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CHAPTER I
PRESS OPINION ON WORLD WAR II 1939-1941

In the annual message to the Seventy-sixth Congress, the President of the United States warned of "storm signals from across the seas."1 During the previous year Germany had annexed Austria, partitioned Czechoslovakia, strengthened the Rome-Berlin Axis and had established its economic and military predominance in Central Europe. The Japanese invaders extended their conquests in China. President Roosevelt had these precarious incidents in mind when he chose "defense" as the theme for the annual message. The Nation commented that the opening message to Congress "rang out like a bugle across the world to rally the dispirited and retreating democracies to a stand."2 Some of the high lights which the message conveyed to the nation and to the world were as follows:

All about us rage undeclared wars---- threats of new aggression--military and economic. Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans.... The first is religion. It is the source of the other two--democracy and international good faith.... Where freedom of religion has been attacked, the attack has come from sources opposed to democracy. Where democracy has been overthrown, the

1 Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 1st sess., 74.
2 The Nation, January 14, 1939, editorial: "The President's Message."
the spirit of free worship has disappeared. And where religion and democracy have vanished, good faith and reason in international affairs have given way to strident ambition and brute force. ³

The press of the isolationists was loud in its disapproval of many nonintervention elements. The Omaha World Herald admitted the Nazi menace "to be real enough" and that it was "horrible and terrible." ⁴ It made a very pointed comment when it stated that the American people were ready to "defend themselves against aggression and if necessary, stand ready to go the full limit of the road." ⁵ It was neither the concern nor the ambition of America to take up the "role of world policeman", nor to protect the "politics, morals and religions of all the earth by force of arms." ⁶

Pleas for peace and peace negotiations were much discussed topics. In order to avert world wide conflagration, a few months previous to the opening of Congress, the President sent a message advocating peace to Germany upon her threats to invade Czechoslovakia, Great Britain and France for the same

³ Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 1st sess., 74.
⁴ Chicago Daily Tribune, January 6, 1939, quoting editorial from World Herald (Omaha, Neb.).
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Ibid.
purpose. The Reno, Nevada Evening Gazette may have had the
peace negotiation talk in mind when it released this comment
to the public: "Mr. Roosevelt beats the drums of war. While
Europe is trying to obtain peace by some territorial arrange-
ments, he pours oil on its smouldering fires." 7

A similar attitude was taken by a mid-western newspaper,
the Cleveland News, which declared, "The President...telling
us that we are off in a race to preserve democracy...reminds
us further of the days when President Wilson was stoking the
American war sentiment...." 8

A lengthy spectacular editorial entitled "Mr. Roosevelt
Goes to War" appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune. In the
usual fighting spirit, it made an attack on its opponent, the
Roosevelt administration, and logically argued that "there are
irreconcilable systems of governments in the world today and
the probabilities are that the worst of them will blow up in
an explosion of internal forces." 9 The editor regarded it as
most unusual that the Chief Executive should "designate
certain powerful nations as enemies although none of them had
yet offered the United States an offense." 10 He further com-

7 Ibid., quoting from editorial from Evening Gazette (Reno,
Nev.).
8 Ibid., quoting from the Cleveland News.
9 Ibid., editorial: "Mr. Roosevelt Goes to War", January 6,
1939.
10 Ibid.
mented that the rulers of the aggressive nations would only attack the United States if given a "reason and an opportunity."11 The Chicago Daily Tribune saw no participation of war in the near future since all the nations had their "hands full with more immediate matters" and none of them had "indicated a desire to be other than really on friendly terms with us."12

The New York Times indicated that the President's message at the Seventy-sixth Congress was a "ringing defense of the democratic system against those rival systems which challenge it."13 Always a powerful supporter of the Administration's foreign policy, it too saw the need of strengthening against dangers our defense which are "implicit in the swift rise of the totalitarian dogmas."14 Not merely would it encourage the strengthening of our physical defense, but also the spiritual defense "which is found in the whole hearted conviction of the American people that because democracy is the best guarantee of personal preservation of the existing order."15

During the fateful month of August, 1939, events in

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
In substance the Neutrality Law had stated that when the "Chief Executive should proclaim the existence of war, it would be unlawful to sell or transport munitions to the Belligerents. If the President found it advisable...he could prohibit travel on ships of the warring nations." 17 In 1936 Congress amended the original measure by "prohibiting loans to belligerents."18 The following year Congress passed a joint resolution "forbidding the export of munitions for the use of either of the opposing forces in Spain."19 Later during the year the so-called "cash and carry" provision was added. Everything seemed at for "permanent neutrality."

"People were never so stupid" sharply criticized the Saturday Evening Post, "as to imagine they could make themselves neutral by passing a law."20 In the minds of many, the neutrality legislation brought about confusion. The Saturday Evening Post tried to explain matters by publishing an editorial explaining how all the confusion about neutrality legislation had developed. "Neutrality", insisted the Saturday Evening Post, "was not the subject." In the dimness

18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 Saturday Evening Post, October 14, 1939, editorial: "Phantasy of a Bloodless Sword".
of confusion, and almost unknown to the people, a perilous change in this nation's foreign policy had taken place.

Congress had imperfectly enacted the Neutrality Law to "chain down a three-headed monster," namely, the munition makers, international bankers, and profiteers, since these were supposedly the war bringers. When these would be controlled, the peace of the world would be promoted and we would be less likely drawn into another European conflict. The Neutrality Law had annulled the rights United States citizens formerly enjoyed under international law. There was restriction on the exporting of raw materials and food stuffs to nations of war. Goods could not be carried to a belligerent in American ships; title to the cargo had to be transferred to foreign buyers; American bankers were forbidden to buy or sell bonds. With no change of idea, the law was strengthened by an amendment in 1936 and 1937. It was inflexible and worked sometimes contrary to our wishes and always to the advantage of the great maritime nations controlling the seas, namely, Great Britain, France, and Japan; it was a drastic limitation upon the rights of neutrals in time of war.

The editorial continued to point out that the Administration did not begin to attack the law until after its foreign policy had suddenly changed. In the President's 1936 "Chautauqua speech" he had said, "I hate war," and, "If war
should break out on another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country, thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches... would attempt to break down or to evade our neutrality...." Then in October 1937 in his "quarantine speech" in Chicago, he said there was no escape for us through mere "isolation and neutrality," and proposed that the peace-loving nations of the world combine and make a concerted effort to quarantine and stop aggressors.

From then on the Saturday Evening Post implied that the Administration had never been neutral in thought, word, or deed. It had evolved a dangerous foreign policy of its own during two years of un-neutrality. The concluding words of the editorial contained a paragraph of regret that we didn't have at this time "a government steadfast in the American tradition of jealous neutrality and willing, if necessary, to fight for that, instead of one hotly demanding the sword of this nation's economic power to wield in Europe's war."21

The embargo issue had become a "symbol of peace or war," since the outcome of this momentous issue was believed by many, to determine the case whether the United States would enter or keep out of the European conflict.22

21 Ibid.
22 America, October 14, 1939.
At once heated and fiery debates began in the Congress and the press on this muddled issue. "The American attitude" asserted the *New York Times* at this early date, "is not so definite nor is the country's means for expression through government so absolute, as to make its position crystal clear, especially when the immediate consequences of that position are no clearer than they are today."\(^{23}\) The editor stated merely what he considered as a candid report and not as a statement of opinion that "this government, so far as it is represented by officials in the Executive branch, hopes and prays for a British and French Victory in the present European war from the standpoint both of moral and of our own national defense."\(^{24}\)

However, when the final vote on the embargo resolution whether passed or defeated would, according to the *New York Times* "be a definite indication as to the views and desires of the people to the present European conflict."\(^{25}\)

The *Milwaukee Journal* ran an editorial in which it was implied that the Senate was not "facing the real issue."\(^{26}\)

---

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 *Milwaukee Journal*, October 8, 1939, editorial: "Is the Senate Facing the Real Issue?"
Repeal the arms embargo is more likely to keep the United States out of war because:

1. The shorter the war, the less likely is the United States to become involved. But the war will be prolonged if the Allies cannot get arms from the United States....

**Rebuttal:** If the Allies realize that they can't get arms...they may make peace more quickly....

2. Continuing the arms embargo might make the Allies lose the war, deprive the United States of the nations which are now its buffer states....

**Rebuttal:** The Atlantic is a broad ocean, and the next war is not here yet....

Retention of the arms embargo is more likely to keep the United States out of war because:

1. Repeal of the arms embargo would make the Germans very angry and possibly lead them to take reprisals against the United States....

**Rebuttal:** The Nazis have been and always will be angry with the United States....

2. If the United States sells arms, economy will depend on war trade--business will depend on it for profits, labor for jobs, possibly even lenders for the security of their loans--and eventually the United States will go to war to save its customers.

**Rebuttal:** Embargo or no embargo the United States is going to have a huge war trade....

---

30 *Time*, October 2, 1939, "Congress quotes and Arguments."
By publishing this outline during the time of the drive to keep America out of war, Time assisted its readers to understand both sides of the argument and then to decide on the vital question whether embargoes should be applied equally to all belligerents.

The Chicago Daily Tribune had forecast a long "Congressional fight" on this very debatable issue. By cartoons, news columns, and editorials it vigorously opposed the repeal. The day preceding the final vote in the Senate, the Chicago Daily Tribune had another challenging editorial in its columns. It was a reminiscence of the "Roosevelt" inconsistencies, and it concluded with the conviction that "once the embargo is lifted a serious obstacle to America's entrance into the war has been removed."31

America maintained a more definite attitude in its columns. It took the stand that repealing the Arms Embargo was the first step toward war since "in this country war is generally thought of as financial aid given by the United States to some nation at war or as active participation in hostilities initiated abroad."32

The momentous controversy over the Roosevelt adminis-

31 Chicago Daily Tribune, October 29, 1939, editorial: "Roosevelt Against Roosevelt."
32 America, October 2, 1939, editorial: "We Conscientiously Object."
tration's neutrality act ended in the Senate when sixty-three Senators voted for its repeal, and thirty for retention. It was then transferred to the House of Representatives where it was also speedily passed by a vote of two hundred forty-three for repeal to one hundred seventy-two for retention. Next day the President attached his signature to the Neutrality Resolution, thus repealing the arms embargo and substituting cash - and - carry regulations. The following day the Chicago Daily Tribune had the satisfaction of publishing a poll taken by the delegations to Washington from the midwest. For the retention of the Embargo, the midwest voted three as to one against it. The Chicago Daily Tribune added, "This shows an overwhelming conviction that the Arms Embargo should be retained in the Neutrality Law."33

"Isolationists unlimbered their guns for a fight on the Senate floor," alleged an editorial in the August 5th issue of Newsweek, as the Senate opened debate on the "Selective Training and Service Act of 1940."34 It was a fight over certain provisions of the draft act which the minority of the Senate never could subscribe. The Senate body approved the provisions for "Registration and its exemptions, volunteer

33 Chicago Daily Tribune, October 28, 1939.
34 Newsweek, August 5, 1940, editorial: "Draft Bill's Complications Pose Need for Sober Study."
induction, transfer of trainees to reserve—components, wartime conscription and many other of its important features. However, the bone of contention was mainly over peacetime conscription and the low basic pay standards.

