hands so fast that it could not flee the country.

Nor do I foresee any rapid return to civil liberties, to the free participation of free citizens in public debate, discussion, and decision. No government will be able to tolerate the growth of free activities and revolutionary groups in its midst. And the men who have finished with a few years of war, who themselves have suffered from all the modern gases and weapons, and then seen their own loved ones, far behind the lines, bombed to death, are not likely, I venture to say, suddenly to revert to being pacific citizens. Show me an American veteran, Mr. President, who was overseas in 1917 and 1918 and who saw combat service at the front, and I will show you a man who cannot and who will not discuss what he went through. They are more likely to be radicalized as no body of men in this world were ever radicalized before. The Russians who were called upon to fight in the last war, almost with their bare hands and without guns, against the machine guns and modern equipment of their enemy, the Germans, and who saw their families starve and die behind the lines, will seem like conservatives by comparison.

Mr. President, I think it important that we search out the possible developments in Europe, because it seems clear to me that if we participate in this war we will not have established democracy; we will simply have exchanged one totalitarian government for another in the defeated countries, and have been unable to prevent the establishment or continuance of totalitarian governments in what were once democracies.

In addition we will find that revolutions in Europe do not mean a stable Europe. We will not only have failed to save democracy but law and order may well have been permanently suspended.

In such a situation plausible arguments would be made to continue our wartime dictatorship. Those political parties and persons responsible for our getting into the war, if we should get into it, would then hesitate to restore full democratic rights to the people, lest in wrath, disillusionment, and suffering the people would punish those they blamed for their misery and their dead.

WHAT IS OUR REAL NATIONAL INTEREST?

The repeal of the arms embargo, if it should be consummated, would be the first official choosing of sides that would have congressional assent. I see nothing in the contention

that we can keep out of the war by going into it a little. That is probably the craziest of all illusions which can beset us. But where does our national interest in this war really lie? In going in? Or in staying completely out?

Is it credulous to accept the propaganda that we are, or can be, menaced by invasions from abroad?

In this connection I wish to quote briefly from the economist John T. Flynn in his column in the Washington Daily News of October 4, 1939:

PLAIN ECONOMICS

There is a general feeling that somewhere brooding over this Nation lurks that terrible monster propaganda—propaganda which will get us into the war.

To be prepared against this propaganda is our only hope of escape. Everybody, therefore, is all set for the flood which will descend upon us from England and France.

But what will be the nature of this propaganda? What do the European powers have to produce in our minds in order to make us willing to go to war?

At once it is apparent to the propagandist setting out to trap us that he must (1) create in us the fear that if Germany—and now Russia—is victorious, they will come over here and attack us; (2) create in our minds a horror of German ruthlessness that will deepen and emotionalize our sympathies for the Allies; and (3) play upon our pride in the event that our interests become affected.

1. The first of these is already at work. But it is not proceeding from Europe. Every man who is frank with himself must admit that no foreigner could have done so good a job on this as our own Government has done. For 3 years—and particularly in the last year—the Government has lost no opportunity to persuade us that we are in grave danger—that Germany and her allies might turn their hungry eyes to our vast resources and those of South America.

How Germany and her allies could send an army to this hemisphere—from 3,000 to 5,000 miles from their bases—to conquer this country or South America, they never say. Every military authority knows and will admit that this is utterly impossible. Yet the Government keeps on terrifying us with this bogey. This is the propaganda we have most to fear.

The idea that a war-exhausted Europe could muster strength to attack this continent or this hemisphere, and to bring across the hundreds of transports and supply ships to do it, is simply preposterous. This war may possibly teach us that we need not throw two or five billion dollars more to our avid shipbuilding companies for vessels which may be useful only to tow up the river to New Orleans.

This war may even teach us that the British fleet is no longer able to protect the commerce coming to the British Isles, that airplanes alone can destroy both commerce and the historic blockading functions of a fleet. Recent events have, for the first time, challenged the assumption that because we think the British fleet might be valuable to us on some occasion we must therefore fight for the British Empire every time it gets into difficulty. It is a very open question whether it is to our best national interest to fight whenever the Empire is in trouble; for it may be in trouble, in serious trouble, from now on steadily. Most certainly it will be in trouble in case events should prove the inefficiency of the fleet to protect the commerce within its dominions and colonies.

