

CHAPTER **From**
35 Isolationism
to War
(1932-1941)

215 A "Bug's-Eye" View
of Europe

Don Marquis, a newspaper writer, became famous as the creator of an imaginary insect named Archy. Archy, a cockroach, was a shrewd observer of people and events, and he did not hesitate to express his opinions on any subject. He had very strong viewpoints, especially about American society.

Each night, Archy used Marquis' office typewriter to write down his ideas about what was happening in the world. Archy supposedly operated the typewriter keys by jumping on them head first. Because he was unable to move the shift key on the typewriter, he was not able to use capital letters or punctuation. In this selection, you will read Archy's view of "post war europe."

READING FOCUS

1. Why did Archy the cockroach favor the League of Nations?
2. Did the author believe the war was really over?

Don't bring the League home!



if the league of nations
 can survive the mutual animosities
 of the powers which belong to it
 it is safe from the activities
 of the countries which stayed outside of it
 it furnishes a wonderful mechanism
 with which to do what the powers
 want to do if they only knew
 what they wanted to do
 incidentally i wonder why europe of today
 is always referred to by highbrow writers
 as post war europe
 they seem to think that the war
 which started in nineteen fourteen
 is over with whereas there have been
 merely a few brief truces
 that war is merely worrying through
 its first half century
 and will only cease permanently
 when a generation comes along
 which has forgotten all the old feuds

archy the cockroach

"the league" from the lives and times of archy and mehitabel by don marquis.

READING REVIEW

1. To what "mutual animosities," or hatreds, was Archy referring?
2. (a) According to Archy, when would wars cease permanently? (b) Do you agree with him? Why or why not?
3. (a) Why did the author use a make-believe character to express his opinions about "post war europe"? (b) Do you think that using a make-believe character was effective? Explain.

216 The Menace
of Hitler

Many Americans were deeply concerned about events in Europe in the late 1930's. They were disturbed by the rise of dictators in some European nations and the aggressive ambitions of these dictators. With each new act of aggression by Germany, Italy, and Japan, some Americans feared that war was certain.

One person who was especially concerned about these events was Dorothy Thompson, a famous journalist whose newspaper and magazine writings were well known to Americans. During these years, it was said that she was "the equivalent of a troop of tanks in the prewar skirmishing with Adolf Hitler." The following selection was written on February 18, 1938, shortly after Austrian chancellor Kurt von Schuschnigg had met with Hitler and agreed to admit Nazi members into the Austrian cabinet. Still not satisfied with this agreement, Hitler sent an army into Austria a few weeks later. Austria then came under the total control of Germany.

READING FOCUS

1. Why did Hitler want Austria?
2. What did Dorothy Thompson see for the future of Europe?

Write it down. On Saturday, February 12, 1938, Germany won the world war, and dictated, at Hitler's mountain retreat, a peace treaty to make the Treaty of Versailles look like one of the great humane documents of the ages.

Write it down. On Saturday, February 12, 1938, Nazism started on the march across all of Europe east of the Rhine.

Write it down that the world revolution began in earnest—and perhaps the world war.

From *Let the Record Speak* by Dorothy Thompson.

War rumblings from Europe

Write it down that the democratic world broke its promises and gave in, not in the face of strength, but of terrible weakness, armed only with ruthlessness and daring.

What happened?

On February 4, Hitler ousted his chief of staff and fourteen other generals. Why? Because the army leadership refused to move against an unarmed, friendly country—their German-speaking neighbor, Austria. Why did they refuse? Because of squeamishness? Hardly. Because they thought that Britain and France would interfere? Perhaps. Or because they themselves feared the ultimate catastrophe the future would bring as a result of this move? I think this is the best guess.

A week later, Hitler, with his reorganized army, made his move. How did he make it? He called in the chancellor of Austria, Doctor von Schuschnigg, and gave him an ultimatum. Sixty-six million people against six million people. German troops were ready at Austria's borders. Hitler's generals stood behind him as he interviewed the Austrian chancellor. Hitler taunted his victim. "You know as well as I know that France and Britain will not move a hand to save you." Hitler will doubtless hail this meeting as a friendly reconciliation between two German-speaking peoples and the strengthening of peace in eastern Europe.

What does the chancellor of Austria really think about Nazism?

He expressed himself hardly more than a month ago, on January 5, in the *Morning Telegraph* of London.