Day by day the press comment paralleled Senate debate. The Commonweal backed the Senate minority by vigorously opposing peacetime conscription and loudly proclaiming that the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill was obviously a "long leap toward entry into the war." The same periodical adopted the view that the draft was a "Collectivized institution—for—war and an "arrangement to meet force with force, to throw weight around the balance of power." Further, it argued that America could mobilize an enormous force, which would make other national forces reluctant to oppose our will and to chance an actual contest. But if the United States kept itself ready it would "sooner or later run into an opponent," and the more wholeheartedly it militarized the country, the less shy it would be about "getting in the way."

36 Commonweal, August 23, 1940, editorial: "Against Peace Time Conscription."
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
It was considered as "foolishness" by Freda Kirchwey in an editorial in The Nation, "to call the Selective and Service Act a measure for peacetime conscription."39 In her opinion the United States was not-waging "Military war" but was only "nominally at peace." The editorial further stated that:

Openly and officially we have identified ourselves with the nations fighting against Hitler. We are rapidly perfecting joint defense plans with Canada and agreements for the establishment of air and naval bases on Canadian territory in this hemisphere....40 It is a war measure enacted on the assumption that actual participation in the struggle cannot ultimately be avoided. The virtue of the present measure is that it offers some chance that our soldiers may be sufficient in numbers and trained in the complicated techniques of modern warfare when the day of battle dawns.41

The quick passage of the Conscription bill was considered by President Roosevelt essential to the defense plans.

39 The Nation, September 7, 1940, editorial: "The Draft Bill!"
40 On September 2, 1940 the United States government had acquired the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland, and in the islands of Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, and in British Guiana. The right to bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda were gifts from Great Britain in exchange for 50 United States over-age destroyers.
41 The Nation, September 7, 1940, "The Draft Bill."
versal selective draft is the only really democratic way to build up a big defense establishment."44

A similar opinion was confirmed by the New Republic which considered the need for conscription unavoidable. The editorial contended that we were directly threatened by an attack from Hitler. "If England falls" urged the New Republic, "it seems to us absolutely clear that sooner or later and probably sooner, we shall be attacked by Hitler."45 It did not expect the attack to be exclusively military. Hitler would seek to throttle foreign markets which would weaken this country and strengthen Germany. For these and similar reasons these editors too with "heavy hearts endorsed the principle of compulsory service", though they rejected many aspects of the Burke-Wadsworth Bill.46

Sufficient opposition to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 did not crystallize in order to stop its passage either in the Senate or the House of Representatives. Some members in the House hailed the enactment and completion of this legislature as a "distant triumph for America."47 The measure generally referred to by the newspapers as a "con-
scription" bill was considered by the House of Representatives as a "misnomer." It defined the bill as "merely a selective-service, peacetime method of training the necessary men for the maintenance of not only an army of well trained men, but sufficient trained reserves to assure the country's safety in case of any future contingency or any emergency, including that of post war." The bill was finally approved by both houses September 16, 1940. However, the minority in the House of Representatives never subscribed to all its provisions. It considered the bill a dangerous departure from American ideals and tradition, which would lead ultimately to the destruction of the American form of government in a totalitarian military economy.

The United States News in the September 6, 1940 issue, published in its columns several conscription views of the press. Its own view was that the military training bill just passed by the Senate "wins the approval of more than nine-tenths of editorial commentators." The remaining small percentage of editorial commentators contended that necessity for a draft of man power had not been demonstrated.

The Missouri Kansas City Star admitted that it "is frank-

48 Ibid.
49 United States News, September 6, 1940, "Conscription: Views of the Press."
ly puzzled over the proper course taken," and added, "doubt still exists as to the nature of the emergency." As a basis for this argument it pointed out that there had been only statements, sometimes conflicting, from army and naval officials and members of the Defense Commission.

The Cleveland, Ohio Plain Dealer offered the opinion that "not all of the hostility comes from the interior of the country," and added: "It's the same poison which persuaded Americans that the Atlantic is a stone wall ten miles high"...

"The opposition to the bill" according to the New York Herald Tribune, "is either being frightened by myths of its own manufacture or else it is playing a peculiarly disgraceful kind of narrow politics with the safety and vital interests of the United States."  

"The sole reason for limitations on the draft which has been offered," declared the Charlotte News, "is the attempt of partisans and isolationists to convince the American people that great precautions are necessary to keep Mr. Roosevelt from hurrying into an unnecessary war. These men

50 Ibid., quoting editorial from the Kansas City Star, (Missouri).
51 Ibid., quoting from Plain Dealer, (Cleveland, Ohio).
52 Ibid., quoting from editorial from the Herald Tribune, (New York City).
play with the destiny of the nation to gratify their dislike and self-interest."53

The Lowell, (Mass.) Courier-Citizen indicated that the draft should be left to the "sweet will of the individual" but it should be a thing required by all without exception.54 The Courier-Citizen further implied "it is incumbent on a decent American citizen to be a soldier if need be, as well as a voter or a man of business."55

Three months after the entrance of England and France in the European conflict, the New York Times observed that the American attitude toward the war was crystallizing. As the conflict narrowed and broadened into a test of political pressure and economic staying power, there grew up in Washington a fresh conception of the rise of neutrality. It was viewed more as a positive policy, capable of operating as a decisive influence on the shape of the war. The Administration, the press added, was still bent on remaining neutral and there seemed to be more conviction in Washington that "we will stay out of this round." 56

After a year had elapsed and the blitzkrieg had been operating in full force in Europe, France, nation number nine, had collapsed under its assault. The New York Times again

55 Ibid.
56 New York Times, November 18, 1939.
made an effort to get a cross-section view of the American attitude toward the war. Six editors of representative cities in the nation were asked to describe the nature of any recent shifts in opinion concerning America's role and the war. What follows were the reports that were then published.

In New England there had been no important shift of opinion on any of the questions relating to the war. People were reported to be talking less about the war than they had been doing, after France collapsed. They however, endorsed American preparedness as a duty which must not be shirked.

Richmond, Virginia was chosen as the representative city of the South. The editor reported that Virginia and near-by states were overwhelmingly pro-British and so strongly behind measures to aid the British, "short of war," that any such steps by the Administration would undoubtedly be popular there.57 Virginia's delegation in both branches in Congress was reported to favor the Burke-Wadsworth Bill.

Despite England's struggle for the survival against Germany and despite the danger which might confront the United States, if England fell, the Midwest remained as

57 This section of the country is predominantly Anglo-Saxon in its racial and cultural origins which would be one reason for its favorable attitude toward England.
strong as ever against armed intervention in this country in the European conflict. Evidence collected by a survey of opinion in Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana and Illinois, supported this same conclusion. In Ohio there was no crystallization of opinion. In Michigan sympathy was reported definitely pro-British, but against intervention. The one unchallenged stand of the majority in Wisconsin was the opposition to American intervention in any foreign war. It was against the draft.58 Indiana held the opinion that the country eventually would be in the war and felt that selective service was the best method of raising an army.

The farm belt section of the Middle West favored the passage of the Selective Service Bill. It had represented by the Gallup Poll survey as favoring the measure by percentages ranging from 56 in Kansas, to 71 in North Dakota. There was reported less talk about keeping out of the war and more about being ready for involvement, if it would come.

The report from Dallas, Texas representing the Southwest, showed a growing realization that the United States "must assume responsibilities and burdens undreamed of...in order to protect its own shores and safeguard its democracy."59

58 Wisconsin is as predominantly German as Virginia is British. This may partially account for the determined stand it took against American intervention.
59 New York Times, September 1, 1940.
The Administration's defense program was reported here to have stronger support than ever before. Newspaper editorials had frequently expressed impatience with the delay in pushing along the compulsory service program. Finally, the West Coast was reported to have had a decided shift toward greater help for Great Britain, "short of war."

Edward A. Fitzpatrick in his scholarly book entitled, Conscription and America, said that conscription was more democratic and efficient than volunteering. To him the simple fact was that:

Conscription as selective service is a more democratic process than voluntary enlistment. It is too a more effective one not only from the standpoint of the paramount military necessity of the nation, but also from the standpoint of the civilian interest both during the war and after the war.60

During the 1940 political campaign, the Democratic plank promised material aid to liberty-loving peoples wantonly attacked. Other planks of the platform had committed the President and Congress to the policy of keeping this country out of war. When the elections were over, Roosevelt turned his attentions to rendering large-scale aid to bomb-battered

Britain. In December 1940 he outlined the lend-lease scheme which was entitled: "An Act Further to Promote the Defense of the United States." It was introduced into Congress in January of 1941. When it was originally introduced, it conferred almost unlimited powers on the President. It authorized him to do the following, among other things:

1. to designate as a beneficiary of its provisions any country in the world, whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States;
2. to manufacture or otherwise procure any weapon, munition, aircraft, boat or other article of defense;
3. to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of any such implements, articles of defense, and machinery or tools for the manufacture of the same to any government so designated by the President....

The press had many opinions concerning this most controversial and complex issue. It was debated as strenuously and as bitterly as no issue on our foreign policy had ever before been debated. "A tug of war" keenly observed the Sign, "is going on in and out of Congress between those who favor a neutrality more or less strictly interpreted, and those who

61 Charles A. Beard, President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948, 23.
favor help short of war for the democracies." Its opponents however, were agreed on one thing about the Lend-Lease Bill namely, "This is a war bill which grants to the President almost dictatorial power over the human and material resources of the United States and will, if enacted lead inevitably to the participation in war on a large scale."  

*Life* in a picturesque and meaningful words made the comment that "the Administration's big guns boomed out in defense of the bill" and then added, "all fired the same ammunition. If Britain lost...the United States would be vulnerable to attack the Axis. Unless the President were given powers to act swiftly and emphatically, aid might come too late to help Britain."  

According to the *United States News*, "the Lend-Lease plan is the President's antidote for isolation" and then implied:

It is intended:
- As a means for providing Britain with all possible war materials.
- As a means for assuring that war can continue if Germany conquers England.
- As a means of keeping Hitler bottled up in Europe and Japan out of the South Seas.

---

62 *Sign*, February 7, 1941, "Neutrality and Peace."
63 *Beard*, 39.
64 *Life*, January 27, 1941, "The Administration's Big Guns Go Into Action for 'H.R. 1776'".
As machinery for merging British-American world interests in event of need. 65

Two weeks after the Lend-Lease Bill, H.R. 1776 was introduced in the United States Congress, the Narod (Nation) likewise offered the opinion that effective aid to Britain was important in the American scheme of defense. 66 In these striking words it stated:

Vtomto ohledu Anglické prece maji pravdu. Skoda, ze zde ve Spojemch Statech máme tolik lidí, ktere pracuju proti Anglii. Jsou slepi? To jsou ti pravi nádherí Hitlerovi a zrácí teto země. 67

Vigorous opposition to the measure appeared daily in the Chicago Daily Tribune. In a pointed column it went to the extreme of designating New York City as the war bloc which was making a "ballyhoo campaign to attract Uncle Sam into the

65 United States News, January 3, 1941, "Newsgram".
66 The Narod, published in the Czech language for over a half century, is the only daily Catholic newspaper in the United States. During the war it had a circulation of approximately 10,000.
67 Narod, January 26, 1941, editorial: "Maji Pravdu" (They Are Right).