Those who advocate the repeal of the arms embargo on the ground that our national interest requires a victory for Great Britain and France predicate their arguments on what seems to me a whole series of false ideas, including that of an armed attack on our shores, the immutable importance of the British Fleet in connection with such an attack, and the pleasant hope that a little patched-up liberal and democratic procedure will solve all Europe's ills. I think we should proceed to question, during the next days, each and every one of those interventionist assumptions, for they end up with a conclusion that our national interest is involved in this war in Europe and that we must get into it, the sooner the better.

First, can we assume that at the end of this war England and France will be dominating southeastern Europe? They have had 20 years to unite and accomplish this purpose but they have not done so. Was it because Czech, Polish, Hungarian, and Rumanian agricultural products were in competition with Canadian products? Was it because their foodstuffs were in competition with Australia's? Is there any reason to suppose that after all the slaughter southeastern Europe will be in any different situation than before?

But if England and France are not to dominate southeastern Europe at the end of the war, if that is not one of their objectives, is it to our national interest, let alone theirs, to fight for the war aims of independent eastern European nations? It was not our decision suddenly, 3 months ago, to guarantee the frontiers of Poland. It was theirs, suddenly arrived at. Does our national interest lie in seconding and duplicating this guaranty?

Another question: Is it in our national interest to insist upon the complete destruction of the present political system in Germany? England and France have, for the moment at least, so far as we know, pledged themselves to that war aim. Do they go on from there, I ask, and pledge a complete destruction of the Russian system, and later perhaps of the Italian system, and of the Japanese system—all of them more or less completely totalitarian? Do we find it in our national interest blindly to follow them, to go about the world forcing their system upon every nation?

And suppose England and France change their ideas, as they might well do, and decide that what they want is to strengthen Germany at the expense of Russia: Is it to our national interest to decide that, in spite of their change of mind, we will still fight "to the finish of the form of government and the party organization in Germany"—in Mr. Churchill's words?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator undoubtedly has noticed the fact, which appears in the public press of today, that while the Prime Minister of Great Britain was in the very act of making a speech to the House of Commons stating that it would be a national stultification and a dishonor to Great Britain to make peace with Germany because of Germany's attack on Poland, Great Britain was making a trade pact with Russia, which also almost simultaneously had made an attack on Poland. The two items appear in the very same editions of the press.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I very much appreciate the Senator's interruption. He has anticipated me. I was just about to mention that fact.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sorry I anticipated the Senator's statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is all right. I am glad to have the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield to the Senator from Florida in just a moment.

Mr. President, I desire to read a clipping from the Washington Post of this morning:

LONDON, October 11.—The British Government began today to repair its relations with Soviet Russia, strained by the Russo-German dismemberment of Poland, by reaching an agreement for the exchange of Russian timber for British rubber and tin.

Although no details of the agreement were disclosed, neutral observers expressed the opinion that this evidence of a rapprochement between London and Moscow constituted a "diplomatic setback for Hitler, following the strategic defeat involved in Russia's swift domination of smaller Baltic states."

Mr. President, I am not criticizing in any way, directly or indirectly, anything which may have been done by Great Britain; but since the interventionist theory and philosophy proceeds upon the premise that our national interest is involved, it seems to me that we should give serious consideration to the fluxing situation in Europe, and to the strange occurrences from day to day. If we start playing the game of power politics 3,000 miles away, by remote control, when the rules of the game and the partners are being changed every few days, it seems to me we are in a fair way to lose all the things which we hold dear.

I am raising these questions because I think they are pertinent to the issue. I hope they will be thoroughly debated and discussed as time goes on, so that we may have a fundamental decision upon a fundamentally important issue.

I now yield with pleasure to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator if he construed the action of Great Britain in buying supplies from Russia as necessarily amounting to an approval of what Russia did in Poland.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I do not put any construction on it. I will let the Senator from Florida, and every other Senator, put their own construction on it. I do say, however, that under the situation prevailing—as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggested, and as I intended to suggest—in one breath the Chamberlain government says that it cannot consider any peace offer because of what Germany did to Poland; and on the same day, or the night before, it signs a trade pact and brings about a rapprochement with the Russian government, which gobbled up as large a slice of Poland as Germany ever did, or a larger slice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield; certainly. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator whether the territory which the Russians occupied in Poland is territory which was awarded to Poland by the Versailles Treaty, or whether it is territory which the Poles captured from the Russians after the Versailles Treaty?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, from my standpoint, I do not think that makes one featherweight's difference so far as the aggression is concerned, so far as seizing the territory which once belonged to Poland is concerned. If the Senator can find a defense on that basis, he may take it to the jury; but, so far as I am concerned, it seems to me there is not any real distinction.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator perhaps will allow me to make this statement: Although I have no disposition to be an apologist for Great Britain—I think "perfidious Albion" has established herself in the annals of history in many instances—I can understand that Great Britain might be a party, as she was, to the Versailles Treaty and to the guaranty of the territorial integrity of a Poland established by the Versailles Treaty when she might not have obligations to help Poland retain territory that Poland by her own aggression took from some other country after the Versailles Treaty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not criticizing anybody. I am raising these questions because I think they are involved in the ultimate decision of the matter before us. All I say to the Senator from Florida is that I hope the razor does not slip when he splits that hair. [Laughter.]