"All the News That's Fit to Print."

The New York Times

EXTRA

Pearly cloudy and somewhat windy today. Tomorrow generally fair with moderate temperatures. Temperature Yesterday—Max. 67, Min. 61.

VOL. LXXXVIII, No. 25,806
Entered as Second-Class Matter, Postoffice, New York, N. Y.
Copyright, 1939, by The New York Times Company
NEW YORK, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1939.
THREE CENTS

GERMAN ARMY ATTACKS POLAND; CITIES BOMBED, PORT BLOCKADED; DANZIG IS ACCEPTED INTO REICH

BRITISH MOBILIZING

Navy Raised to Its Full Strength

Bulletins on Europe's Conflict

London Heats of Warsaw Bombing

LONDON, Friday, Sept. 1 (AP).—Reuters British news agency said it had learned from Polish sources in Paris that Warsaw was bombed today.

HOSTILITIES BEGUN

Warsaw Reports German Offensive Moving on

FREE CITY IS SEIZED

Forster Notifies Hitler of Order

Hitler Acts Against Poland

HITLER GIVES WORD

In a Proclamation He Addresses Warsaw

This is what he said:

"There is no question of ever accepting Nazi representatives in the Austrian cabinet. An enormous distance separates Austria from Nazism. We do not like arbitrary power, we want law to rule our freedom. We hate terror. Austria has always been a humanitarian state. As a people, we are tolerant by nature. Any change now in our *status quo* could only be for the worse."

Why does Germany want Austria? For raw materials? It has none of any importance. To add to German prosperity? Austria is a poor country with serious problems. But strategically it is the key to the whole of central Europe. Czechoslovakia is now surrounded. The wheat fields of Hungary and the oil fields of Rumania are now open. Not one of them will be able to withstand the pressure of German domination.

It is horror walking. Not that "Germany" joins with Austria. We are not talking of "Germany." We see a new Crusade, under a pagan symbol, worshipping "blood" and "soil," preaching the holiness of the sword and glorifying conquest. It hates the Slavs, whom it thinks to be its historic "mission" to rule. It subjects all of life to a militarized state. It persecutes men and women of Jewish blood. Now it moves into the historic stronghold of Catholic Christianity, into an area of mixed races and mixed nationalities, which for a thousand years the Austro-Hungarian Empire could rule only with tolerance. Adolf Hitler's first hatred was not communism, but Austria-Hungary. Read *Mein Kampf* [Hitler's book]. And he hated it for what? For its tolerance? He wanted 80 million Germans to rule with an iron hand an empire of 80 million "inferiors"—Czechs, Slovaks, Magyars, Jews, Serbs, Poles, and Croats.

Today, all of Europe east of the Rhine is cut off completely from the western world. The swastika banner, we are told, is the crusader's flag against Bolshevism [Communism]! Madness! Only the signs on the flags divide them [Germany and the Soviet Union].

And it never needed to have happened. One strong voice of one strong power could have stopped it.

Tomorrow, one of two things can happen. Despotism can stop where it is, through the lack of real leadership and creative brains. For the law of despotisms is that they kill off the good, and the brave, and the wise. Perhaps all

of Europe east of the Rhine will become, eventually, a no-man's land of poverty, militarism, and despair. But nonetheless a plague spot.

More likely the other law of despotism's nature—the law of constant aggressiveness—will cause it to move farther and onward, made bolder and stronger by each success.

To the point where civilization will take a last stand. For take a stand it will. Of that there is not the slightest doubt.

Too bad that it did not take it this week.

READING REVIEW

1. Why, as Dorothy Thompson saw it, did Germany want Austria?
2. (a) According to Thompson, who or what could have stopped Hitler? (b) Do you agree or disagree with the author? Explain your answer.
3. (a) What two alternatives did Thompson predict for the future? (b) Was her prediction correct?

217 London During the Blitz

After Hitler's invasion of Poland in September 1939, Great Britain and France went to war against Germany. By June 1940 Hitler's blitzkrieg warfare had been so successful that only Great Britain was left to fight Nazi Germany. Then Hitler decided to try to bomb Great Britain into surrender.

All during these long months of war, foreign correspondents, or reporters stationed abroad, kept the American people informed about the war. One of these correspondents was Edward R. Murrow. He was in England during the Battle of Britain, and his radio reports of the nightly Nazi air raids made him famous. Night after night he told Americans of the courage of the British people, the daring of the Royal Air Force pilots, and the horrors they faced. The following are selections from Murrow's broadcasts during the Battle of Britain.