Translation: The English are in the right. It is a pity that we have in our United States so many people who are working against England. Are they blind? They are the real co-workers of Hitler and the traitors of this country.
parlor of the British commonwealth of nations." And further added, "Many of its sponsors are also pushing for American participation in the European conflict." 68

Another opinion offered by the Herald American (Chicago) was that the measure was going immeasurably beyond the requirements of extensive assistance to Great Britain. It indicated the bill committed the United States to "deliberate acts and policies which under recognized international law are reserved acts of war." 69

"The president's Lend-Lease bill...amounts to an unprecedented delegation of the war making power" argued the World Herald (Omaha). 70 The editor took the stand that if the bill were once enacted, the president in his wisdom and discretion could "precipitate this country in full-fledged war over night." And added, "steps toward war are coming disconcertingly fast, and they are amazingly long steps." 71

In a lengthy editorial when the bill was almost ready for the final votes in the House of Representatives, the

68 Chicago Daily Tribune, February 2, 1941, "War Bloc Tries to Put United States in British Empire."
70 World Herald (Omaha, Nebraska), January 1, 1941, editorial: "The Road to Peace."
71 Ibid.
Milwaukee Journal endorsed the provision giving aid to England in these words:

We have sense enough to know that we shall be better off in a war in which England survives and fights, than by tackling it all alone, with Britain gone, most of its navy sunk, endless outposts impossible to defend. 72

On March 11, 1941 opposition to the bill in Congress gave way and the final vote was taken. In the Senate the vote was sixty to thirty-one in favor of the bill and in the House of Representatives it was accepted by a vote of three hundred to seventy-one. Thereupon, the New York Times applauded its passage in these metaphorical words:

The shot that the embattled farmers fired at Concord was heard round the world... literally when the President demanded the enormous sum of $7,000,000,000 for the aid program. 73

In a previous editorial the New York Times implied, "Britain is absolutely essential to our security" and added,

72 Milwaukee Journal, February 20, 1941, editorial: "Opposition to Lease-Lend Fails". It was thought by many that if Britain went down, the Axis powers would control the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and the high seas. They would then be in a position to bring enormous military and naval resources against this hemisphere.

73 New York Times, March 17, 1941 editorial: "America's Decision".
"there is less risk in the temporary surrender of some of our traditional democracies at home than in the utter destruction of democracy at the eastern gates of the Atlantic Ocean."\footnote{New York Times, February 3, 1941, editorial: "The Lease-Lend Bill."}

After the bill had been entered in the statute books, America still took the stand that the Lend-Lease Bill "clothed the Executive with powers hitherto unused by this government."\footnote{Ibid.}

It further indicated that it put the war-making branch of the government in the background and added "this law made possible the beginning of a war against Hitler and his satellites."\footnote{Catholic World, April 4, 1941, editorial comment: "Defense a Tricky Word."} 

The editor of the Catholic World did not take the view of the New York Times. "To me", the editor said, "it seemed not a Lend-Lease Bill, but a grant of Dictatorship Bill."\footnote{Ibid.}

The editor implied that we had been lending and leasing and giving all that we could spare and in so doing made ourselves vulnerable, and weakened our own defense in order to protect England and the Empire. This had been done with the help of what seemed a "concatention of falsehoods."\footnote{Ibid.} And further, "whatever good might come from the bill", the editor openly stated, "a curse rests upon it because it was put over with a lie."\footnote{Ibid.}
The Lend-Lease was a new development in the foreign policy of the United States. The sharing of resources, on a world basis, was achieved for the first time in World War II. Goods and services valued at more than 42 billion dollars were made available to forty-four countries. Of this total according to figures issued by the Foreign Economic Administration, more than nine billion dollars worth of goods were received by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. Only Great Britain had received more aid from the United States than the U.S.S.R.

About the time that France was near prostration, The Richmond (Virginia) News Leader released the following opinion on America's duty, namely, that "we cannot sit peacefully by and disregard the wreck of half of the world." There was danger from an economic standpoint, that in the event of a German victory, Germany would dominate all Europe and would dispute with us every market of the world. Then sooner or later Germany would challenge us by force of arms. In con-

80 Exports to Russia went like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Gross long tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
<td>194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1,351,788,000</td>
<td>2,468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2,965,923,000</td>
<td>4,794,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>3,429,545,000</td>
<td>6,218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 (Jan.-June)</td>
<td>1,371,598,000</td>
<td>2,977,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81 The Richmond News Leader, June 17, 1940, editorial: "What America Thinks".
sideration of these dangers, The Richmond News Leader stated that "the largest duty we can render the world is to play for time in which to make our armament effective."82

Two months previous to the bombing of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese, Social Justice published in its columns the opinion it had always maintained. It was as follows:

The United States of America is an independent nation, and fully capable of remaining so regardless of what happens abroad, providing we keep ourselves adequately prepared with a strong army, navy and air-force—together with a strong national economy, The United States has no obligation to attempt the impossible task of policing the world... We cannot finance foreign wars and expect to stay out of them. And we cannot enter them, in this day and age, with any hope of salvaging the freedom and comparative prosperity we now enjoy. 83

A few excerpts taken from editorials in the Watseka, Illinois Daily Times over the period from 1939 to the bombing of Pearl Harbor, reflect the non-intervention opinion of a daily newspaper in a small community. The editorials were considered important enough to be broadcast from time
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83 Social Justice, October 6, 1941, "Comment".
to time to the students of the University of Illinois. These editorials were definitely in line with local sentiment, more so, perhaps, than many another large newspaper of a large community. In April 1939 the editor had suspected Roosevelt's "routine" sending of the fleet to the Pacific as a "secret understanding between Britain and the United States."

Upon the entrance of Great Britain and France in the European conflict these questions with its prophetic answer appeared.

Who will be the winner of this war? Great Britain and France? Germany? No! Russia, and she'll have a beaten down Europe to sow her seeds of Communism.

A month later vehement opposition to America's entry into the war was expressed in the candid statement. "We can lose our own democracy and the world can lose a splendid foundation upon which to build its civilization, if we let ourselves be hauled into this war by either of the conflicting forces."

84 Daily Times, (Watseka, Illinois), April 10, 1939, Editorial: "Roosevelt Suspected".
85 Ibid., September 7, 1939, Editorial: "Who Will Win?".
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Column after column had been written for its readers opposing the repeal of the arms embargo, the adoption of the cash and carry plan and for the sale of munitions of war to European belligerents since the editor viewed it all as a "step along the same course we followed into the first World War."87

With regard to the defense program, the Daily Times believed the United States should adopt a fixed and adequate defense program and carry it through to the extent that "no nation would dare attempt an invasion over here."88

During the middle of the year 1940 when it became evident that America was no longer neutral but had passed to non-belligerency, which meant a step closer to the conflict, this powerful, little organ of the community persistently declared that "Americans still wish to stay out of it (European war)" and implied "some clear, calm thinking is going to be necessary if that wish comes true."89

The Daily Times viewed the adoption of the Lend-Lease as America did, namely, that it gave the President such

87 Ibid., April 20, 1940, Editorial: "Following the Same Course".
88 Ibid., May 16, 1940, Editorial: "Must the United States Enter the War?"
89 Ibid., June 11, 1940, Editorial: "America Is No Longer Neutral".
broad powers that he could "carry the nation into international difficulties, escape from which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, without armed conflict."90

Nine months in advance of the Pearl Harbor disaster, the editor indicated that "if the United States becomes a participant with armed forces,...we shall be fighting with Japan before we become directly engaged with any European power."91 This conclusion was arrived at as the result of the suspicion we had of the ambition of the Japanese to dominate the Pacific; Japan had declared that the fortification of the island Guam by the U.S. would be a warlike act so considered, and so it was.

In every issue of the Daily Times, the editorial policy had been consistently in opposition to steps leading America to the brink of war. The editor's final opinion in the late spring of 1941 was that the nation had taken so many steps leading to war, that the nation could not turn back and consequently, it became the duty of every loyal citizen to "join in united effort for our country."92

90 Ibid., January 15, 1941, Editorial: "Too Much Power".
91 Ibid., March 13, 1941, Editorial: "Keep Your Eye on Japan".
92 Ibid., May 29, 1941, Editorial: "Are You Set".
CHAPTER II
THE TREND OF PUBLIC OPINION

When the news came that the Franco-British allies declared war on the Axis, *Fortune* immediately made a survey of public opinion in order to catch it before the full force of propaganda had been loosed upon it. Three questions were asked for the purpose of discovering to what extent the public was already disposed to take sides in the European war and of defining the policy toward which those attitudes led. The first question was the following one.

In the trouble now going on in Europe, which side would you like to see win?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England, France, Poland and their friends</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany and her friends</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither side ..........</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know ............</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before France and England were involved in the European conflict, public opinion had been found so indifferent to foreign nations that almost half the people were disinclined to commit themselves as to their favorites or the ones they liked best. It was quick to take sides now that an issue was drawn. Among the economic levels, favor toward the

---
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Allies climbed from 77.7 per cent of the Negroes to 88.5 per cent of the prosperous. The widest difference appeared to be geographical, and by the size of place. The extremes were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities over 1,000,000</th>
<th>Villages under 2,500</th>
<th>North west plains</th>
<th>South east plains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France, England, Poland and friends 58.4%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany and friends</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither side</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There may have been several unrelated reasons behind these wide variations of opinions where people lived. In the Northwest Plains there were large numbers of people of German descent and perhaps rather than appear pro-German, preferred to answer "Don't know". Possibly too the British ancestry of the South was reflected in its large pro-Ally vote. In the large cities there may have been a kind of urban cynicism which led the people to answer "neither side". A like answer would rarely occur to the simpler farmer and small town person.

The United States public was next asked to decide the all important question of what the position of our country
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was to be. The next question presented to the public was:

Which of these courses of action comes closest to describing what you think the United States should do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions asked in</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter the war at once on the side of England and send an army to Europe</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter the war at once, but send only our navy and air force to help England and France</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter the war on the side of England, France only if it looks as though they were losing, and in the meantime help that side with food and materials</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not enter the war, but supply England and France with materials and food, and refuse to help ship anything to Germany</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take no sides and offer to sell to anybody, but make them pay cash and take it away in their own ships</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refuse to sell actual munitions, but sell the raw materials ...... 6.4

Refuse aid of any kind to either side; and refuse to sell anything at all to either side .......................... 24.7 23.7

Approximately 62.7 per cent of the population stood against economic isolation and 25 per cent were opposed to any trade with the belligerents. To the first three answers, 16 per cent were willing to go into the "Second World War", some 20 per cent favored taking sides in the conflict by economic means short of war. The total vote for using our army or materials was 36.7 per cent. Against this stood 24.7 per cent voting for complete isolation. And between these extremes was a 22.8 per cent vote which favored equal trade with all nations.