Another question is: Is it so necessary for us to have the British Empire preserved that we should, and must, be willing to defend it whenever and on whatever terms it chooses to fight? Underlying that is the corollary question of whether the destruction of the British Empire is involved in this war, or whether what is involved is simply the British intent to destroy the German form of government, and to establish in its place some government which will leave British trade and British interests in southeastern Europe untroubled?

I think we might well say that it is far preferable to us to have the British Empire left untouched, but that it is not so necessary for us as to make us fight every few years for that end. We are belittling our own strength when we accept the assumption that we are suddenly rendered helpless without the British Empire, the British Fleet, or the French Army. I have too great confidence in the power and the destiny of this Nation to believe that its fate is dependent upon the fate of the British Empire, the British Fleet, or the French Army. The contrary is so true that if and when the Empire ever starts disintegrating, we are likely to find ourselves urged to extend, and incidentally to weaken, our lines of influence and defense by an agitation to take Australia and New Zealand under our protection.

I seriously question the interventionists' major assumption in this war, that because we are dependent on her navy we must be irrevocably committed to the vagaries of British foreign policy, under all the changing circumstances of the present world. It is preferable for us to have as neighbors

satisfied nations, but it is not so necessary as to make us fight a costly overseas war every 20 years for that purpose.

THE POST-WAR RECORD OF BRITAIN AND FRANCE

I am as much opposed to dictatorship of every kind and description, foreign or domestic, as is any living man, and my record will show that I have done my share to preserve civil liberties and maintain democracy. Therefore I challenge a major assumption of the interventionists that these nations—England and France, subject to the pressures of their own problems, their own alliances, their own provincial governing classes—are trustworthy partners for us either in our own national defense or in any grandiose schemes which may later develop for reforming the world.

I do not remember any historic occasion on which the British Cabinet sat down and asked itself the question, What can we do for the good of the United States? I am not objecting, I am not complaining, I am simply stating what seems obvious enough—that the British interests, scattered around Asia Minor, southeastern Europe, Africa, Australia, and Asia, are enough to keep that cabinet busy with more important worries. We are not in their first line of worries. But those nations which have, in the past years, chosen to be honored by British attentions, have suffered some betrayals to which we should not shut our eyes, betrayals which should remind us of Versailles, and the way our noble 14 points were accepted only to be torpedoed and sunk after we had paid our money and put more than 2,000,000 men in the field. I refer particularly to the violation of the tacit pledge not to turn the World War into a land-grabbing expedition, and to the millions of square miles England took in spite of that pledge.

What is the post-war record of the alleged democracies which the interventionists now ask us to support? After the defeat and disaster of the World War, democracy might have flowered in Germany if the British and French Governments had given some encouragement to the democratic forces which were eager to make their country into a strong and vigorous republic. Democracy, however, could not live in a defeated, demoralized, economically impoverished nation.

The Treaty of Versailles, the reparations, the French invasion of the Ruhr, the refusal to permit an Austro-German customs union, the refusal to disarm, none of these was calculated to strengthen a democratic Germany which would live at peace with its European neighbors. The French post-war policy of military alliances, blocs, ententes, of financial domination of Europe, was aimed to keep Germany weak while France became the dominant power on the Continent. It was a suicidal policy. It provided Hitler and the other Nazi demagogues with plenty of ammunition, which they used unscrupulously but effectively to arouse and unite behind them a large part of the German people. The job of welding Europe into an economically integrated Europe was not done by France and Britain after the last war. Without that the facade of peace erected in the League of Nations proved a hollow shell.