READING FOCUS

1. How did the nightly air raids affect the British?
2. What difficulties did Murrow encounter in trying to report the war?

September 10, 1940

This is London. And the raid which started about seven hours ago is still in progress. Larry LeSueur [a fellow correspondent] and I

have spent the last three hours driving about the streets of London and visiting air-raid shelters. We found that like everything else in this world the kind of protection you get from the bombs on London tonight depends on how much money you have. On the other hand, the most expensive dwelling places here do not necessarily provide the best shelters, but certainly they are the most comfortable.

We looked in on a renowned hotel tonight and found many old dowagers [women] and retired colonels settling back on the overstuffed settees [couches] in the lobby. It wasn't the sort of protection I'd seek from a direct hit from a half-ton bomb, but if you were a retired colonel and his lady, you might feel that the risk was worth it because you would at least be bombed with the right sort of people.

Only a couple of blocks away we pushed aside the canvas curtain of a trench cut out of a lawn of a London park. Inside were half a hundred people, some of them stretched out on the hard wooden benches. The rest huddled over in their overcoats and blankets. Dimmed electric lights glowed on the whitewashed walls, and the cannonade of anti-aircraft and reverberation of the big stuff the Germans were dropping rattled the boards underfoot at intervals. One woman was saying sleepily that it was funny how often you read about people being killed inside a shelter. Nobody seemed to listen. Then over to the famous cellar of a world-famous hotel, two floors underground. On upholstered chairs and lounges there was a cosmopolitan crowd. But there wasn't any sparkling conversation. They sat, some of them with their mouths open. One of them snored. King Zog [the former king of Albania] was over in a far corner on a chair, the porter told me.

The number of planes tonight seems to be about the same as last night. Searchlight activity has been constant, but there has been little gunfire in the center of London. The bombs have been coming down at about the same rate as last night. It is impossible to get any estimate of the damage. Darkness prevents observation of details. The streets have been deserted, save for a few clanging fire engines during the last four or five hours. The planes have been high again tonight, so high that the searchlights can't reach them.

Adapted from In Search of Light by Edward R. Murrow.

Once tonight an anti-aircraft battery opened fire just as I drove past. It lifted me from the seat and a hot wind swept over the car. It was impossible to see. When I drove on, the streets of London reminded me of a ghost town in Nevada—not a soul to be seen. A week ago there would have been people standing on the corner shouting for taxis. Tonight there were no people and no taxis. Earlier today there were trucks delivering mattresses to many office buildings. People are now sleeping on those mattresses, or at least they are trying to sleep.

And so London is waiting for dawn. We ought to get the all clear in about another two hours. Then those big German bombers that have been lumbering and mumbling overhead all night will have to go home.

September 13, 1940

This is London at 3:30 in the morning. This has been what might be called a "routine night"—air-raid alarm at about nine o'clock and intermittent bombing ever since. I had the impression that more high explosives and fewer incendiaries [fire bombs] have been used tonight. Only two small fires can be seen. Again the Germans have been sending their bombers in singly or in pairs. The anti-aircraft barrage has been fierce but sometimes there have been periods of twenty minutes when London has been silent. Then the big red buses would start up and move on till the guns started working again. That silence is almost hard to bear. One becomes accustomed to rattling windows and the distant sound of bombs, and then there comes a silence that can be felt. You know the sound will return. You wait, and then it starts again. That waiting is bad. It gives you a chance to imagine things.

The scale of this air war is so great that reporting it is not easy. Often we spend hours traveling about this sprawling city, viewing damage, talking with people and occasionally listening to the bombs come down, and then more hours wondering what you'd like to hear about. We've told you about the bombs, the fires, the smashed houses and the courage of the people. We've read you the communiques and tried to give you an honest estimate of the wounds inflicted upon this, the best bombing target in the world. But the business of living



Nightly bombings devastate London.

and working in this city is very personal—the little incidents, the things the mind retains, are in themselves unimportant, but they somehow weld together to form the hard core of memories that will remain when the last all clear has sounded. That's why I want to talk for just three or four minutes about the things we haven't talked about before; for many of these impressions it is necessary to reach back through only one long week. There was a rainbow bending over the battered and smoking East End of London just when the all clear sounded one afternoon. One night I stood in front of a smashed grocery store and heard a dripping inside. It was the only sound in all London. Two cans of peaches had been drilled clean through by flying glass, and the juice was dripping down onto the floor.

