Meredith, and also an address by Nicholas Murray Butler, entitled "The Need for Action."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10030. An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10141. An act for the relief of the First National Steamship Co., the Second National Steamship Co., and the Third National Steamship Co.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2758. An act for the relief of Wade Crawford, formerly superintendent of the Klamath Indian Agency; and

S. 3400. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert W. Evans.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills. reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9751. An act for the creation of the United States De Soto Exposition Commission, to provide for the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Hernando De Soto, the commemoration of De Soto's visit to the Chickasaw Territory in northern Mississippi, and other points covered by his expedition, and the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, and for other purposes.

# ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m. the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 22, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 574. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10339, a bill to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2875). Referred to the House Calendar.

# CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9695) for the relief of Alexander Edward Metz, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

# PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY

H. R. 10390. A bill providing additional pay for aides to the President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H.R. 10391. A bill to increase the authorized numbers of warrant officers and enlisted men in the Army Mine Planter Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 10392. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act (the Motor Carrier Act, 1935), as amended, so as to make certain provisions thereof applicable to freight for-

warders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 575. Resolution to inquire into the enforcement of antitrust laws; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 10393. A bill granting a pension to Clarence Clyde Cope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H.R. 10394. A bill for the relief of James E. Butcher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 10395. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence by Rudolf Michl; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10396. A bill to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Elizabeth Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9205. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Lithuanian Information Service, in reference to the present situation in Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9206. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Owen R. Green, commander, Chief Paduke Post, No. 31, American Legion, Paducah, Ky., requesting immediate passage of Compulsory Mil tary Training Act; immediate introduction and passage of legislation for release of 50 United States naval destroyers to England, as many fighting and bombing planes as possible, and all other material aid possible for defense of England; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9207. By Mr. HART: Petition of Lodge No. 678, International Association of Machinists, Weehawken, N. J., endorsing the conscription bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9208. Also, petition of the New Jersey Congress of Industrial Organizations, opposing the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9209. Also, memorial of the Jersey City and Hoboken (N. J.) Junior Chambers of Commerce, favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9210. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of Nona Tubbs, of Pasadena, Calif., and containing the signatures of 60 other residents of the Eleventh Congressional District of California, urging Congress to consider changes in House bill 5620, the proposed General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9211. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of A. G. Elliott, of Corsicana, Tex., opposing Senate bill 1318; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, the protector of all that trust in Thee, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy: Increase and multiply upon us Thy mercy; that, Thou being our ruler and guide, we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal. Through Jesus Christ,

Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Barkley, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, August 21, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll

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

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

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] is in camp with the Illinois National Guard and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Bilbo], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Frazier] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Holman] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

# LUKE A. WESTENBERGER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 419) for the relief of Luke A. Westenberger, which was, on page 2, line 3, after the word "Administration", to insert a comma and "notwithstanding the date of his alleged injury."

Mr. GUFFEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF BOOKS IN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TO BEAUFORT (S. C.)
LIBRARY

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there is on the desk House bill No. 10004. It is similar to a bill reported by the Library Committee of the Senate, which was passed by the Senate with an amendment. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none.

The bill (H. R. 10004) to provide for the transfer of the duplicates of certain books in the Library of Congress to the Beaufort Library of Beaufort, S. C., was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to replace the books taken in 1862 by the order of an officer of the United States from the library of the Beaufort Library Society of Beaufort, S. C., which books were subsequently destroyed by a fire in the Smithsonian Institution where they had been stored for safekeeping pending the termination of the War between the States, the Librarian of the Library of Congress is authorized and directed to transfer to the Beaufort Library of Beaufort, S. C., books of the same value as those which were so taken and destroyed. The books transferred under the provisions of this act shall be from duplicates owned by the Library of Congress and shall not exceed in value, in the aggregate, the value of the books so taken and destroyed, such values to be fixed by the Librarian of the Library of Congress.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTION OF EIGHTH DISTRICT, DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution adopted at Oconto, Wis., by the Eighth District, Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas there is before the Congress of the United States a conscription bill known as the Burke-Wadsworth bill, which conscripts manpower and not wealth, and is not in conformity with the policy of resolutions as adopted by the national conventions of the veterans' organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Eighth District, Department of Wisconsin of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, go on record to instruct its Congressman and the two United States Senators that we favor a preparedness program in conformity with all veterans organization recommendations; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman Johns and Senators La Follette and Wiley.

Adopted at a conference assembled at Oconto, Wis., this 18th day of August 1940.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9898) to further amend section 13a of the National Defense Act so as to authorize officers detailed for training and duty as aircraft observers to be so rated, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2032) thereon.

Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4250) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgments upon the claims against the United States of I. M. Cook, J. J. Allen, and the Radiator Specialty Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2033) thereon.

### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on August 21, 1940, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 769. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish mats for the reproduction in magazines and newspapers of photographs of national-park scenery;

S. 2686. An act authorizing the reenlistment of John Mudry in the United States Army;

S. 2997. An act for the relief of the Greenlee County Board of Supervisors;

S. 3581. An act for the relief of John L. Pennington;

S. 3594. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939;

S. 3741. An act for the relief of Charles P. Madsen;

S. 3866. An act for the relief of George W. Coon:

S. 3975. An act granting to certain claimants the preference right to purchase certain public lands in the State of Florida;

S. 4011. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept payment of an annual equitable overhead charge in connection with the repayment contract between the United States and the Strawberry Water Users' Association of Payson, Utah, in full satisfaction of delinquent billings upon the basis of an annual fixed overhead charge, and for other purposes; and

S. 4137. An act relating to transportation of foreign mail by aircraft.

# BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

S. 4291. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ethel Wise, widow of Brig. Gen. Frederic May Wise (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 4292. A bill to provide for Federal assistance to the States in making surveys, studies, and recommendations for the planning, location, and enlargement of vocational schools which will provide adequately for vocational training for defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 4293. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Millison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

S. 4294. A bill for the relief of Marcel Max Roman, his wife Clara M. Roman, and their daughter Rodica Edith Roman; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 4295. A bill to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Ave. N. E., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

# SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. Davis submitted an amendment, Mr. White submitted two amendments, and Mr. Maloney submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the so-called Maloney substitute to Senate bill 4164, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

### PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 298), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Resolved. That a special committee consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable, and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, during the Seventysixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, witch shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION-APPLICABILITY TO SEAMEN

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 299), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the United States Maritime Commission, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and the Maritime Labor Board are authorized and directed jointly to make a thorough study of workmen's compensation with a view to determining whether the same, by act of Congress, should be made applicable to seamen; to supply the Senate with statistical information and other data that may be helpful in considering such legislation; to confer in respect thereto with representatives of the seamen and shipowners, and to report to the Senate, on or before February 15, 1941, the findings and specific recommendations of the aforesaid agencies.

STATEMENT ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE BY BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in the current issue of Scouting, the official magazine of the Boy Scouts of America, I found a statement on national defense, and a pledge of allegiance to the ideals and practice of democracy, so much worth while that I feel compelled to call it to the attention of the Senate.

I was particularly struck by the following quotation:

Liberty is not only a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation.

Mr. President, in a few generations of soft living following the World War, some of us I fear may have forgotten that liberty is not only a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation. And in the past decade of disillusionment, this political axiom has been somewhat obscured from view. I am glad that the Boy Scouts, and other organizations-the Boys' Club of America, the Federal Council of Churches, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, the American Jewish Committee, Roosevelt Memorial Association, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Jewish Welfare Board, the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, Workers Education Bureau of America, Catholic Youth Organization of New York, International Society of Christian Endeavor, the Camp Fire Girls, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the American Federation of Labor-are organizing to defend democracy and to defend our Nation.

Mr. President, for a quarter of a century I have followed with interest and enthusiastic approval the work of the Boy Scouts of America under the leadership of Dr. James E. West. I am proud to be a member of the national council of this great organization, which now has a membership of more than 1,400,000. Most of us remember when the Boy Scouts held their national jamboree in Washington 3 years ago. Those 27,000 boys from every State in the Union, with several hundreds from foreign lands, gave us a renewed vision of clean, intelligent, self-disciplined and self-reliant youth at its best. I venture to say that Washington never has had a meeting of that size where all the delegates were so well behaved, so orderly, and at the same time so lively, as was this Boy Scout jamboree. The jamboree and the 27,000 Boy Scouts were an inspiration to me, and I believe to all of 115

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement and pledge of the Boy Scouts and other organizations, stressing "The paramount need in national defense is the strengthening and invigorating of democracy," as carried in the current issue of Scouting.

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

"THE PARAMOUNT NEED IN NATIONAL DEFENSE IS THE STRENGTHENING AND INVIGORATING OF DEMOCRACY"

We, the undersigned, representing organizations cooperating with Citizenship Educational Service, which have a membership of 30,000,000 Americans, join in sounding a clarion call to all our members and to all our fellow citizens to arouse themselves to vitalize the ideals of American democracy.

While recognizing the urgent necessity for military preparedness, we are deeply convinced that the paramount need in national defense is the strengthening and invigorating of democracy in the United States. This we propose to do through our respective programs of activity and education.

United States. This we propose to do through our respective programs of activity and education.

We have a keen appreciation of the meaning of the liberties guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights, insuring freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, right of assembly, right of petition, right of private property, security from arbitrary power, equal justice, and trial by jury. Everyone must be made to realize that "liberty is not only a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation." The preservation of liberty rests upon the affirmation of the dignity of the individual and the acceptance of individual responsibility by every citizen of our land.

Nazi-ism, communism, and fascism, alike with other dictatorships, represent a return into the age-old slavery from which humanity has risen to the freedom of democracy. It is democracy that is young and strong, that has steadily won its way against the grim tyrannies of the past, and that has proved its vitality by preserving liberty and by establishing here the highest standard of living of any society on earth.

With trust in the God of our fathers, each of us girds himself for whatever struggle we may face. We stand firm in the full knowledge that shoulder to shoulder with us stand the American people. They share our faith—faith in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Mindful of the hard work, sacrifice, and clear thinking of our forefathers, who, with the help of God, gave us our liberties, we will carry on with all our might in meeting the problems we face in the present world crisis and in our own national life. To this end—

We, as Americans, solemnly pledge ourselves: To join wholeheartedly and with personal sacrifice in strengthening the work of our organizations and of other civic and social

activities in our community, our State, and our Nation.

To be vigilant and courageous in maintaining human sympathy and respect for the rights of others.

To beware of the enemies of democracy, whatever their passwords or places of birth, and wherever they may be found.

To stand united with all lovers of freedom, whatever their tongue

or origin.

To keep our Nation strong in valor and confident in freedom, so

or origin.

To keep our Nation strong in valor and confident in freedom, so that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Theodore Roosevelt, vice president, Boy Scouts of America; James E. West, chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America; Sanford Bates, executive director, Boys' Clubs of America; Samuel M. Cavert, general secretary, Federal Council of Churches; Everett R. Clinchy, director, National Conference of Christians and Jews; Mrs. John French, past president, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations; Edward S. Greenbaum, past chairman, survey committee, American Jewish Committee; Hermann Hagedorn, director, Roosevelt Memorial Association; Judge Murray Hulbert, past grand exalted ruler, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, president, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations; Judge Irving Lehman, honorary president, Jewish Welfare Board; John E. Manley, general secretary, the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations; Spencer Miller, Jr., director, Workers' Educational Bureau of America; Rev. Edward Roberts Moore; Daniel P. Higgins, president, Catholic Youth Organization of New York; Daniel A. Poling, president, International Society of Christian Endeavor; Lester F. Scott, national executive, Camp Fire Girls; Walter White, secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Matthew Woll, vice president, American Federation of Labor. president, American Federation of Labor.

Personal participation: As evidence of my approval of the statement made by representatives of various organizations above set forth, I personally subscribe to the pledge and agree to do all in my

power to have others do likewise.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS BY SPECIAL AGENTS OF DIVISION OF INVESTIGATIONS, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, yesterday the bill (S. 2627) to empower and authorize special agents and such other employees of the Division of Investigations, Department of the Interior, as are designated by the Secretary of the Interior for that purpose, to administer oaths in the performance of their official duties, came from the House of Representatives with amendments by the House. Due to some misunderstanding of the consequences of the amendments, I moved that the Senate concur in the amendments. That motion was agreed to.

I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the amendments. I will say that the bill has not left the custody of the Senate, so there is no occasion to ask

to have it recalled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendments of the House were agreed to? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. Adams, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. NYE, and Mr. Gurney conferees on the part of the Senate.

# SEPARATE AIR CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the sentiment expressed by several persons in favor of establishing a separate corps for naval aviation, I ask that a letter from Admiral J. E. Richardson, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, on this subject be printed in the RECORD. This letter was forwarded to me for my information by the Secretary of the Navy.

My personal views, not, however, conclusive without hearing evidence from all interested sources, are in accord with the sentiments expressed in this letter. However, I have felt for some time that a better or more complete system of coordination should be developed between the Army and Navy Air Corps in the purchase and maintenance of planes and equipment, and especially in their tactical operations together. For example, the Army Air Corps should be able to cooperate very effectively with the Navy in the event an enemy fleet were approaching our shores. I should add, however, that this opinion is one that has not been thought out thoroughly and is more an expression of general impressions that I have entertained.

Mr. President, I renew my request to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

> UNITED STATES FLEET, U. S. S. "PENNSYLVANIA," FLAGSHIP. Pearl Harbor, T. H., August 12, 1940.

Restricted.

From: Commander in Chief, United States Fleet.

To: The Secretary of the Navy. Subject: Naval aviation—separate corps—recommendation against.

1. From indirect but reliable sources I understand that there is a relatively small but increasing group of persons in and out of the service who appear to be organizing a determined move for the establishment of a separate corps for naval aviation. My impression is that pressure for such a step is largely congressional and that its support in naval aviation, while not general, does a viet emong a number of vounger individual officers. exist among a number of younger individual officers

2. I assume that the Navy Department's attitude on such a proposal is definitely one of opposition and I realize that it is quite possible that the situation is being, or will be, handled with no insurmountable difficulty. I am so impressed, however, both by the momentum which the proposal, judging from information available to me, has already acquired, and by its extremely serious potentialities, that I am placing on record my views on the subject

potentialities, that I am placing on record my views on the subject for such use as they may be to the Department.

for such use as they may be to the Department.

3. As emphatically as I can say it, I consider that the effect of establishment of a separate naval aviation corps would be catastrophic not only for naval aviation, and for the Navy of which it is so essential a part, but for the Nation.

4. The steady progress of naval aviation to its present position of outstanding proficiency with respect to the aviation of all other navies has been due primarily to its complete unity with the fleet as a whole. Early recognition of the necessity for and consistent adherence to this principle has resulted in its complete justification. as a whote the lecessity for and consistent adherence to this principle has resulted in its complete justification. Such early growing pains as there may have been were due almost entirely to lack of mutual understanding between naval aviation and other arms of the fleet. These handicaps, in far more serious form, would still-exist were it not for the initial wise determination to iron them out by continual contact in the same organization. It is my positive conviction, having closely observed the development of naval aviation from its inception, that no other method would have produced even approximately as good results.

have produced even approximately as good results.

5. The system has worked and is working. The entire fiber of naval aviation, both material and personnel, is inextricably woven into that of the Navy. To jeopardize its effectiveness by any radical change of whatever nature at any time, and particularly at this time, would be an inexpressibly harmful mistake. The approved expansion of naval aviation unquestionably stems primarily from its successful demonstration to date of its value as a completely integral part of the fleet. Because of this demonstrated value we are expanding our fleet air arm so as to produce the same result in greater degree. It would be utterly illogical to take, at the same time, a step which all our experience to date indicates would in greater degree. It would be utterly illogical to take, at the same time, a step which all our experience to date indicates would seriously militate against the objective of the expansion.

6. It stands out too clearly for successful refutation, and needs 6. It stands out too clearly for successful refutation, and needs no amplification, that the direct and inevitable result of any separation in any degree of one essential portion of the naval organization from the rest will be less efficiency, less preparedness, and fatally less effective coordination of effort in all the functions, particularly including battle, of the organization as a whole. As a striking example, the lamentably inadequate performance of the British naval air arm in the current conflict is attributed by all sources of information to the fact that British naval aviation was not for many years and is not altogether even now an actual part not for many years, and is not altogether even now, an actual part of the British Navy.

7. It may be advanced that the proposition of establishing a separate naval aviation corps must, in spite of all objections, be seriously considered because of the officer personnel problem which the expansion program will bring about. I recognize that this is a very difficult matter and that special provision will unquestionably need to be made for its handling. I do not recognize, however, that the special provision to be adopted need entail a separate corps nor, in fact, anything which contains to any degree, direct or implied, the idea of separation.

8. It may be that the proposition is presented as one which

implied, the idea of separation.

8. It may be that the proposition is presented as one which involves separation only as far as officer personnel is concerned. This, if true, lessens my objection in no degree. The immediate result would be the loss of not one inch, but of a full half mile, with the rest of the proverbial mile shortly following. In itself, even if action miraculously went no further, this much separation would fatally reduce the naval value of naval aviation. Besides causing at once insurmountable problems in the functioning and control of all parts of the naval aeronautic organization, particularly ship-borne units and their ship bases, it would quickly dissolve the mutual understanding, respect, and friendship which now exist and

on which, in the last analysis, the success of any complex organiza-

tion must rest

9. The present problem, of course, is to obtain sufficient officer material to satisfy the greatly increased pilot requirements; to make prospects sufficiently attractive to do so; and to handle those concerned fairly with respect to their future. I do not believe that anybody now knows how attractive these prospects need be made in the problem. order that enough suitable material may be obtained, though I am of the opinion that the degree of necessary attractiveness has been

exaggerated.

10. Actually, we have no idea now how many aviators will want to remain in the Navy when the present emergency is finished. We do know that more will remain if more advantages are offered. We may, if too much is offered now, be creating or aggravating to a very considerable and needless degree our own problem. I do not believe that it is possible now, in any case, to reach a sound decision as to what must be done in the relatively distant sound decision as to what must be done in the relatively distant future. I am convinced that the Navy need not and should not, now or later, be stampeded into any radical change in the fundamental principles of unity on which naval aviation's success to date has been based. I cannot too strongly express my conviction that any action taken now or later regarding naval aviation's officer personnel must be based on what is best for the Navy and for the Nation, and not on undue consideration of "the greatest good for the greatest number."

J. O. RICHARDSON.

J. O. RICHARDSON.

# ARTICLE BY JOSEPH ALSOP AND ROBERT KINTNER ON ADDRESS BY AMEASSADOR BULLITT

IMr. Guffey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, published in the Washington Evening Star of August 20, 1940, relative to the recent address by Ambassador Bullitt, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER ON REPLY OF SECRETARY ICKES TO MR. WILLKIE

[Mr. Holr asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler, published in the Washington Post of today, entitled "I Can Lick Ickes," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES ON DRAFTING WEALTH

[Mr. Lee asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of August 13, 1940, entitled "Draft the Dollars Now," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES ON TRANSFER OF DESTROYERS TO GREAT BRITAIN

[Mr. Lee asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of August 21, 1940, entitled "Send the Destroyers," which appears in the Appendix.1

FINAL DECLARATION OF TWENTY-SEVENTH NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

[Mr. Murray asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the final declaration of the Twenty-seventh National Foreign Trade Convention, held in San Francisco, Calif., July 29, 30, and 31, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSSIBILITY OF WAR-ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "War Before November is the Writer's Forecast," published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREAT PRECEDENT-ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. Wiley asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article under the heading "The great precedent," by Walter Lippmann, published in the column Today and Tomorrow of the Washington (D. C.) Post of today, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THIRD TERM-EDITORIAL FROM THE STANDARD TIMES, NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

[Mr. Wiley asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Basil Brewer from the Standard Times, New Bedford, Mass., issue of July 22, 1940, under the heading "Roosevelt 'drafted,'" which appears in the Ap-

# MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10361) to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2758. An act for the relief of Wade Crawford, formerly superintendent of the Klamath Indian Agency;

S. 3400. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert W. Evans;

H. R. 10030. An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10141. An act for the relief of the First National Steamship Co., the Second National Steamship Co., and the Third National Steamship Co.

### HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 10361) to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

#### SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

Mr. HOLT obtained the floor.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment so that it will read as follows:

On page 15, line 25, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That there shall not be in active training or service in the land and naval forces of the United States at any one time more than 800,000 men inducted under the provisions of this act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Massachusetts making the modification he suggests?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator does not have to get unanimous consent to do that. He can modify his own amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The year and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, and, under the rules, after the yeas and nays have been ordered there can be no modification of the amendment except by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to read the proposed modification.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it. Mr. BARKLEY. The rule does not preclude amendments offered from the floor to the amendment before it is voted on, does it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not. It only applies to the modification of the amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the amendment is so modified.

# BACKGROUND OF CONSCRIPTION

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, we are considering a bill which changes the traditional policy of 150 years of the United States. I feel that the people of the country have a right to know the background of the drive for peacetime conscription.

There is a decided difference between peacetime and wartime conscription. This is not the first effort to have compulsory military training in time of peace. In recent years the first one was made in 1913, when General Leonard Wood started a drive preceding the World War. I feel that the people should have the background of that drive, and compare it with the present drive for compulsory military training, because there never has been a drive for compulsory military training which was not made at a time of war hysteria, either pre-war hysteria or post-war hysteria.

I desire, therefore, to give the historical background of the first drive for peacetime conscription preceding the World War of 1914-1918.

I quote from a man who, I am sure, should not be criticized by many, because he is the editor of the New York Herald Tribune. I speak of Walter Millis, a man who, I understand, has now written an editorial asking that we go to war. So I do not think my authority can be considered prejudicial to our side of the case.

This is what he says in his book:

These were the voluntary citizens' training camps, the origin of what was later known as the "Plattsburg idea." It was in the summer of 1913 that Wood opened the first two of these camps with 220 students in all—for the most part college undergraduates.

with 220 students in all—for the most part college undergraduates.

Ostensibly the camps offered to patriotic young men a chance to equip themselves at their own expense with the military training which Congress had basely failed to provide; actually, General Wood was never under any illusions as to the military value of the experiment. "We do not expect," he wrote at the very beginning, "\* \* \* to accomplish much in the way of detailed military instructing \* \* \* but we do believe a great deal can be done in the implanting of a sound military policy." The camps, to state it more bluntly, were designed from the start to be (as their successors still are today) not practical schools of war, but seminaries whence propagandists for preparedness might be distributed through the civil population. General Wood was not really trying to provide an officer reserve. "He was seeking," as his own wholly loyal biographer puts it, "to develop missionaries in the cause of patriotic service." Four camps, with three times as many novitiates, were organized for the summer of 1914. General Wood was inspecting one of these camps at the moment that the great hurricane broke—to fertilize, beyond all hope or expectation, the ground which he had been so diligently sowing.

Mr Millis continues:

### Mr. Millis continues:

He was stationed now on Governors Island, in the heart of the powerful and pro-Ally Northeast, a 5-minute ferry ride from all the more important diners-out in the United States and from the incomparable sounding board of the New York press. He talked preparedness day and night to whomever would listen, wrote letters, made speeches, buttonholed everyone. And soon the results began to show. With November, influential editors were calling him into conference; letters began to flow in demanding data or giving encouragement; presently a civilian friend and col-laborator, Frederic L. Huidekoper, came back from a tour of the battle fronts to found the National Security League, which was to become one of the chief organs of nationalistic patriotism and preparedness.

And Mr. Millis goes ahead to discuss how the National Security League, to which I shall refer in a moment, was the chief organ of nationalistic patriotism and preparedness. The author of the pending bill himself has said that this particular bill was the result of the meeting of the Military Training Camps Association, which was an outgrowth of the Plattsburg idea itself; and we find at that time two men who were famous in the United States, both soldiers, who were much interested in peacetime conscription before the World

One of them was President Theodore Roosevelt. The other was Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood. Mr. Millis quotes Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt as saying the following about the drive for peacetime conscription and preparedness:

Both you men are exactly like two small boys playing soldiers. It's a lovely game.