The post-war peace machinery received a severe blow when Japan marched into Manchuria in 1931. Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson turned to England for cooperation in attempting to restrain the Japanese aggression. But the British Government was not interested. Sir John Simon stated instead that:

* * * in the Far East * * * British interests are summed up in the words, "Peace and trade." We do not seek to secure trade through the boycott of other people * * *. (Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th series, February 22, 1932, p. 182.)

In his book, *The Far Eastern Crisis*, Secretary Stimson has revealed that the United States was willing to consider more drastic steps against Japan than mere moral condemnation of her actions in China, if the British Government had been willing to cooperate with us. But it was not. (Stimson, pp. 99 et seq. and 161 et seq. N. Y. 1936.)

I need hardly remind you of the fiasco of sanctions in the Italo-Ethiopian war, or of the Hoare-Laval agreement made by the respective British and French foreign ministers to buy off Italy with a large slice of Ethiopia. The British retreat

from oil sanctions which by general agreement would have hurt Italy more than anything else was the end of the story. Our own Government had in the fall of 1935 given all possible indication of its desire to stop or delay the oil shipments of American companies to Italy. Italy proceeded to conquer Ethiopia with a minimum of outside interference from the mild sanctions England and France saw fit to impose. Their own games of power politics were far more important to them than support and strengthening of the peace machinery of the League of Nations to which they were both, in theory, attached and committed.

And what of Spain? The British and French hid behind the futile nonintervention committee sitting in London, while Germany and Italy openly supplied arms and men to Franco. And our administration rushed through an arms embargo with breakneck speed, early in January 1937, because the President and the administration leaders insisted we had to have that arms embargo immediately to protect and safeguard our peace. They expressed the fear that the civil war might develop into an international conflict and the arms embargo was vital, they said, to protect us from involvement.

In the light of what the President and the administration leaders say now about the same embargo, it is perfectly obvious that their insistence on the ban on arms to Spain in 1937 was in fact an attempt to cooperate with England and France. But the British and French Governments made no effort to enforce their policy which was allegedly to keep supplies of arms and munitions from reaching either side in Spain.

Not in Manchuria, nor Ethiopia, not in Spain, or in post-war Europe did the British and French Governments, whose democracy we are expected to support, show the slightest interest in carrying out the tenets of democracy. Then came Munich. Then democratic Czechoslovakia, pledged protection by France, was betrayed by them into Hitler's clutches.

In this connection, I recall the words of Jerome Frank, now Chairman of the S. E. C. and the author of a book entitled "Save America First," which interventionist leaders might do well to read. He was speaking of the peculiar upper-class government of England and the peculiar form of government they think of as democracy. He said—page 150:

It is little more than an insular regard for certain liberties and institutions which we, in common with them, hold dear. It is not a world program; it is not even an agenda which would involve aid to us if our democracy were attacked. English democracy is, and always has been, primarily a code for Englishmen.

He goes on—page 161:

What right has any American to suggest that when Downing Street, on its own and without consulting us, determines on a foreign policy, we must fight a war that results from that policy?

OUR GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR SERVICE

Mr. President, I am firmly convinced that our great opportunity for service to the cause of civilization is to stay out of this war, to stay all the way out of the war. Thus we can preserve in this hemisphere a haven of sanity in a world where madness now prevails. We can then concentrate on our own problems and prove that democracy can work in a modern economic environment. When the war is over we will then indeed be in a position to give the world succor and leadership. We will have kept the lamp of democracy and tolerance alight. We will have demonstrated the soundness of our way of life. War-weary and disillusioned people will see in our example the way to rehabilitate civilization in their own lands.

But if we become involved we will be in no position to help anyone, not even ourselves. For we will suffer the same economic collapse which will be abroad in every nation that engages in this war. We will have snuffed out democracy. Intolerance and hate will be rampant in the country, and a staggering debt will be piled on top of the forty billions now owed by our Government.

But if we want to stay out of war in Europe—and I know most of us do—we must not take steps that will take us into the war. It is one thing for you and me to take sides in our capacity as private citizens; it is a far different thing when our Government takes sides.

In other words, we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We either make up our minds to stay out of this war in Europe, or by a series of steps we will ultimately find ourselves in it.

It is perfectly clear that if we repeal the arms embargo after the war has started, it will be regarded abroad as an official act of our Government to take sides in this war. In Great Britain and France they will hail it as they would a great military victory.