In comparing the September and October survey, it indicated that 12.7 per cent of the nation's adults had swung away from a belief in deliberately taking sides toward faith in the neutrality of technically granting equal treatment to all belligerents, either by limited or unlimited selling to all on a cash-and-carry basis or by selling to none.
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These two latter votes totaled would indicate technical neutrality.

In the breakdowns of this survey there appeared an astonishing unanimity of opinion regardless of sex. The number of women who favored getting into the war sometime if necessary was nearly equal to the number of men. The two greatest factors in building these totals were economic and geographic as the following indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pros-</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Negroes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perous</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter the war at once on the side of England, France and send an army to Europe ... 1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter the war at once but send only our navy and air force to help England and France ... 2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter the war on the side of England and France only if it looks as if they were losing and in the meantime help that side with food and materials ... 11.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do not enter the war, but supply England and France with materials and food, and refuse to ship anything to Germany ....... 20.0 19.4 20.5 21.0 16.4

Take no sides and offer to sell to anyone, but on a cash-and-carry basis ............. 36.2 33.7 29.9 25.7 20.1

Refuse any aid of any kind to either side and refuse to sell anything to either side ............. 21.7 23.9 25.1 26.2 24.0

Find some way of supporting Germany . -- -- .2 .2 .3

Other ............. 5.3 3.4 3.3 3.3 2.3

Don't know ........... 1.1 3.8 5.6 7.1 11.5

Negroes excepted, the differences were not great, by classes, on getting into the war. The upper levels leaned a little more toward partial military assistance, the lower brackets were more in favor of getting in if our help was needed. It was the Negro who stood far ahead of the rest in the desire to enter the war at once. By geography some of the widest differences appeared. The following was

---
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Fortune's analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Middle West</th>
<th>North West Plains</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>Mountains &amp; Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter war now and send army ..... 1.9%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter now with only navy and planes ... 1.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter only if needed, 9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Allies material aid without declaring war ..... 19.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-and-carry trade with all ..... 30.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic boycott of all the belligerents</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southeast, inhabited in large part by the belligerent Negro showed up as the most pro-war, with about 30 per cent of the people favoring military aid to the Allies, either then or later if needed. Both the Southeast and the South-
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west were the least for economic isolation. The Northwest Plains where the German American element may have had influence turned in only 5.1 per cent votes for war under any circumstances. From this section also came the lowest percentage for economic assistance to the Allies, namely, 16.2 and the highest for doing no business with the belligerents, 32.3 per cent. This would indicate that in the southern part of our country there were at that date about six times as many people ready to commit the country to fighting Germany as there were in the Central States, and only half as many who were ready to boycott all the belligerents.

The Fortune survey of October 1939 indicated in general that the desire of the United States to remain at peace did not, however, seem to have been accompanied by a firm conviction that we would be able to keep out of war. Interviewers reported that there was an undercurrent of uneasiness, and a deep conviction that something would happen to change neutral sentiment over night. This was public opinion as it stood just after hostilities commenced.

The following survey by Fortune was submitted to the press just when Congress complied with the President's request by repealing the Embargo Act and committing the nation to a policy of cash-and-carry with belligerents, including
war materials.

No trade with any belligerents .... 29.9% ...

Cash-and-carry even though Germany may benefit .... 54.5% neutral policy

Cash-and-carry only if Germany does not benefit .... 24.6 ...

Allies and boycott Germany .... 29.9% pro-Ally neutrality

Trade with the Allies and go into war if needed .... 14.7 ...

Enter the war on Allies side now .... 2.5 immediate or eventual war policy

Other .... 4.8

Don't know .... 3.9 ...

This indicated that the measure of sentiment in the United States could be described as consistently neutral.

Another question for the public to determine the real meaning of "cash" was this one:

Under the Johnson Act now in force, this country is forbidden to lend money to any of the countries whose debts to us have not been paid. England and France are among those countries. Do you think the

---
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Johnson Act should be repealed, so that we might lend money to England and France to buy supplies here?

Yes................ 11.5%
Only if it looks as if the Allies were losing...... 12.3
No..................... 68.1
Don't know........... 8.1

These answers implied that the Frenchmen and Englishmen were looking to this country not only for cash purchases, but possibly for credit purchases later, would think of United States as "Uncle Shylock". The surveys of the past months showed that United States hoped France and England won the war, nevertheless, it didn't propose to be made a "sucker" and help them again with American dollars.

Another survey threw new light upon the kind of neutrality sentiment revealed up to this point. The people were willing to see England and France lose without our help in their war against Germany. However, if Germany and another strong military power combined, this was regarded as a political threat. This is what the following cross tabulation implied:
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People believing that we should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter war now</th>
<th>Enter later</th>
<th>Supply Allies</th>
<th>Sell if needed</th>
<th>Sell only</th>
<th>Carry no one and-carry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would help if Japan entered now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More ..........</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less ..........</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know ...</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interventionists were for even more intervention if Japan joined the war. A majority of the cash-and-carry partisans who were willing for Germany to receive United States goods if she could help them, and who were opposed to extending credits to the Allies, admitted they were inclined to change their ideas if Japan went to war. The strict embargoists were apparently the only people who took a firm stand.

The next set of questions in the December 1939 issue of the Forum survey, pertained to arms and men. To check upon the feeling as to whether the United States public believed in preserving peace by preparing for war, the following questions were asked:
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No matter what happens, do you think that we should immediately increase our:

- Air force? Yes... 88.3%
- Army? Yes... 84.8
- Navy? Yes... 86.8

Would you favor a term of compulsory military service for all young men of eighteen or nineteen?

- Yes.............. 31.3%
- Yes, if necessary... 11.6
- No.............. 48.8
- Don't know..... 8.3

(Southeast North West Plains)

- Yes.............. 40.9% 18.6%
- Yes, if necessary... 12.8 9.0
- No.............. 35.2 66.9
- Don't know..... 11.1 5.5

Here again the part of the country which was most represented of intervention had total percentage of 53.7 for compulsory military service for all young men of eighteen or nineteen years of age, whereas, the Northwest Plains most representative of nonintervention had a total percentage of 27.6.

The people expressing themselves as opposed to general military training for young men gave these reasons for their opposition:

- Don't believe in compulsion .... 21.6%
- Not democratic--un-Amer.ican ...... 11.6
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Too much like dictatorship........ 11.5
Too much like Europe ............ 3.0
Not necessary-no immediate
danger................................ 19.7
Plenty of volunteers.............. 3.9
Creates war spirit ................ 11.0
Too young .......................... 8.0
Interferes with education and
careers ............................... 3.8
Other .................................. 6.8
Don't know ........................... 2.0

This survey implied that the most obnoxious thing about
the idea was not militarism, nor a strong belief that the
training was bad, but the idea that compulsion was un-
American.

On this subject the American Institute of Public Opinion
released a survey made in October 1939 with comparable re-
results. It was as follows:

Do you think all able-bodied men
twenty years old should be made
to serve in the army or the navy
for one year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>Over 30</th>
<th>Upper Income</th>
<th>Lower Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion ....</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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October 8, 1939.
Do you think the United States should increase the size of its
(1) Army, (2) Navy, (3) Air Force?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>East Central</th>
<th>West Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A year previous to the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, the Gallup poll indicated 82 per cent of the people voted for an increase in the size of the army, 86 per cent for the navy and 90 per cent for the air force. This would be a total increase of 7 per cent in all three divisions.

War between the Allies and Germany broke out on September 3, and on this same date the American Institute of Public Opinion made the following survey on the Neutrality Act which had been buried by the legislation when Congress had
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Should Congress change the present Neutrality Law so that the United States could sell war materials to England and France?

| Total  | New England | Middle Atlantic | East Central | West Central | South Central | West
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another question on this vital issue made by the Gallup Poll survey was:

If the Neutrality Law is changed should France be required to give them credit if they cannot pay?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Require Cash</th>
<th>Give Credit</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the middle of September 1939, only 10 per cent were willing to consider the sale of war supplies to England and France on credit. In its survey of December, Fortune found that 11 per cent favored repeal of the Johnson Act. Twelve per cent more indicated they would favor such action if England and France were losing.
The American Institute of Public Opinion conducted a survey on United States participation in the war shortly after the outbreak in Europe to see what influence it had on American opinion. These questions which were similar to those of the Fortune survey were asked:

Should we send our army and navy abroad to fight against Germany?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Upper Income</th>
<th>Middle Income</th>
<th>Lower Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If it looks within the next few months as if England and France might be defeated, should the United States declare war on Germany and send our troops abroad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September Total</th>
<th>October Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If it appears that Germany is defeating England and France, should the United States declare war on Germany and send our army and navy to Europe to fight?
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 Poll results of the American Institute of Public Opinion mirrored the fact that uppermost in the minds of most Americans was "keeping out of war". Strong sentiment was voiced for strengthening the national defense forces by increasing the preparedness of the army, navy, and air force. Compulsory military service was not approved by a majority, though indications were that more support would be given for this policy in the face of real necessity.

The 1940 January issue of Fortune magazine viewed our national policy toward England still as "fondness mingled with aloofness", and toward Germany "anxiety mingled with justice". It also saw a growing willingness to fight for certain causes and fear that we might have to do so. The following survey made by Fortune at the beginning of the new year showed pessimistic tendencies toward the possibility of United States being drawn into the European conflict.

108 Ibid. October 22, 1939.
Regardless of what you hope, what do you think the chances are that the United States will be drawn into this war?

- Sure .................. 9.9%
- Probable .............. 29.2
- Fifty-fifty ............ 22.8
- Unlikely ............... 22.2
- Impossible .......... 4.0
- Don't know .......... 11.9

Dr. Hadley Cantril, social psychologist at Princeton University, traced the trends of public sentiment from the out-break of the war. Early in September 1939, the director of the Princeton Public Opinion Research Project found an "Overwhelming majority of the American people confident that England and France would win." Only "a tenth" predicted a victory for the Nazi. At the same time, the research project found that almost 50 per cent of the population thought the United States should declare war on Germany, if it appeared that the Allies were being defeated. The same percentage likewise believed that the United States would be drawn into conflict sooner or later. About 33 1/3 percent believed however, that it was necessary for conscription of all able bodied men twenty years old to serve in the army, navy or air force for one year.