# PREPAREDNESS AND PROFIT

So they wanted to play soldier and establish compulsory military training preceding the World War; and as we find that that condition developed, we find this in Mr. Millis' book. He says:

Diligently the new preparedness groups, subsidized by a patriotic industry and finance-

And I digress there to say that the very same thing is happening today-

Subsidized by a patriotic industry and finance, spread the gospel; more and more clearly the effects began to appear. No one could accuse Mr. Wilson or his administration of a vulgar interest in the profits of munitions manufacture; but they were not blind to the fact that patriotism might have advantages of a different

And so it was the case that patriotism did have an advantage. Today we have some men preaching patriotism

who are interested in patriotism with the accent on "pay" instead of the patriotism of the boys. They are interested in the profits. That is the kind of patriotism that interests them. When I say that, I want to repeat what I said yesterday: I do not say that every person who is for conscription is in that group. They are not. Many of those who favor it are sincere and conscientious; but I say that many individuals who are getting profit out of war, and want more profit out of war, are behind this drive, and their names should be known, as they will be before we finish this

### PLATTSBURG'S SOCIAL REGISTER

Referring to this talk about Plattsburg, and how wonderful it was, let me read again from Mr. Millis of the original Plattsburg group. He says:

The muster rolls at Plattsburg, when General Wood's "business-men's" camp opened there at the beginning of August, sounded like Who's Who and the Social Register combined. The Roosevelts were there, of course; so were the adventurous Chanlers from their patrician fastnesses in Dutchess County—

We know where Dutchess County is and we know who comes from there. It is a patrician county.

Then Mr. Millis goes ahead, as follows:

So were the Fishes and Milburns. Mr. Richard Harding Davis appeared in the gathering twilight of his glory. Mr. Robert Bacon, a former Secretary of State and Ambassador to France, packed the humble rifle

Let me digress there long enough to call to your attention the fact that it was Mr. Bacon who had the conversation with Mr. Hanotaux in France, when Mr. Bacon was ambassador. in which he said there were 50,000 men in this country who wanted war and 100,000,000 who did not want war, and that "our task is to see that the 100,000,000 change places with the 50,000."

But going ahead with this book, who else was there?

So did John Purroy Mitchel, the gallant young reform mayor of New York, whose life was to be one of the sadder sacrifices 2 years later. Arthur Woods, his police commissioner, accompanied him; George Wharton Pepper, Pennsylvania's pure light of legality and morals, offered himself to his country; so did Dudley Field Malone, Willard Straight, and (it is perhaps necessary to add) some hundreds of humbler clay. dreds of humbler clay.

Then this is important:

"The butterflies of Newport and Bar Harbor," according to eneral Wood's devoted biographer, "complained that life was "The butterflies of Newport and Bar Harbor," according to General Wood's devoted biographer, "complained that life was desolate, since the best of their young men were at Plattsburg. Once more, as 17 years before, the public read of millionaires doing 'kitchen police,' digging ditches, and caught the message behind the incongruity." It was all very strange, very fascinating, and very democratic. For this was no play soldiering. Although one might have thought that the total absence of hostile bullets, of gas, shellfire, or bloodshed might have damaged the verisimilitude, they really did dig trenches.

And again today, in 1940, I ask you to read the roll and roster of the Plattsburg group, and there also you will find a combination of "Who's Who" and the Social Register.

Let me again quote from Walter Millis about the specific association which drafted this bill, and which is known to have sponsored it. This is what Mr. Millis says:

The great bandwagon to which General Wood had set a prophetic shoulder so long before was at last beginning to roll in earnest. The younger businessmen and millionaires, back now from their bloodless trenches at Plattsburg, were organizing the Military Training Camp Association to put more powerful pressures than the General himself could exert upon the Congress about to convene.

Get that. These men were beginning to put on pressure in 1915 and 1916, the same sort of pressure that millionaires are trying to put upon us now in 1940.

# NO SOLDIER BE SENT OVERSEAS

The Millis proceeds to speak of Colonel Palmer, who was sent out by this association to speak over the country for preparedness. Did Colonel Palmer tell the country that we were going into war? No. I quote Colonel Palmer:

Even the strongest advocate of a large army never breathed a word suggesting that a single soldier should ever be sent to Europe.

Never a single one of them breathed that a soldier would be sent to Europe. That was in 1916, when these men were trying to drum up the preparedness hysteria which took us into the World War of 1917.

#### USING INVASION ARGUMENT

They used the same argument they are using today, that we are in danger of invasion. They say today that if we do not have this compulsory military training we will be invaded. But let me read what was done before the World War, quoting from the same book:

At a dinner given by the Pilgrim Society in New York to Mr. Alfred Noyes and Sir Walter Raleigh, the eminent poet solemnly warned his hearers that Germany was contemplating establishing colonies in South America in contravention of the Monroe Doctrine.

# Then the speaker said:

I have in my possession an atlas published in Germany. This contains a map of South America upon which 25 or 30 places are inscribed in red as German colonies

And the listeners were amazed at this crushing proof of the perfidy of the Teutons. Today we find the same sort of atlases and the same maps, showing that Germany is going to establish colonies in America. It is all a part of the proposal to get America interested in going into the war. The danger of invasion was used then just as it is used now in order to stir up hysteria in America. Now, we can see that the group was not interested in patriotism.

# CLAUDE KITCHIN

I should like to quote from the book Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies. He shows that it was not the common man of this country who was interested in compulsory military training, it was not the laborer, it was not the homes of America, but it was the trafficker in munitions of war.

Mr. President, I ask permission that at this point in my speech I may put in these documents and these records, so that the Members of the Senate can, if they care to, read them without my taking their time on the floor of the Senate. I want them to compare what is happening in 1940 with what happened in this country in 1915 and 1916. I shall place these records in the Congressional Record as a part of my speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

# CLAUDE KITCHIN AND THE WILSON WAR POLICIES

# (By Alex Mathews Arnett)

But by the summer of 1915 the agitation for preparedness, lavishly financed by "war traffickers" and assiduously exploited by Republican politicians, had become politically alarming to its opponents. The militaristic propaganda not only appealed to those belligerently inclined, but also swept many thousands into line with the time-worn delusion that preparedness was not for war but against war. If we were properly prepared, not even a victorious Germany would dare attack us; otherwise, dire were the prophecies as to what would happen when the Central Powers should have crushed the Allies and turned to world conquest. In general, the element favoring preparedness swallowed the

should have crushed the Allies and turned to world conquest.

In general, the element favoring preparedness swallowed the Allied propaganda, hook, line, and sinker, and hence was violently anti-German. It pictured the Allies as innocent lambs attacked by the big, bad wolf of German militarism. It credited every "atrocity" lie that the British Foreign Office and the Northcliffe press sought to propagate. It easily envisaged the destruction of our ports and the devastation of our land by German "fright-fulness"—made plausible by the arch munitioneer, Hudson Maxim, in his widely distributed book, Defenseless America, and in the screen version of it, the Battle Cry of Peace. No more specious propaganda was ever broadcast. But it served its purpose. Along with other such rantings, it scared millions into accepting its moral: to remain unprepared was to invite disaster; to give our militarists and munitions makers a free hand was to insure perpetual peace. petual peace.

It was further argued that if "prepared" we could make more effective use of our diplomatic weapons. We could force both sides—with the emphasis on Germany—to mitigate their blockade policies and respect our neutral rights. The consequent enlarge-ment of our trade opportunities would promote increasing

Such arguments were reinforced by the emotional drive of a rising spirit of militancy. The tremendous excitement aroused by the war demanded an outlet. Some found it in the insane activities of the Ku Klux Klan (revived in 1915), others in the martial treed of preparedness parades. William J. Ton Delan the martial

tread of preparedness parades. William Lyon Phelps characterized the situation under the title "The Dance of Death":

"Very few persons can see a dance without wishing to participate. The whirling figures develop a centrifugal force that pulls the spectors. Perhaps this is one reason why the dance of

death that has been shaking the floor of the Continent (of Europe) for over a year is constantly becoming more alluring to Americans. For there can be no doubt that the war spirit is steadily growing in this country. It has been sedulously fostered by many newspapers, by persons who are after political or commercial capital, and by the sentimental slogan, 'preparedmercial capital, and

"The terrible dance of death, played with appropriate music, with plenty of bands, plenty of substitute dancers, goes along swiftly. There are many new figures never seen before. Whole nations have been preparing for it so long, under the most capable masters, and with frequent rehearsals, that we now behold the most capable in history.

masters, and with frequent rehearsals, that we now behold the greatest military ball in history.

"Signs are multiplying in America of a general desire that we too may learn this dance. Many young Americans are already trying the steps, and are praised for their proficiency; the dancing masters are busy, and it is probable that when Congress opens \* \* \* huge appropriations will be made, so that everyone can learn the dance of death \* \* \*."

Many who approved the slogan "preparedness against war" and expected only a grand "rehearsal" found emotional compensation for our absence from the "dance"—little realizing that such "rehearsal" was an almost certain prelude to the carnival of blood.

hearsal" was an almost certain prelude to the carnival of blood.

#### MORGAN HELPS TO FINANCE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, at that time we did not have the William Allen White committee, which, it was admitted in Time, was started by a contribution of \$500 from J. Pierpont Morgan. Did Senators realize that the William Allen White committee got its first check from J. Pierpont Morgan? Mr. Morgan's firms are not at all interested in the war, just as they were not interested in the war in 1914. From the very day the first shot was fired the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. put all the pressure possible to get America into the war, and from September 1, 1939, the same firm of J. P. Morgan has been putting on the pressure they used in 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, and the records will prove that.

These facts cannot be dodged. We find the individuals who created the hysteria in 1914 to 1917 through the adoption of the National Security League, and the pushing of that program, were in some instances the very same individuals who are trying to create the hysteria today.

Who were some of the contributors to the National Security League preceding the World War? Let me name some of them. J. P. Morgan was one. Henry P. Davidson was another. His interest in the loans, and his activities to get America involved through using the loans will be recalled.

There was John D. Rockefeller. I have not seen anywhere since this world war started any of the Rockefeller group listed in the present pro-war group. They may be, but to their credit they have not done what John D. Rockefeller did in helping to promote war hysteria before the World War through contributing to the Security League.

Whom else do we find? We find Arthur Curtis James a large contributor. We find George Perkins, of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. We find the Schiffs of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. We find the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which gave \$50,000 on the 8th day of April, and \$50,000 more on the 29th day of August, all interested in promoting war hysteria in this country.

Mr. President, I shall place in the RECORD at this point a list of those individuals who contributed. Senators will see by the same parallel policy today by those interested in getting America into the present war. These men helped to finance the bill. For every dollar they put in, behind it they got many dollars of profits. We all know that out of the last World War over 20,000 millionaires were made. We know that the firm of Morgan and many others of the banking firms of New York made millions upon millions of dollars. For every dollar invested in the so-called preparedness campaign preceding the World War they got not one dollar back, but from ten to one hundred dollars back.

Who financed it? Some of the same individuals, the same banking firms, the same corporations which are today financing the drive for compulsory military service. As I have said, I shall place the names of some contributors in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there obection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SOME LARGE CONTRIBUTORS TO NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE

C. Vanderbilt, Nicholas Brady, W. L. Harkness, Arthur Curtis James, Joseph H. Choates, Mortimer L. Schiff, George W. Perkins, H. H. Rogers, William K. Vanderbilt, Jr., Clarence H. Mackay, J. C. Brady, Bernard M. Baruch, H. C. Frick, Simon Guggenheim, Murray Guggenheim, T. Coleman DuPont, Charles Deering, Jacob Schiff, J. P. Morgan, J. G. White, Henry P. Davisson, Jules Bache, Victor F. Lawson, J. P. Morgan & Co., John D. Rockefeller, H. E. Huntington, Carnegle Corporation of New York, Remington Arms Co., Arthur E. Newbold Ridley Watts, Lames Byrne S. Stanwood Menken Newbold, Ridley Watts, James Byrne, S. Stanwood Menken

### NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, the National Security League not only was strong for compulsory military service but actually put out pamphlets and books in an effort to generate sentiment in the United States for peacetime compulsory military training. I shall not burden the Congressional RECORD with quotations from those books, but they can be gotten at the Congressional Library, and there it will be found that the very reasons now being used on the floor of the Senate were used by this group of scoundrels which the House committee investigated. This is not RUSH HOLT speaking. This is the exact language of the House committee which investigated the National Security League, which tried to drive through the peacetime conscription law in 1915. This is what they said:

In the judgment of your committee-

A committee of the House of Representatives-

the National Security League has violated the provisions of that act, the penalty for which is a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprison-ment for not longer than 1 year, or both.

The statement of the committee to which this refers follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE AND UNLIMITED WEALTH

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE AND UNLIMITED WEALTH

The National Security League and like organizations in their political activities constitute a serious menace to representative government. Ordinarily their real purpose is concealed, and their appeal is made to the public on some principle in harmony with dominant sentiment. Usually, as in this instance, they have access to almost unlimited wealth—and borrow respectability by the use, in honorary positions, of the names of men of national prominence. If their real purpose were apparent, the danger would be relieved.

Men in public life are given by them to understand that they must be subservient to the demands of such institutions; and, upon their failure to do so, they will be held up to public scorn and humiliation by false accusations. Under such circumstances the best-intentioned candidate for office realizes that he has one of two alternatives—he must be either subservient to the demands of these camouflaged organizations or be put on the defensive by

of two alternatives—he must be either subservent to the defination of these camouflaged organizations or be put on the defensive by false charges. Such activities on the part of organizations similar to the National Security League have a tendency to compel obedience to the wishes of special interests rather than obedience to a real concern for the welfare of the people. This condition is not at all fanciful, since its baneful effects have been fully demonstrated

all fanciful, since its baneful effects have been fully demonstrated by the activities of the National Security League.

The fight made by the National Security League upon the loyalty of men of the highest patriotism was so glaringly unjust and so patently false that it falled of its purpose.

But the failure was due to an error of judgment on the part of the league, and not because of the lack of vicious purpose.

In times of war, organizations avowing patriotism, such as the National Security League did, will receive many adherents and for that reason the league secured membership of nearly 90,000 people throughout the United States. It was the duty of the league, therefore, to exercise the greatest care and caution in its publicity matter, for the good names of men were involved. matter, for the good names of men were involved.

Section I of the Federal act, generally known as the Corrupt Practices Act, approved June 25, 1910, is as follows:

"The term 'political committee,' under the provisions of the act, shall include national committees of all political parties, the national congressional campaign committees of all political parties, and all committees, associations, or organizations which shall in two or more States influence the result, or attempt to influence the result, of an election at which representatives in Congress are to be elected."

Section 5 and 6 of the act, as amended by an act approved

Sections 5 and 6 of the act, as amended by an act approved August 19, 1911, required that such political committees as are defined in section 1 shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, at Washington, D. C., certain itemized statements which shall be verified by oath.

We will find, as this record shows, that a committee of the House of Representatives made an investigation, and called many of those individuals before it and they were almost unanimous for compulsory military training. There were none to the contrary, some did not express themselves. Every witness called to represent the National Security League asked America to put compulsory military training into force. Do you know that some of these same individuals are still

living, and are advocating this law, and are contributing to the drive and the propaganda behind the drive?

THE WORLD WAR

They finally got us into the war in 1917. I say here this morning that in my honest opinion propaganda and profits did more to drive America into the World War in 1917 than any other thing. And when I say that, I do not condemn the boys who went across. They went across in what they thought was a war to end all wars. They went across the ocean in a war to make the world safe for democracy. But after the war was over the diplomats of Europe gathered around a conference table, and out the window went the ideal, but we could not bring back to life the boys who were dead in France. It did not help the boy who was shellshocked; some in the hospitals in Washington or in other veterans' hospitals. These boys gave 100 percent of their capital. The boy who had his arm shot off gave 10 percent of his capital. The boy who had his leg torn off by a bombshell gave 20 percent of his capital. He was not given 8 percent of an investment when he was sent over there in order to protect the blundering diplomacy of America before the World War.

Long before America went into the war Robert Lansing wrote a memorandum in which he said that they had to "educate" the people before we could get them into the war. After 2 years' education they got us into the World War of 1917. Today there have been some individuals in our Government who have started an educational policy to get us into the war that is now being fought. Let us hope, yes, let us pray, that they will not be successful in their educational campaign of 1939 and 1940 as was Mr. Lansing and as were the financiers, as was the press that was controlled at that time, in getting us into the war of 1916 and 1917.

Again I say, I praise the soldiers who went over to fight for an ideal, but I condemn with all the force that is in me those individuals who sent the boys to their needless death.

We got nothing from that war, no one got anything. The war created Hitlerism. It created the conditions from which the world is now suffering.

If we once again go across that ocean in 1940 to make the world safe for democracy, we shall be destroying the last democracy on the face of the earth, because America cannot get into the war and preserve her democracy. So when we talk about saving the world for democracy, our task is not involved in war, but staying away from war. As the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] said, once we create this tremendous military force it is just like a stone that starts rolling-its motion continues to increase and increase.

It has been said that if we allow the Army to have its way it would go so far as to arm the world against a possible invasion from Mars. I would not be surprised if some of the Army men would like to see an Orson Welles invasion, so they could have military groups springing up all over the land. That is not something that is peculiar with the American Army. That has been the history of armies for thousands and thousands of years. If we allow an army to have its way, and it sets itself up first in control of the military policy of the country, soon thereafter that becomes the political policy of the country.

We in America know of this country being established by those who fled from military systems in Europe. We know that many of our forefathers came over here to avoid militarism and war. They were men who opposed militarism. Yet the very thing they fled from is being set up under the pending bill. Some of us are forgetting our history, and we are following the same trend that was followed in Europe and from which our forefathers fled.

Mr. President, I wish to say that if America establishes this militaristic policy we shall never retreat from it so long as America lasts.

Militarism is a policy which grows as it increases in strength. It is just like power-power wants more power and feeds upon power.

What did General Palmer say? This is what a man who helped push this bill and who appeared as a witness said. He is quoted as saying that at one time when he was a lieutenant he wanted the Army to be increased so he could be promoted to be a captain. Yes; and many captains, no doubt, would like to see the Army increased so they could become majors, and many majors would like to see the Army increased so they could become colonels, and, no doubt, many colonels would like to see an increase in the Army so they could become generals.

Mr. President, I do not condemn those in the Army for that, perhaps natural, desire, but I do say that we have some ambitious men in the Army who would gladly see militarism brought about. It is not that they are insincere in their belief. They believe in increasing the Army. But we in America know that militarism has never brought reform to any country. Militarism has never brought a single social gain in the history of the world. Militarism has been the weapon by which social gains have been struck down and destroyed.

Let a country rise as a militaristic power and I will show you a country which is on the way down, and whose people will be forced to live on a lower and ever-lower scale.

We find that by 1920 the war hysteria in the United States had not gone down. I know from personal experience that the war hysteria grew somewhat after the war was over, and in 1920 again there was a drive to put peacetime conscription on the American people. That can be read in the committee hearings, as I wish Senators would do. I have tried to read them as thoroughly as I could. In those hearings Senators will find the same sort of a drive, the same kind of hysteria, post-war hysteria, which is just as dangerous as prewar hysteria in destroying judgment. We still had hysteria when the effort was made to establish militarism in this country in 1920.

Who was a promoter of that action then? He was the same man who is now the author of the pending measure on the other side of the Capitol. Yes; the then Senator from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] was fighting for compulsory military training then. We were in no danger of invasion in 1920. So that excuse could not be used in the effort to establish compulsory military training. But the then Senator Wadsworth was in favor of compulsory military training in 1920, just as one of his distinguished ancestors was in favor of the same policy in 1792.

Uniforms are important to me, but they are not important enough for me to wish to see a drive succeed against those things we hold dear in this country. We have gone a long way in the last few months in the way of striking at individual liberty. Individual liberty and military control do not belong together. They cannot grow up together, because military control is absolute despotism, as we know. When military control is set up individual liberties are thrown aside.

Mr. President, I know that it is not only to protect us in this country that the Military Training Camps Association wants the pending bill passed. No; they have said in effect, if you send these boys here we will give them a feeling—a feeling within themselves that we should have a large Army.

Back in the days of Plattsburg, General Wood said, in effect, allow me to establish Plattsburgs throughout the country and I will show you how I can get all those who go to Plattsburg to become propagandists for more Plattsburgs. Most of those who came under these men have been inculcated with the theory of militarism, and when they leave the camps they continue to have that spirit of militarism. Not all—but many.

# BREAKS DOWN PERSONAL INITIATIVE

The first step in any military training is to break down personal initiative in a man. What is the theory in an army? A private salutes a corporal; a corporal salutes a sergeant; a sergeant salutes a lieutenant; a lieutenant salutes a captain; a captain salutes a major. In other words, it is the old caste system, the system that Europe has had and still has in some instances today, but not the system that we have seen in America.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator did not go quite far enough—and everybody salutes the Commander in Chief.

Mr. HOLT. Yes; everybody salutes the Commander in Chief. In other words, the one who is a little lower than another salutes the man above him in rank, and so on.

Oh, yes; the last man down, the boy we are going to conscript, is going to shine the boots of the men who want conscription. Oh, yes; Senators will find behind conscriptionnot that those who urge it are not sincere, I say again, for they believe it-we will find behind conscription men who are just as sincere as the men in Germany who marched through France and who actually believed in Hitler. We know that they were wrong. We know that their theory was wrong, but they believed it. Simply because men are sincere in their belief does not mean that we should not condemn that belief. Any group, any individual, any idea should be condemned if we ourselves think that they or it is wrong. The theory of militarism in this country is being sought to be established. Some individuals can rid themselves of that desire. Many of them have. I do not condemn all the Army when I make that statement. Not at all. However, I do condemn those individuals in an army who, in their belief in a vast growth of the military system in America, would place on America a system which in my opinion will never be wiped out.

We are not establishing a compulsory military system only until 1945 by the passage of the pending measure. The bill so provides, but in reality we are establishing it for time immemorial; 1945 simply ends the first period. The system will be renewed and renewed so long as the present hysteria continues and so long as people can be made to believe that the continuation of danger in this country is necessary.

### HALLGREN'S TRAGIC FALLACY

Mr. President, I wish to place in the Record at this point a chapter from Morris Hallgren's book. I do not care to read it. In the chapter in question is set forth what some proponents of the idea think about this matter. Some have said we should have a large army—in order to do what? In order to protect America? No; in order to protect America from labor. That was one idea. It has been proposed that we have a large army—what for? In order that labor may realize that it owes something, they say, to the system, and that it should not have radical ideas. Oh, yes; behind this we will find the same thing. Every one of these boys in the Army could be used for any purpose the Commander in Chief wants to use them.

I wish to place in the Record as part of my remarks at this point the chapter from Morris Hallgren's book to which I referred, which sets forth in far better language than I can command what I wish to bring out.

I ask unanimous consent that the matter I have described may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

# DEMOCRACY IN ARMS

The American professional soldier was long the unhappiest of men. Certainly he was the unhappiest of the country's public servants. Of late, to be sure, things have been picking up for him, and today he contemplates the future with more than a little optimism. But for a century or so he nursed a seemingly endless grievance. He was troubled by what he regarded as the democratic mismanagement of the Nation's military affairs.

His troubles began immediately after the Revolution. The victorious rebels, having overthrown one military autocracy, made it plain that they did not intend to permit another to gain a foothold in the new Republic. So strong was their reaction against the

His troubles began immediately after the Revolution. The victorious rebels, having overthrown one military autocracy, made it plain that they did not intend to permit another to gain a foothold in the new Republic. So strong was their reaction against the man in uniform, whether king or hireling, that for a while they kept only 80 men under arms. Though General Washington himself had recommended it, the National Legislature at that time would not even tolerate a permanent armed militia. Congress did finally establish a small army in 1790, an army consisting of no more than 1,283 officers and men, which it sought to keep strictly under civilian control. Nor was this a genuine professional force. It was not until after 1812 that a standing army, as that term is known today, was regularly organized. The citizens of the new Republic believed that they could count upon their own loyalty to protect the state that they had erected. It was felt that, should the need ever arise, the people would hasten spontaneously and en masse to the defense of their country. That was how a free

democracy was supposed to work. And that was the accepted basis of the military policy of the United States in 1790. In form this policy was to undergo a number of changes in the next century,

policy was to undergo a number of changes in the next century, but in principle it remained virtually unaltered.