Today I went to buy a hat—my favorite shop had gone, blown to bits. The windows of my shoe store were blown out. I decided to have a haircut; the windows of the barbershop were gone, but the Italian barber was still doing business. Someday, he said, we smile again, but the food doesn't taste so good since being bombed. I went to another shop to buy flashlight batteries. I bought three. The clerk said, "You needn't buy so many. We'll have enough for the whole winter." But I said, "What if you aren't here?" There were buildings down in that street, and he replied, "Of course we'll be here. We've been in business here for a hundred and fifty years."

September 18, 1940

There are no words to describe the thing that is happening. Today I talked with eight American correspondents in London. Six of them had been forced to move. All had stories of bombs, and all agreed that they were unable to convey through print or the spoken word an accurate impression of what's happening in London these days and nights.

I may tell you that Bond Street has been bombed, that a shop selling handkerchiefs at \$40 the dozen has been wrecked, that these words [of the broadcast] were written on a table of good English oak which sheltered me three times as bombs tore down in the vicinity. But you can have little understanding of the life in London these days—the courage of the people, the flash and roar of guns rolling down streets where much of the history of the English-speaking world has been made, the stench of air-raid shelters in the poor districts. These things must be experienced to be understood.

September 22, 1940

I'm standing again tonight on a rooftop looking out over London, feeling rather large and lonesome. In the course of the last fifteen or twenty minutes there's been considerable action up there, but at the moment there's an ominous silence hanging over London. But at the same time a silence that has a great deal of dignity. Just straightaway in front of me the searchlights are working. I can see one or two bursts

of anti-aircraft fire far in the distance. Just on the roof across the way I can see a man wearing a tin hat, a pair of powerful night glasses to his eyes, scanning the sky. Again, looking in the opposite direction, there is a building with two windows gone. Out of one window there waves something that looks like a white bed sheet, a window curtain swinging free in this night breeze. It looks as though it were being shaken by a ghost. There are a great many ghosts around these buildings in London. The searchlights, miles in front of me, are still scratching that sky. There's a three-quarter moon riding high.

Down below in the streets I can see just that red and green wink of the traffic lights, one lone taxicab moving slowly down the street. Not a sound to be heard. As I look out across the miles and miles of rooftops and chimney pots, some of those dirty-gray buildings look almost snow-white in this moonlight here tonight. And the rooftop spotter across the way swings around, looks over in the direction of the searchlights, drops his glasses and just stands there. There are hundreds and hundreds of men like that standing on rooftops in London tonight watching for fire bombs, waiting to see what comes out of this steel-blue sky. The searchlights now reach up very, very faintly on three sides of me. There is a flash of a gun in the distance but too far away to be heard.

READING REVIEW

1. How did Murrow describe the air raids?
2. According to Murrow, what was a "routine night"?
3. Why was Murrow's reporting job so difficult?
4. What opinions do you think Americans formed from these broadcasts?

218 America, "The Arsenal of Democracy"

When World War II broke out in Europe in 1939, the United States faced the problem of what role, if any, it would take in the conflict. During the following year, as Hitler's armies defeated one country after another, the debate over what course of action America should take became increasingly heated.

At first, most Americans wanted to remain out of the war. But by 1940, with Great Britain the only nation left in the struggle against Nazi Germany, many Americans became deeply concerned.

Some Americans began to question whether neutrality was a wise policy for the nation. Then, near the end of 1940, President Roosevelt dramatically declared that he favored aiding Great Britain with weapons and military supplies. In a historic "fireside chat," broadcast to the American people over radio on December 29, 1940, President Roosevelt argued that the United States could not remain neutral.

READING FOCUS

1. Why did Roosevelt say the United States could not remain neutral?
2. What actions did Roosevelt urge the United States to take?

This is not a fireside chat on war. It is a talk on national security. The whole purpose of your President is to keep you now, and your children later, and your grandchildren much later, out of a last-ditch war for the preservation of American independence and all of the things that American independence means.

Never before since Jamestown and Plymouth has our American civilization been in such danger as now.

For, on September 27, 1940—by an agreement signed in Berlin—Germany, Italy, and Japan [the Axis powers] joined together. They threatened that if the United States interfered with their expansion program—a program aimed at world control—they would unite against us.