They will say in so many words that we are coming in. In Germany it will be equally clear that we have taken sides against them. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] was frank about it over the radio when he said in effect that what the advocates of repeal were trying to do was to find a way to wipe Hitler off the face of the earth without our country getting involved in war. But this cannot be done with any certainty. If arms, ammunition, and implements of war on a limited credit-and-carry basis are not enough, then long-term credit will next be provided. The Johnson Act, passed to prevent nations owing us ten billions since the last war from floating any more loans until they pay up, will be repealed. If this is not enough, the same arguments which are now being made for repeal of the arms embargo will be made for our sending troops abroad.

A CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVE TO INTERVENTION

Those of us who are opposed to repeal of the arms embargo, and equally opposed to a false and dangerous war boom, must propose a constructive alternative. We must have some other way of using the strength, energy, and ideals of this Nation instead of letting them be shot or drained away in the trenches of western Europe or Asia Minor or Asia, wherever the battles of this mysterious war take place.

In place of this dangerous war boom, in place of this little flier into partnership which is proposed by repeal of the embargo, I urge a sound boom, a solid prosperity, a foreign policy which will last us through the years because it expresses our real national interest. I propose that we build, not only on this continent but in this hemisphere, an economy which will give us the stimulus we need for prosperity, which will utilize the energies and resources of our dynamic people. It alone can maintain this whole hemisphere on a rising level of life, and allow us all together, the great nations of the south as well as ourselves, to fend off the Fascist attacks which may come with persistent unemployment and disillusioning wars.

We can do this. We not only stand a chance of succeeding in doing it, but we have a certainty of succeeding in it. It is different from searching for America's future among the 400 years "of encrusted blood lusts" and hatreds of Europe.

We have the strength to do it.

We have practically a free-trade area within our own boundaries. We are not bothered with the necessity of paying a high tariff if we ship goods more than a few miles to the East from the West. We do not need to enter a life and death struggle to preserve a vital life line to feed our people, or clothe or house them, or to get raw materials to keep the machinery in our factories humming.

We have in the United States about 6 percent of the population of the world and about 6 percent of the land area, omitting Alaska. But note this—our production and our resources go far beyond 6 percent. According to Stuart Chase—the New Western Front, pages 56-59:

We move 43 percent of the world's freight, produce nearly 40 percent of the world's raw materials for industry, generate half of the world's horsepower, and 35 percent of its electric power. We produce 34 percent of the coal, 62 percent of the petroleum. We are strong in the "big four" metals—iron ore, copper, lead, zinc. We make more than a third of the world's pig iron and steel. Incidentally we have 30 huge mills for the new continuous process of making steel sheet and strip. No other nation has more than one.

We grow half the world's corn. We have half the world's telephones. In New York City alone there are as many telephones as in Russia, India, China, Poland, and Czechoslovakia combined. We have four-fifths of the world's automobiles, two-thirds of the trucks and busses, more than half the radio sets. We consume two-thirds of the world's rubber and silk goods; produce 90 percent of the world's moving pictures.

Comparing our economy with that of Europe (outside of Russia), and with Russia, we find many significant figures. Out of 36 vitally

important items, we lead or tie in 21 items. Europe leads or ties in 14 items; Russia in only 3. Both Europe and Russia have more arable land than we have, but we are far out in front in the production of energy and in industrial raw materials. Europe leads both the United States and Russia in food and fiber production. This is natural, because she has so many more people to feed. To grow food on the land, you must feed the crops themselves certain substances, including potash. Europe has a big lead in the production of potash, but recently we have discovered deposits of 100,000,000 tons in New Mexico, most of it on Government land. We need not worry about this mineral. Russia has large unworked deposits of various raw materials, especially in Siberia, but it is evident that Russia has a long pull ahead before her people can enter the industrial class of the other two continental groups.

The tremendous thing is the fact that the United States, one Nation, is more powerful industrially than Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy combined, with 23 other nations thrown in for good measure.

Of 26 important items of production listed by Mr. Chase in comparison with the five Great Powers—Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan—the United States leads in production of everything but potash, sugar, and silk. From the industrial point of view we are so far ahead that we surpass all five of them together. So much for production.

As for resources, according to Mr. Chase—Stuart Chase, The New Western Front, p. 61:

The United States is well equipped with most resources, especially arable land, coal, water power, and sulphur. It is short of mercury, and far short of tin, nickel, manganese, and chromite. It raises no rubber or coffee.

If North America is taken as a unit, the inventory is even stronger. Manganese and chromite are still short, but supplies exist and could be further developed, especially in Cuba.