This does not mean that control of defense policy, or of foreign policies that make for war, was left wholly or even largely with the people. At the very start, authority over the military departments passed into the keeping of the Secretary of War, who was responsible neither to Congress nor to the people but to the President alone. A few years later the administration of foreign affairs, where lies the real power to choose between peace and war, was assumed exclusively by the President. Nor did the fact that the basic military policy was democratic in pattern mean war, was assumed exclusively by the Freshelt. Nor did the lact that the basic military policy was democratic in pattern mean that there were no wars in this period. There were several occasions when the people themselves boldly called for war, acclaimed it for what it might bring the country. More than one of the earlier conflicts was provoked by their insistent demands for room in which to expand.

At that time it was not war but militarism that the people At that time it was not war but militarism that the people feared. And so, through their chosen delegates in the National Legislature, they maintained the right to say what form the military system should take. Congress literally organized the Army to suit itself. It stipulated what units should be created and how they should be set up, although Congress left to the Secretary of War the authority to manage these units after they had been organized. While the military men did not particularly relish having a civilian commander set over them, they were far more disturbed by the legislative interference with the organizamore disturbed by the legislative interference with the organiza-tion of the Army. To them this was a source of constant distress.

Indeed, the military man considered himself as good a democrat as anyone in the country. He could never understand, therefore, why he should not be allowed his full say in the administration of military affairs. He was confident that he was infinitely better equipped than the body of the citizens, or their delegates in the national legislature, to determine the defense needs of the country. He held that, "as the man who uses a weapon is the best judge of its fitness, so a professional soldier should be the best judge of what constitutes a good military system." He was disturbed when public sentiment, prevented him from giving the Naturbed when public sentiment prevented him from giving the Na-tion an "adequate" defense scheme. He objected not only to the way in which Congress organized the peace establishment, but also to the manner in which the American democracy conducted its wars. They were never fought as they should have been; citizen soldiers could not be raised when they were needed and could not fight when brought into action; the militia system was a "positive menace" to the security of the country; popular suspicion of the standing Army simply made a "sound" military policy impossible. Thus ran the arguments of General Upton, most outspoken of the military critics; and so ran the never-varying complaints of his fellows

The military men themselves appear to have been divided on the question of what might be a "sound" military policy. But most of them stood with Emory Upton, who wanted an "expansible standing army." Under this plan the Regular Army would have been a more or less skeletonized force made up of many more units than would be needed in time of peace, but units that could be quickly expanded to full strength with the addition of recruits in time of war. This system would have necessitated the maintenance of a fairly large standing corps of technical specialists and leaders, especially officers, for while recruits in the ranks could be got ready for war with relatively little training, the leaders and specialists needed more training and active experience. And in war, of course, there would hardly be time to train enough of them take charge of the expanded army. Hence they would have

to be retained on active service in peace.

The alternative scheme was one which Baron von Steuben and General Washington had favored. This scheme would have considered the Regular Army a fairly complete and unified force. time of war this force would have been expanded, not by enlarging skeletonized units included within the regular peacetime establishment but by adding new units from an organized militia, the members of which would have undergone periodic training within their own organizations. (Something akin to this militia was later to arise with the development of the National Guard.) Washington, indeed, believed it was not necessary to maintain a Regular Army except for the purpose of guarding the frontiers against Indian attacks. It appears that for defense against a possible foreign foe he wanted the country to rely mainly upon an organized militia. And Von Steuben felt that "a system of this nature will make us more respectable with the powers of Europe than if we keep up an army of 50,000 men." It may be said that of the two the Steuben-Washington plan promised the more efficient defense force, for it would have given the country a small but compact army, complete in itself, which could instantly have beaten back any possible invader. Even today the United States has no such force.

But Congress took kindly to neither of these schemes, for under both the power and prestige of the professional soldier would have been enhanced. Instead, Congress continued to depend upon its small Regular Army, which was based upon no formal philosophy or system, and to call volunteer units and State militar regiments into service in time of war. It seemed to lean more to the Steuben-Washington idea than to the Upton plan. But the Uptons were in the majority in the military service, and they were thoroughly displeased with this practice. After each war they hoped that the displeased with this practice. After each war they hoped that the lessons of conflict, being fresh in the experience of the people, would win their case for them. They thought that the people and Congress would have learned enough at last to overcome their traditional fear of militarism, to heed "expert" advice, and let the professional soldier lay down national-defense policy and manage the country's defense system. But each time they were disappointed.

Meanwhile the dread of militarism was beginning to lose its hold upon the American people, or rather to assume a new aspect and new direction. The soldier was still suspect, but by now faith in democracy had become so ingrained in the people that they took it for granted that the control of the military rested essentially with them. They seemed to feel that if there was any danger of militarism arising anywhere, that danger would

any danger of militarism arising anywhere, that danger would not be found at home but abroad. Simultaneously other factors were operating to relieve the professional soldier of that demowere operating to relieve the professional soldier of that demo-cratic yoke which was irking him so much. The Nation was increasingly occupied with its domestic economic affairs, with the "American dream," which was to bring everlasting prosperity to everyone. The country, moreover, had grown enormously. It appeared that in consequence the defense problem had become far too complex to be dealt with under the simple principles of the 1790 policy. And with the growth of the country the na-tional interest abroad had expanded prodigiously and it was supposed that the professional fighting man alone could protect this great and presumably vital interest. (The rise of American navalism has, indeed, gone hand in hand with the rise of American imperialism.) Lastly, war itself and the instruments of war had become infinitely more complicated. The tendency was to leave the defense problem in ever greater measure in the hands of the military specialist.

Not that the soldier was to be permitted boldly to unsheath the sword. The American people would still resent, if not physically resist, any audacious outward manifestation of militarism at home. But the soldier could now start laying plans for the national defense—in the name of democracy, of course, but also in accordance with his own notion of the fitness of things. While the year 1903 saw the beginning of this development, it was not until after the great crusade against militarism in 1917–18 that the military man was to become confident enough to reach out for power on a truly impressive scale. As was to have been

out for power on a truly impressive scale. As was to have been expected, perhaps, he overreached himself. But that did not prevent him from gaining most of his objectives.

In the national-defense law adopted in 1916 the principle of the "expansible standing army" was first recognized by Congress. But little was done to implement the principle, and in the war that followed a mass army was built, not about the standing army, but upon the hit-or-miss pattern that Congress had always used. After the Armistice the General Staff moved quickly to take advantage of the preliminary victory that had been you in 1916 and of the greatly distended prestige with which it had itself emerged from the European war. It felt that now, finally, it could set up that "good military system" for which the professional soldier had always hankered.

The 1919 plan was, to say the least, presumptuous in scope and revolutionary in implication. It stood in violent contrast to the avowed aims of the United States in the war that had just been concluded. It was certainly not designed to strengthen the founda-tions of the democratic tradition. Instead, had the generals managed to carry it through in full, the ostensible triumph of democracy over militarism in Europe would have been matched by a more genuine victory of militarism over democracy in America.

What the staff wanted was a standing army of 576,000 officers and men. This force was to be so constituted—on the Upton principle—that it could overnight be expanded into an army of 1,250,000 regular soldiers, National Guard men, and trained reservists. Provision was made to add to this force within a few months after the outbreak of war anywhere from 4,000,000 to 19,000,000 conscripts. No power on earth had ever dreamed of overships archives scripts. No power on earth had ever dreamed of organizing such a monster army. But that was what the General Staff had in mind, and the Chief of Staff did not even blush when he suggested to a congressional committee that an army of 19,000,000 drafted men might some day be called into service.

Since the lessons of the European war had unmistakably revealed to the generals that a vast conscript force had become indispensable to the national defense, it quite obviously followed that it would be the height of unwisdom not to train the youth of the country for duty on the battlefield. Under the 1919 plan, therefore, every American boy, upon reaching the age of 19, was to be sent to camp to be drilled in the art of killing. The War Plans Division of the General Staff recommended a 9 months' training period for each conscript. General Pershing and several others thought that the training should run to at least 6 months. Some of the officers urged that the training be followed by a tour of active service as was required in the conscript armies of Europe. But General March, the Chief of Staff, did not agree. He doubtless knew that, as it stood, his plan, which called for 3 months' training and no further service except in the event of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This was, indeed, one of the chief attractions of the "expansible" General Palmer recently recalled that he, as a second lieuplan. General Paimer recently recalled that he, as a second leutenant, once worked out the problem of putting the Army on an "expansible" basis. His conclusion was that that would at that time have added five infantry regiments to the Army, with enough extra officers to command these additional units—and it would automatically have elevated him to the grade of first lieutenant. Little wonder that most officers favored this plan. (Congressional Record, August 22, 1935.)

war, already violated American tradition to such a degree that

war, already violated American tradition to such a degree that the chances of its being accepted were none too good.

This ambitious program was supported on various grounds. The Chief of Staff favored the technical side. What he wanted, after all, was approval of the "expansible" principle—and virtually blanket authority to organize the Army and lay down military policy without legislative interference. So he emphasized "the experi-ences of this war" and sought to show how they had made necessary ences of this war" and sought to show how they had made necessary many changes in the technical structure of the Military Establishment "in order to be successful in war." "In addition to that, also," he said, "the War Department organization itself had been compelled to be changed by the progress of events during the war." The General Staff, therefore, had "started this study of what we learned during the war, because we believed that nobody wanted to go back to the old order, to the old condition of defenselessness, or to the organization which existed before the war; and we attempted to put in the form of a recommendation to Congress an organization for the War Department and for the Army at large that would embody the result of our experience during the war. that would embody the result of our experience during the war.

\* \* The studies which were initiated in the War Department were initiated with the idea of bringing to Congress some scheme which would not be overwhelmingly expensive, but would still give

us an efficient military policy."

Here was the ghost of Emory Upton speaking through the person of Peyton March. All of the arguments Upton had used in the 1870's were now being rehashed and served up new by General March. And for the same purpose. The Chief of Staff might have been in a stronger position had he been able to come to an understanding with his follows generals as to the number of soldiers. standing with his fellow generals as to the number of soldiers needed to bring about the technical reforms he desired. At least with regard to this aspect, it seems, his colleagues were not in agreement as to the lessons of the war. General Wood, for example, saw no necessity for "recommending an army whose strength will be in excess of 225,000 men, or at most 250,000. I can find no reason whatever for the larger army recommended by the War Department bill; that is to say, if we are to follow our traditional policy." <sup>2</sup>
But this was perhaps a minor detail. In all other respects the

bill; that is to say, if we are to follow our traditional policy." <sup>2</sup>
But this was perhaps a minor detail. In all other respects the generals were practically unanimous. One or two of the military men, General Palmer among them, preferred the Steuben-Washington scheme to the Upton plan, but the rest stood with General March. They stood together, too, in wanting a system of compulsory training established. They seemed supremely confident that in this they had the enthusiastic support of public opinion. And it did appear that virtually all of the prominent and influential civic leaders of the country were calling for such training, that the great finance capitalists, industrialists, merchants, clergymen, educators, publicists, and professional uplifters were in the very forefront of the fight for compulsory service. <sup>3</sup> It was possible that

<sup>2</sup> Other estimates as to the size of the army needed were as follows: Maj. Gen. Eli A. Helmick, 225,000 men, with universal training; Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall, 225,000, but 300,000 if universal training were instituted; Maj. Gen. J. L. Chamberlain, 250,000 combat troops; Maj. Gen. William M. Black, 250,000 for standing peace army; Maj. Gen. W. L. Sibert, 250,000, with universal training; Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, 250,000 sufficient for all purposes; Maj. Gen. Gen. William Mitchell, 250,000 sumcient for an purposes; Maj. Gen. Ernest Hinds, 250,000; Col. John McA. Palmer, 280,000 until the citizen army was established, then 225,000; Maj. Gen. W. J. Snow, 300,000 with universal training; Gen. John J. Pershing, 300,000 maximum of both officers and men; Maj. Gen. William G. Haan, 306,500; Maj. Gen. P. C. Harris, 232,839 minimum, 500,000 preferable; Maj. Gen. Henry Jervey, 509,000; Brig. Gen. Marlborough Churchill, 500,000 under existing conditions; Maj. Gen. E. Coe. 541,000 not 509,000 under existing conditions; Maj. Gen. F. W. Coe, 541,000 not too large. It may be noted that most of these officers were not members of the General Staff. (Hearings on the Army reorganization bill before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Repre-

sentatives, 66th Cong., 1st sess.)

The Universal Military Training League, for example, numbered among its directors the following: Henry M. Byllesby, engineer, Chicago; Clarence S. Funk, investment banker, Chicago; Alexander M. White, New York City; Victor F. Lawson, publisher, the Chicago Daily News; James A. Flaherty, supreme knight, Knights of Columbus; William H. Childs, manufacturer, New York City; H. Walters, chairman of the board, Atlantic Coast Line; Charles G. Curtis, manufacturer, New York City: Guy Emerson, banker, New York City: bus; William H. Childs, manufacturer, New York City; H. Waiters, chairman of the board, Atlantic Coast Line; Charles G. Curtis, manufacturer, New York City; Guy Emerson, banker, New York City; William Wrigley, Jr., manufacturer, Chicago; John T. Pratt, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Albert H. Loeb, merchant, Chicago; John S. Goodwin, farmer, Naperville, Ill.; George W. Perkins, financier, New York City; John Borden, financier, Chicago; B. E. Sunny, president, Chicago Telephone Co.; Karl H. Behr, manufacturer, New York City; Daniel J. Keefe, former vice president, American Federation of Labor; Dean Shailer Mathews, University of Chicago; Chesley R. Perry, secretary, International Association of Rotary Clubs; Wright A. Patterson, editor, Western Newspaper Union; Frank D. Sout, transportation, Chicago; H. H. Merrick, president, Association of Commerce, Chicago. Its advisory committee included Henry M. Pindell, publisher, the Peoria, Ill., Journal; E. P. Ripley, president, Santa Fe Railway; Charles A. Hinsch, banker, Cincinnati; Cyrus H. K. Curtis, Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia; Cardinal Gibbons, Baltimore; W. H. Roberts, D. D., permanent standing clerk, Presbyterian Church; Harry Pratt Judson, president, University of Chicago; Julius Rosenwald, merchant, Chicago; Russell H. Conwell, D. D., founder, City College, Philadelphia; S. Parkes Cadman, D. D., Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Bishop Samuel Fallows, Reformed Episcopal Church, Chicago; R. T. Crane,

these civic leaders did not truly reflect public opinion, but the generals thought that they did and in any case were quite willing

to accept their support.

These citizens and their hired representatives themselves believed that they could and did speak for most of the people. Henry L. Stimson, the former Secretary of War, considered it "very significant" Stimson, the former Secretary of War, considered it "very sighthat "the other day at the State convention in Rochester that "the other day at the State convention in Rochester \* \* \* the American Legion voted unanimously for a system of universal military training." The national convention of the Legion had previously taken a similar stand, so it was supposed that practically all of the returned soldiers were for compulsory training. The president of the Universal Military Training League, who said that for 4 years he had done "nothing else but study" this very problem, had no hesitation in reporting that "a vast majority of the people are ready for universal military training—I should say 80 to 90 are ready for universal military training—I should say 80 to 90

To be sure, these public-spirited civilians advocated military conscription mainly as a peace measure. They saw nothing militaristic in it. The chairman of the Military Training Camps Association held that "if we had had our citizens organized and trained as a citizens' army, we would never have had to go to war." The president of the Universal Military Training League said that "if we had had universal training 5 or 6 years ago. I question whether president of the Universal Military Training League said that "if we had had universal training 5 or 6 years ago, I question whether there would have been a World War—certainly we would not have been forced into it, and I think the *Lusitania* would be affoat today." He did not stop to explain how a citizens' army in the United States could have prevented a world war. The American Legion in convention in Minneapolis resolved, inter alia, that "national safety with freedom from militaries is beet accurately." tional safety with freedom from militarism is best assured by a national citizen army and navy based on the democratic and American principles of the equality of obligation and opportunity for all." The Association of Military Colleges and Schools contended that an "armed democracy" offered the only dependable antidote for militarism.4

But it was not only "peace" and "democracy" that were to be served by conscription. The class struggle was to be disposed of by served by conscription. The class struggle was to be disposed of by the same magic means. Most of the advocates of compulsory training dealt in euphemism in discussing this point, but their meaning was abundantly clear. Winthrop Talbot, who described himself as a "consultant in industrial management," asserted that such training "is essentially in line with the democratic requirements of American education" and through it the youth of the country would be "instructed in the school of the citizen." Mr. Stimson regarded compulsory training as "an educational force in the direction of molding together the divergent elements that have come into our compulsory training as "an educational force in the direction of molding together the divergent elements that have come into our civilization." General Atterbury, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, told a Senate committee that compulsory training could not help allaying class feeling. "I think it is the best thing for everybody," he declared. The president of the Universal Military Training League, seemingly less given to rhetoric in expressing plain

Jr., manufacturer, Chicago; F. D. Coburn, former Secretary of Agriculture, State of Kansas; Edward L. Ryerson, manufacturer, Chicago; Horace S. Wilkinson, manufacturer, Syracuse, N. Y.; Ike T. Pryor, livestock, Texas; Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War. Apart from the retired labor leader and the gentleman farmer from Illinois, there was no one on this list who even in the remotest sense could be said to speak for the great body of workers and farmers of the country. (Ibid., pp. 710–711.)

\*Its argument, truly remarkable for the insight it gives us into

the mental processes of some of the more extreme patriots of the

day, is reproduced here:

"1. What do we mean by a nation in arms? A nation in arms is a democracy, every male citizen of which is mentally, physically, and morally prepared to answer the summons to the defense of its rights and liberties. Such forces would refuse to engage in wars of conquest and ambition, but when the emergency arose they would be ready to redress outrages and repel attacks. When great nations are efficiently organized on a national defensive basis, then

and only then will peace, permanent peace, allow civilization to proceed, undisturbed, on its glorious march.

"2. Can a democracy be a nation in arms? A real democracy can and must be a nation in arms, for it must stand ready to defend itself. The ideals of a true democracy cannot tolerate an imfend itself. The ideals of a true democracy cannot tolerate an immense Prusslanized permanent army system, with its classes, prejudices, and self-interests. A nation in arms will not militarize democracy, but will democratize the military system. The army must be the people; the people must be the army.

"3. Can a world power, in the light of recent events, be a nation in arms? If a nation in arms means a militarized autocracy, with the armyting and tealousies, then the armys or Print the armyting and tealousies, then the armys or Print the armyting and tealousies.

tion in arms? If a nation in arms means a militarized autocracy, with its ambitions and jealousies, then the answer is no. But if a nation in arms means a people, physically trained, mentally prepared, and materially equipped to punish nations offending against the laws of peace and justice, then every member of an international society must be a nation in arms. Peace pacts will again be trampled under foot unless peoples are prepared to restrain the selfish ambitions of vulture nations. Economic pressure alone is not a sufficiently powerful weapon."

In short, put a rifle or machine gun into every man's hands,

not a sufficiently powerful weapon."

In short, put a rifle or machine gun into every man's hands, teach him how to use them in killing other men, and we shall not have militarism, never that, but "peace, permanent peace." It is hardly surprising to find the same organization, anticipating Mussolini by at least a decade, urging the training of the male youth of the country from the age of 6. (Hearings on the Army reorganization bill before the Committee on Military Affairs, U. S. Senate, 66th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 450–451.)

thought, held that "universal training will be a great factor for

industrial tranquillity."

The generals likewise brought the class struggle into their argu-Pershing invited "special attention to one particularly important advantage" of compulsory training. "We are now con-fronted," he said, "with serious social problems resulting from the presence of large masses of ignorant foreigners in our midst, who are highly susceptible to the anarchistic or bolshevik proposals of numerous agitators now at work. \* \* \* Universal military training is the only means I see available for educating this foreign element in the real meaning of the democracy of our government and its institutions, and for developing them into good citizens before they fall under the sway of dangerous agitators and become a

real menace to the country."

"This war," General Parker added, "has been about as democratic "This war," General Parker added, "has been about as democratic a proposition for our Nation as anything I have been thrown in contact with. I think we have seen the rich and the poor, the social classes, mingled together, getting, as they always do when they mingle, that respect for each other based on a man being a man wherever he is." General Parker wanted the good work to continue in order that "the young men of our country" might receive "certain uniform instructions with reference to the needs of the country, patriotism, moral training, and such matters which pertain to their utility to the state." His "principal desire" was "to get uniformity of thought into the youths." He doubtless had no way of knowing that "uniformity of thought" was within a few years to be one of the primary objectives of the new Fascist war lords in Germany and Italy.

Only one sour note was raised by a military man with regard to these several arguments. General Sherburne, of the Massachusetts Militia, was rather dubious.

to these several arguments. Gen setts Militia, was rather dubious.

Our General Staff [he asserted] is patterned almost exactly on the pre-war German staff methods. Well, perhaps, it would be invidious to go very much further on that line, but take, for ininvidious to go very much further on that line, but take, for instance, the question of saluting. Undoubtedly you gentlemen have talked to private soldiers. I can speak as a general going around in a Cadillac limousine, and say that my arm has gotten so lame at times from saluting that I have pulled down the curtains of my car so I would not have to salute. I have seen boys along the road who would have to jump up and salute every few minutes, and if they did not, they never knew when they were going to get called. I have seen general officers stop their cars and get out and go back and call poor doughboys, treat them like dogs, because they were marching along the road perhans tired out, and had they were marching along the road, perhaps tired out, and had failed to salute. I have seen it happen time after time, and that was, I think, a pity. It was a little thing in itself, but it was an outward and visible sign of an inward and invisible condition that

was nevertheless very apparent.

There was hardly a returned soldier who could not have testified to the truth of General Sherburne's observations. His forthrightness was not relished by the General Staff, which was just then ness was not relished by the General Staff, which was just then trying to sell Congress and the country the idea that compulsory military service would make the American people one big and happy democratic family. Yet the Staff did not care to engage in a row with Mr. Sherburne, for that obviously would have called public attention to the utter falsity of its argument and would have revealed the great extent to which the autocratic as well as the martial spirit prevails among American military men. Besides, the other generals had little time for him. They had their hands more than full in seeking power to enlarge the permanent Military Establishment and extend still further their growing influence and authority.

Military Establishment and extend still further their growing influence and authority.

They, too, insisted that peace would be promoted and safeguarded by the General Staff's plan, that a bigger Army and conscription would serve as insurance against war. If the country were only strong enough, if every male citizen could be trained as a soldier, they argued, no one would dare to violate America's just rights. And since the United States, they said, would go to war only in defense of these rights, a great Army and compulsory training would obviously keep the country out of war in the future. "It is my belief," General Pershing asserted with respect to the war with Germany, "that if America had been adequately prepared, our rights would never have been violated; our institutions would never have been threatened." General March held that "if we had been in the position we should have been in, Germany would not have dared to have brought us into the war at all." The European war, then not yet 12 months over, presented tragically eloquent proof of the falsity of this plea. Every one of the major powers had had a huge standing army or a big navy or both on the eve of war. Still they had not remained at peace, their adequate preparedness had not prevented war. Was it not, indeed, the official thesis of the American Government that Germany's preparedness for war was

<sup>5</sup> A fair sample of what the military man really thinks of democracy may be found in the following definition as set forth in Training Manual No. 2000–2025 for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, a War Department publication: "Democracy—a government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of direct expression. Result is mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse without restraint or regard for consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, and anarchy." (The New Republic, December 2, 1936, p. 144.) <sup>5</sup> A fair sample of what the military man really thinks of democa menace to the peace and security of the world? Yet here were generals who could close their eyes to brutal fact and continue to give voice to this treacherous argument.

to give voice to this treacherous argument.

Neither national policy in general nor the realities of the international political situation appear to have played any part in the General Staff's reasoning. There is no evidence whatever that in formulating its 1919 plan the Staff took geographic or other factors of a similar nature into consideration, nothing to show that it built its plan upon any real study of the problem of defense. Not once did a member of the Staff seek to demonstrate that the new plan was needed to guard the country against invasion. General March simply wanted a force big enough to fight anybody or everybody. He admitted that there was "no emergency of that kind confronting us now," but he insisted upon having a Military Establishment large enough "to meet any emergency that might confront us." gency that might confront us."