The United States has no right or reason to encourage talk of peace until there is a clear intention on the part of the aggressor nations to give up all thought of dominating or conquering the world.

Some of our people like to believe that wars in Europe and in Asia are of no concern to us. But it is a matter of most vital concern to us that European and Asiatic war makers should not gain control of the oceans which lead to this hemisphere.

Does anyone seriously believe that we need to fear attack while a free Britain remains our most powerful naval neighbor in the Atlantic? Does anyone seriously believe, on the other hand, that we could rest easy if the Axis powers were our neighbors there?

Adapted from "Fireside Chat," December 29, 1940, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, from the National Archives and Record Service, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.



President Franklin D. Roosevelt

If Great Britain goes down, the Axis powers will control the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia, and the oceans as well. They will be able to throw enormous military and naval resources against this hemisphere. It is no exaggeration to say that all of us in the Americas would be living at the point of a gun—a gun loaded with explosive bullets, economic as well as military.

We would enter upon a new and terrible period in which the whole world, our hemisphere included, would be run by threats of brute force. To survive in such a world, we would have to convert ourselves permanently into a militaristic power with a war economy.

Some of us like to believe that even if Great Britain falls, we are still safe because of the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans. But the width of these oceans is not what it was in the days of clipper ships. At one point between Africa

and Brazil, the distance is less than from Washington to Denver, Colorado—five hours for the latest type of bomber. And at the north of the Pacific Ocean, America and Asia almost touch each other.

Frankly and definitely there is danger ahead—danger against which we must prepare. But we well know that we cannot escape danger, or the fear of it, by crawling into bed and pulling the covers over our heads.

There are those who say that the Axis powers would never have any desire to attack the Western Hemisphere. This is the same dangerous form of wishful thinking which has destroyed the powers of resistance of so many conquered peoples. The plain facts are that the Nazis have said, time and again, that all other races are their inferiors and therefore subject to their orders. And most important of all, the vast resources and wealth of this hemisphere make up the most tempting loot in all the world.

The experience of the past two years has proven beyond doubt that no nation can appease [make concessions to] the Nazis. No one can tame a tiger into a kitten by stroking it. There can be no appeasement with ruthlessness. There can be no reasoning with a bomb. We know now that a nation can have peace with the Nazis only at the price of total surrender.

The American appeasers ignore the warning to be found in the fate of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and France. They tell you that the Axis powers are going to win anyway. They argue that the United States might just as well use its influence to achieve a dictated peace and get the best out of it that we can.

They call it a "negotiated peace." Nonsense! Is it a negotiated peace if a gang of outlaws surrounds your community and, on threat of death, makes you pay tribute to save your own lives?

The British people are conducting an active war against an unholy alliance. Our own future security is greatly dependent on the outcome of that fight. Our ability to keep out of war is going to be affected by that outcome.

I make this direct statement to the American people. There is far less chance of the United States getting into war if we do all we can now to support the nations defending

themselves against attack by the Axis than if we go along with their defeat, then wait our turn to be attacked.

If we are to be completely honest with ourselves, we must admit there is risk in any course we may take. But I believe that most of our people agree that the course I suggest involves the least risk now and the greatest hope for world peace in the future.

The people of Europe who are defending themselves do not ask us to do their fighting. They ask us for the implements of war—the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters which will enable them to fight for their liberty and our security. We must get these weapons to them in sufficient volume and quickly enough so that we and our children will be saved the agony and suffering of war which others have had to endure.

There is no demand for sending American military force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your government to send such a force.

Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its only purpose is to keep war away from our country and our people.

Democracy's fight against world conquest is being greatly aided, and must be aided still more, by the rearmament of the United States and by sending every ounce of munitions and supplies that we can possibly spare to help the defenders who are in the front lines. It is no more unneutral for us to do that than it is for Sweden, Russia, and other nations to send steel and ore and oil into Germany every day.

This is not a matter of feelings or of controversial personal opinion. It is a matter of realistic military policy, based on the advice of our military experts. These experts and the members of Congress and the Administration have one single purpose—the defense of the United States.

I want to make it clear that it is the purpose of the nation to build now with all possible speed every machine and factory that we need to manufacture our defense material. We have the people—the skill—the wealth—and above all, the will.