110 Ibid.
111 Public Opinion Quarterly, September 1940.
112 Ibid.
The survey in the early summer of 1940 showed that more people conceded a German rather than an Allied victory. Then in the late summer after Hitler's listen-to-reason-or-be-an-nihilated speech to England, the trend was again a 45 per cent forecast of an English victory and only 24 per cent of the population thought the Axis would win. On August 1 the great majority thought England should continue to fight and 76 per cent thought this country should do more to help England, though no proposals were suggested to provide aid. About 66 2/3 per cent of the people saw themselves affected if Germany won the war. To meet this threat 75 per cent were willing to pay increased taxes to build up our national defense.

Opinion rose and fell. On some questions there was enormous flux, going up or down as each succeeding event followed; on other questions there showed surprising stability. People reacted differently as the news came from Europe.

The following questions were asked in order to measure opinions concerning the war, the aid this country should give England, and national defense policies. 113

113 The Princeton Public Opinion Research Project obtained its information through the fact-finding facilities of the American Institute of Public Opinion. The figures obtained were estimated as being within 3 or 4 per cent within accuracy. All interviews were dated so that the effect of sudden developments was not obscured by the time required to collect the answers.
Expectations and War Aims

Do you think the U.S. will go into the war in Europe or do you think we will stay out of the war? (July 20, 1940)

Go in Stay out Undecided
39%  48%  13%

Which side do you think will win the war - England or Germany and Italy?

England-Germany & Italy-Neither-Undecided
45%  24%  4%  27%

Which side do you think will win the war if no other countries go into it - Germany & Italy or England? (July 20, 1940)

England-Germany & Italy-Neither-Undecided
43%  31%  3%  23%

If Germany and Italy should defeat England in the present war, do you think Germany and Italy would start a war within the next ten years? (July 20, 1940)

Yes No No Opinion
55% 34%  11%

Suppose the U.S. does not go into the war, and Germany defeats England and France. Do you think you, personally would be affected by this German victory? (July 20, 1940)

Yes No No Opinion
69% 25%  6%

Foreign Policy: General

If the question of the United States going to war against Germany and Italy came up for a national vote within the next two weeks, would you vote to go into the war or stay out of the war? (July 3, 1940)
Go in  
13%  

Stay out  
79%  

Don't know  
8%  

If you were sure that Germany would attack the United States after England is defeated, would you favor our declaring war on Germany right now? (July 20, 1940)

To keep out of war ourselves .. 59%
To help England win, even at the risk of getting into the war .......................... 37%
No choice ..........................  4%

At the present time, which of the following should the United States do about helping England? (July 20, 1940)

Do less than we are doing now ..  5%
Do more or no less than we are doing now .......................... 14%
Do everything possible to help England except go to war .. 73%
Declare war on Germany and Italy and send our army and navy to Europe .......................... 3%
No opinion ..........................  5%

Foreign Policy: Specific

Should the United States delay enlargement of our own air force in order to send England and France right now all airplanes we can now make? (July 20, 1940)

Yes  
35%

No  
59%

No Opinion  
6%

The United States army and navy have about 5,000 airplanes. Would you approve of selling all, some, or none of these planes to England and France at this time? (May 29, 1940)

Yes All  
9%

Some  
38%

None  
49%

No Opinion  
4%
The Johnson Act prevents any act which has stopped paying interest on its debts of the last World War from borrowing money in the United States. Would you approve of changing the law so that England and France could borrow money from our government? (July 29, 1940)

Yes  No  No Opinion
32%  60%  8%

The Neutrality Law prevents American ships from traveling in war zones in Europe. Should this law be changed so that American ships can carry war supplies to England and France? (June 29, 1940)

Yes  No  No Opinion
18%  74%  8%

If it appears certain that England will be defeated by Germany and Italy unless the United States supplies her with more food and war supplies, would you be in favor of this country giving more help to England? (July 20, 1940)

Yes  No  No Opinion
85%  12%  3%

In order to help England - Should the Neutrality Law be changed so that American ships can carry war supplies to England? (July 20, 1940)

Yes  No  Don't know  Don't know
36%  54%  10%

National Defense

Do you think every able-bodied young man should be made to serve in the army or navy for one year? (July 25, 1940)

Yes  No  No Opinion
59%  35%  6%
The United States wants to increase the strength of its regular army to 400,000 men. If enough men do not volunteer would you favor drafting men until this figure is reached? (June 11, 1940)

Yes 67%  No 25%  No Opinion 8%

Do you favor increasing the size of our army and navy by drafting men between the ages of 18 and 32 to serve in the armed forces for one year? (July 20, 1940)

Yes 69%  No 27%  No Opinion 4%

This survey of public opinion made by the Princeton University during the months of April to August 1940 gave the following picture: The people saw the hope of an English victory and believed that a powerful Germany would be a menace to their own and this country's interests. There was a large majority of the people who would have England receive more aid from the United States. However, they considered it more important that his country be kept out of war, than to aid Britain. The majority of people agreed in building up our national defense.

The Catholic Laymen's Committee for Peace organization

114 Public Opinion Quarterly, September 1940.
released the following results on a nationwide poll of Catholic priests' opinion on war. All of the priests in the United States except bishops and service chaplains were asked:

1. Do you favor the United States engaging in a shooting war?

2. Are you in favor of the United States aiding the Communistic Russia?

To the first question 91.5 per cent of the priests voted "no", 6.7 per cent "yes" and 1.8 per cent did not vote. To the second question 90.5 per cent voted "no", 7 per cent "yes" and 2.5 per cent did not vote. These numbers would indicate that the great majority of the priests leaned toward opposition to American entry into the war.116

The response of the clergy from one state to another varied greatly. In Maine, New Hampshire, Delaware, West Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Montana, and Arizona, less than "30 per cent" of the clergy replied.117 More than "42 per cent" replied in New York,

115 Commonweal, October 31, 1941.
116 The questions were mailed to 34,616 priests of which 13,155 replied. Only 38 per cent of them replies, and 62 per cent were not represented in the poll. A thirty-eight per cent response is considered a high percentage of returns in a questionnaire.
117 Commonweal, October 31, 1941.
New Jersey and Massachusetts. A total of 7,174 of the 13,155 votes were from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California and Ohio. The returns from these seven states indicated that the opinions of a minority of the clergy made up more than half of the answers which would be interpreted to represent the almost unanimous opinion of the clergy.

The magazine Editor and Publisher conducted a nationwide poll of daily newspapers of the United States on July 9, 1941. A questionnaire was forwarded to 1,878 daily American newspapers listed in the 1941 Year Book. There were 871 or almost 50 per cent that replied. The following were the questions put to the nation's dailies and the results of the balloting:

Do you favor immediate active military and naval participation in the war?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the best interests of the United States will be conserved by avoiding conflict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

118 Ibid.
119 America, August 23, 1941.
These figures indicated that the daily newspapers of the United States registered opposition to intervention by a vote of more than 2 to 1 and opposition to future intervention by a substantial majority. In thirty-nine of the forty-eight States, the editors of these dailies voted against war. Six States revealed an editorial sentiment for active participation. Newspapers of Florida voted 10 to 1 for immediate participation; Louisiana 3 to 1; Maine 5 to 0; Vermont 4 to 1; Virginia 7 to 3; Wyoming 4 to 1. The vote in North Carolina, North Dakota and Rhode Island tied. With the exceptions of the New York editorial sentiment which was 25 to 22 against war participation, there was an overwhelming majority of editors who opposed immediate intervention. The returns of the remaining newspapers against war participation were as follows: California 38 to 20; Connecticut 11 to 1; Illinois 43 to 7; Massachusetts 18 to 6; Michigan 23 to 3; Missouri 21 to 8; New Jersey 11 to 4; Pennsylvania 47 to 13; Ohio 39 to 14; Indiana 35 to 12; Wisconsin 13 to 4; Texas 27 to 19.

On the second question the poll of the dailies dropped to less than two to one. Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas had either voted against war or tied on the question, revealed an editorial sentiment not adverse to future intervention. Again on the
second question the States containing the bulk of the nation's population voted against intervention at a later date. California voted 34 to 21 against future participation; Illinois 37 to 9; Indiana 35 to 11; Massachusetts 14 to 9; Michigan 22 to 5; Missouri 17 to 12; New Jersey 10 to 5; New York 25 to 23; Ohio 37 to 16; Pennsylvania 40 to 17; Wisconsin 12 to 4.

The Editor and Publisher questionnaire indicated that the attitude of the numerous influential newspapers of the country in opposition to American participation in the European conflict was the same as it had been four months previous to the outbreak of the war in September 1939.

Five months previous to the Pearl Harbor disaster, a state wide survey of Illinois by the Chicago Daily Tribune's war poll showed an 80 per cent opposition to war. There was a return of 77,229 state-wide ballots which broke into the following percentage:

Yes (for War): 14,176 or 18.36%
No (against War): 69,394 or 80.79% 120

In the 150 city wards of Chicago, only one, the 24th

voted consistently for war, the percentage being 53.3 per cent.121 The banner ward for peace was the 145th. Here noninterventionist sentiment was 90.9 per cent.122

The survey also indicated the belligerent inclination among the colored population. In the 2nd and 3rd wards where the Negroes predominate, intervention strength ran 30 per cent. Governor Dwight Green's old ward, the 46th, the vote was 19.7 per cent for war and 80.3 per cent against war. Intervention strength in Mayor Kelley's ward, the 142th, was recorded at 27.3 per cent and sentiment for peace at 72.7 per cent.123

There were people of the opinion that the scientific methods employed by the surveyors, made the polls from day to day increasingly reliable and dependable and were consequently taken seriously by some politicians. There were others who viewed them as a new propaganda machine employed for the purpose of influencing and speeding up the entrance of United States in war. They considered them as hardly a serious, honorable reflection of what people thought. Sen-

121 The Chicago Daily Tribune attributed this slight majority to the heavy Russian, Jewish, and Polish population living in the 24th ward.

122 This overwhelming majority was likewise attributed to the many Northside voters who are of German descent.

123 This state-wide poll was conducted by post-card ballots printed, mailed, and counted under the Chicago Daily Tribune supervision by the Buckley - Dement Co., Chicago.
ator Nye was one who was of the opinion that the polls of public opinion did not reflect the attitude of the people toward war involvement. He maintained there was an overwhelming sentiment against entrance into hostilities and that the polls were used in an effort to overcome the opposition and to build up a war psychology. In view of the power of the polls to create war trends of thought, he introduced into the Senate a resolution which called for an investigation of them on the following points: the trustworthiness of the fact-finding methods, and who determined the manner in which the polls were conducted.