Nor were the other generals able to point to any specific menace to the national security either present or potential. Some thought that the country might again be involved in a war crisis as the result of its growing power and expanding political and economic activity. General Hinds suggested that "the world is growing smaller every day, due to improvements in methods of transportation; our relations are consequently reaching out into channels that they have never reached before, and in my opinion no one can foresee what may happen in the next month or the next year." Others agreed that "the advent of America into world politics" made necessary a great standing army. Indeed, the consensus among the military men was that the country now needed a Military Establishment not merely for territorial defense but to provide for such expeditionary forces as would be required when the country should again find itself involved in a war abroad.

country should again find itself involved in a war abroad.

The cost of the 1919 plan would have been no less impressive than its other startling features. How much, indeed, would it have actually taken in the way of new taxes or new Government borrowing to keep up a war machine large enough to serve as effective insurance against war, to enable the country to defend itself against any possible combination of enemies, to safeguard the little tablet wither wherever they might be found trailer. itself against any possible combination of enemies, to safeguard its just rights wherever they might be found, to allow it to enter into world politics with an enhanced sense of security, to provide for a nucleus for other expeditionary forces to be sent abroad, to bring about the contemplated democratization of the Nation, to

bring about the contemplated democratization of the Nation, to introduce uniformity of thought among the younger male citizens, and to secure the several other advantages the generals professed to see in this plan? The estimates varied considerably.

General March had said that the intention was to work out an adequate defense scheme that would not be overwhelmingly expensive. What he considered overwhelming he did not reveal, but when he got down to specific figures it was found that the cost, in his judgment, would have come to about \$1,000,000,000 a year. He first figured that the total, "at the present pay for an army of 500,000 men, would be \$798,660,000." To this, however, had to be added the cost of the compulsory training system, which was put at \$100,000,000 annually. And then other expenses had to be included—a larger clerical staff in the War Department, maintenance and improvement of additional training facilities, more barracks, and so on—none of which seems to have entered into the reckonand improvement of additional training facilities, more barracks, and so on—none of which seems to have entered into the reckoning of the General Staff. Perhaps the final figure would have run close to \$1,500,000,000 a year. At least, some of the higher estimates exceeded \$1,200,000,000, and these did not include every essential item. General Wood suggested, referring to the estimate by the Chief of Staff, that "you can add 30 percent to that figure pretty safely. Our experience has always been \* \* \* that estimates are more apt to be under than over."

It may be that the bill would not have been overwhelmingly expensive, but it would have been more than five times as large

expensive, but it would have been more than five times as large as the total War Department budget in any year of peace before 1917. In 1916 the War Department spent only \$183,176,000 on all its activities, including river and harbor work and the administration and maintenance of the Panama Canal. Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, offered another interesting comparison. After Congress had trimmed the General Staff's plan down to somewhat more reasonable proportions, he declared that "the cost of the bill has been reduced to about \$4,000,000,000—which, by the way, is about twice as much as Germany, in the heyday of her militarism, ever expended upon her army in times of peace \* \* \*."

Until Congress tackled the job, moreover, no one had seemed able to point to any way in which the original estimate might be reduced—without, that is, also reducing the size of the war machine the General Staff wanted. The Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, intimated that even this machine might not be large enough. But

Just how much greater it would really have been may be seen from these comparative figures: In 1907 the actual strength of the Army was 62,398 and the population of the country 97,000,000, or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Elsewhere Mr. Baker had asserted that "500,000 is a child's play army, compared with what the United States will have to have unless some arrangement is made by which international disputes will be amicably adjusted, and unless that happens, I think the will be amicably adjusted, and unless that happens, I think the United States and every other country will have to arm to the teeth, and 500,000 will be a baby army compared with what we will need to keep our position in the world." In further justification of a bigger Army he said that "the United States is very much larger than it ever was before, and the size of its Army as compared with the size of its population is not much greater at 500,000 than it used to be at 200,000."

Lust how much greater it would really have been may be seen

he agreed that the estimated cost represented "a great deal of money." He told the Senate Military Affairs Committee that he was "sympathetic with every dollar you can save." Yet, when asked for particular suggestions as to how that might be achieved, he had to confess that he was "not expert enough in military matters to answer that. \* \* I would like to have the com-

matters to answer that.

I would like to have the committee take the judgment of men like General Pershing and General March and let that be discussed by military men."

Unhappily, the question of cost was one that the military men were reluctant to dwell upon in detail. Some were emotionally upwere reluctant to dwell upon in detail. Some were emotionally upset by the necessity of discussing it in any way. General Parker, who had seen such shining democratic virtues in universal militarization, was so disturbed when the time came to talk about finances that in an unguarded moment he suggested that it might be wiser not to keep regular soldiers "under the colors all the time," since the expense of maintaining them tended to put military service in a "mercenary" light. What he really wanted, he said, was "to see military service done for nothing but love of country." After all, a billion dollars was rather a steep price to ask the American people to pay out every year, not for national defense, but for a military system of audacious scope and highly questionable value. It was perhaps better to forget the cost and put the whole business on a basis of patriotism.

Mr. HOLT. In 1920 the move I have described was beaten by Congress, and then the effort along this line died down, because the hysteria began to ebb. There was no hysterical effort made to involve the United States in any war. There was no longer any militaristic hysteria such as that which is now growing.

But now, when they see a bright opportunity, with all Americans thinking that Hitler is right at our door, that he is going to land tomorrow, and with all the scares concerning the establishment by Hitler of colonies in South America, and fear of bombing planes, and all the stories that are appearing throughout the country, the war hysteria is once again being built up. Some of the same individuals who tried to have compulsory military training in 1920 are back at work in 1940 with some converts that they have gained in the meantime. They have not only gained groups of converts but they have gained financial support along with them.

#### THE BACKGROUND OF PRESENT DRIVE

I wish to show the background of this group, which met at the Harvard Club in New York. After this portion of my remarks I shall place in the RECORD that part of the story I told the Senate, because I wish it to be shown in its true light, and all together, and in it Senators will find appearing the same individuals who previously took the same position.

Where did they meet? They met at the Harvard Club, just as the Plattsburg group met in 1916 in the Harvard Club. Not satisfied simply with meeting at the Harvard Club, where they had met in 1916, they met in the very same room where they first tried to put military conscription on the people. They met in the Biddle room of the Harvard Club, just as the group met there 24 years ago, to put over compulsory peacetime military training. They wanted to feel the spirit of those individuals back 24 years ago who had tried to set up compulsory military training in the United States. They were not satisfied, as I say, only to meet in the same city, in the same club, but they met in the Biddle room, the very same room where the drive had once before started.

I referred to the New York meeting a moment ago and stated that the data would be submitted for the RECORD. The following statements are from my speech on the floor of the Senate on August 6:

1 soldier for 1,565 citizens; under the National Defense Act of 1916 the Army had a maximum peace strength of 175,000 (its actual strength being below 100,000) and in that year the population was 112,000,000, giving 1 soldier for 640 inhabitants; in 1920, under the General Staff's plan, which Mr. Baker approved, the Army's strength General Staff's plan, which Mr. Baker approved, the Army's strength would have been 576,000, while the population was 118,000,000, or 1 soldier for 205 citizens, which would have meant a gain in proportionate strength of more than 650 percent since 1907. Stated otherwise, in 1920 the population was 22 percent larger than in 1907 and 5.4 percent larger than in 1916, but the Army planned by the General Staff would have been 820 percent larger than that of 1907 and 230 percent larger than that permitted under the 1916 law. (Hearings on the Army Reorganization Bill before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, 66th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1774–1775; William Addleman Ganoe; The History of the United States Army, New York, 1924, pp. 430, 457–458; Statistical Abstract of the United States, Washington, 1930, p. 3.)

It was at the Harvard Club (New York City) on the 22d day of May these patriots met to start the conscription drive. Who do we find was there at that time? We find ville Clark, of the proletarian law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner, and Ballentine.

Who else was there? Gen. John F. O'Ryan. Let me read to you what General O'Ryan said before the last war as to why we should draft boys and have them ready for war. This is the exact language of General O'Ryan then, and I want to read it to

the Senate:
"The first thing that must be done is to destroy all initiative,

and that with the training fits men to be soldiers. \* \* \*
"The recruit does not know how to carry out orders. His
mental state differs from that of the trained soldier who obeys mechanically. We must get our men so that they are machines.
"We have to have our men trained so that the influence of fear

"We have to have our men trained so that the influence of fear is overpowered by the peril of an uncompromising military system often backed up by a pistol in the hands of an officer."

I want to repeat the words of General O'Ryan as to the need of conscription. This is what he says:

"We have to have our men trained so that the influence of fear is overpowered by the peril of an uncomprising military system, often backed up by a pistol in the hands of an officer."

Then he continues:

"The recruits have got to put their heads into the military noose. They have got to be jacked up. They have got to be bawled out."

General O'Ryan, as most of you know, has already advocated the entrance of the United States into this war. He is in favor of the United States going over there now. He is for con-scription, and was present at the Harvard Club when this com-

mittee was set up.
Who else was there? Let us go down through the list of

Some of them.

Lewis W. Douglas was there. I shall not say about him what the President did. I shall just pass him over.

Who else was there? Henry L. Stimson, the Secretary of War, who is carrying out in the Cabinet the wishes of those who want who is carrying out in the Cabinet the wishes of those who want us to go to war. No matter how much he proclaims otherwise to the public, Henry L. Stimson would be for war today if he felt he could get a declaration of war through Congress. Henry L. Stimson has been present at all these meetings to push America a little closer to the precipice. Henry L. Stimson was present at the meeting, as he was at the meeting that set up the infamous Clark-Eichelberger-William Allen White committee. Was that why he was appointed to the Cabinet, because they knew his record so well?

why he was appointed to the Cabinet, because they knew his record so well?

Who else was present at this meeting to draft American boys?

Robert P. Patterson, who is now Assistant Secretary of War. He was present. No wonder Mr. Stimson wants him as his assistant

was present. No wonder Mr. Stimson wants him as his assistant in the Department of War.

Who else was present at that meeting? I was speaking a moment ago of Lewis Douglas. I do not want to bring politics into this matter. I want to be fair. Whom else do we find? Elihu Root, Jr. He was present at that meeting to set up this conscription drive. He is also a member of the firm of Root, Clark, Buckner, and Ballentine, and has many other interests that I could name to you, but I do not want to delay the Senate.

Who else was present at that meeting? Julius Ochs Adler gen-

Who else was present at that meeting? Julius Ochs Adler, general manager of the New York Times, and a man who holds stock in corporations located in countries now at war. Mr. Adler wants

the American boy to protect his investments.

Now, let us see who else was there. We find that Mr. K. P. Budd was there. That may not mean anything to you; but who is Mr. K. P. Budd? He is a director of the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co., with headquarters in London.

Let us look at the others that we have in the list. We find Mr.

J. B. Taylor, Jr., who has money invested in aircraft, and a director of aviation corporations.

Let us see who else was there. We find Mr. F. M. Weld. Who is Mr. Weld? I will tell you who he is. He is a director of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, which is making millions out of this

Now let us go down the list of these individuals, and see what their patriotism is, that they want American boys to be regimented. What else does Mr. Weld do? He is in the oil business, in the Pilgrim Exploration Co., and other enterprises that I could mention to vou.

Whom else do we find present at that meeting? Brig. Gen. Benedict Crowell, who was Assistant Secretary of War and Director of Munitions during the World War. You recall that—the Director of Munitions during the World War. You recall that—the Director of Munitions during the World War—do you not? He was also present at the Harvard Club to set up this conscription drive to get American boys in the Army. Other individuals were present whose names I could place in the Record, together with a list of the interests with which they were identified.

They met on the 22d day of May and established this drive for conscription. On the 23d day of May they went back to the same club and there passed resolutions for "aid to the Allies short of war." I have been advised that their statements there were as bellicose as if we were in war at that time.

Now, let us see what else they did. They know where to get money. What did this committee do? On the 3d day of June they met again. They met to raise money. It is hard to tell how much they raised, but they said they were going to raise one-quarter of a million dollars. What for? Why should men in business have

to raise a quarter of a million dollars to drive a conscription bill through the Congress of the United States? Why, I ask again, should businessmen raise a quarter of a million dollars to drive conscription through the United States Congress? If conscription was a good thing for this country, would not our Army and Navy ask for it without pressure? Would we not vote for it without pressure that the delay of the constraint of the country of the congress of the constraint of t ask for it without pressure? Would we not vote for it without propaganda to drive us into line? That quarter of a million dollars was to pay for the type of propaganda spoken of just a moment ago by the Senator from Michigan. A quarter of a million dollars was raised at that one time. Think of that—men raising a quarter of a million dollars to conscript boys in America. Such patriotism.

Who else was present? And what financial enterprises do we find that these individuals are engaged in? Here are some of their financial holdings: We find that some of them have foreign investments—very decided, strong, large foreign investments. We find that some of them are directors of abrasive companies, directors of rubber companies, directors of chemical companies, directors of wire companies; and wire is very important in war. It is very usual to see a boy, one of these conscripted boys, hanging over a barbed wire, with his stomach torn open by a bomb. So we need wire in war.

Whom else do we find? We find directors of iron-ore mines and Whom else do we find? We find directors of iron-ore mines and iron furnaces, directors of oil companies, directors of British insurance companies, of aircraft companies, of the Baldwin Locomotive Co., of machine tools, of phosphates, of air brakes; and in that list you will find such a group of patriots as this country has

Yesterday I spoke about the Philadelphia group, and how it originated. I mentioned the six men. I am sorry I was interrupted so much yesterday. I could have gone into detail and shown more of the background of the movement. I intend to place that matter in the RECORD later.

Let us bring the history of the movement down to 1940. do not care to detain the Senate longer than necessary. What do we find? We find that this group met in 1940. I told the story of how they met and raised a quarter of a million dollars to put over peacetime conscription. As I then asked on the floor of the Senate. Why should any group of financiers and international bankers be required to raise a quarter of a million dollars to force through compulsory peacetime conscription in America? I have before me-and I intend to put it in the Record as a part of my remarks—a letter which was sent by Mr. Allan L. Lindley, treasurer or director of the finance committee-I am not sure which. He did not send it to the boys on the street asking contributions. From whom did he ask contributions? Every single solitary member of the New York Stock Exchange was sent a letter, asking him to donate money to force through compulsory military training in America. I shall place that letter in the RECORD. It follows:

NATIONAL EMERGENCY COMMITTEE, MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS ASSOCIATION,

New York, N. Y., August 5, 1940.

Those who believe in selective compulsory military training and its immediate adoption make the compelling argument that with the equal opportunity offered to all citizens of the United States there goes the equal obligation to serve.

A corollary of this, in the judgment of the National Emergency

Committee, means that citizens able to give—and who believe we must immediately adopt this form of military training—should willingly contribute to help enact the Burke-Wadsworth bill into legislation.

Time is too short to permit us to make a wide national appeal for the \$100,000 fund imperatively needed for the purposes set forth in the enclosed leaflet. When you write your check payable to James G. Harbord, treasurer, make the amount proportionate to your stake in American freedom.

Delay has cursed the cause of the Allies day in and day out. This is a major test of the democracy we seek to protect. Can patriotic Americans move quickly enough to provide an adequate defense?

Part of the answer-your part-may be found in your response to this appeal.
Sincerely yours,

ALLEN L. LINDLEY.

Is this the Allen L. Lindley that was vice president of the New York Stock Exchange when Richard Whitney-now in Sing Sing-was president? This is a copy of what is being sent to New York Stock Exchange members.

Does anyone suppose that the Military Training Camps Association was organized among poor people? Does the Senate know how much the banking and insurance assets of the banks of which members of this committee are directors amount to? I was not able to check them all, but I checked some of the banks and financial institutions of which these men are directors. What did I find? I found that the

directors of the Military Training Camps Association were directors in banking institutions which had assets, not of \$1,000,000,000, but of six and a half billion dollars—six and a half billion dollars' worth of pressure.

Who else is behind the international movement? rectors of both the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System. Everyone knows the power which Major General Harbord has with the National Broadcasting Co. as a director of radio communications. Is that why the ether has been filled for weeks and weeks with the idea of compulsory military training? I have in previous speeches discussed directors of the other chain. Does the Senate realize that as soon as the bill was reported the story was given out that the compulsory military training bill was almost passed, and that it was a question of only a day or so before the bill would be passed? Why was that feeling generated? In order to try to keep the American people from protesting. Anyone who listens to the comments of Mr. Kaltenborn or some of those paid by the National Broadcasting Co., to give the so-called impartial news, will find that it is loaded in favor of compulsory military training. I hate to say these things, because I have sometimes taken great pleasure in listening to the commentators. I say that they are destroying themselves in the eyes of impartial thinking people in this country. They are destroying themselves because they are loading their so-called impartial comments with propaganda for

Some time ago I showed the Senate who paid for the "Stop Hitler" advertisements. Whom did we find? Two directors of the Columbia Broadcasting System. It is not that the broadcasting companies do not give us time. I have been very fortunate. They have been very kind to me whenever I have asked for time on the networks; but that is not the power of the radio.

The men to whom I refer appear night after night, giving the news and their comments on it. Night after night they are generating the feeling that America is in danger, and that if we do not have compulsory military training the American democracy will fall. That is why I protest. It is not that the broadcasting companies do not give us 15 minutes every now and then. I say that their paid propagandists are on the air, not spreading the doctrine of Americanism, but the poisonous doctrine of internationalism—the doctrine that America is no longer strong.

# AMERICA HAS BEEN HER OWN PROTECTOR

We thought America was great. I was taught as a child in school that the fine American soldiers protected America. I thought we had a great army and a great navy. I was taught that America never lost a war; but recently I have been disillusioned, because I have been told that we are not strong because of ourselves, but because of the British Navy, and that we would have been invaded and destroyed if it had not been for the British Navy.

All the teachings of history have been wiped out in the past few months. I thought that American soldiers and American sailors defended us, but I now find that the Union Jack has been our defender. I learn that from listening to the propaganda we are hearing over the country. The greatest insult to American history is the propaganda which has been put out that America cannot defend herself with her own might. Let us see that America rests only on Americans. "Let none but Americans be put on guard tonight." Let us not make the British Navy our protection, because we know Britain's theory of the balance of power and her theory of colonial empire. Let us make the American Army and the American Navy our defenders, and not tie ourselves for all time to come to internationalism.

# GRENVILLE CLARK'S LETTER

Some of the very same individuals who are preaching internationalism are the ones who are preaching compulsory military training. Let me read part of a letter written by Mr. Grenville Clark, the man who actually wrote this bill for compulsory military training. Is he interested only in the defense of America? Let me tell the Senate about Mr. Clark. I have given some of his history before. These are the suggestions he offers:

Being weary of generalities, I offer the following concrete suggestions:

Repeal the Johnson Act so as to permit private loans to the Allies. If we really want them not to be defeated, what difference does it make that years ago they defaulted on their vast debts from the last war? If we really believe that it is in our national interest that they shall not be defeated, is it not common sense to aid them, at least with private credit voluntarily supplied by our citizens?

So Mr. Clark, the man who actually penned the compulsory military training bill, calls upon us first to repeal the Johnson Act. He says, "What difference does it make if they defaulted?" I should like to borrow some money from Mr. Clark on that basis. What difference does it make? It is all paid by the taxpayers. Just waive it aside. Repeal the Johnson Act, so that we will be "Uncle Sap" once again. Remember the "Uncle Shylock" incident?

What is the second thing which Mr. Clark advocates?

Let the law that prohibits American volunteering in the Allied armies be forthwith repealed. Since there are aviators and others who feel the call to serve against Hitler, why should we forbid it? Their aid might be invaluable.

Let Americans volunteer in the army of Great Britain. That is the second suggestion of Mr. Clark, the author of the bill.

His third suggestion is:

Let our Government facilitate in every way the procurement by the Allies of the most modern planes and arms we can supply.

This is the dangerous thing:

Let no "secrets" be withheld; let permission be given freely for the sale or charter of our shipping in order to safeguard their lines of supply by sea.

Let no secrets be withheld. In other words, give England our bomb sight, which American ingenuity and American science gave us. This is from the man who wants to defend America by compulsory military training. Yes; let no secrets be withheld. Not only that, but let us give them or charter to them any part of our Navy they may want.

The fourth step, according to Mr. Clark, is this:

Let immediate steps be taken to stop entirely the export of copper, tin, rubber, and other war materials to Russia or other countries whence these materials may find their way to Germany.

I have no objection to that. If we are going to put on an embargo, let it apply to all. That point itself is not particularly dangerous.

What else? Mr. Clark's fifth point is:

Let our Government see to the doubling, at least, of our merchant shipbuilding capacity so that, in a long war, a new supply of ships may be forthcoming to insure communications. Let these new ships be sold or chartered to the Allies on reasonable terms, without profit,

That is the suggestion of Mr. Clark, the author of the bill. I wish to read it again:

Let these new ships be sold or chartered to the Allies on reasonable terms, without profit.

Yet Mr. Clark, as a member of an executive committee, criticizes excess-profits legislation. Build ships for the Allies without profit, but the American taxpayer should give a profit to the man who builds ships for America. This is the man who wrote the compulsory military training bill which we are now considering. That is the fifth point which he advocates.

The sixth point is:

Let a great public discussion be begun as to the advisability of Government grants of all the money required. Let this question relate to outright grants, not loans. For what is the use of piling up new debts that we know cannot be repaid? Let discussion proceed as to all other ways to place our full resources, short of actual military participation, at the disposal of the Allies.

Mr. Clark says we should take American money out of the United States Treasury and give it to the Allies—not lend it to them, but give it to them.

Think of those points, and then consider whether or not Mr. Clark is particularly interested in the defense of America.

I wish when Senators read the Record tomorrow they would check the six points that Mr. Clark advocated in a letter of the 17th day of May 1940, against the so-called patriotism of drafting every man between the age of 18 and 65, as that was his proposal.

The same international group will be found talking about that.

GEORGE HUDDLESTON ON CONSCRIPTION

May I read something that I wish I could say in my own words? I think it is one of the strongest things I have ever read on conscription. I refer to the speech on conscription made by George Huddleston, of Alabama, a great and independent Member of the House of Representatives. This is what Mr. Huddleston said:

First, I would inquire, Where does the demand for compulsory service come from? What influences are back of the agitation which would in time of peace make us a nation in arms? Does it come from the friends of the people, from those who have concerned themselves with the welfare of common men? Does it come from those who have proven their faith in democracy? Or, on the other hand does it come from those who hate the rule of the people and would delight to thwart it? Who are they that are carrying on this agitation and seeking to convince America that compulsory military service is democratic?

Then he calls the roll of those who are for it. Who are they?

The military satrapy.

They are for compulsory military training. Mr. Huddleston proceeds:

Officers of Army and Navy, representatives of a system which is the very antithesis of democracy, an organization dependent upon a multitude of ranks in which each station adulates its superiors and despises those below it, which has its very breath of life in distinctions, differences, and their insignia.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the other members of the group and what they say but I shall place further extracts from the speech of Mr. Huddleston in the Record. I will, however, call in the order as given by Mr. Huddleston a few of those who were for conscription in 1917.

First, the military satrapy.

Second, the great financiers.

Third, war traffickers, munitions makers, and contractors for Army and Navy supplies.

Fourth, the parasite press.

Fifth, sychophants and snobs.

Sycophants and snobs. Today we have many men who like to bow to a king. I know some men in Congress who actually had to buy tuxedo suits on credit so that they could go see the King and Queen of England. Oh, yes; we have men who like to be invited to embassies. We have men who like to go with the mighty, and every one of those are in the group of sycophants and snobs such as we had in 1916 and 1917. Show me a man who longs to be introduced and bow to a king, and I will show you a man who believes that America owes an obligation to Great Britain.