We must be the great arsenal of democracy. For us this is an emergency as serious as war itself. We must apply ourselves to our task with the same determination, the same sense of urgency, the same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice as we would show if we were at war.

READING REVIEW

1. According to Roosevelt, in what danger was the United States?
2. What reasons did Roosevelt give for supporting his position that the United States could not remain neutral?
3. What would happen if Great Britain was defeated?
4. (a) What two actions did Roosevelt suggest the United States take? (b) Do you agree with his suggestions? Why or why not?

219 A Famous Flyer on Neutrality

In March 1941 Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act, which permitted the United States to send unlimited weapons and military equipment to Great Britain. But even after passage of the law, Americans continued to debate the nation's role in the European war. On one side were the interventionists, who wanted the United States to enter the war on the side of the Allies. On the other side were the isolationists, who thought Americans should keep completely out of Europe's affairs.

One of the best-known isolationists was the famous American flyer Charles A. Lindbergh. He became a leading member of America First, a nationwide organization that favored arming for defense but argued that the United States could not save the Allies. Lindbergh made the following speech at an America First meeting in New York City on April 23, 1941.

READING FOCUS

1. Why did Lindbergh urge neutrality?
2. How did Lindbergh justify his position?

I know I will be severely criticized by the interventionists in America when I say we should not enter a war unless we have a reasonable chance of winning. That, they will claim, is far too materialistic a view. But I do not believe that our American ideals and our way of life will gain through an unsuccessful war. And I know that the United States is not

Adapted from "We Cannot Win This War for England" by Charles A. Lindbergh, in Vital Speeches of the Day, 1941.

220 An Editorial on the Danger of Neutrality

Charles Lindbergh, America's flyer-hero and a leader of the isolationist America First Committee, attracted nationwide attention with the speech he made on April 23, 1941, urging that the United States should stay out of the war in Europe. A week later, on April 30, *The New York Times*, one of the nation's most influential newspapers, published a strong editorial challenging Lindbergh's point of view. The *Times* editorial, which follows, argued forcefully that the United States had no choice but to aid England in its fight against Nazi Germany.

READING FOCUS

1. According to *The New York Times*, why was it dangerous to take a neutral position?
2. What would happen if England was defeated?

Those who tell us now that the sea is still our certain bulwark [defense], and that the tremendous forces sweeping the Old World threaten no danger to the New, give the lie to their own words in the precautions they would have us take.

They favor an enormous strengthening of our defenses. Why? Against what danger would they have us arm if none exists? To what purpose would they have us spend these almost incredible billions upon billions for ships and

planes, for tanks and guns, if there is no immediate threat to the security of the United States? Why are we training the youth of the country to bear arms? Under pressure of what fear are we racing against time to double and quadruple our industrial production?

No man in his senses will say that we are arming against Canada or our Latin-American neighbors to the south, against Britain or the captive states of Europe. We are arming solely for one reason. We are arming against Hitler's Germany—a great predatory [warlike] power in alliance with Japan.

It has been said that if Hitler cannot cross the English Channel he cannot cross 3,000 miles [4,800 kilometers] of sea. But there is only one reason why he has not crossed the English Channel. That is because 45 million determined Britons, in a heroic resistance, have converted their island into an armed base, from which proceeds a steady stream of sea and air power. As Secretary [of State Cordell] Hull has said: "It is not the water that bars the way. It is the resolute determination of British arms. Were the control of the seas by Britain lost, the Atlantic would no longer be an obstacle—rather, it would become a broad highway for a conqueror moving westward."

That conqueror does not need to attempt at once an invasion of the continental United States in order to place this country in deadly danger. We shall be in deadly danger the moment British sea power fails; the moment we are compelled to divide our one-ocean Navy between two oceans simultaneously.

The combined Axis fleets outmatch our own: they are superior in numbers to our fleet

From "Editorial Challenging Lindbergh's Views on Entry into World War II" in *The New York Times*, April 30, 1941.

The New York Times response to Charles Lindbergh's speech

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WE

LET US FACE THE TRUTH

In New York Harbor, on an island close to the steamship lanes, stands the most famous statue in the world. It is not the most beautiful statue but to many millions of passengers coming up the bay it has seemed to be. It stands for one of the dearest dreams in human history—Liberty.