If the Western Hemisphere is taken as a unit, rubber is the only major shortage. Brazil, where rubber was first found, still grows some and could produce enough for the West, given capital and improved technical methods. Bolivian tin may or may not be adequate for all western needs.

* * * Comparing the resources of the United States with those of the five Great Powers one by one—Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan—we find a condition similar to that noted earlier in current production. There is no real comparison. The shortages of the Great Powers are pathetic. Germany, for instance, out of the 23 materials listed, shows "nothing" in 7, "way short" in 3, "short" in 8. Her resource budget is out of the "red" in only 5 materials. She has substantial surpluses in coal and potash alone. With Austria she gained a little iron and water power, a trace of petroleum, and 7,000,000 people to feed.

Mr. Chase tells us it has been estimated that a nation needs 2.5 acres of arable land for every man, woman, and child in order to produce adequate food and fiber crops for a high living standard. On this basis the United States is 2 1/2 times better off than Europe in its ratio of population to arable land.

Almost any way you look at it—

Says Mr. Chase—

from the economic point of view the United States is far, far in the lead. Russia, the other great continental nation, still trails to the rear. Behind Russia, in resource strength if not in production, trail the Great Powers—England, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan. Bundle all six of them together, and we can match their resources. We could more than hold our own against the British Empire itself. In event of war, we have oil in a dozen home States. England must send ships down the Bay of Biscay, past submarines, airplanes, mines in the Mediterranean to pipe lines in the Near East—3,000 miles to reach the nearest oil supply (from Our New Western Front, Stuart Chase, p. 62).

WE CAN HAVE AN INVULNERABLE HEMISPHERE

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. At that point I should like to say just briefly, if the able Senator will permit me, that the Senator might well add that we have the largest army of "world savers" in the world, the largest number of international meddlers extant I have ever heard of in the history of any country, and if we allow these foreign-minded sentimentalists to continue their brain-storming around they will ruin all these great American resources the Senator has so ably enumerated and they are well on their way now. One more World War, and our intervention therein, I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, may well bring chaos and anarchy to our marvelous America. I am much impressed with the clear and able address of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I cannot wholly agree with the Senator. I will say at the outset that I have a great respect and will continue to have, for all those who disagree with the position that I feel constrained by the logic of my own thinking to take. But I want to take advantage once more of the opportunity to urge in my feeble way that the debate upon this momentous issue turn upon the fundamental problems that are at stake, for, as I see it, this is no dilettante, amateur thing which we are undertaking. This is for keeps, Mr. President, and everything we have and everything we hold dear, everything that this country stands for turns in the balance of our ultimate decisions in this international crisis.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will debate these issues. So far as I am concerned I shall extend to everyone of my colleagues, as I have always tried to do, and I think successfully, in the 14 years I have been a Member of the Senate, credit for the same sincerity of purpose, the same patriotic ideals which I have had and strive to maintain for myself.

Make no mistake about it, we can have an invulnerable hemisphere. No nation or group of nations can successfully attack it if we but provide the necessary army, navy, and the bases needed for their efficient operation. This policy requires that we do not permit strategic islands to fall into hostile hands. It means that we interpret the Monroe Doctrine to include the prohibition of penetration of foreign nations through propaganda or otherwise in this hemisphere. The great body of expert opinion on national defense agrees that we can make this hemisphere safe against all comers.

But this policy must be clearly to the national interests of the Latin American nations as well, if fascism is not to take root there and spread branches across the seas.

Our policy has, until recently, reeked with exploitation, and the defaulted loans, which were in many cases forced on the pre-depression governments, tell the story of the failure of that policy.

Now, with the collapse of European trade with South America because of the war, we have a new set of opportunities, but a new set of responsibilities as well.

Our fundamental objective should be the reenforcement by economic action of the political independence of the Western Hemisphere so that the governments may retain their territorial integrity and their liberty. Economic action to obtain this objective should be of a kind that would insure a rising standard of living from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn. The rising standard of living, north and south, should be the great objective rather than the old-time policy of exploiting and draining off wealth.

Our financial assistance for this purpose would make possible an increased demand for American exports, incidentally helping us to secure full employment at home.

I recognize that the difficulties of our trade with Latin America have centered around the fact that she produces raw materials and agricultural products. I do not favor our capital going down there for the further development of those materials, of which both they and we have enough. I make exceptions of the development of rubber and tin, materials of which we can both use more. But, in general, I propose that we concentrate our investment down there on making goods which Latin America can use, which will raise their standards of living definitely, and utilize some of their resources now being exported. Furniture, clothing, and construction materials can be made from their own resources. Some roads and public utilities would raise the standard of living. Only in such ways can the Latin-American nations be made sufficiently strong economically so that they will not be dependent on the fluctuating prices in the world markets or subservient to the bargaining power of industrial nations.