Never before in American history have we had so many of these sycophants and snobs who like to bow to a king and a queen. It will be remembered when the King and Queen of England held a garden party at the British Embassy in Washington, the guests were not supposed to walk on the same path trod by the King and Queen for 5 minutes; they were supposed to let the path get cold. It will be remembered rules and regulations for the party were issued by the Embassy, which were sent to those who wanted to see and were invited to see the King and Queen that day. I was not particularly interested and did not go. Everyone was supposed to bow from the waist and, being as fat as I was, I was afraid to do that. The embassy sent out rules and regulations. It will be remembered how, I think it was the lady in waiting or some such personage, sent a message to Mrs. Roosevelt, the First Lady of the Land, advising that there should be on hand hot-water bottles in the White House because the King and Queen were used to such things even in June.

So it is that we have developed the idea of a society of snobs. Today, if the British Embassy desires to get money, all it has to do is to invite guests at \$10 a throw to a party at the Embassy, and the quota will be filled. There is no question about that, but ask them to donate a dollar for a poor kid in the alleys of Washington, and they will say, "We are sorry, but today we just do not have any money for that," though they do not hesitate to ask \$10 for a ticket to obtain money to send over across the sea.

I need not tell the Senate, all Members of the Senate know it, even though some of them will not say it, that behind this drive is the social lobby. Show me the social lobby, and I will show you individuals who are interested in internationalism. As Mr. Huddleston said, it is the sycophants and snobs and the other classes to whom he referred who favored conscription in 1917. The extracts from Congressman Huddleston's speech follow:

#### WHO FAVORS CONSCRIPTION?

WHO FAVORS CONSCRIPTION?

First, I would inquire, Where does the demand for compulsory service come from? What influences are back of the agitation which would in time of peace make us a nation in arms? Does it come from the friends of the people, from those who have concerned themselves with the welfare of common men? Does it come from those who have proven their faith in democracy? Or, on the other hand, does it come from those who hate the rule of the people and would delight to thwart it? Who are they that are carrying on this agitation and seeking to con-

hate the rule of the people and would delight to thwart it? Who are they that are carrying on this agitation and seeking to convince America that compulsory military service is democratic?

I call the roll of great Democrats and humanitarians, those who have battled for political freedom and the rule of the people, who have striven to elevate the condition of labor, to make the lives of women and children and the voiceless under half of humanity brighter and happier, who have labored for peace, who have recognized man's duty to his fellow man in the universal brotherhood. No answer comes. Out of all the leaders in efforts to ameliorate the condition of mankind, no one answers in behalf of a system of conscription. To the contrary, with one voice they unite in denouncing it. they unite in denouncing it.

Where, then, does the support for this odious system come from?
What classes favor compulsory service? I answer.
The military satrapy. Officers of Army and Navy, representatives of a system which is the very antithesis of democracy, an organization dependent upon a multitude of ranks in which each station adulates its superiors and despises those below it, which has its very breath of life in distinctions, differences, and their has its very breath of life in distinctions, differences, and their insignia, which finds its opportunity in increased numbers and has its honors and emoluments augmented by every humble private who may be brought into the ranks. The military system, with its manifold gradations, with its iron discipline, which has as its ideal the making of a senseless human machine with which the superior may work his absolute will; where the dangers and hardships are borne by the inarticulate men in the ranks and the honors and rewards are enjoyed by the wearers of gold lace and enaulets. and epaulets.

The great financiers. Owners of railroads and ships; captains of The great financiers. Owners of railroads and ships; captains of industry, who have heaped their millions out of the sweat of the masses and who desire patient and docile servants in their industries; men of great wealth, who hold in their hands the capital of the Nation; who are seeking investments in the weak and undeveloped countries of the world, where they may fatten on concessions of mines and railroads; who are demanding the open door for investment and exploitation in China, though it involve fighting a bloody war 6,000 miles from our shores; who plan the financial conquest of Mexico and South America: who would send the American quest of Mexico and South America; who would send the American flag into the remote corners of the world so that rich profits may be brought home to their coffers; these men who hate democracy, who fear it, who with their vast wealth are chiefly interested in preserving the established order, with a free hand to monopoly and exploi-

War traffickers, munitions makers, builders of ships for the Navy, and contractors for Army supplies. Those who coin their profits out of human blood and suffering, who owe their affluence to the great tragedy, battle; men who, masquerading as patriotic societies, have fomented the fears of the people, have financed moving pictures to terrorize the people, and carried on a Nation-wide propaganda for vast increases in Army and Navy in order that they might sell their wares.

The parasite press. The corrupt newspapers, preaching the doctrines of reaction; subsidized by selfish interests; echoers of all the undemocratic voices in our country; pandering to the selfishness of the small percentage of our people who aspire through wealth and prestige to rule over the many; drawing their support from the classes, and always insidiously seeking to discredit the common people, to make them ridiculous, and to destroy their influence. always the advocates of capital in its disputes with labor; always

praising those of place and importance and spitting upon the humble and unfortunate.

Sycophants and snobs. All those who hang upon the coattails of the great and imitate and praise wealth and power wherever it is found; aristocrats of new-found wealth and ephemeral prestige, scorners of hard hands and soiled clothing, the would-be elect and privileged.

I would not charge all who favor compulsory service as belonging to the classes I have denounced. No doubt many unselfish and

patriotic men favor conscription, have been convinced that it is necessary; but in the main these have been misled by a false propaganda. The agitation has had its source and mainspring in the

ganda. The agitation has had its source and mainspring in the selfish and undemocratic classes.

I speak in scoffing words of those who favor the new policy of conscription, but my bitterness is only forensic and superficial. I do not hate them. Many of them are not conscious of their undemocratic tendencies. They are clutched in the grip of their environment, associations, and selfish interests, and do not realize where the road leads to. Again, many of them are sincere in thinking with Carlisle that the world advances through its heroes and that the masses are of little worth. They would not have America a democracy ruled equally by all its citizens. They regret that we have no aristocracy, no class privileged by law, which would give greater stability to society. I do not hate them, but I abhor their opinions.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Undoubtedly a large number of earnest and patriotic people are for the draft.

Mr. HOLT. That is true.

Mr. ASHURST. Although they do not like to say draft; they like to use the more euphemistic term, selective service. They will not use the word "draft." I believe, and have no hesitancy in saying so, that every proper step should be taken looking toward preparation for our national defense on land and sea and in the air; but, Mr. President, I make this prediction as to the draft, that those who are urging in the most excited and heated way that we vote for the draft belong to that class of persons who are invincible in peace, invisible in war. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Arizona. He always contributes much to the thought.

According to their theory, they can take a boy out and kill him, and that is democracy; but if they are required to put their hand in their pocket and take a dime out before they kill him, that is regimentation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. Many good Christians of high character and great patriotism are in favor of the draft-

Mr. HOLT. That is true.

Mr. ASHURST. And many good persons of high character and great patriotism are in favor of the drafting of wealth to pay for war; but, mark my words, in many, if not most, cases, if a careful examination be made, it will be discovered that those who most excitedly and heatedly advocate the draft of men will never support a draft of money.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Arizona. interesting to pick up the New York Times which prints "all the news that is fit to print." In the New York Times we find editorials saying, "Congress ought to stop talking and pass the draft bill," or words to that effect; "Let's get this through; draft men." That is democracy; but when something is said about taxing excess profits they say, "Let us go

a little slowly on that."

Mr. President, I wish to make it emphatically clear, if I can, that I agree with the Senator from Arizona. Some of the finest and most patriotic men I know are for the draft; there is no question in the world that they are for it; they are just as much for it as I am against it. It is not their names that I call in this group; the individuals I condemn are those who are hiding behind the American flag to make dollars; it is those who are willing to take a boy and send him to his death but are not willing to send a dollar along

Yes; we need men; but we also need money. America is far more financially unprepared than she is unprepared with manpower; but they do not want to meet the financial unpreparedness; no; not at all. They say, "Let us wait and study that; let us wait; we are not in war yet; take the boy tomorrow and then study the financial aspects after he is taken." They say "make rules and regulations as to wealth after you take the boy but let us be a little careful in touching property; let us be a little careful because you might do something that would be against traditional American policy," as though drafting men were not against traditional American policy.

Oh. Mr. President, I wish to state when the time comes these individuals who are preaching regimentation of manpower will find that they have opened the door for regimentation of everything. Let no one fool himself about that. They think they are smart; they think they are about the smartest group on earth; but once they step in and regiment manpower in a time of peace it will be only a short time until there is regimentation of industry, regimentation of business, and regimentation of America. How in the world can you condemn regimentation of property once you have established regimentation of blood? It is impossible.

Oh, but they say they are smart enough to get regimentation of manpower, but there will never be a regimentation of wealth. They are going to find out they are not so smart as they think they are. This is the first step on the road to regimentation in America, or it is a further step in regimentation, and I ask, How can you condemn regimentation of wealth when you regiment people's lives? It is impossible; and the American people are going to demand that same sort of regimentation when the time comes.

As I said a moment ago, who are some of those behind conscription? Wealth, the Army, sycophants and snobs, and the controlled press. I again say certain supporters of the policy are sincere, but others are not.

# LABOR OPPOSES CONSCRIPTION

Who are against it? Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I intend to place in the RECORD what the American Federation of Labor said about the draft, what the C. I. O. said about the draft, and what the railroad brotherhoods said about the draft. The statements follow:

From a dispatch from Niagara Falls on August 20, the following viewpoints of William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, and Thomas J. Lyons, of the New York State Federation of

"Criticizing the Burke-Wadsworth bill as 'not well planned,' Mr. Green urged that the voluntary enlistment system have a full trial before the draft was applied.

"If resort to conscription eventually became necessary, he said, there should be a guaranty that the soldiers would be used only for home defense and protection of the Western Hemisphere; workers should have assurance of getting their jobs back and compensation during the training period should be sufficient for maintaining living standards.

"Mr. Lyons said in his criticism of the Burke-Wadsworth bill that it would make for a system of regimentation far beyond the needs of the country, and that it would be particularly injurious to labor."

[Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors of America, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Switchmen's Union of North America]

CLEVELAND, OHIO, August 1, 1940.

The Honorable Morris SHEPPARD,

Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

The Honorable Andrew J. May,
Chairman, House Military Affairs Committee, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: The undersigned chief executives of the organizations

representing engineers, freemen, conductors, trainmen, and yardmen employed on the railroads of the United States have this day given consideration to the provisions of the proposed compulsory peacetime draft or conscription bill which contemplates the inducting into the military and naval service of the United States in the immediate future some hundreds of thousands of citizens of this country for a period of training.

we refer to the Burke-Wadsworth bill now before Congress for consideration and feel that you should be made acquainted with our views, which we are confident reflect the views of the membership of these organizations employed on American railroads.

We are in general agreement with the prevailing sentiment in the United States that every support should be given to adequate measures necessary to the protection of our democratic institutions against attack from the force of dictatorship, both within and without our country. However, grave doubt exists in many quarters with respect to the wisdom of enacting a peacetime conscription bill when it is believed other adequate measures are available. Such proposal borders closely on the principle of dictatorship, and we hold the view that regimenting our people is un-American and unnecessary. unnecessary.

Patriotism is not the monopoly of those who are feverishly urging this conscription bill. We may rightly assume that all citizens are patriotic and if given the opportunity and impressed with the necessity for their doing so, they will volunteer their services in defense of our country.

At present there is a vast army of unemployed, thousands of whom would be desirous of enlisting in the military and naval service if given an opportunity to do so, but they are so circumscribed by technical military and naval physical requirements that many of them are precluded from voluntary enlistment. Consideration should be given to assisting them in removing minor physical

them are precluded from voluntary enlistment. Consideration should be given to assisting them in removing minor physical defects so that they may be acceptable as volunteers.

Compulsory military service in time of peace is the very antithesis of freedom. It involves an infringement on the very principles of democracy which it is invoked to defend. It imposes upon the individual a mandate to give service which he may not be in position to render without serious sacrifices on the part of himself or his family, or both, and this at a time when there are thousands of other individuals who would be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity to serve if such opportunity were not denied by the restrictive rules observed by the recruiting service.

The youth of our country who are inducted into the military and naval services under the principle of conscription and who are made

naval services under the principle of conscription and who are made to serve will quite naturally acquire the viewpoint that forceful means should be adopted in all the affairs of life as an avenue to achieve desired ends.

While you are giving thought to the Burke-Wadsworth bill let not the hysteria of the moment sweep you into supporting such a drastic and ill-advised change in the American way of life. Democ-racy means that the state exists to serve the individual. The racy means that the state exists to serve the individual. The program at present contemplated will cause hundreds of thousands of our youth to become war-minded and will, if carried out, establish the fabric of a giant war machine, which experience teaches us cannot and will not be permitted to rust in peace. "War games" inevitably lead to war. The voluntary-enlistment principle confines and restricts the dissemination of war-mindedness to actual necessities through the longer term of service and, above all, preserves the principle of democracy in its strictest sense.

These organizations are wholebeartedly in accord with the estab-

These organizations are wholeheartedly in accord with the establishment and maintenance of an adequate national defense, and their membership will not be found wanting in any support of such proper measures, but we are convinced that under present conditions the regimenting of our people according to the contemplated military pattern is unnecessary and is an infringement upon the civil liberties which they may resconably expect to enjoy

civil liberties which they may reasonably expect to enjoy.

We trust that your committee will not favorably report the Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill.

Respectfully yours,

A. JOHNSTON,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

J. A. PHILLIPS, President, Order of Railway Conductors of America. D. B. ROBERTSON. President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engine-

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
T. C. Cashen,
President, Switchmen's Union of North America.

(Following is an abridged text of the memorandum opposing peacetime conscription which was sent this week by C. I. O. president, John L. Lewis, to all Members of Congress:)

AUGUST 14, 1940. The Congress of Industrial Organizations stands second to no one in its desire for effective national defense. It has, therefore, pledged

itself to the fullest cooperation with proper defense measures.

In the establishment of adequate national defense, however, it is just as essential that unsound and unwise proposals be defeated as it is that proper measures be taken. In the excitement of a period of crisis measures are sometimes advanced so fundamentally in opposition to our national democratic traditions that their proponents would not dare propose them at any other time. It is our belief that peacetime military conscription is just such a measure.

SOURCE OF THE BILL

The very genesis of the measure for peacetime conscription is open to serious question.

1. The proposed bill was drawn up under unofficial auspices by

private citizens, although no measure could be more affected with

the public interest.

2. The bill was launched by a group of prominent New York corporation lawyers and other wealthy persons. Neither these persons nor the congressional sponsors of the bill have been notable in their support of legislation for the welfare of the common people of

this country.

3. The measure has not been formally requested of Congress by the President of the United States, the responsible head of preparation for national defense.

4. At their recent national conventions both of the major political parties gave the proposal for conscription consideration, but neither saw fit to give endorsement to the proposal.

# REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

Briefly, these are the reasons which have impelled the C. I. O.

to oppose the pending measures:
1. There is a better way to recruit a proper army for defense than conscription.

Voluntary enlistment under terms which have a real concern for the needs of the individual would quickly provide a suitable army. The period of enlistment should be shortened to 1 year. The pay should be raised at least to compare with that of the self-respecting should be raised at least to compare with that of the self-respecting workman. The right to return to private employment should be protected. Provision should be made for the continuation of social-security protection during the period of such enlistment. Private debts should be either assumed or suspended. Officers' commissions should be more freely open to enlisted men, so that an army career is open to men from the ranks. Under such circumstances the most effective and loyal kind of an army could be raised, with much less cost to the Nation than the enormous expenditures much less cost to the Nation than the enormous expenditures necessary for conscription.

#### MEN VERSUS MONEY

2. Military conscription now would establish the principle in this Nation that the lives of our young men are less privileged than the

profit rights of dollars.

Today the Nation is watching the shameful spectacle of our Government yielding to the imperious demands of corporate industry for vast tax concessions and enormous loans as a precondition to manufacturing arms. The same interests who thus strangle our national defense call loudly for the forcible conscription of our young men. They claim in one breath that no dollar will be turned to the defense of our Nation without a fat and untaxed profit being assured, while almost at the same moment they call upon our young men, most of them workers, to cast aside their liberty and sacrifice their ambitions or suffer punishment as a felon. It would be a terrible day in American history should our young men be forced to the draft while industry is free to lay down its ultimatums to

to the draft while industry is free to lay down its ultimatums to the Government.

3. Forced military service in peacetime would be an alarming departure from the basic principles of our democracy. It is the first step toward the break-down of those free institutions which

we seek to protect.

Citizens who become subject to conscription lose a substantial part of those civil rights and liberties which distinguish a free democracy from a totalitarian state.

Such conscription would further establish in the minds of the young people of the Nation the idea that voluntary loyalty to the Nation is no longer a necessary virtue. It would introduce them to the principle of compulsion, a principle native to the Fascist state and alien to our own.

#### NO MATERIALS

4. The production of equipment for an army has lagged far behind the enlistments into the military service.

Already there are more men available to the Army and the National Guard than can be equipped for some time to come. The present speed of enlistments is far more rapid than the provision of equipment. From the point of effective defense, an efficient, loyal, and highly trained army, highly mechanized, is many times more efficient than a sullen, ill-equipped, poorly trained, conscript army of three times the size. Conscription now would be an enormous waste of money and manpower.

5. The entire fabric of the Nation, both industrial and social, would be torn by conscription. The dislocations in industrial production and in community life caused by conscription would take years to heal.

years to heal.

Therefore, the C. I. O. is opposed to provision for peacetime conscription as a measure inimical to the most effective kind of national defense and alien to the democratic way of life.

They are all opposed to it. Those are the ones who have borne the brunt of making America, also. Compare that list with those who are for conscription, and you find the issue clearly drawn of wealth against man.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President-

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like also to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the largest farm organization throughout the West, the Farmers' Union, has not only pronounced against the draft in its national organization, but in practically every one of its locals throughout the country it has passed resolutions condemning the draft.

Likewise, let me call attention to the fact that the Methodist Church is opposed to conscription, the Presbyterian

Church, the Lutheran Church-Mr. HOLT. And the Catholic Church, through the

Mr. WHEELER. And the Catholic Church, through the bishops. In fact, in addition to the labor organizations, I do not know of any church group in the United States or any farm group in the United States which has not gone on record against conscription.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. HOLT. I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. In our power, our greatness, and our opulence, our own race, like any other race, might be inclined to forget that in all this power, greatness, and opulence there is a moral influence that operates through and by the medium of the churches of the country; and the statesman scorning that influence will come to no good end.

Mr. President, statesmen should remember that in every human breast there is an invisible temple which no law can violate or subvert. That is the fundamental trouble with the draft in time of peace: It seeks to violate, and destroy the invisible temple which is within the breast of every free person. It seeks to regiment the Nation. I am glad the Senator from Montana has directed attention to the fact that the ministers of religion of our country, whose voices are to be respected whether we believe in all the various creeds, or not, have not surrendered their duties or abandoned their altars in this time of excitement.

I shall not mention the name, but only an hour ago I received a letter from a rabbi, one of the most scholarly and devout men in America-I do not feel at liberty here to read his letter-in which, in high and exalted language, with the scholarship of his race, which has 6,000 years of culture, he pleads that we do not attempt to violate this invisible temple in the breast of human beings by a draft in time of peace

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President-

Mr. HOLT. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky. Mr. CHANDLER. I know that my young friend from West Virginia sincerely desires to avoid for his country participation in war. I know that the Senator from West Virginia realizes that I, too, am anxious to avoid war for the people of my country. I have not found in the membership of the Senate a single man who does not sincerely want to find the right answer to this question, which may mean the lives of our people in the years to come. We differ in the ways in which we seek to find the right answer.

I, for one, do not believe we can afford to speculate on the safety of the people of this country. If we should speculate and make a mistake, if we could pay for the damage occasioned by our action it might be well; but generations now living and those to come will suffer and pay for the mistakes we make here, if we make mistakes.

I should not like to see this country become a military nation. If armies are trained year after year, the first thing you know, it is necessary to give them a fight. If that is not done, they will fight each other. I had experience with that sort of thing as a youngster, as a football coach; and I make the assertion that if a football team is coached 3 or 4 or 5 weeks and is not given a game, mutiny will break out in the ranks of the organization.

Mr. HOLT. I said that after an experience of 5 years in coaching, too.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not know the Senator from West Virginia had been a football coach.

Mr. HOLT. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a great experience.

I know that if tomorrow England should fall, the prospect of danger to the people of this country would be so great that we probably would immediately ask for all the men we could get in the country, and have them immediately take up arms and start training.

I desire to repeat something I said the other day: There was one man who, year after year, told the people of Great Britain how unprepared they were for emergencies that he saw in the future, and they paid literally no attention to him. It is an ironic and a somewhat tragic thing that in their desperate hour they called that man to save them, and he has to use, not much equipment and not many trained men.

I, for one, am sincerely anxious to guarantee, as long as it is humanly possible, that the people of this country shall live in reasonable peace and contentment. I hate to think that I might cast a vote here for failure to provide a sufficient number of men, when we consider that we are appropriating fourteen or fifteen billion dollars to buy equipment and machines which will not run themselves. They must have men to run them.

I voted against sending the National Guard outside the possessions of the United States because I think we have enough territory and enough possessions in America to train the boys that we want to get in shape to fight if an emergency comes; but I desire to know how far my friend from West Virginia is willing to go, because I want to find out if there is a common ground upon which men of good reason and good judgment and good patriotism can stand with regard to our facing this emergency so that we can protect America against any eventuality that we can foresee or anticipate. For example, as I said, it would change the whole complexion of the thing if tomorrow England should fall. I doubt if there would be a vote against calling every man immediately, and putting him somewhere where he could immediately get ready to defend this country.

I know how sincere and how earnest the young Senator from West Virginia is and how patriotic he is. I do not share the view of any Senator or anybody else who questions the patriotism of one of his fellow citizens. I wish they would not do that. I do not like to hear people ascribe to others motives which I doubt if they possess. But we must realize here, every one of us, that the country will have to pay for the mistakes we make. The very fact that we have not enough men in the Army now to man the machines and the planes and the antiaircraft guns and the other essential elements of defense makes me feel that I might make a mistake if I did not ask for more

If I were in the position of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, I think I would go frankly before the country and say, "It is absolutely necessary and essential that we have at least so many men", and give the approximate number of men required, "at once, in order adequately to defend and protect the people and possessions of America."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from
West Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in this life we should be under no illusions. I believe that the draft in time of war is justifiable, but it must be remembered that now we are asked to change the policy of the United States. We are asked now to regiment America. We are asked now to set up a system like that of continental Europe.

The business of Europe is war. Two hundred and sixty great battles have taken place on the battlefield of Waterloo. I shall not and could not name them all. As I say, the business of Europe is war. If we vote for a draft in peacetime, we shall never live long enough to rid ourselves of that system. It will be permanently upon us. We shall not be able to rid ourselves of it. Its very centripetal force, its very momentum, will keep you regimented all the remainder of your careers, and the careers of your sons.

We are asked now by this draft bill to contemplate one of the most serious questions ever presented to a free people. America is the most opulent, most powerful, of all the nations of the earth. The piled-up wealth of the United States transcends and is greater than the piled-up wealth of all other nations combined, while the potential wealth of the United States is as great as the wealth of any six nations.

Yet we are asked to be afraid.

Mr. President, if this proposal were for a day, if it were for a year, if it were for a decade, you might be reconciled to a draft in peacetime; but, Mr. President, be under no illusions. When once we put this continental European system upon our people we shall have done it forever, not for a day. That is the reason there is so much solemnity in this hour. That is why men on either side of this question are earnestly seeking the truth.

I am proud rather than scornful of the heated debates in the Senate. If there is ever to be a heated debate in the Senate of the United States, the only free forum in the world, surely this is an appropriate occasion.

I am not assuming the role of a prophet, but mark me, when we shall have left these seats forever, and when the record of our times is gathered into history's golden urn, if indeed history deigns to notice any of us, this is the day

when we touch at Saguntum, this is the day when by draft in time of peace we sowed dragon's teeth, from which we will reap a terrible harvest through all days that are to come. Do not delude yourselves into the belief that you may shackle yourselves, handcuff yourselfs, and gag yourselves under a military despotism and then easily throw off the shackles. It will not easily be done. I repeat, when you put a draft upon the people in time of peace, you have touched at Saguntum, you have sown dragon's teeth.