In an editorial entitled, "War Polls and Realism" the editor of the Wheeling (W.Va.) Intelligencer of the July 8, 1941 issue discussed polls and their lack of benefit. The editor pointed out that the polls conducted by newspapers and various sampling organizations designed to sound out public opinion reported uniform and overwhelming sentiment against participation by the United States in a "shooting war". In the concluding paragraph of the editorial there was brought out another important point in these words:

... time is past when sentiment about whether or not we want to go to war is pertinent, or when debate of the matter can serve any useful purpose. The time to have shaped official action to public sentiment, was before steps which meant war were taken.
We are in the war now, and will have to see it through. If that means sending troops to Europe, we will send them, no matter what our preference might be. And the sooner we quit shadow boxing with straw votes and evading the facts in official Quarters, the better prepared we will be for what the future holds. 124

CHAPTER III

POLITICAL PRESSURE GROUPS

In the beginning of the year 1941 there was much controversial legislation in Congress with certain drastic moves by the executive department of the government. This gave rise to the birth of various national citizens' committees organized in support and in opposition. Some of these pressure committees had vast influence. Many of them had developed more or less spontaneously to meet definite vital needs in an unprecedented emergency. The committees did help to arouse the American people to awareness of their responsibilities in face of great danger. They also helped to clarify the issues involved in important problems; to unite for effective co-operation, citizens of like minds, on these issues; to make known to the government the will of the people; to bring pressure by the people upon their government for action in accord with the majority will. The Living Age designated them as "democracy in action".

From every part of the country these Americans fought the administration and demanded that it "do this, not do that." 125

125 Newsweek estimated 2,000,000 Americans in approximately sixty so-called foreign policy pressure groups were active in the United States.
Groups operated in the Congressional lobbies, others maintained offices in the national capital and all issued pamphlets; there were some also that had ample funds who "screamed their warnings in paid newspaper ads." 126

Notable pressure groups favoring more aid to Great Britain included the William Allen White's Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, The League of Women Voters, The National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, and the American Association of University Women. Then there were opposing groups that exerted every effort to keep the United States isolated, notably the America First Committee which was most influential and most powerful, America's Future Inc., Keep America Out of War Congress, The War Resisters League, the American Federation of Peace, the Youth Commission Against War, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Peace Section of the American Friends (Quakers) Service Commission, the World Peace Commission of the Methodist Church, World Peaceways, and many other strongly emotional groups.

In the spring of 1940, the Nazi invaded the neutral countries of Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg without warning, without a declaration of war, and in violation of a non-aggressive treaty negotiated less than a

126 Newsweek, "2,000,000 Voices," November 25, 1940.
year previous. Within a few weeks all had surrendered thus throwing America and the rest of the world into a nervous tension. It was then that William Allen White and Clark M. Eichelberger agreed that there should be an organization for making vocal the belief that the nations of Western Europe which were resisting aggression constituted America's first line of defense and should have full American economic and moral support. 127

The proper power of this committee was demonstrated when almost single handed it worked up the pressure which finally induced the President by executive action, without letting Congress know what was contemplated, to exchange fifty American destroyers on ninety-nine year leases on eight British naval and air bases in the Atlantic and Caribbean area. 128

Amending the Neutrality Act was part of the program of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. Two sections which the group pressed for amendments were the

127 According to a study made by the St. Louis Post Dispatch the White Committee had 662 local chapters with more than a 100,000 members.

128 To get this deal through the White Committee claimed it gathered petitions from more than 3,000,000 signatures in favor of the destroyer deal. Women volunteers in favor systematically called up the 735,488 residential numbers in the five boroughs of New York in an effort to secure added pressure for the immediate adoption of the plan to dispatch to Great Britain 25 "flying fortresses", 20 "mosquito" torpedo boats, and as many pursuit planes as possible.
sections which forbade the arming of American ships and the prohibiting of American merchant and naval vessels from entering the combat zones. Among the members of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies were diverse personalities as Julius Ochs Adler, general manager of the New York Times, President Aydelatte, close associate of Lord Lothian in the Rhodes Trust; David Dubinsky, labor leader; Bishop Manning, J.P. Morgan, Mrs. Dwight Morrow and Wythe Williams, radio commentator. It was Robert Sherwood, the playwright, who put the committee on the map when he wrote the startling, "Stop Hitler Now" advertisement which appeared in full page size in eighteen of the nation's largest newspapers, at a cost of $25,000. He announced that he favored immediate entry into the war on the side of the Allies for the moral effect. Herbert Agar, Col. Henry Breckenridge, Calvin B. Hoover and Lewis Mumford were also frontiersmen who urged an immediate declaration of war. When the Aid the Allies Committee was first announced an article in the May 25, 1940 issue of Uncensored referred to it as the "William Allen White's Committee No. 2," Committee No. 1 having been his Nonpartisn Committee for Peace. Through the revision of the Neutrality Law which devoted itself to fighting the arms embargo Uncensored further commented that

The present attitudes and past records of many mem-
bers of Mr. White's Committee
No. 2 indicate that they will
not long be satisfied with aid-
ing with our supplies and wealth.
By all logic Committee No. 3 should
advocate aiding with planes and
pilots and Committee No. 4 with
an expeditionary force. 129

The White Committee urged the sending of guns, munitions,
food and planes to Great Britain. This was dangerous since
such an act could be regarded by Germany as a declaration of
war, thus committing the United States to immediate war.

William A. White made the statement that the Aid the
Allies group was not for war, and went on to state that

America will go to war or stay
out of it not because we make
Hitler mad, but only when, as,
and if Hitler thinks he can win
the war. And so long as we can
arm behind the British fleet and
England fights, Hitler never thinks
or will think he can win the war,
unless he starts war to slow down
aid to Britain. Any organization
that is for war is seriously play-
ing Hitler's game. 130

By the unanimous consent of the Senate, the Hon. Rush
D. Holt of West Virginia had an article entitled, "Is the
William Allen White Committee as Pure as It Pretends" in-
serted into the appendix of the Congressional Record. He

129 Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 3rd sess., 4097.
130 Congressional Record, 77th Congress, 3rd sess., A. 6979.
declared the Committee was an "internationally conceived organization to involve the U.S. in war ... having had its origin with international interests." The names of prominent individuals were used to "line up others". He exposed the background of many of these men thus clarifying his statement. The J.P. Morgan firm with its holdings in the British Empire helped, he declared, plan the organization and donated its first expense money.

What follows were the findings of Senator Holt of the backgrounds of many of the members of the Committee to Defend America. Eighteen persons, among them Frederick R. Coudert, met secretly on April 29, 1940 in New York City and started the framework for establishing the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. The Repeal of the Arms Embargo had been the nucleus of the Committee. It was felt inadvisable at this meeting to have some person too closely identified by the public with the international financial group as director, and it was considered important to get somebody in the West, thus to escape the attack that it was controlled by Wall Street, somebody whose name was not tied with their work. After a little discussion, William Allen White was named as the front for the "British-inspired-organization". Being a Republican and a mid-westerner,

131 Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 3rd sess., A. 7019.
132 Ibid., 7020.
he filled the bill in an excellent fashion. 

It was in the international banking circles of New York that the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies had its source. The investigation of the background of Frederick Coudert showed that he had been a paid representative of the British Embassy in generating war sentiment in 1917. Lewis Douglas, a former president of the American Cyanamid Company which had been getting both British and American war orders, was trying to take over the leadership of White. Many of the members of the William Allen White Committee were English born, notably the two well known active propagandists, Bishop T. Manning and Rev. John Mac Ivon.

The West Virginian Senator pointed out the powerful connections the Committee had with banks, insurance companies, financial investing firms, and industrial firms or concerns. These exerted powerful influence on college presidents and professors. The hotbed for war he declared was centered in the large endowed groups of colleges and universities, Chicago, Columbia, Yale, New York, and Harvard being among the worst. Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University and James Conant of Harvard were considered by him as the two outstanding "war-hawks." Some of the colleges "actually

133 Other important personages represented at this meeting were Thomas W. Lamont of the firm of J.P. Morgan; John Davis, attorney of Morgan; Lewis Douglas, president of Mutual Life; Henry Stimson, Secretary of War.
owed allegiance to the Empire of Great Britain"; some have desired to get in with the financial circle, whom they felt would be interested in intervention." 134

Further, Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador, had made contacts with American professors and presidents. He was secretary to the Rhodes Trust and had made approximately fifteen trips to the United States as a part of his work with the Rhodes money. He knew President Frank Aydelotte who was a Rhodes scholar, a Rhodes trustee in 1918, and then a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation. Conant and Butler were likewise trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and all were members of the Defend America by Aiding the Allies Committee. 135

Since many presidents and other college officials sat in on the boards of the big financiers' foundations of the British Empire, many of them, the Congressman declared became "infected, conditioned, immunized and intimidated." 136 And to keep open and to protect the sources of income, he added "they are ready to sacrifice and waste the human re-

134 Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 3rd sess., A. 7020.
135 In his book, Money to Burn, Horace Coon spoke of the Carnegie fund as an endowment for war.
136 Ibid., page 7023.
sources of the country to preserve the present status of world dominion."

On December 23, 1941, William Allen White startled his committee with a signed, copyrighted, newspaper editorial in which he explained that his resignation from the chairmanship of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was brought about by some of the warmongering activities of the Committee. He stated that the only motive of the organization was to keep the country out of war and added that if he were asked for a motto to fit the committee it would be, "The Yanks Are Not Coming." The following is his opinion as stated in the Emporia (Kan.) Gazette. During the year of the Committee's organization the job he was working at had been "purely a propagandized job," to give the average American a feeling that he is one of many and that by belonging to the nation-wide organization, he can make his private sentiment, public opinion. The next job was to crystalize that public opinion and then use it to put pressure on the president and Congress that they would act accordingly.

---

137 Ibid., page 7023. The following individuals were spokesman for England since they were educated at the expense of English capitalists: Charles Seymour, honorary fellow at Kings College, educated at Cambridge; William B. Monro, educated at Queens College and Edinburgh; Daniel Marsh, Oxford; Arthur O. Lovejy, lecturer of London; Frank P. Graham, University of London; Marshall Field, educated in London; Ernest M. Hopkins, Oxford University and others.
The first pressure succeeded in getting destroyers to aid Great Britain. Then the isolationists were beaten in their nominations of a man to both the Republican and the Democratic platform. Next came the success in the campaign for the bombers for England and for airplanes priorities and for tanks and other things. The group was also successful in keeping the issue of aiding Great Britain out of the presidential campaign. Then the Kansas editor saw a definite war fever rising after the presidential election especially on the eastern seaboard, particularly in New York. He declared the war fever set a lot of perfectly good men to "ghost dancing, whooping it up for war, demanding convoys, wanting to send our ships into belligerent zones carrying contraband of war and trying to repeal the Johnson Act."

The America First Committee, the antithesis of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, was organized by a law student in the Yale University, for the purpose of opposing the entry of the United States into the World War. The young man, Robert Douglas Stuart, deplored President Charles Seymour's espousal of open aid to the Allies believing it would eventually lead the United States into war. He thought the President's views were not those of the student

138 Congressional Record, 77th Congress, 1st sess., A. 63.
body and got up a poll which showed 3 to 1 on his side. The newly organized committee with General Wood (Sears Roebuck) as chairman, spread like wild fire throughout the length and the breadth of the country. Its members included such names as Colonel Lindbergh, Kathryn Lewis, daughter of John L. Lewis; Alice Roosevelt-Longworth, Laura Ingalls. 139

The committee grew from a small group that met in one room in the Board of Trade building in Chicago, to six hundred fifty chapters in and throughout the United States after the first six months of its existence. It boasted of more than 500,000 active members plus hundreds of thousands more who signed petitions or indorsed the principles of the organization. Three special trains staffed with the nonintervention speakers toured the country under the auspices of local America First committees; radio addresses were delivered and transcriptions of the addresses furnished to small radio stations.