I am not recommending a policy of rash, quick loaning to buy favors. But I do think we can adjust the past debts with Latin-America much as we adjusted our internal debts when the banks went under. We can wisely, and with great foresight and consideration of our own national interest, utilize part of our already large oversupply of idle gold, not only to make direct investments, but even to provide local credit facilities through stabilization of their banking systems. I am sure

the growth in trade coming in the immediate future will of itself ease their exchange restrictions and make further trade possible.

A study of the problem has been made recently by Plan Age. It concludes with the following words—pages 234-235, September 1938:

Before the Western Hemisphere can be regarded as adequately strong for the purpose of resisting aggression, it will be necessary to overcome the inefficiencies found in the chronic unemployment of resources, both of labor and materials. These inefficiencies are primarily financial in character, and are, in part, due to the failure to formulate new methods and to adjust to new conditions. The appearance of war has now broken down some of the resistances of inertia, and economic measures which have hitherto been considered too drastic for application in the cause of raising standards of life may be introduced for the purpose of achieving economic solidarity in the Western Hemisphere. Latin-America's problem of unstable prices for raw materials and our problem of unemployment are interrelated at many points. By adopting measures which will give full employment here, we can extend trade advantages to Latin-America superior to those which Germany was giving.

Now that the threat to the security and liberties of all peace-loving nations has been made so abundantly clear, nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of making the Western Hemisphere as strong as possible. If the effort to achieve economic collaboration is to be taken seriously, and if democratic principles of living are to be established as so incontestably superior to any other system that no country will willingly continue to put up with anything else, it is essential that every opportunity of cooperation should be fully explored. Attempts to secure exclusive advantages should be replaced, as a matter of principle, by mutual advantage, which is basic to any fair system of trade. Such a system of trade is, of course, but a contribution to that genuine cooperation which arises from the creation of a community of interests not only among governments, but also among people themselves.

In the next few months decisions will probably be taken by democratic leaders in the economic as well as the political sphere which may well determine the destinies not only of the present generation but also of other generations to come. No single measure is ever likely to govern; it is the combination and interaction of a number of measures which normally determine the ultimate course of events. Clear thinking on the subject of the ultimate aims of economic policy is essential if we are to avoid the mistakes of the first war period in assembling together a ramshackle collection of expedients and calling it a policy. It seems more than ever vital at the present time, when whatever action is possible must be taken quickly, to retain a clear picture of the ends which we have in view so that the measures adopted are not self-contradictory, but are capable of being knit in the course of time into a coherent whole.

It is in this Western Hemisphere that we can use our pioneer energies, our wealth, the hopes of our young, the unspent energy of our people to build the greatest economy that the world has ever seen.

This is, I repeat, the constructive, the statesmanlike alternative to a policy of partisanship and adventuring in Europe's perpetual quarrels with their self-interested ramifications throughout the seven seas.

OUR PATRIOTIC COURSE IS CLEAR

Our patriotic course is clear. It is to stay out of Europe and the Far East, which would drain our blood, our manhood, and our wealth forever. It is to concentrate on making democracy function here in the last great industrial nation which has a chance of making it function in the modern machine world. It is to preserve our civil liberties and the American concept of life. It is to be ready to aid and assist a stricken world when both victor and vanquished have collapsed. It is to be ready, in cooperation with the nations of Latin America, to defend the American continent and to provide the national defenses and bases necessary for that purpose.

We should keep the embargo on arms and enact all the other features of the pending measure designed to reduce incidents likely to lead to war. We should limit the trade in other commodities to a strict cash-and-carry basis, not credit and carry. We should restrict this trade so as to protect our resource base and not permit an uncontrolled wartime commerce to develop which will help to drag us into war in Europe or in the Far East and will distort our whole economy. We have a great opportunity to build up an intercontinental economy in this hemisphere. We can provide an army and navy to defend it for a fraction of the cost of our involvement in war abroad. We do not have to accept as the solution of our problems the employment resulting from trade produced

by slaughter and destruction of human beings on another continent.