Mr. President, I receive dispatches from some of my constituents saying, "Unless you vote for the draft you are defeated." If I could defeat this draft measure by my own

defeat, the country would be immensely benefited.

The man who would oppose or support such a measure by thinking only a coward's thought of praise or blame in political campaigns regarding his vote on this question is not fit to be a Senator. If he could look upon a question such as this with the contemplation of how many votes he would get here or there, he is not fit to be a Senator.

My vote against the draft may or may not defeat me; but I am accustomed to disappointments. I bear them with equinimity. Let me tell my colleagues something about defeats. Each of you will meet defeat in due time. In the first half hour of defeat you think the earth has slipped from beneath your feet, and that the stars above your head have paled and faded. Such is the sensation for the first half hour. Then, with the flight of a few hours, there comes such a peace as would be the envy of the world's greatest philosopher.

I received this morning what I will not say was a savage but a heated dispatch from an organization in my State composed of very excellent and worthy persons, in which they excoriated me because I am opposed to the draft in peacetime. They are within their rights in thus criticizing me. Mr. President, if you were to come to this planet a stranger from another planet and should seek to know what governments were free, you would not look to the army, you would not look to the navy, you would not look to the treasury; you would look to the parliament, and if the parliamentarians spoke freely and the people at home criticized their parliamentarians freely, you would know that such was a free country. Free criticism of lawmakers is an infallible index of a free people.

I telegraphed these young men that I was glad to receive their criticism. People have flattered me so much in my career that a telegram of criticism is welcome and timely. So far from feeling any irritation about criticisms that come to me over this vote, I welcome them. They are the signs of a free, intelligent people.

You will not be free to criticize your Government, you will not be free to criticize your parliamentarians or your law-makers when once a military caste is imposed upon you. Be under no delusions, the man who deceives other people is dishonest, but the man who deceives himself is a fool. The man who believes that we are going to put this measure—conscription in peacetime—into force and then easily relieve ourselves of it later will be deceived. These excrescences, these growths, these baleful devices which we adopt from continental Europe, which has been fighting for 2,000 years, will not disappear easily. If you think you can speedily remove them, you are deceiving yourselves.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Chandler] is a young man; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Holt] is a young man. I believe they will be here many years, long after I am gone. But they will not live long enough to repeal this military-conscription system, this enforced conscription, this enforced draft, if once it is placed upon the people in peacetimes.

It was with the assurance during the World War that so soon as the war was over the draft would be repealed, and would not be a permanent institution in our Government, that Congress passed a draft bill even in time of war. I should say that, while I supported it as a war measure, some of the ablest men in the Senate and some of the ablest men in the House of Representatives opposed it. I have known many men in the public life, but one of the most redoubtable

men I ever knew in public life, one of the ablest, most courageous, and one of the most scholarly, was Speaker Champ Clark, who was a walking encyclopedia of information. He was president of a college at the age of about 22 or 23 years. He was bitterly criticized because he opposed the war draft. I was for it, but I respected him.

The distinguished father of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette], Robert M. La Follette, Sr., was a man of tremendous power. Only those who served with him here could have an estimate of the giant strength he possessed, physical courage to a high degree, and moral courage to a superlatively high degree. He did not favor the wartime draft. I retained to his last hour my respect and affectionate regard for him. I honor anyone for views manfully stated, and I beg of my colleagues to be under no delusions. One who votes for peacetime draft will never escape its blighting and its damning influence, once this system of continental Europe is fastened upon our country.

When I go permanently out that door of the Senate—and I hope it will be many years before I do, for I enjoy my service here—when I go out that door, it may be said, "There goes a man who made mistakes but he did not make the mistake of leaving his country with less of liberty than the day when he entered the Senate through that door."

If you impose this continental European system, you will walk out of this Chamber having taken from your people more liberty than you ever gave them. You will walk out having taken from them a meed of liberty they should have retained. And, mark me, at the first opportunity, with lips compressed and with heart firm, they will march in a phalanx to the ballot box, there to repudiate those who attempted to fasten these shackles upon them.

The heat, the passion of this day, this moment of traducing those who oppose the peacetime draft, will pass, and reason will resume her throne

So in my service here the greatest contribution I have made—I have not made great contributions, but the contribution I have made on which I may rest my fame, if I am to be allotted even a small token, will be the circumstance that I warned my countrymen not to allow themselves to be gagged, bound, and shackled by a system which will last forever, by a system European in its nature, which has devastated and destroyed Europe. That will be the muniment upon which I base my title deeds, to remembrance, if I am to have any remembrance in the future.

I am grateful to the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLT. I am very grateful to the Senator for permitting me to hear him.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, let me say that this bill is lopsided. Very few men think alike about it; no two men agree upon what it actually is. That is true, and my colleagues know it to be true. They do not know what is in the bill; they do not know what is within its four corners. If called upon to go upon the rostrum and answer questions as to what the bill means each Senator would supply different answers, because none of us knows what the bill is and what it actually contains.

More than a year ago I offered a considerable prize to the student in college who would give me the name of the man who uttered this sentence, a great sentence, uttered in England more than 300 years ago:

Whenever it is not necessary to do a thing, it becomes necessary not to do it.

Senators, do not forget that. In medicine, in law, in statecraft, in surgery, in all departments of life, remember and observe that sentiment, particularly when you are excited. I repeat:

Whenever it is not necessary to do a thing, it becomes necessary not to do it.

It should be the guide of statesmen.

It is not necessary to impose in peacetime this lopsided, mysterious conscription—this draft bill.

Do you realize, Mr. President, that the candidates respectively, for President, do not like to discuss this bill? They

know that wrapped up in its four corners are a hundred lawsuits, a hundred mysteries, and a thousand injustices.

I shall not accuse either candidate for President of a lack of frankness or a lack of courage. In my judgment, they are frank and candid men. Neither of them has said: "We favor a draft in time of peace." Masters of language that they are, they will resort rather to euphemistic terms as "selective service."

Mr. President, it is only about 320 years ago since the first settlements were made on our eastern coast at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock. It is only one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years that we have been a National Government. Our ancestors challenged the most powerful nation and achieved liberty. In all the history of the world, there is nothing which can compare with the rapid growth, glory, and the prowess of the United States. A fringe of colonies on the Atlantic challenged a powerful government and achieved liberty. They conquered the forests on the eastern coasts. Then their men pressed forward, with their noble women by their side, and conquered the plains; they ground the bitter dust of the deserts between their teeth, and conquered the deserts. They established a great civilization. I might liken it to a beautiful tapestry hung upon the wall. It is shot through with threads of silver, with threads of gold, and threads of crimson. The threads of crimson represent the lifeblood of the pioneers, freely shed, in their contest with savage beasts and savage The world affords in no other episode such a splendid picture as the picture of the United States marching forward, believing in liberty, sustaining liberty, never losing a war, and never fighting an unjust war, but careful to retain the privilege and right to criticize their parliament, careful to retain the privilege of allowing in the Senate one forum, the only one in existence where men may speak as free men.

When I came to the Senate I was in favor of cloture. I thought these dreary speeches ought to be shut off. Mr. President, if we were to adopt cloture in the Senate we would have eagles without wings, eagles whose claws were clipped.

So, we have retained freedom of speech in the Senate, freedom of the citizen to criticize his Parliamentarians.

The step proposed, peacetime draft, is another step toward the regimentation of the United States. No one seizes power at one fell swoop. The dog does not leap to Dover. It is leg over leg the dog goes to Dover.

The great muniments of liberty of the American people are not to be overwhelmed at one fell blow. If done, it will be accomplished by Congress yielding its privileges, its duties and prerogatives, here a little, there a little. It will be done by a nibbling here at the cornerstone, a chiseling away there at the cornerstone.

In teaching young men to speak I sometimes advise them, "do not be too smooth, do not be too lubricous. Make a few mistakes and you will get the sympathy of your audience."

If I have made errors of diction or locution in my speech today they were not simulated or pretended, they were very real, but what I have said today is, I believe, as true a contribution as I have made in my years of service here.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona that section 11 (b) of the pending measure actually provides as follows:

(b) The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally to effect the purpose thereof, the spirit always controlling the letter, and any technical deficiencies therein shall be supplied by the reasonable intent of the act as a whole, in the light of national needs.

Senators, get that! I have never seen such language in a law. Such language may have appeared in laws heretofore, but it is challenging. I read it again:

(b) The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally to effect the purpose thereof, the spirit always controlling the letter, and any technical deficiencies therein shall be supplied by the reasonable intent of the act as a whole, in the light of national needs.

In other words, it is not a question of the legislation we pass here but it is how that legislation will be interpreted,

as the distinguished and great Senator from Arizona has said. No one knows what is in the bill. It will mean what it is interpreted to mean.

I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without paying my tribute to a great speech by the Senator from Arizona, who has done much to bring before the Senate the real issue involved, which is the question whether we shall permit a start of regimentation, which will mean the crumbling of American liberty.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. When the Senator from Arizona obtained the floor I had been speaking with the Senator from West Virginia. I appreciate the interruption, because there is no one in the Senate in whom I have more confidence and for whom I have more respect than the Senator from Arizona. I have such a high regard for the intelligence of the voters of Arizona that I am certain they will repeat what they have done every time they have had a chance in his lifetime and return him to the Senate of the United States.

I count it a great privilege and a great honor to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of which the Senator from Arizona is chairman.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator from Kentucky, and desire to reciprocate and say that we are very much enlightened and very much helped by the Senator's membership on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the borderline between peace and war today is much narrower than it ever was before. I wish every Member of the Senate and every citizen of the country could have heard General Marshall a few days ago when he appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and undertook to recite the story of the march of the Germans through Flanders. That story presents the most horrible example of the use of tanks, machine guns, dive bombers and other planes that could be imagined. It was simply an irresistible drive of destruction, wrecking the hopes of the whole country.

I repeat what I said a few moments ago to the Senator from West Virginia. I do not believe we can afford to speculate. If I felt that we could speculate and win; that is, keep war from the country, very well. But I say with the greatest sincerity that I am certain we are not prepared to sustain such an attack as the Army of France was called upon to meet in those dreadful days of the Battle of Flanders. We in this country today are not equipped to stop such an attack if we were called upon to meet it. We could not stop it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky knows that I have the highest regard for him personally. The fact that we disagree does not mean that I do not have the highest regard for his sincerity, for I have. There simply exists between us a difference of opinion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator how far he would go under certain circumstances in the matter of preparing. Assume that England were to fall tomorrow, then what would the Senator do? These things come very quickly. They come without warning. They come like the thief in the night, and they strike and are gone, and they leave destruction in their wake.

A few days ago I said in the Senate that the women and children of Britain in their homes are being bombed and machine-gunned day and night. I earnestly want to avoid such a condition for the people of my own country. What does the Senator propose to do? I do not like to hear simply criticism of what someone else suggests. I might be on the Senator's side. I wish to find the right side if I can. In the Committee on Military Affairs the bill was held up for several weeks, for we were anxious to present a bill which had been carefully considered and we wished to consider every proposal that might be made with respect to it. We sought to report a bill which would permit us adequately to defend the United States of America and its people and its possessions.

What would the Senator from West Virginia do? The Senator has not told us that, or, at least, I have not heard him tell it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I am coming to that in my speech.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the Senator would tell me, and perhaps I will be on his side. If the Senator can think of a better way to defend the people of the United States of America than that proposed in the pending bill, I wish he

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky, and I wish to say that I intend to discuss that matter later. I believe in a voluntary system. I believe the voluntary system can work, and will work if given an opportunity to be used. But I intend to discuss that later on, if the Senator from Kentucky does not insist that I do so now.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the Chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Kentucky and others have great respect for Woodrow Wilson. In 1914, when the Allies and Germany were at war, everyone contended that we were facing a crisis.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the country never has faced a greater crisis than when the Constitution of the United States was written. Yet at that time the careful drafters of the Constitution of the United States made no plan for peacetime conscription. This is what Woodrow Wilson said with reference to the very subject we are now discussing:

It is said in some quarters that we are not prepared for war. That is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready upon brief notice to put a nation in the field? A nation of men trained to arms. Of course, we are not ready to do that, and we shall never be in time of peace, so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions.

That is just exactly what the Senator from Arizona said a moment ago.

And what is it that is suggested that we should be prepared

To defend ourselves against attack? We have always found

means to do that, and shall find them whenever it is necessary without calling our people away from their necessary tasks to render compulsory military service in time of peace.

We have never had, and while we retain our present principles and ideals we never shall have, a large standing army. We will not ask our young men to spend the best years of their life making soldiers of themselves. soldiers of themselves.

Mr. President, no one disagrees with the Senator from Kentucky with reference to the necessity of being prepared. Some have tried to make it appear that the Senator from West Virginia is opposed to preparedness. Some have tried te make it appear that every man who is opposed to conscription is opposed to preparedness. Nothing could be further from the truth. No greater misrepresentation has ever been carried on by the propagandists for war. I have been through it before, and I am willing to go through it again.

It seems to me there can be no doubt in the mind of any sane man in the United States that if we had voluntary enlistments in the Army for a period of 1 year, and the boys were given an opportunity to learn something about running mechanized war machinery, the opportunity for a decent life, as they have in the Navy, and an opportunity actually to learn something, millions of our boys would come forward and be delighted to volunteer for that service.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question. The difference between us seems to be on the question whether or not there is a real, actual emergency, such an emergency as makes it necessary that we do quickly everything we can by way of preparedness.

Suppose Britain should fall tomorrow. Would the Senator have a different view about the danger which threatens the country? The Senator realizes that we cannot train men in a short time to operate airplanes, tanks, and the various elements of a mechanized force. Time is required.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. A period of training is required. The men must have knowledge of what they are doing.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Suppose that contingency should arise.

What would the Senator say?

Mr. WHEELER. I should say, first of all, let us get the machinery to train the boys. We have not the machines today. We have not the engines, we have not the airplanes, and we have not the tanks. We have not shoes enough for an army of a million men. We have not clothes enough for them. We have not camps enough for them. We have nothing with which to give the men training.

The Senator asked me a question, and I wish to answer it. First, we have not the necessary machines and equipment to train the men; second, we ought first to obtain the planes, ships, and other equipment. Then, if England should fail, what would be our situation? There are those who say to us that our first line of defense is in England and that we must depend upon the British Navy. Let me ask, When has the British Navy defended the liberties of the people of the United States? Since when has the British Navy been our first line of defense? When did the British Navy ever come to the rescue of the United States when the United States was at war? Aside from Spain, with whom have we ever been at war besides Great Britain? I am not anti-British by any manner of means, but I am reciting the cold facts of history. As I have said before, every drop of blood in my veins is English. I am not anti-English, and I am not antianything else. I am not pro-anything else, except pro-American.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator and I are not in disagreement on that point.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator wants equipment, and I want men and equipment, for both are necessary to defend the country. We cannot defend the country with men without equipment, or with equipment without men. We must have both.

Mr. WHEELER. We must have both.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator and I are in agreement on that point.

Mr. WHEELER. We are in agreement.

The way to defend America is the traditional American way. If we are to have our boys and men defend the country, let us pay them enough money so that we can get them without making paupers of them, and without taking men who have no other means of support and no ambition in life. Let us put into the Army men who want to make a career of it-men who have some ambition, who want a home and children, and who want to be typical Americans. Let us, pay them enough so that they can live like typical Americans.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator and I are in agreement on

that question.

Mr. WHEELER. If we prepare in the traditional American way, there is no question in my mind but that we can obtain all the enlistments we need.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Chan-DLER] has asked the question, "Suppose England should fall tomorrow?" He asked the Senator from Montana whether or not he would feel any differently. If the Senator from West Virginia will permit me, I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. Taking his same premise, if England should fall tomorrow, what good would the pending bill do? How would it help us in that kind of a situation?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not certain that it would do any good, but I am certain that it would change the disposition of every Senator with regard to getting ready. I am certain that there would not be a Senator, or an official of the Government, including the President of the United States, who would not want to call upon every man in the United States immediately and get together every possible device for our defense and rush them to the oceanside to provide for the defense of the country.

I have not only read the history of the country, but I have seen how it has progressed step by step. I have seen how the country has become frightened at times. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska would not become frightened. In 1917 he opposed America's entrance into the war. I think the history of the country has proved that he was correct in that position. However, no Senator-not even the Senator from Nebraska-could come before the Committee on Military Affairs and listen to the Chief of Staff of the Army tell the committee how the great German machine drove through the French Army, which was supposed to be the best army in the world, without being impressed. It drove across the country and destroyed everything in sight by sheer power, force of numbers, and determination. We cannot afford to speculate and sit idly by and take a chance on such a thing happening to the people of the United States. I for one do not propose to do so.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Senator think that the first and most important obligation is to provide the machinery and equipment necessary for our defense?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from West Virginia will further yield, I will say to my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts that on every occasion since I have been a Member of the Senate I have voted and worked as a member of the Military Affairs Committee in cooperation with members of the Naval Affairs Committee and have supported everything which I felt was necessary to build up a machine equal or superior in strength to that of the Germans. Senators have said that we are the greatest country in the world, the richest country in the world, and the most powerful country in the world. Yet every Senator knows that our defense is so hopelessly inadequate—I hate to say it, but it is true—that we are no match for the machine of the German Government. My answer is, "Get ready."

If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I return to the question: Suppose England should fall tomorrow? What good would the pending bill do us? I cannot see that it would do us any good. We have already prepared for a larger Navy, and have done everything we can in that direction. We have prepared for a larger power in the air and on the sea. The first attack would come by the sea. If Hitler should start after us day after tomorrow, we should be able to meet him with a navy which he cannot equal, and with an air force which is as good as we have been able to get together. I think we have done all that anybody could ask along that line. We should be able to meet him with a standing army of practically 700,000 men. Before Mr. Hitler got through all those obstructions there would be time, regardless of the pending measure, and independent of it, to train and equip an army on the land, which I think would be effective, if we can ever make such an army effective. We should have time to do it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The question of the Senator from Nebraska has interested me very much, because, of course, it goes right to the heart of the problem. I should like to suggest to him that in the hypothetical instance he cites—the defeat of Great Britain—the Panama Canal might be destroyed, and in that case the Army would be our first line of defense. That is a very important possibility which we must contemplate.

Mr. NORRIS. Assume that to be true, and apply it to the question which has been propounded. Suppose England should fall tomorrow? What good would the pending bill do to defend the Panama Canal the next day?

Mr. LODGE. It would not do any good in the defense of the Panama Canal tomorrow.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. LODGE. However, it would give us men for our Army to prevent the establishment of air bases in Canada or Cuba in the future.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; in the future. But it would not meet the emergency. We are considering a conscription bill for compulsory military training in time of peace.

It is conceded that even if the things which have been imagined should happen, this measure would not do us any good in that kind of an immediate emergency. It would in the future, and so far as this bill is concerned, it is the future that I am afraid of. I am afraid of building up a society based on compulsory military training in time of peace, for that leads to dictatorship and ultimately to the downfall of such a government as ours, at least, to the ending of democracy, just as surely as the sun rises in the east. History has demonstrated that to be so down through the ages.

Mr. HOLT. In other words, the Senator feels as I do, that we are striking at America and Americanism from within America in order to meet a possible or an impossible invasion from outside?

Mr. NORRIS. I did not put the question; it is not mine, but we are talking about the emergency which would arise if England should fall tomorrow. My answer is that this bill would not make one iota of difference in that case, whether England fell or did not fall.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Nebraska and I do not agree about the form the emergency would take. If we were in agreement that it would be by the sea, then we would be in bad shape, unless we had the British Navy to help us, because all our Navy is in the Pacific, and the entrance to Pearl Harbor is only three-quarters of a mile wide.

I am going along with the Senator from Massachusetts, who said that something might happen. We are dealing in possibilities, and something might happen to the Panama Canal, something might happen to the entrance to Pearl Harbor; and, if it did, an enemy might get in there. What could the Navy do after that happened? We would have no defense, because the Navy is in the Pacific.

Mr. WALSH. And we would have no trained efficient spearhead in the shape of an army.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator said the attack might come by sea. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will proceed in order

Mr. CHANDLER. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to yield to me.

Mr. WALSH. I was probably out of order.

Mr. HOLT. I have no objection to yielding to any Senator who wants to interrupt.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe if an invasion should come it would be more likely to come by air, from some base that could be obtained.

Mr. HOLT. If that be the case, would it not be far better to develop our air force? In other words, we should have sufficient airplanes built with which to train our pilots. We are sending our airplanes abroad and do not have a sufficient number to train our pilots. We have more boys who want to volunteer for the air than there are airplanes to put them in,

Mr. CHANDLER. I will not disagree with the Senator about the needs that seem to be first; we are not in disagreement about that, and about preparing this country to face any eventuality; but I repeat the question, Suppose England should fall tomorrow, the Senator from Nebraska does not think that we would be in danger. I think perhaps we would be, and if we should be in danger, then, the fact is, that with this bill in effect we would have men in camps, whereas if it were not in effect, if an emergency should come, we would be just as we are. The quicker we have men in training, and in time to help the country defend itself, the better off we will be.

Mr. BONE and other Senators rose.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Washington. Mr. BONE. I wanted to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators, but I withhold the question for the time being.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky says this might be possible or that might be possible, and if this occurred something else would follow and something might happen to us when the fleet is in the Pacific. Does the Senator think that if England should fall tomorrow that Hitler could get over here quicker than our fleet could get into the Atlantic? Does he think that Hitler could get here the next day? Does he think that Hitler has a navy superior to ours even as it now exists?

While we ought to have a larger one, perhaps, we cannot get it tomorrow nor the next day, no matter whether England falls or not. It seems to me unreasonable to think that if England falls tomorrow Hitler will invade us the next day. He would have to come in row boats, and one or two flying machines would be enough practically to meet his army if he got them over that quickly. He has not the bases to come here and fight us with airplanes. Everybody concédes that is not practicable. Of course, it is possible; it is possible for God in his wisdom, if He wants to help Hitler, to raise up tomorrow another continent in the Atlantic Ocean, all prepared with flying machines and air bases for Hitler to occupy and operate from there against America, and, if he did, we would be in a bad row of stumps, but I do not think we ought to let our imagination carry us beyond a reasonable scope. I want to confine the Senator to his own question. Suppose England fell tomorrow, what good would this proposed legislation be to us?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Nebraska knows as well as I do that all things are possible, but I did not speculate except for the purposes of the discussion. The Senator may know how Hitler would come; I do not know and do not claim to know.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not asked the question. The Senator asked the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will agree to that, and I asked it for the purpose of finding out how far the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Montana were willing to consider a modification of their views with respect to the pending proposition.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West
Virginia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been told by people who are supposed to be experts with reference to naval and military matters that in order for Germany or any other country to attack the United States from across the sea it would be necessary to bring modern equipment along with an army. The Senator evidently is talking about what Germany did to France.

Mr. CHANDLER. Germany did the same thing to Norway. Mr. WHEELER. Wait a moment. The Senator does not place Norway or Holland or any other country on the same basis as the United States, does he?

I am told that in order to transport an army across the sea it would be necessary to have 26 tons of equipment and tanks for every single man brought over, if it was intended to carry on the same kind of warfare that Germany has been conducting, and there would hardly be sufficient boats to bring that kind of an army of 500,000 men over here. I am not an expert on these matters, but that information was given to me by reliable authority.

When we are talking about Germany coming here and attacking the United States from across the sea with their

Navy, we should remember that they cannot come here in boats and land on the beach and then from there attack the United States of America. We are not so helpless as many people would have us believe when they intimate we have not

any equipment and have not anything at all.

Probably we are not so fully equipped as we ought to be, but, nevertheless, I think it is a reflection upon the Navy and the Army to say that we have not any equipment and cannot defend ourselves against any nation at all. I do not believe that; I refuse to believe it after all the money we have spent. I have a much higher regard for the Army and the Navy than to believe anything of that kind. I think that we are equipped to a large extent. Probably we have not the largest and best mechanized forces, which the European war has shown should be developed. On the other hand, it is a reflection upon us, is it not, that we have not kept pace with those developments in the past and that the acquisition of such equipment has not been recommended to us? But when people are talking about sending an army over here to invade the United States, it should be remembered that they have hardly a boat that will carry the big tanks, and they will have to bring a great variety of armament across the water. What will we be doing in the meantime? Would our soldiers be doing nothing? our people be sitting on the beach knitting socks?