During this same period Illinois pointed out the following success of its activities. It printed and distributed 1,500,000 pamphlets and folders; answered 100,000 separate printed requests for information, and posted more than 750,000 pieces of mail. In Chicago, the chapter gathered more

139 Laura Ingalls faced a trial for being a paid propagandist agent of the Nazi.
than 750,000 signatures demanding defeat of the Lend-Lease Bill and also tabulated 328,000 protests in telephone calls.

The America First Office in Washington D.C. provided senators, representatives and chapter officials with analysis of the Lend-Lease Bill and its amendments. Every week a news-letter was mailed to its 1,250 speakers. Besides the thousands of mass meetings throughout the United States, one hundred chapters showed a movie entitled, "America First."

Detroit, Michigan sponsored an anti-war rally at which 5,000 American citizens in an America First Committee voted unanimously to submit the following resolution to Members of Congress as a sincere indication of their earnest desire to keep out of war. It read:

Resolved: The people of this country as appears from repeated polls and tests of public opinion are overwhelmingly opposed to involvement in the present European war. We therefore insist that this administration has no legal or moral right to risk our involvement, by acts which would invite or provoke an outbreak of hostilities.

Be it further
Resolved: That we commend the members of Congress who by their votes have truly reflected this desire for peace, and we pledge to them our continued support and allegiance.  140

140. Congressional Record, 77th Congress, 3rd sess., A. 1714.
The representatives from chapters of the America First Committee from San Diego, California to Boston, Massachusetts, met in Chicago and vigorously condemned and repudiated the unauthorized utterances and conduct of the Secretary of the Navy for his out right advocacy of undeclared war in defiance of the Constitution.

When the Lend-Lease Bill which was entitled, "An Act to Promote the Defense of America" was being debated in Congress the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies warmly adopted it as a "defense measure" which would keep war away from America; on the other hand, the America First group denounced it as the "blank-check-bill" and a sure guarantee of war.

Despite passage of the Lend-Lease Bill, the America First group launched new membership drives and put up a hard fight to keep the United States at peace. Anti-war campaigns were operating in every state of the Union. In Denver, Colorado the Committee met with opposition from the commanding officer of Lowry Field, Colonel Early E.W. Duncan. He accused the America First Committee of inciting anti-war sentiment among his soldiers and subjecting them to thoughts and ideas harmful to morale. Thereupon, an order was issued forbidding any member of his command to frequent the Denver headquarters of the America First Committee or to attend any
meetings sponsored by it. Violations of the order were to be punished by court martial or other military discipline.  

This resolute group put pressure on the British and on the President and the Congress to keep the United States out of war. However, "the torpedoes that sank the American battleships in Pearl Harbor, also sank America Firstism."  

At a time when other pressure groups were lining up, there appeared in the June issue of the National Legionnaire an editorial from the pen of the national commander, Ray Kelley. It was addressed to the "men and women who want peace, but not at any price." The commander stated that the Legion had during the twenty previous years raised its voice to the "highest pitch" in the demanding effort to arouse the nation for an adequate national defense. The nation remained complacent despite the fact that the world had been becoming an armed camp with high explosive potentialities. The American Legion indicated that its attitude  

141 The America First Committee denied the charge that it was seeking to tamper with the morale of the army or navy. Likewise, it stated that it refrained from any solicitations of membership in the armed forces; it neither accepted contributions from soldiers nor distributed literature to them. The Colonel's order was looked upon as an imposition of dictatorship in a free country.  


143 Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 3rd sess., 4072.
and its position on the war issue was that at no time, and at no place, had it ever come out for war, nor had it ever advocated United States going into the European war. Neither did it ever make any resolution to this effect at any time in any connection.

On the occasion of the celebration of the adoption of the constitution by the Polish diet in 1791, ten thousand Americans of Polish extraction gathered in Buffalo, New York on May 25, 1941. They pledged their loyal support to whatever plan of action deemed necessary by the President or by the Congress to deliver to Great Britain and her Allies all the material they needed from our "arsenal of democracy." This, and other resolutions were forwarded to the President and to the Senators and Representatives from New York.

A month later a similar group of citizens of the United States and Canada of Polish extraction gathered at the annual pilgrimage to Niagra-on-the-Lake, Ontario, to pay homage to one soldier dead. The attitude of this group toward the war was expressed in the following resolution:

Whereas Great Britain, Poland and their allies constitute the first line of defense in the preservation of Christian democratic ideals... be it Resolved: That to the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we express our deep gratitude
for the far reaching necessary steps he has taken in the defense of the United States; in sponsoring the lend-lease bill; ... we extend a message of admiration and our sincere hope and confidence in final victory for Great Britain, Poland, and other countries fighting side by side with Great Britain, based on God's own law and democratic principles and ideals. 144

The Seattle Peace Coordinating Committee, a nonintervention federation of peace groups, representing citizens of different persuasions, various religious affiliations and of varied races, vehemently demanded the taking of every precaution yet to safeguard America from becoming "embroiled in the bloody holocaust of Europe." 145 It pledged itself to a program of strict neutrality in word and action, opposition to the repeal of the Johnson Act and to conscription and to compulsory military training.

Pressure was put on the Ohio congressmen by the Selectee Parents' Legion to exert their influence to keep their "sons out of Europe". Their letter of protest read as follows:

Mothers and fathers of sons enlisted or selected will march to defend these United States. We believe in the best military training under
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the auspices of Uncle Sam's own men, as we believe in maintaining at all times, not only in time of political expediency to keep our United States secure from all combinations of foreign powers.

...

Most powerful in these United States is the family group. Who betrays first and destroys secondly this same family group, helps tear democracy apart and outrageously ignores the will of the fathers and mothers, who, all over our land, are most emphatically opposed to having their sons blown to bits in foreign battlefields....

Convoys of war supplies into combat zones by our ships and men, spell war; we fathers and mothers of sons know it and want none of it. ...

American Mothers' Organization, headquarters at Point Pleasant, New York, dispatched a letter written in strong language to their congressman, the Hon. Joseph J. O'Brien, and in it they expressed their sentiment towards the war situation. They emphatically stressed opposition to the United States sending armed forces to police or fight on foreign soil; to the order given the navy "to shoot on sight;" to the United States furnishing arms and supplies
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to foreign nations. In an angry tone they demanded that
the Congress take drastic action to preserve the American
form of government and added "even if such action must be
the impeachment of the President."147 Likewise, the organ-
ization bitterly resented the idea of United States being
an "arsenal for any country but our own" and entering upon
the "wholesale murder business."148

The international events which occurred after February
27, 1941 indicated that immediate world peace was far remote:
Thereupon, the Hon. Louis Ludlaw of Indiana introduced the
House Concurrent Peace Resolution.149 On April 6, 1941 a group
of American mothers framed a Ludlaw Peace Group for the pur-
pose of circulating a petition to urge passage of the peace
bill. Within a few weeks the signatures of almost 3,000
American citizens in every part of the country had been ob-
tained. The signers of these petitions clearly declared
themselves in favor of peace and likewise demanded that the
Members of Congress who had been elected on a peace platform

147 Congressional Record, 77th Congress, 1st sess., A. 4517.
148 Ibid.
149 This bill proposed that the Western Hemisphere shall be
made an arsenal of world peace, and that the Congress
shall request the President to invite the American re-
publics to send delegates to a conference to be held in
the city of Washington to offer to the nations at war
the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator.
"devote their time and energies to the realization of a peaceful world order." 150

An organization known as Women United, headquarters in New York City adopted this resolution:

The time has now come when, under the leadership of our President, a decisive step should be made for peace; therefore, we suggest that Congress pass the Ludlaw peace resolution... 151

The Women's Patriotic Conference held in Washington made a resolution by which they reaffirmed their stand on neutrality and urged the Congress to retain their power to keep this country from any policy that might draw the United States into war. They advocated permitting England to purchase needed material in exchange of her islands in the Western Hemisphere, which they indicated "are so necessary for the defense of the United States of America." 152

An emergency organization of women known as the Mother's National Executive Committee, was formed in 1939 for the sole purpose of coordinating the activities of mothers' and
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women's groups in the United States to oppose foreign involvement. It frequently represented them on Capitol Hill and expressed for them their anti-foreign-war involvement. Representative views of the Women's Club of Kremlin, Montana were expressed in a petition to the Hon. Jeannette Rankin, congresswoman in these words: "We favor giving material aid to Great Britain...but are opposed to becoming so involved that it will be necessary for our men to fight in any foreign war." 153

There were women's organizations that did not endorse the "peace at any price policy." One of these was The National League of Women Voters. In a statement to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, its members urged "forthright repeal of the Neutrality Act" in order to "free the hands of the Congress and the Executive." 154 It further indicated that public opinion recognized the futility of attempting to "legislate peace" and the danger of "tying the hands of government" in advance of circumstances so that it would be unable to exercise its constitutional functions as circumstances demanded. 155

The Elective Officials of Orange County, Indiana re-
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quested their congressman to do all in his power, both by vote and influence to "defeat any measure which in his opinion might have a tendency to involve this nation in the European war" and to "wholeheartedly support all measures destined to prohibit such involvement."156

Political pressure put on congressmen, by the university professors, was, for the most part, favorable towards measures of intervention. When the Lend-Lease Bill was pending, some 214 professors of the University of Michigan sent a letter with their signatures and a short statement to their United States Senator in which they voiced their opinion in support of the bill. The signatures of these citizens and "American patriots" indicated their attitude towards war measures and this served to strengthen the hands of their congressmen in their "gallant struggle for national security."157 The faculty and staff of Bryn Mawr College, Swarthmore College, Haverford College, and the University of Pennsylvania also met and sent telegrams to Congress vigorously protesting against "any attempt to block the will of the majority of them by filibuster" and urged "prompt passage" of the Lend-Lease Bill. 158 Another telegram signed by student chairmen
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of twenty-four college chapters and affiliated with the
Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, was sent
to Senator Warren R. Austin with this message:

We know that democratic safety
throughout the world depends on
the vision and energy of our
country. We urge our Congress
to take this step which democratic
safety demands. Pass H.R. 1776. 159

A contrary attitude was shown by one thousand students
of the University of Chicago who signed petitions supporting
President Hutchins in condemning Lend-Lease Bill and demand-
ing extension of democracy at home. The students at Garrett
Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois, also registered
opposition. The America Youth Congress when it met at Lake,
Geneva (Wis.) too went on record as "opposing all forms of
dictatorship, compulsory military training, conscription or
un-American regimentation of youth in compulsory labor
camps." 160

Further thoughts on interventional relations were ex-
pressed in a provocative editorial from the University of Wash-
ington Daily, the official publication of the vast student
body. The attitude of the majority of these students in
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January 1941, towards American participation in the European conflict was expressed in these forceful statements:

We love our country dearly. We will die for it if necessary. But we want no part in Europe's war, and we have not the foolish notion that Adolph Hitler will find crossing the Atlantic Ocean one hundred times more difficult than crossing the English Channel. American young men and women are ready to meet any challenge. ... Franklin Roosevelt has promised the young men of this Nation that they will not fight in Europe. We have also heard about a promise to the boys who went before, "They shall not die in vain." We are cynical enough to believe in peace. 161

The ire of the noninterventionist group was aroused when it had been intimated that the United States Fleet would be used as a convoy for merchant ships carrying munitions of war to certain belligerent nations at war in Europe. These ships would necessarily have to travel in waters infested with submarines and sunken mines. They were in danger of being destroyed and such an act would inevitably bring the United States into a European war. Letters of protests were forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the State and to members of Congress from the Anaconda (Mont.) Ancient Order of Hibernians in America; from
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the Study Group of Farm Women of Park Co. (Mont.); from the citizens of Missoula and Joplin Montana; and from the two County Boards of Supervisors of LaCrosse and Waupaca (Wis.).