We can utilize our idle manpower, productive capacity, and idle capital to restore our natural-resource base; to rehabilitate and conserve our human resources; to develop our Nation and this great and rich hemisphere. Here is a program that will give us a dynamic America, and restore that equality of economic opportunity that characterized the development of our own physical frontier. Here is a program which gives this generation "a rendezvous with destiny" in this hemisphere instead of with death in some other.

I put this program up against the program of taking sides; against the program of selling arms; against the program of intervention in a long, weary war, which will probably end abroad in revolution, and, if we become involved, may end here in dictatorship.

(Manifestations of applause in the galleries.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the information of Senators I wish to announce that it is our purpose to hold a session on Saturday. In that connection, I wish to express the hope that during the remainder of this week we may very largely complete what we may term the general debate on this measure. Up to this time no specific consideration has been given to amendments which are pending or which may be offered. Therefore, I am asking that Senators who still intend to address the Senate on the general subject of the legislation be prepared to do so without delay.

I think all sides can agree that thus far the debate has gone forward on a high level. It has been very largely pertinent. No effort has been made in any way to hamper any Senator who desired to discuss the measure; but I think we may feel that the time is rapidly approaching when we ought to complete the general discussion and get down to specific proposals in the joint resolution or amendments which may be offered to it. I therefore ask Senators on both sides of the question who still intend to speak to prepare to do so without delay, so that we may not be called upon to lay the bill before the Senate for amendment before we have completed the general discussion, or to adjourn or recess because some Senator is not quite ready to speak.

Mr. President, I offer these suggestions in a spirit of cooperation, and I ask Senators to contribute all the cooperation they can accord in following out this program.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please explain what he meant when he said he hoped we might not be called upon to lay the bill before the Senate for amendments before we have completed the general discussion?

Mr. BARKLEY. When any Senator finishes an address and no other Senator addresses the Chair to obtain the floor, it is the duty of the Chair to lay the joint resolution before the Senate for amendment. Of course, that will be done. What I am undertaking to do is to bring about the completion as early as possible of general debate on the measure itself, in which we have engaged for the past 2 weeks.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 13, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou, O Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek Thee; arise and let not man prevail; let the nations be judged in Thy

sight. Mankind sees dimly as the flame of humanity burns low and the clouds still trail the earth. Almighty God, bid the strong and courageous rise and demonstrate the priceless human values in the life of nations and men. O Saviour Divine, Thy timely aid impart; lead us to Thy holy hill that we may be wisely and faithfully guided. As we meet life's challenges without fear, brighten the dawn of a golden day of a happier humanity in a world of peace. Clothe our land with a strong adventurous faith which in the past has sustained us a godly people and spare us from the ruinous delusions which are sweeping across the world. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Miller]?

There was no objection.

STRIKE AT BOHN ALUMINUM & BRASS CORPORATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I send two privileged resolutions to the Clerk's desk which I ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first resolution for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 313

Whereas it has been charged on the floor of the House by a Member on his responsibility as a Member, that a strike was called at the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, located at Detroit, Mich., on the 29th day of August 1939, and that such strike continued until the morning of the 9th day of October 1939, a period of 41 calendar days; and

Whereas it was further stated that said corporation against which said strike was called had contracts with the War Department for the manufacture of certain articles which were essential in the construction of motors which were needed to carry out the President's rearmament program of 1939; and

Whereas it was further charged that said strike was called for the purpose, among others, of forcing the corporation to enter into a contract with the C. I. O. affiliate for a "closed" or "preferential" shop; that is, a shop where all employees pay dues to a particular union; and

Whereas it was further charged that said strike interfered with the activities of the War Department in its efforts to carry on its national defense program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of War report to the Clerk of the House—

(a) Whether the War Department did have a contract with said corporation.

(b) Whether a strike which interfered, or which would interfere, with the activities of the War Department occurred.

(c) How long such strike continued.

(d) What, if any, representations were made by the War Department to the union or its representatives looking toward the ending of said strike.

(e) What, if any, representations were made by the Department to the union or its representatives looking toward the settlement of the strike.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] offer this as a privileged resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I think so.

The SPEAKER. On what basis does the gentleman offer it as a privileged resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I offer it as a resolution of inquiry.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, if it is not a privileged resolution I shall object to its consideration at this time and ask that it be referred to the proper committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] makes the point of order that it is not a privileged resolution under the rules of the House.

After hearing the resolution read, the Chair is of the opinion that it is merely a resolution of inquiry and not privileged for consideration at this time. It will therefore take its usual course by being referred to a committee for consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the same with the second one?

The SPEAKER. Yes.