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope we will not be merely talking. Mr. WHEELER. If an attempt at invasion should come about, every man, woman, and child in this country would volunteer and go forth to stop the enemy. We have airplanes, the best airplanes in the world, and no foreign foe could bring an armada across the sea including tanks and

everything of that kind.

I think it is exceedingly unfortunate for those who are carrying on this propaganda to frighten the women and the men of this country into thinking that Germany is going to come here; that a German army will land on the beaches and capture the United States of America overnight.

We ought to use common sense in these matters. Supposing that England should fall tomorrow, what would the conditions be in Europe? There would be starvation; there would be misery. Let me make a prediction: Unless the war over there ends before very long there will be revolution after revolution, there will be starvation, there will be misery, and there will be bolshevism sweeping Europe.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator is right; but suppose he is not?

Mr. WHEELER. I hope I am not right.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not hope bolshevism will sweep Europe. I hope the war will end, and something favorable will happen. If so, we shall all be safe; but if not, what then?

Mr. WHEELER. I hope the war will end. I know some persons are going to say, "Senator Wheeler is an appeaser"; but I say that what we ought to be doing, and what this Government of ours ought to be doing, is trying to bring about peace in the World.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator. Mr. WHEELER. We ought to be trying to bring about peace in the world, and we ought to be trying to stop the killing of human beings, and to stop the starvation and misery that are going on, rather than encouraging people to carry on a war that will mean the extermination of civilization from the face of continental Europe.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President-

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. To the eternal credit of the President of the United States and every one of his officials, I do not believe any government ever worked harder to avoid war than the government of President Roosevelt worked to avoid this war. I think they did everything on earth they could do to keep Europe out of this war. The Senator and I are not in disagreement at all.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHANDLER. When the Chief of Staff of the United States Army comes to the Committee on Military Affairs and paints, not a fictitious picture, but a real picture-

Mr. WHEELER. Not a real picture of attacking the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not say that I believe that Hitler will come here, or come quickly, or come tomorrow, or come next week; but if the Senator will read what he said he was going to do he will find that we are on the list, and he has reached every one of his other objectives in a reasonable time. I am not so frightened that I believe he will be over here tomorrow. I do not know whether he will come by sea, or by air, or by undersea craft, but I have the right to believe that he may try; and if I could get this country so aroused that they would do everything that in reason they ought to do in order to stop him, that is what I want to do. But the Senator did not hear, as I heard, the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States say that the German machines in solid phalanx over a considerable territory destroyed everything in their wake.

Mr. NORRIS. But can they do it on the water? Mr. CHANDLER. They fly them. They flew them to Norway. The Senator from Massachusetts knows that. Let him

continue from there.

Mr. HOLT. I want to say in my own time to the Senator from Kentucky that these machines have not yet reached the point where they float. That was on solid land. In other words, the Germans would have to bring the machines over 3,000 miles of water. I want to say this, too: It has been the usual thing throughout the history of the world to generate the feeling that somebody is going to invade you, and going to come over and "get" you, and, of course, that means building up a stronger military system. James Madison spoke of that years and years and years ago.

Mr. CHANDLER. The British came here to the Capitol in 1812 and burned it, or set fire to it, and they were not nearly

so powerful as Hitler is.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit just a comment on the very interesting remarks which were made by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. Mr. LODGE. I agree with many of the things the Senator from Montana has said, as I think everybody does, particularly when he said we have to fight our own battles. I agree that we have always fought our battles, and if we depend on others we have nothing to depend on. When, however, the Senator speaks of an attack being made on our shores, I should like to suggest a few possibilities to him, and I am not one of those who think that such an attack is going to be made. I do feel, however, that we ought to assume the worst, and then, if the worst does not happen, so much the better.

I agree that it would be utterly impossible to land on our shores an enemy armed force that would be of any effectiveness without taking a big seaport. Troops could not be put ashore on a beach and amount to anything. They could be arrested by the local police. It would be necessary to have shipping, to have facilities for unloading ammunition and artillery and tanks and guns, and so forth. I do not contemplate that it would be a simple matter to put ground troops ashore in Boston or Philadelphia or New York; but to establish an airplane base in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia would, in my opinion, be a far simpler problem than the Germans encountered in going into Norway.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him?

Yes. Mr. LODGE.

Mr. WHEELER. Suppose that were done. Suppose an enemy of this country should establish an air base in Newfoundland. The Senator knows that that could not win a war. The United States could not be defeated by an enemy establishing an air base in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia. The Senator knows that in modern warfare a country cannot be captured by simply establishing air bases and bombing cities, disagreeable as it may be.

Mr. LODGE. That is very true.

Mr. WHEELER. That is best demonstrated, it seems to me, by the fact that the Germans are only 22 miles from England across the English Channel, and they have not been able to conquer England. They ought to be able to do a tremendous amount of damage to London and to the other large cities of Great Britain, and they probably could do some damage to us if we were unprepared in the air, but they could not capture the United States.

I am one of the few men in the Senate who agreed with Billy Mitchell. I thought we ought to have a consolidated air force. I am one of those who for a long time has been in favor of building up and building up and building up our air force, so that we would have the very best air force that existed anywhere in the world; and I felt that we ought to have concentrated on that rather than on building big battle-ships, which have shown themselves in this war and in the last war not to be nearly so effective as the bombers and the other airplanes.

Mr. LODGE. With the permission of the Senator from West Virginia—

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. Mr. LODGE. I agree that the establishment of an air base in Newfoundland would not, in and of itself, be decisive; but let us take the case of Nova Scotia. Let us assume, as the Senator from Nebraska assumes, that England is defeated: It would be a comparatively simple matter, under those conditions, for troops to be put ashore in Nova Scotia as of today; and if the Senator will examine the geography of Nova Scotia, and the narrow neck of land that connects it with the mainland, I think he will agree that once a beachhead was established in Nova Scotia it would be an excessively difficult and prolonged undertaking to get those troops out; and, from a place like Halifax, England would not only be effectively cut off from her principal dominion. but all the shipping lines could be threatened. I do not say that is going to happen, but I say that is something that could be done, and that, as of today, we could not

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Where would the Senator have our fleet while this was being done?

Mr. LODGE. The assumption is that the fleet is in the Pacific, and that the Panama Canal is destroyed.

Mr. TAFT. Oh. The Senator is assuming that the Panama Canal is destroyed?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct, because it is perfectly impossible to give the Panama Canal 100 percent defense unless it is closed to commercial shipping.

Mr. TAFT. Well, it can be closed to commercial shipping.
Mr. LODGE. But that has not been done. I am talking
as of today. The whole point is that that has not been done.
That is very fundamental.

Mr. TAFT. But the fleet could reach the Atlantic by going around Cape Horn.

Mr. LODGE. That takes about a month or more.

Mr. TAFT. That is all right. It will be many months before the Germans get as far as Newfoundland. The moment England is defeated, our fleet will be in the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and if the Germans get into Nova Scotia we will get the Germans out of Nova Scotia; but it will take us quite a while to do it, and we cannot stop them from getting into Nova Scotia as of today.

Mr. TAFT. I say that we can stop them from getting into Nova Scotia as of today. I say that our fleet can reach Nova Scotia before the Germans can get there.

Mr. LODGE. It is just a question of mileage from Honolulu to Nova Scotia and from Ireland to Nova Scotia.

Mr. TAFT. But the moment England loses, the moment England is on the point of surrender, our fleet will be in the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator is correct in that statement, that puts an entirely different face on the matter; but the assumption under which we have been having this discussion is that the fleet is in the Pacific, and the Panama Canal has been destroyed, and under those conditions we cannot stop the landing of troops in Nova Scotia as of today.

Mr. TAFT. But the Senator is assuming something contrary to all the naval strategy of the United States, contrary to the theory on which we have built our fleet, and contrary to every principle of naval defense of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I support my statement on the testimony given before the committees of the Senate that it is absolutely impossible to prevent a ship from being blown up in one of the locks of the Panama Canal. That is not my statement; it was testified to by the Army engineers.

Mr. HOLT. But will not the Senator from Massachusetts say that it certainly would show very bad judgment—it might even show stupidity—if the Navy Department, knowing that this might happen, should allow the fleet to stay in the Pacific? In other words, if we are in that danger, why is not the fleet over in the Atlantic now?

Mr. LODGE. I have asked that question times out of number, and I have never had an answer that has satisfied me.

Mr. HOLT. I do not want the Senator to think I am criticizing his statement; but I say if the Navy is muddling its way through like that, it would not make any difference what kind of a force we had.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. When we assume what the Senator from Massachusetts assumes, we have first to assume that our Navy is to stay in the Pacific, and then we have to assume that the Panama Canal is blown up, and then we have to assume that England is defeated, and then we have to assume that the British Navy is to be taken over, and then we have to assume that we have not enough airplanes to go up to Nova Scotia and fight off the landing of troops up there so as to keep the Germans from getting a foothold.

Then you have to assume that the minute they defeat England they will immediately come over to take Nova Scotia. The trouble is, in this war hysteria, that if you want to conjure up in your mind things which may possibly happen, and conjure up enough of them, you can come to the conclusion that we should close up all of our factories excepting those making munitions, and make nothing else but munitions in this country for the next several years, and devote everything we have to war.

Living out in Montana, and being a frequent visitor to the Pacific coast, I have known of the people on the Pacific coast worrying, and have heard them talk about how Japan was coming over and attack us and take over the United States. It has been explained to me time and time again that the Japanese could just come over and take San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and Portland, and all the other cities along the Pacific seaboard; that, as a matter of fact, they were on the verge of doing so most any time. Every time they saw a Japanese working in some of these places they have conjured up that this was going to happen—not all the people, but a few people.

Mr. President, it has not happened and it is not going to happen. I have talked with reliable people who have said that our Navy would have a difficult time going over and taking Japan, and that the Japanese Navy could never come over to the United States and do any harm because it is so far away from their supplies, and that their battleships would be so slowed down coming that long distance across the water.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator's position is upheld by the President himself, who has made such a statement.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for calling that to my attention. I had forgotten it, but I think that is true.

Mr. HOLT. I think it was in the magazine Asia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I prefaced my remarks by saying that I thought we had to assume the worst, and I did assume the worst, I frankly admit.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator; but he assumed not only the worst, but the impossible. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. Nothing is impossible. And lest my attitude be misconstrued, I will say to the Senator from Montana that I have no more sympathy than he has with a campaign which endeavors to terrify and frighten the American people.

I have never believed that the way to get good results was by fomenting terror and fright and hysteria. I do not think that we should be alarmed, but I think we should be alert, and I think there is a tremendous difference between those two concepts.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree entirely that we should be alert to build up our defenses and modernize our Army. The first line of defense probably is the Navy; the second line of defense is the air force: and the third line of defense is our Army.

Mr. LODGE. Unless the Panama Canal is destroyed.

Mr. WHEELER. Unless that is destroyed. We have built up the Navy and have appropriated large amounts of money to build up the Army. Now we should build up the air force. But there are people accusing you and me and everyone else who is not for conscription as desirous of tearing down the defenses of our country, and the same people are advocating that we give 50 destroyers to Great Britain, are advocating that we give all our airplanes to Great Britain, and are advocating that we give everything else we have to Great Britain, and then criticize you and me and everyone else, saying, "You are not for building up our defense."

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator knows I was one of those voting against sending so-called surplus equipment abroad. I do not think there is any such thing as surplus equipment in a nation whose defenses are in the condition in which

ours are.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HOLT. I yield. Mr. BONE. In view of the colloquy on the floor of the Senate concerning the number of men available for national defense. I recall a statement made on the floor of the Senate several weeks ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], who read into the RECORD a statement of the number of men in the National Guard, the Regular Army, the marines, men who have been trained in the R. O. T. C. activity, and in the Organized Reserves of the country. The figure was astoundingly large. I will not attempt at the moment to repeat it with any idea of approval of the accuracy of what I might say, but it seems to me it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 800,000 or 900,000 men.

How can we believe that the country is defenseless in the matter of trained men, men trained in the military arts, when we have had that many men who are not only in active service but who have been through the service mills and know the manual of arms, and are in a sense trained and skilled men? Why the fear that we will be overwhelmed, which seems to impress so many people, when we have perhaps close to a million men? And that does not include the veterans of the World War, many of whom are still able to carry arms. If the worst came to the worst, and we had to defend this country, there are four or five million men who served in the World War who could in a pinch carry a rifle

So I think the fears which have been generated about our not having enough armed men are rather groundless, because if the figures given by the Senator from Minnesota are correct, we have quite a sizable number of trained men of military age. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether those figures are somewhere near accurate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from West Virginia-

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I have not seen the figures recently, but as I recall them, the figures given by the Senator from Washington are substantially accurate. But I should like to point out the difference between a trained man and a seasoned man. A man can have had training, and he can have passed certain tests and can have demonstrated certain knowledge. but he may not be a seasoned man, may not be in the physical condition which would enable him to take the field. He may not be in close touch and understanding with all the people with whom he would have to work. No one knows better than I, who happen to be in the Reserves, that having had a certain amount of training is no substitute for being on active service. They are two entirely different things. While a trained man is much better than an untrained man, he is nothing like a seasoned man who is in the active service.

Mr. BONE. I assume he could be whipped into shape in a shorter time.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. BONE. I suppose that if I had had 2 or 3 years in the National Guard and understood the Manual of Arms and had gotten the feel of the service, it would not take long to take me, being a normal human being, out into the field and make a good soldier of me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to supplement what the Senator from Massachusetts has said. I do not believe that many of the World War veterans could now pass a physical examination or could endure the difficulties of active service. Put 30 or 40 or 50 pounds on the back of a man who has not been seasoned, and start him off on a 10- or 15-mile march, and it is quite likely that before he gets to the end of the journey he will be pretty well tired out, and will have to quit. It takes young men to fight a war, there is no doubt, and while I do do not mean to disparage the veteran, or to say that he would not be good for ordinary service in an emergency, in my humble judgment he would not have the physical endurance which a younger man would have and which he would have to possess in order to bear the exigencies of war.

Mr. BONE. I think that is indisputably true. My real reason for mentioning the World War veteran was that if some overwhelming, overpowering emergency should arise. when men would have to stand, as it has been suggested the English might have to stand, literally on the beaches and fight, of course a man who saw service in the World War, while the years have come on him and made it impossible

for him to give maximum service, could fill in.

Of course, in mechanized warfare there is a somewhat different problem, as is the rule in many industrial organizations. I do not believe in retiring a man when he reaches the age of 40. I think that is one of the supreme tragedies of American life, and I am not so certain that a fellow over 40 or 45 could not get in a big tank and operate it. Perhaps his sense of timing would be bad. I was only thinking of a great emergency, a compelling necessity, which might necessitate bringing them into service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think there would be many branches of any force where men who probably would not have the physical vigor younger men would have could fill in and be very helpful, and release other men. But while I am not familiar with the tank service, I would think that would be one of the hardest on the physical being, because it is pretty rough in a tank, the fumes are pretty bad, and they do not always have good roads to traverse. It takes a pretty robust fellow to stand the punishment which operating a tank normally entails. The operators have to wear headgear and that sort of thing to protect them.

Mr. BONE. I think that is true, and riding inside a tank probably would be hard for even a younger man, but there would be the mechanical and the repair work which, in war, would be almost as vital as the operating of the machine.

I am glad the Senator from Maryland is here, because other Senators, like myself, who are interested in these matters, find statements which seem so odd as means of trying to state a premise and prove it, that I think it is worth calling some of them to the attention of Senators. I take up the RECORD this morning and find that a Member of the Senate put into the RECORD yesterday an article by a writer in a prominent business magazine, who enumerates some of the reasons why France fell, why she collapsed. As I read this, if one can get amusement out of anything as tragic as this-and I assure you I cannot-I would have gotten amusement out of this article.

I want my colleagues to listen to what this writer says caused the downfall of France, and as I read it, I want them to recall that this is exactly what happened in Germany. This is the formula in France which made Germany able to destroy France. This is the sort of reasoning Americans see every day in papers, and no wonder they are befuddled. These are the conclusions of the writer as to the things which caused the downfall of France:

The French \* \* promoted centralized planned economy.

That is exactly what Germany has done. Yet that is given as an evidence of the frightful weakness of France.

2. It assumed that prosperity could be achieved by heavy governmental expenditures

That is all Germany has been doing, pouring out a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield. Mr. TOBEY. Is not that exactly what has been going on in the United States for the last 7 years?

Mr. BONE. The purpose of the article was to be critical of this administration, but I am not reading it to defend the administration, merely as an example of the sort of thing that is pumped into the people.

Perhaps this is an argument against the administration. but the point is that the writer says these are the fatal flaws in the French set-up, but they are paralleled in Germany.

# RADIO AND HYSTERIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I have taken a great deal of interest in listening to the radio night after night, especially the news broadcasts, and I find that there is a deliberate. premeditated effort not only on the part of some of the radio commentators, but on the part of the present administration to try to tie up our hope with that of France: in other words. to make people feel that we are going to fall as France fell.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has been very gracious with his time. I wish to take about 3 minutes. I wish to point out that in my judgment there is no factor more potent in controlling and influencing public opinion than the radio. As the Senator said, night after night these commentators come into the homes and influence the minds of the American people. Their names have become almost household words. We know that Mr. So-and-So, and commentator, is announced to speak. What does he do? He holds before us in subtle language the possibilities ahead of us. He inculcates in the minds of the people the need for conscription, the need for giving England our destroyers, the dangers of our being attacked by Germany; he decries delay by senatorial debate. So he goes on using the power of suggestion adroitly conceived and worded.

If such a gentleman is retained and hired by some great oil company, for instance, which has extensive interests abroad, and which holds in its heart the damnable doctrine that the American flag should follow the dollar, I think the public ought to know about it, but it does not. All we know is that this eminent commentator comes on the air and reasons with the American people, with his power of suggestion and adroit eloquence, and seeks to stir them up with philosophies that may be un-American, that may be propaganda, and he is paid for doing so by some great oil company, or some other great commercial concern.

I demand now, in the interest of fair play and unbiased public opinion, that we should know, by definite statement over the radio preceding these commentators, who is paying for them, and what they are being paid.

THE CASE OF BOAKE CARTER

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, before I again yield to the Senator from Washington, that I have before me, and I wish to place it in the RECORD at this point, a statement as to how Mr. Boake Carter was put off the air at the instance of the British, which is made clear in an article entitled "Warp and Woof of American Policy", in volume 28, December-September, 1937-1938, pages 297-304 of the magazine The Round Table. That shows how the pressure was going to be put on to drive Boake Carter off the air, because he was preaching a doctrine of isolationism against Britain.

I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### MR. LUDLOW AND MR. CARTER

The full depth and nature of isolationist feeling, as well as a graphic illustration of practical politics on the American scene, were disclosed in the Ludlow amendment episode. This tale really deserves telling at adequate length. A burly and amiable ex-news-paperman, Representative Louis Ludlow, of Indiana, introduced several years ago a constitutional amendment providing for a popuseveral years ago a constitutional amendment providing for a popular referendum before Congress and the President could declare war. He introduced his resolution at the behest of pacifist groups, as a friendly gesture which might provide some good publicity for Representative Ludlow. The bill was ignored by the congressional leadership. After it had grown dusty in committee for several years, Representative Ludlow began to pass around what is called a "discharge petition." If a congressional committee fails to report a bill to the floor of the House it becomes precessary to "discharge". charge petition." If a congressional committee fails to report a bill to the floor of the House, it becomes necessary to "discharge" the committee of consideration of the bill by a petition signed by a majority of the full membership of the House. Few such petitions ever get enough names.

But Representative Ludlow, whom everybody likes to please, carried his petition around with him, and from time to time Members of Congress would sign it, just as a favor to a colleague, and because his proposal seemed a good idea—but not an idea and because his proposal seemed a good idea—but not an idea that anybody ever expected to get into law. By this process of steady accretion Representative Ludlow by last December suddenly found himself within a dozen votes of his majority of signatures. Then the Panay was bombed and sunk on the far-away Yangtse. Instantly more than enough Members to put the Ludlow resolution over the top hastened to the good Congressman and put their signatures on his petition, alarmed lest President Roosevelt should put us into war overnight, and anxious to file a moral protest, at least.

Then, however, it was Representative Ludlow's turn to be

Then, however, it was Representative Ludlow's turn to be alarmed. He had the bear by the tail. For the administration began to turn its full guns upon his resolution. They were desperately afraid it would pass, and be a shot heard round the world—a declaration that the United States would never go to war until after a long and dubious popular referendum had taken place. President Roosevelt and his advisers feared a serious upset to the constitutional prerogatives of President and Congress, a blow to the basic representative system. And they knew that as a real safeguard the referendum was worthless; for popular opinion can be swayed as readily as congressional, and in this democracy no President could think of waging war without overwhelming national support.

So the administration turned all its guns on the Ludlow resolution. President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull wrote stern letters to House leaders. Alf M. Landon, the last Republican candidate for the Presidency, appealed for the opposition votes of his party, and Henry L. Stimson, last Republican Secretary of State, delivered himself of an immensely weighty and imposing argument against the amendment. The obliging Mr. Ludlow, who least of all wanted to be in the President's bad books and lose all his political patronage, was unhappiest of everybody, but he had to keep clinging to the

bear's tail.

bear's tall.

Came the day for voting. In preparation, the administration turned on all possible political heat. The State and city bosses, the national political manager—Jim Farley—and all the faithful machine-controlled leaders instructed their representatives to vote "nay." And the Ludlow amendment—after the opposition of President and Secretary of State and their opposite numbers in the other party, almost unanimous newspaper opposition, and all possible political whipcracking—was lost by the tiny margin of 214 nays to 196 yeas. And these majority votes came from the party machines in three big States—New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois—and from the solid South, which is not much interested in foreign machines in three big States—New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois—and from the solid South, which is not much interested in foreign affairs but sets great store by party loyalty. No more striking proof could be afforded of the real depths of antiwar sentiment in the American commonwealth. That the measure was only defeated by the worst type of machine-politics votes, with Tammany polling strongly, is a clear commentary on the task confronting the leaders set they seek to presude the public that vigorous conversion is as they seek to persuade the public that vigorous cooperation is necessary if war is to be avoided.

On the other side of the fence there are various spokesmen defending isolationism, and it is a curious streak in democracy that the most formidable of them is a British-born naturalized-Amer-ican radio news commentator, one Boake Carter. Mr. Carter speaks 5 nights a week, 15 minutes a night, to the American public on a

radio period bought by the manufacturer of the product he advertises, which happens to be radio sets. He has an immense following in every part of the country. His words reach millions of people every night. Mr. Carter, moreover, gives a running news commentary, and only weaves in his isolationist views as they fit the news. His propaganda, therefore, is doubly effective.

It is difficult to estimate the real effect of Mr. Carter's personal efforts, but the best authorities declare it to be immense, and Secretary Hull makes the air blue at the mention of his radio rival. Mr. Carter, remember, is appealing to a sympathetic substratum of emotion. It seems fantastic to draw the conclusion, but students of American public opinion may well decide that this one man alone (though he is not alone) can do much to blunt the edge of the whole administration effort to work out a more active foreign

policy.

This sort of thing has happened in democracies before, and it will happen again; it is a projection of the power of the press, as it was shown in Great Britain, for instance, in the Zinoviev-letter affair. But it is strikingly dramatic when transferred to the radio waves. Mr. Carter was born in Baku, Russia, son of a British consular agent and an Irish mother, Edith Harwood-Yarred Carter. He served in the Royal Air Force and came to the United States in 1920, but was not naturalized until 1933. He was at one time a newspaper reporter and worked for some years in the oil business in Mexico and Central America. Since 1932 he has been amazingly popular as a radio commentator.

popular as a radio commentator.