The National Maritime Union whose membership comprised 52,000 dues-paying American seamen, advocated protection for their seamen by permitting the arming of ships. While at the New York Membership Meeting, they unanimously adopted in their thirty-three branch offices and at the headquarters the following resolution:

Resolved, That the National Maritime Union urge the immediate adoption of Senator McKellar's resolution calling for the repeal of the Neutrality Act, and that the National Maritime Union support and advocate the declared intention of the President to arm and protect American ships and American seamen carrying vitally needed supplies to the heroic peoples of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

A similar resolution for the full support of President Roosevelt's program of all-out-aid to all nations fighting against Hitler and his Axis partners was adopted by the Cigar Makers International Union of America No. 42 and forwarded to Capitol Hill.

In Hartford (Conn.) a trade union division of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was formed.
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It received active support from the A.F.L. and the C.I.O. Its outstanding leaders urged the trade-union movement in the United States to do everything in its power to mobilize the forces of labor in full support of the foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration of giving all-out-aid to all the Allies fighting Hitler. They also tried to impress upon labor the realization that the future of the free trade-union movement could only be assured by a full military defeat of Nazi Germany. Labor adopted a statement of principles which briefly were these: that Hitler threatened the security and independence of the United States; a Hitler victory meant the end of the free trade-union-movement; the United States would be left alone and isolated which would then necessitate the maintenance of a tremendous army and air force; American standard of living would be lowered and a future attack by Hitler on this country.

The July 5, 1941 issue of America indicated that practically all the Protestant denominations were "preponderantly in the direction of peace." The attitude of the Lutherans was illustrated at the National Welfare Conference of America held in Baltimore. More than three hundred Lutheran charitable agencies were represented from all parts of the country. The sentiment of the Conference was strongly against intervention. The delegates were urged to write to the President
and their Congressman and plead with the officials not to "pursue any course of action which would lead to war." 163

The United Lutheran Synod which covers New York, New England and northern New Jersey met in Buffalo; at the convention a resolution was approved urging the Christian people to "seek out every possible opportunity for practicing the way of peace and love in a world of war and hate." 164 Similarly, the Lutheran Augustana Synod convened in Minneapolis, Minnesota and the delegates unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the Christians to "heroically champion" the cause of peace and not to "falter in its traditional opposition to war." 165

At the annual convention in Wichita, Kansas, the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ, raised their voices in protest of war. These delegates were urged to petition the President to use "every influence at his command to mediate a just and lasting peace among the warring nations." 166 Likewise, at the State convention in Bedford, Indiana the Disciples of Christ adopted a resolution by which they condemned the President's declaration of an unlimited national emergency, without first going and giving a trial to the alternative of a just peace through mediation.
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In St. Louis, Missouri, at the 153rd General Assembly of the Presbyterians' Church, the members resolved to remain "free from military participation in the European conflict." 167

At both of the conventions held by the Methodists in Columbus, Ohio and in Kalamazoo, Michigan, the delegates adopted resolutions protesting against America's march toward war. The assembly at Ohio characterized the President's unlimited emergency address as "needlessly provocative."

Pleas for peace were not confined to the official conventions of the Protestant denominations. According to the report of the Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, there were one thousand Protestant ministers from different parts throughout the country, who had signed an anti-war petition recording their "unalterable opposition" to the "present threatened belligerency of the United States," and pledged themselves not to use their ministry to "bless, sanction, or support war." 168 In Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, a central Pennsylvania Peace Fellowship was organized. This organization represented ten denominations and included
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thirty-five ministers and Y.M.C.A. secretaries. There was a rally held in Detroit, Michigan by the Ministers' No-War-Committee which emphasized the belief that America's genuine role in the war was that of "mediator and peace-maker."

The Protestant Episcopal Church was one of the few Churches that went down on record as having advocated immediate entrance of the United States into the war. When it held its annual convention in Ohio, most of the delegates voted intervention. The Bishop of Cincinnati, Hobson, condemned isolationism as morally wrong. He stated that he was aware that giving full aid to Britain meant war, nevertheless, he declared it was the only true course.169

The Catholic Church was neither an interventionist nor a noninterventionist. Individual members and groups of individuals expressed diverse opinions. When America seemed to be on the verge of war, the Hon. Louis Ludlaw of Indiana introduced in the House of Representatives June 2, 1941, a resolution proposing that Congress request the President of the United States to arrange to offer the service of the twenty-one republics of the Western Hemisphere as mediator to end the war. His Eminence Cardinal William H. O'Connell
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of Boston, supported the resolution and telegraphed the following message to the congressman:

There is no doubt in my mind that the American people desire a cessation of this stupid and brutal war, and I may add, that no one can doubt their desire to keep out of the conflict. 170

He was also quoted by the Boston Traveler as saying he had a feeling "secret maneuvers behind the scenes of government are bringing us nearer and nearer to war" and "I know the people want to stay out, but the Government seems to ignore their wishes while still talking democracy." 171 The Cardinal viewed the puzzling situation as a betrayal of American democracy.

The New York Herald Tribune issued in its columns an article entitled "Crisis of Christianity" in which the Catholic bishops of United States reviewed the world situation and pledged Catholic aid to defense. The text of their pronouncement explicitly condemned naziism and communism in this general statement.

"We, the members of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference deputed to the annual meeting of
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the bishops of the United States to express their minds on the crisis of Christianity, declare as shepherds of souls that our concern is the supreme interest of religion. Our thoughts, therefore, turn to the two greatest evils of today which would destroy all spiritual values. We find two subversive forces both in control of powerful governments, both bent on world domination. They are nazi-ism and communism. ...172

Their pronouncement, composed as it were, of lengthy generalities, was viewed by the Washington Post as having great significance, namely that the destiny of the church was involved in the same crisis which confronted the political order, and also that the bishops considered the threat offered to Christianity to be greater than the threats offered by the Great Schism, the Mongol invasion and the wars of religion or the French Revolution.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARDS WORLD WAR II DURING THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 1939 TO DECEMBER 1941

The writer's investigation of American attitude towards World War II, during the period from September 1939 to December 1941, as reflected by the press, the numerous political pressure groups indicates that there was a distinct lack of a war mind in the United States. Likewise, the revelations disclosed in the three documents, totaling 130,000 words, which were released by President Truman, as also the independent actions of Roosevelt as the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, suggest that the most responsible person for the Pearl Harbor catastrophe is President Roosevelt.

In 1939 there was very general condemnation of Nazi Germany, a wide spread sympathy with Great Britain, but by no means a militant attitude, neither was the United States favorably disposed to make great sacrifices in the cause of the Allies. Before September, 1939, public opinion was found to be indifferent and a large percentage of the population indisposed to commit themselves. At the outbreak of the war, American opinion highly favored the democracies. The peoples' assumption was the assurance of a victory for
them. This opinion was dominant until the end of the year.

The tragic events of the spring of 1940, changed the
complacent attitude of the American people. After they
launched their attack on Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France,
the Germans emerged the conquerors of Western Europe. Great
Britain stood in great peril and its destruction implied a
drastic change in the whole international scheme.

A year previous to the declaration of war with Europe,
President Roosevelt prepared for a change in American foreign
policy, that is, for a departure from the tenets of the
Neutrality Act of 1937, and for a more vigorous role in the
Orient. On September 21, 1939, in his message to Congress,
he demanded modification of the legislation of 1937. Possibly
the President was encouraged by the result obtained from a
poll of the Institute of Public Opinion which showed that 56
per cent of the people that polled favored modification of
the Act. His recommendations brought about a bitter fight
in Congress. The Democrats, with few exceptions, supported
the President, and the Republicans, for the most part, were
aligned in opposition.

A long tradition had suggested the maintenance of
American neutrality. It was legal and a philosophical idea
that had been deeply rooted in the thoughts of the people of
the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century. In
January, 1941, the President's lend-lease proposal represented an entirely different idea of neutrality. The lend-lease idea was, however, accepted by the legislative body of the United States; the vote in the Senate for the measure was 60 to 30; in the House of Representatives the vote for its passage was 317 to 171. This represented a partisan vote since there were only 10 Republicans in the Senate and 35 Republicans in the House of Representatives that voted for it. Perhaps not all those who supported the measure were fully aware of its possible consequences.

Cargoes which were assigned or consigned to the democracies abroad, after the lend-lease enactment, had to be protected from being sunk by German submarines. The administration took action by ordering the American naval and air forces to patrol the Atlantic. American airplanes had signified to British vessels the location of Nazi submarines. The next action taken was the occupation of American troops in Greenland and Iceland. These steps were taken by the President acting on his own authority as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. Then in the early fall of 1941, a German U-boat fired a futile torpedo in the direction of an American warship carrying the mails to Iceland. The President began a kind of informal warfare against Germany when he ordered the American vessels to fire when they came
into contact with German submarines.

After this incident, Roosevelt recommended to Congress more new changes in the neutrality legislation of 1937; he asked for authority to arm the merchant vessels of the United States. Congress was not united in support of the Executive, nevertheless, the bill passed the House of Representatives on October 17, by a vote of 259 to 138. The Senate not only passed the bill, but also attached a provision permitting American ships to enter the waters prohibited under early legislation.

During the period 1939-1941 tension was high with Japan. United States resented the Japanese policy in China. It gave China assistance and denounced the commercial treaty of 1911, thus putting economic pressure against the Japanese. The crisis came when on September 27, 1940, the Japanese linked with the Axis powers. To counter-act this alliance, the American government made a new loan to China and on the twenty-sixth of July 1941, by executive order, froze all Japanese assets in the United States; this virtually suspended all trade between Japan and this country. With the attack of December 7, neutrality was abandoned entirely. The events of 1939 to 1941 demonstrate that a great nation such as America, cannot isolate itself physically, morally or intellectually from the rest of the world, and that in the
future, it cannot assume an attitude of cool detachment in the midst of world catastrophe.
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