The millions who pursued that dream began to come before there was a statue to greet them. They came first when the shores were lined with solemn woods. They came in sailing ships when the voyage required two months or more. They came in crowded steamship stowage under hardships not much less. They came to Plymouth, Rock and

five million determined Britons in a heroic resistance have converted their island into an armed base from which proceeds a steady stream of sea and air power. As Secretary Hull has said: "It is not the water that bars the way. It is the resolute determination of British arms. Were the control of the seas by Britain lost, the Atlantic would no longer be an obstacle—rather, it would become a broad highway for a conqueror moving westward."

That conqueror does not need to attempt at once an invasion of continental United States in order to place this country in deadly danger. We shall be in deadly danger the moment British sea power fails; the moment the eastern gates of the Atlantic are open to the aggressor; the moment we are com-

moral and spiritual values which make life worth living. This does mean many things. It means, in first instance, a clear recognition of the most dangerous of all courses could follow in this hour of decision: a policy of drift; of do-nothing there is still time to act effectively of letting hesitancy ripen into dissent, and disagreement curdle factions which will split the country.

It means strong leadership in Washington: a willingness to forego methods of indirection and surprise veiled hints and innuendo, and to the plain facts of the situation. It means leadership which is as serious as it is strong; leadership which is willing to forget old quarrels, and to bring into positions of high

in every category of vessel, from warships and aircraft carriers to destroyers and submarines. The combined Axis air strength will be much greater than our own if Hitler strikes in time—and when has he failed to strike in time? The master of Europe will have at his command the resources of 20 conquered nations to furnish his materials, the oil of the Middle East to stoke [run] his engines, the slave labor of a continent to turn out his production.

Grant Hitler the gigantic prestige of a victory over Britain, and who can doubt that the first result, on our side of the ocean, would be the prompt appearance of imitation Nazi regimes in a half-dozen Latin-American nations, forced to be on the winning side, begging favors, clamoring for admission to the Axis? What shall we do then? Make war upon these neighbors, send armies to fight in the jungles of Central or South America; run the risk of outraging native sentiment and turning the whole continent against us? Or shall we sit tight while the area of Nazi influence draws ever closer to the Panama Canal, and a spreading checkerboard of Nazi airfields provides ports of call for German planes that may choose to bomb our cities?

But even if Hitler gave us time, what kind of "time" would we have at our disposal?

There are moral and spiritual dangers for this country as well as physical dangers in a Hitler victory. There are dangers to the mind and heart as well as to the body and the land.

Victorious in Europe, dominating Africa and Asia through his Axis partners, Hitler could not afford to permit the United States to live an untroubled and successful life, even if he wished to. We are the arch enemy of all he stands for: the very citadel [stronghold] of that democracy which he hates and scorns. As long as liberty and freedom prevailed in the United States, there would be constant risk for Hitler that our ideas and our example might infect the conquered countries which he was bending to his will. In his own interest he would be forced to harry [harass] us at every turn.

Who can doubt that our lives would be poisoned every day by challenges and insults from Nazi politicians; that Nazi agents would stir up anti-American feeling in every country they controlled; that Nazi spies would overrun us here; that Hitler would produce a continual series of lightning diplomatic strokes—alliances and "nonaggressions pacts" to break our

will; in short, that a continuous war of nerves, if nothing worse, would be waged against us?

And who can doubt that, in response, we should have to turn our nation into an armed camp, with all our traditional values of culture, education, social reform, democracy, and liberty subordinated to the single, all-embracing aim of self-preservation? In this case we should indeed experience "regimentation." Every item of foreign trade, every transaction in domestic commerce, every present prerogative [right] of labor, every civil liberty we cherish, would necessarily be regulated in the interest of defense.

READING REVIEW

1. (a) What reasons did *The New York Times* give to explain why the United States must aid England against Germany? (b) Do you agree with these reasons? Why or why not?
2. What did the paper claim would happen if England was defeated?
3. Do you think the arguments in the editorial were effective or not? Why?

CHAPTER 36 Americans in World War II (1941–1945)

221 An Army Nurse in The Philippines

After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the United States entered World War II. The early months of the war were a disaster for the United States. The Japanese armed forces moved steadily through Southeast Asia, conquering nation after nation and invading island chains in the Pacific Ocean. American and Filipino troops under General Douglas MacArthur struggled to defend the Philippine Islands. But early in January 1942 Manila, capital of the Philippines, was forced to surrender. American forces then retreated to the Bataan Peninsula and the