There is one way in which Mr. Carter's powerful criticisms of American foreign policy may be prevented, and the method is being tried. His contract with his radio-company employers expires shortly, and he has signed a new contract with an immense product food company. General Foods. This company is owned wholesale-food company, General Foods. This company is owned by Mrs. Marjorie Post Davies, wife of Joseph E. Davies, American Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and a firm supporter of Administration foreign policy. Ambassador Davies, it is understood, may "speak to" Mr. Carter, and it remains to be seen whether the tone of his comments will change or not.

These strange and spectacular facts may have a trivial and gossipy look to them. Actually they are the warp and woof that make up the fabric of public opinion in this democracy. They are the hard facts, not the abstract theory, of the formulation of our foreign policies, and they reveal some of the obstacles to a courageous and risk-taking policy of action.

Mr. Carter, has bitterly attacked Secretary Hull's world-trade

Mr. Carter has bitterly attacked Secretary Hull's world-trade theories, and that is where his shafts have struck home with the determined Tennessean. But Secretary Hull presses on, and, with British representatives shortly to arrive for actual negotiation of the Anglo-American trade agreement, he hopes for a success that will turn the tide and lead to many future agreements among the members of the American group and sterling area.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the argument of this writer is an illustration of the thing which is becoming a source of bewilderment and confusion to the American people. They read this and they say "Yes, France broke down, and she ought not to have done so." And yet the very thing that is charged as the cause of the debacle in France is the thing that is now being done, and has been done right along in Germany.

Let me proceed to read:

The French Government-

harassed and restricted private enterprise.

That is what the German Government has done right along until a businessman in Germany today has only a nominal control of his business. It is more apparent than real. There is not any substantial control.

I just finished reading a very interesting book on Germany, which says that today Germany is but a hollow shell so far as the orthodox pattern of American business is concerned. It no longer exists. So the thing that is charged by a conservative writer here as causing the downfall of France, and which made France an easy prey to Germany, is the thing that we must conclude gave Germany her might and enabled her to overthrow the other country.

If we were inclined to employ the vulgarisms of the street, we would say that this sort of reasoning was cockeyed, but being merely Senators, we would say that it is slightly oblique.

It-

France-

introduced control of prices.

And that led to the downfall of France and easy victory of

Germany over France. Why, Members of the Senate, Germany has the most rigid

control of prices of any country under the sun, and yet, according to this writer, that is what enabled Germany to LXXXVI----676

lick France. It is like the kettle animadverting at the complexion of the pot, even if the statement were true.

The only statement I find where the parallel is true is the statement that France reduced working hours and increased wages. That is probably true. Germany did not. Germany established an entirely different type of economy.

I read another statement:

It unbalanced the budget-kept it unbalanced.

Well, the operations of the German fiscal system have been the most astounding performance of all times. There is not an economist in the United States, or in the world, that undertsands how Germany has been able to keep up her prodigal expenditures, and unbalancing her budget, which is a very mild way of describing it. It was just so scrambled that no one could understand it; yet the very thing that France did to injure herself, Germany did also, but it enabled Germany to win the victory.

It revalued the currency.

France did that. Well, Germany did also.

It brought about a lowered standard of living.

Any standard work that one picks up dealing with conditions in Germany will convince one that now and for a long time past there has been a definite and constant lowering of the standard of living in Germany. Yet, according to this writer, the thing that destroyed France in turn made Germany so powerful that she was able to whip France.

The French Government-

Destroy the morale of industry.

Well, there is not a businessman today in Germany who can say that his soul is his own. All business is completely controlled by the Government, and every Member of the Senate knows that to be true.

This statement went into the Congressional Record as the argument of a prominent businessman. It will be read, presumptively, by those who read the Congressional Record: it will be used as evidence that France sank beneath the waves, because she did these things, when I say to you right now that Germany has done every single one of those things. And then we ask ourselves, why is thinking in America confused? The pattern of thinking becomes more confused day by day. and the very argument that we enshrine in our hearts is proven to be fallacious the next day, according to someone who thinks it is not the proper argument.

So this draft-if the employment of this kind of argument-I am not saying that the person who made the argument is not sincere, but that sort of argument is one of the reasons why America today is so bewildered.

Many people believe France sank beneath the waves because these things happened, and yet Germany has done every one of them, and if the writer's argument is sound. then there remains only the one question: How could Germany do the same thing that France did and win the victory over France?

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington. I may say that we all know that this sort of thing is to promote hysteria by using France. We know why France fell, but the whole matter for the propagandist is to get America to think that we are going to fall. They will not say that France did not have compulsory military training. When the change in her constitution was made, provision was made for compulsory military training. That was, I believe, 12 years before the present war. The men of France were trained. France has had compulsory military training under her new constitution, in the latest system of military training.

It was not the fact that the men of France were not trained. The fall of France was due to the fact that the mechanized units of Germany were too powerful to be stopped.

Why is it not that the first thing that is done to get America prepared is to provide airplane pilots, mechanics to run the tanks, and trained personnel to man the machines? In other

words, America should first have highly skilled technicians before it is attempted to draft the boys.

When the Senator from Massachusetts was here he hadand I do not say anything by way of condemnation of him, because I admire him very greatly—he had the Germans up in Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia is quite a distance from the United States. It is just like talking about having them down in South America. Very few think how far that is. They do not take out their geographies and show you how far it is from South America to the United States. But we can meet that situation.

The whole truth about the matter is that we have been pumped with invasion hysteria in order to establish a war economy in America.

I regret to say that the administration has condemned business, and now joins with the businessman who wants profit in the war. Some business, not all, but some business and this administration have gone together to get this war hysteria promoted. The money changers have not been driven from the temple. They are back here, and are now filling Government offices in the city of Washington.

No, they are back here getting their pound of flesh, and some in the administration, who want to try to bring back employment to 12,000,000 unemployed, feel that a war economy is the way to do it.

War economy will not settle it. War economy will not bring back prosperity to America. The administration realizes that as long as we "prime the pump" in this way it can get such a policy without much condemnation. I do not attack national defense. I believe in it, but I believe in national defense for national defense, and not for the promotion of hysteria or for the purpose of political gains therefrom.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate. I have tried to hurry on, and at the same time to be generous to my colleagues.

It has been said that the draft was approved by George Washington. Of course, anyone who superficially reads history would say so; but when one actually reads the story of President Washington, he will find that such is not the case.

But the individuals to whom I have referred are not much interested in the advice given us by George Washington. They say, "Accept George Washington's advice on this," but they do not pay any attention to the advice he gave us in his farewell message about not becoming involved in Europe. Farewell Message about not becoming involved in Europe.

The other day I heard the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Burkel rise and say that the American people are behind the bill because the Gallup poll says so. The Senator from Nebraska was very much against the Ludlow amendment; and the Gallup poll in the same proportion, was for the Ludlow amendment. Where does he draw the line in calling the Gallup poll right or wrong? If the Gallup poll is right on the draft, it is right on the Ludlow amendment. I say it is not right on this question. As has been said time after time on this floor, the question itself was weighted in behalf of military training. Dr. Gallup sells the poll to the news-

# SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM

I wish to correct one statement before proceeding. It has been said that the greatest democratic system is the system of Switzerland. Look at Switzerland. It has military training. That is so; but how does it have it? It has it by the vote of the people. The people of Switzerland themselves went to the polls and voted for military training. That is democracy. Compulsory military training will never be submitted to the people of this country, even if

Recently when Switzerland wanted to increase the time allotted to military service, could it be done without going back to the people? It could not.

Once again the question had to be submitted to the people, so that the military training period might be lengthened by 12 to 23 days, depending upon the service affected; 400,000 people in Switzerland voted against it, and only 500,000 for it. But my point is that the Swiss system and the Burke-Wadsworth bill are so different that it is nonsensical to compare them. They are not even close kin.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator vield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I wonder if there is any election machinery which would permit the submission of this particular question in a simple form to the voters of America in the November election? If they should vote for it, Congress would be in session immediately to pass the bill. There would be a delay of only 2 or 3 months. I am wondering whether or not the question in some form could be submitted to the people in an intelligent way, so as to let the American people vote on it. That would end the discussion. So I ask the question, Is there some way of submitting the question to the people? Perhaps the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] can advise us. At the moment I do not know what mechanism could be employed under such conditions, but I think probably the question could be submitted by the States for an advisory vote.

Mr. HOLT. I do not know of any machinery which is set up at present to do so. The point I am trying to bring out is that the Swiss military system is not at all like the Burke-Wadsworth bill. I shall put into the Record at this point the history of the Swiss system, so that even those who do not wish to see the difference may see it.

The Swiss military system was outlined in a letter written by C. Bruggmann, Minister of Switzerland. The part of his letter that outlines the system follows:

Switzerland was the first nation in modern times to introduce compulsory military service. The Federal Constitution adopted in 1848 and revised in 1874, provides in its article 18: "Every Swiss is bound to do military service." The Federal law concerning the organization of the Swiss Army of April 12, 1907, called the Military Constitution of the Swiss Confederation, amended in 1927 and subsequent dates, provides that the army shall consist of three classes, namely, the elite or first line: Men from 20 to 32 years old; the landwehr or second line: Men from 33 to 40 years; and the landsturm or territorial troops: Men from the age of 41 to 48.

Every male Swiss, when reaching the age of 19, must submit to a mental and physical examination. The mental test includes reading, arithmetic, geography, history of the Government, and composition. For physical examination he performs various gymnastic exercises. Some Cantons (States) compel the youths from 17 to 19 years of age to go to night school for 64 hours during winter to prepare for the examination.

When accepted in his twentieth year the infantry recruit enters Switzerland was the first nation in modern times to introduce

When accepted in his twentieth year the infantry recruit enters the recruiting school of his territorial division, or, if he is to become an artilleryman, or a cavalryman, or a pilot, etc., he joins his respective school, of which there are several for each branch.

The length of time devoted to the first year's training of the recruit (recruiting school) is for all branches of the Army (infantry, artillery, sanitary troops, supply trains, etc.)—day of entrance and day of discharge included—116 days; for the cavalry, 130 days. The pilot has to undergo an additional training of 6 months.

pilot has to undergo an additional training of 6 months.

At the time the recruit reports for his service he is given a complete equipment and regulation rifle, all of which he takes home after finishing the course. For yearly inspection and active duty he must turn out with his full equipment, which finally becomes his private property upon his discharge from active duty at the

his private property upon his discharge from active duty at the age of 48.

The recruiting-school course is hard work, as each day means 8 strenuous hours, with night work, such as patrolling, entrenching, and maneuvers probably twice a week.

The completion of the course promotes the recruit to a full-fledged soldier, assigned to a battalion in his home district, which is a unit of the division of which his Canton is a territorial part. As a member of his unit, he serves each year a so-called repetition course of 19 days, until he is 26. He belongs to the first line for 6 years longer, until he is 32, but in these 6 years he is bound to serve only every second year for a period of 3 weeks. A private of the first-line troops must therefore undergo within a period of 12 years after completion of the recruiting school a military training of eight repetition courses of 19 days each.

training of eight repetition courses of 19 days each.

The repetition courses of the first-line troops are so arranged that an adequate change in smaller tactical units with training

that an adequate change in smaller tactical units with training in army units will take place.

From 32 to 40 years, the Swiss soldier belongs to the second line or "Landwehr." In this capacity he serves two repetition courses of 19 days each. For the next 8 years, until he is 48, he serves in the "Landsturm" or territorial troops and is called to the colors only under special orders. In addition, every "Landwehr" soldier presents himself for annual inspection, at which time he must account for the care of his uniform and arms.

A recent decree of the Swiss Government extended the army age limit to 60 years, thus keeping every able-bodied man up to 60 years of age subject to military service in case of general mobilization.

The figures of the time of instruction for a Swiss infantry private are therefore:

Recruiting school at his twentieth year.

First line or "Auszug," up to his thirty-second year, 8 repetition courses at 19 days each.

Second line, "Landwehr," up to his fortieth year, 2 repetition courses of 19 days each.

Plus annual inspection.

Territorial troops or "Landsturm" up to his forty-eighth year, annual inspection and subject to service under special orders. 8 Territorial troops from the age of 48-60, subject to special services only in case of general mobilization.

Specialists, like for instance gunsmiths, farriers, etc., receive their

Those belonging necessary professional training in special courses. to the ambulance corps take besides the recruiting school a hos

pital training course.

Part of the military training of the Swiss soldier is the obligatory and voluntary rifle practice which he attends in civil life under the auspices of a rifle club. Every community is compelled by the Federal Government to build and maintain a rifle range by the Federal Government to build and maintain a rifle range in the open field. Enlisted men and noncommissioned officers of the first line and the "Landwehr" armed with rifles or carbines, as well as subaltern officers of the troops, must pass a yearly rifle practice test. Such tests, as well as the rifle practices, are conducted by the rifle clubs according to the military regulations. Those who neglect this test must take a special course without pay. The Federal Government refunds the cost of the ammunition used to all those who pass the test and subsidizes the rifle clubs. The Federal Government encourages and aids financially any movement toward preparatory military training.

The rederal Government encourages and alos mancially any movement toward preparatory military training.

Those Swiss who are found physically unfit to serve in the regular army are assigned to certain of the auxiliary branches, as for instance, the ambulance corps, commissary department, information department, transportation department, and, more recently, are trained in the air defense of the civil population and as antiparachutists, etc. Members assigned to the auxiliary service attend instruction services of much shorter periods than do the

regular soldiers.

Citizens who for physical reasons are not serving personally in the Army, as well as those incorporated in the auxiliary service, must pay an annual tax of exemption. Swiss citizens living in foreign countries are also obliged to pay this tax, and with few excep-

tions they do so.

The foregoing concerns privates in the Swiss Army. The officers and noncommissioned officers naturally are subject to additional instructions and training. Every Swiss who has the ambition and possesses intelligence and ability, can become an officer in the Army. After completing the 116, or as the case may be, 130 days in the regular recruiting school, if his conduct warrants the recommendation from his superiors, he will be called to attend a school for noncommissioned officers lasting 3 weeks, for those in the artillery, in the air corps, engineering, and fortress troops, 4 weeks, after which he receives the rank of a corporal. As such he attends another recruiting school a year later and the corporal with a good record and the ambition to become an officer enters the school for officers. The duration of this school varies between 60 and 120 days, according to the branch of service (for instance, infantry 88, artillery and air corps, 102 days). For practical and training purposes a school for noncommissioned officers is connected with the school for officers.

poses a school for noncommissioned officers is connected with the school for officers.

The newly appointed lieutenant must pass a recruiting school as instructor to qualify and thereafter he serves the regular annual repetition course of 19 days with his unit. If qualified, he will be promoted to the rank of first lieutenant after the completion of three or four repetition courses. To advance to the rank of captain he must take a 30-day course in the Central Military School No. 1, and attend several other special courses. Officers above the rank of captain devote a considerable part of their time to special courses in tactics information, etc.

in tactics, information, etc.
Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the Swiss military constitution provides for a small corps of instructors. They are professional or career officers and conduct the instruction of recruits and the training of noncommissioned and commissioned officers in the respective courses. A fixed number of instructors are assigned to each of the different branches of the army. The commanders of division and army corps are chosen from among the professional

omcers.

The military-training program is not coordinated with the educational institutions. There are projects to make preparatory training for boys of the age of 17–19 compulsory. This program would be conducted by educational institutions as well as by

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

Mr. WHEELER. I think it is unfortunate that one of the great parties has not had the courage to go on record against conscription. As the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] pointed out, neither candidate for the Presidency of the United States has said, "I am in favor of conscription," or "I am in favor of the draft." They use language which can be confused in the minds of the public. I should like to see the candidates take a stand one way or the other on conscription and on the draft.

We have had a test vote in some States. In Idaho one candidate for the Republican nomination came out against the draft, and was nominated by an overwhelming vote. It was made an issue in his campaign. The same thing took place on the Democratic ticket in Idaho. The candidate who took a similar position was nominated on the Democratic ticket. In my own State I was criticized because of my views about keeping out of war; and yet I was nominated. I venture the assertion that whenever the issue is presented in any State north of the Mason and Dixon's line, and any candidate says, "I want to make out a case for drafting American boys" and properly presents it to the American people, and somebody takes the other side, regardless of whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, the man who takes a position against conscription will win the nomination and the election.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I hope the Senator from Montana will not urge any more platform declarations on that or allied subjects. I suspect that none of us takes the platforms very seriously. When I hear my Republican and Democratic brethren talk with pontifical solemnity about what is in the platform, I want to laugh, because the Republican Party came out for conscription of wealth as well as the boys in wartime. So did the Democratic Party. It would not do a particle of good to put anything in the platform about it. I was almost sorry for my good friend the Senator from Montana, who labored so hard at Chicago to persuade our noble Democratic Party to say something on the subject in its platform, because I was fearful that it would not do much good. The Senator's party and my party came out for conscription of wealth in time of war. That is to say, we agreed that if we should conscript manpower we would conscript wealth. I do not believe that the Senator from Montana thinks it would do any good to repeat such a declaration after defaulting once on the platform.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not talking about the platform. I

am talking about the candidate.

Mr. BONE. I think it would be a magnificent idea if we could submit the question for the arbitrament of the ballot box and let the American people decide the question. Then we could lay it aside and dispense with all the debate and argument in the Senate. I should like to see the question submitted to the American people in November. If we want to end all doubt in our own minds as to where the people stand on the question, we probably could submit it to them and postpone the debate until after we should have had a plebiscite. In the meantime we should have the air filled with propaganda such as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey] mentioned. However, that is the price of democracy. That is the price we pay to live under a democratic Government. Men are permitted freely to speak their minds.

Mr. HOLT. I should not want to advocate debate between the candidates, because I am afraid I should step on the toes of Secretary Ickes. But, at least, the candidates should debate the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. To me there is a tragic side to this debate. It might be well to dwell upon it for a moment, with the Senator's permission.

We should not have any conscription bill in the Congress today, and we should not have billion-dollar appropriations, all kinds of laws to let contracts without competitive bidding, the possibility of repealing all the labor laws which have been put on the books, and thousands of other things which I might suggest, if we had adhered to the policy of having a navy sufficient to defend the country against any reasonably conceivable enemy or group of enemies, and had supplemented that policy with an air force and sufficient

pilots to support such a policy. In that contingency we should not need a large army for our defense, because such a navy and such an air force operating in this hemisphere, because of their position and base, would be almost a sure guaranty for the defense of this country in any conceivable emergency which might arise.

We did not do that; and as a consequence today we are spending \$2 or \$3 where only one might have been spent. We are repealing democratic and progressive laws, in whole or in part, because we did not have the foresight to prepare at least the physical things which we cannot obtain overnight, because 4 years are required to build a battleship, and several years to build an air fleet.

Some day we hope the present emergency will have passed, and the fear which now exists will have been dissipated. When that day comes, I wonder whether even then we shall have the foresight to keep our Navy and our air force as our first line of defense, which will make unnecessary in another emergency conscription bills, billion-dollar appropriations, dictatorial powers given to the Executive, and the repeal of good laws passed in time of peace. At least, if we could learn that lesson from recent tragic events we would have accomplished something.

For my part, I hope that we will always have a military policy something like this: A navy sufficient to defend this country in both oceans, with such improvements at the Panama Canal as will make transit from one side to the other always possible; an air force, the equal or superior to that of any other nation in the world, with able pilots and technicians to man it; and a small army. Then, in times of distress, we would not have another conscription bill and the waste of billions of dollars in hasty contracts to fill deficiencies in the national defense until we could create the degree of defense which would be necessary. If we can only learn that now, we will save the American people from a vale of tears, from a weight of fears, and from backbreaking bankruptcy, and live in security in this hemisphere for all time to come.

The tragedy is that it was not done 2, 3, or 4 years ago, when the so-called menace was beginning to become apparent. We could have done it gradually, we could have made real work for the relief workers, so called, and today there would not have been any conscription debate here, because we could have felt secure behind our defenses. Neither would there have been billions of dollars for all sorts of implements which we are buying which will be outdated almost as soon, perhaps, as they are created.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, before I come to the final discussion of what I would suggest in the place of conscription-

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds, will he allow me to submit a startling exhibit to him, which I think will interest him and the Senate and

Mr. HOLT. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Michigan. Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that the ominous feature of this whole, dread business is the direction as well as the length of the step we are asked to take in our defense and foreign-policy measures. I have just read a most interesting and significant and revelatory item of news from New York City. It is illustrated with the proofs of what it describes. Let me read this to the Senator:

High up in the tower of the skyscraper in the Municipal Building, among the radio aerials and the pigeons, a secret W. P. A. project is under way.

Open the door marked "no admittance" and you are startled

by a huge poster, a man monster skulking among high Man-hattan buildings and the legend "Don't talk! The enemy may be listening!"

Look again and you see, "Panic aids disaster!" against a back-ground of streets filled with milling thousands.

This is New York and not London. Forty close-lipped artists and map makers are at work here, in two tiny suites on the thirtieth and thirty-first floors, and they are governed by the "don't talk" rule.

Inquiry establishes that this project is sponsored by Mayor La-Guardia, who recently formed the emergency defense committee, charged with the responsibility for preparing New York for war, rebellion, and major riots.

The startling posters are samples being made, it is said, at the mayor's order. They are modified copies of posters used abroad, especially in England.

Harry M. Prince, deputy commissioner of housing, is said to be in charge of the enterprise, aided by Sumner Smith. The workers were selected from a carefully culled list. The mayor won't talk about it at all.

Mr. HOLT. That is unusual, is it not-I mean for Mayor LaGuardia not to talk?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that somewhere in the mysterious background of this whole situation there are vague forces at work with which the American people are totally unfamiliar. It seems to me that even we in the Senate cannot be adequately informed respecting the situation for which preparation is being made when we suddenly find W. P. A. projects that are even preparing war posters for use after we get into war. That degree of foresight makes my blood run cold.

But I rise to suggest that we make a virtue of necessity in this amazing situation. I have no complaint against all kinds of preparedness. But if there are any posters available, warning the American people "Be calm! Panic spreads quickly!" I would to God that, instead of waiting for our entry into war, we might have the warnings now, now, now! Let us not wait until it is too late. Now is the time to tell the American people, "Be calm! Panic spreads quickly!" Now; not after we are in a war which our people would avoid.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Michigan. As I said yesterday, if the American people knew what was going on behind the scenes of this administration I would hate to predict what would happen. When I am told that the administration is not preparing for war, I say they are not telling the truth. They are planning for war-not possible war but what they think is definite war.

Oh, yes; some may ask, "Well, where do you get your proof?" I get it from their secret acts. The American people, who are going to do the dying, ought to know why.

Referring to the W. P. A .- if I should begin to talk about that the Senate would not leave the Chamber tonight. I heard the other day that Harry Hopkins was supposed to be the man to clear between the National Defense Council and the President. If that be the case, God pity the soldiers of the United States, because if the United States Army does not get more for the dollars spent than the American people got under the handling of W. P. A. by Harry Hopkins we could not meet a force of Lilliputians coming from any place.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I doubt if there has ever been a war when the order of the day was not prodigal expenditure. The boondoggling of the World War was a tragedy. Blankets, saddles, and branding irons-small things in themselves-were bought in such enormous quantities that reading the purchase orders covering those items sounds like a page from a fairy tale.

I suspect before we are through with this program the American people are going to confront the fact that the per-unit cost of all this material is not only going to soar to high levels but will continue to go up, and we are not doing much to stop it. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Typings] said a few minutes ago that we are proceeding now to abandon so-called progressive laws, such as laws dealing with limitation of profits. We are going to pay a very tragic price in a financial sense, for battleships are costing several times as much as they did in the lush days of 1920, 1921, and

The American people will, I suspect, have merely to accommodate themselves to the fact that this preparedness program is going to take a frightful toll, that tax levels are going to stratospheric levels, and that the cost of the program will make the boondoggling of the old P. W. A., the Civil Works Administration of 1934, look very sick and pale.

We are paying a terrific price for material now. The price of airplanes goes up and up and up; the cost of ships goes up; everything the Government is buying in this program is costing more and more. Senators rise on this floor and

ask-some of them in a critical way-where did all this money go. The Senator from West Virginia knows where it went. The Government simply is not getting a hundred cents of national defense for the taxpayers' dollar. That is where the money is going. When a battleship which could be built a few years ago for \$26,800,000 now costs \$70,000,-000, why should any Senator ask where the money is going? Even my Republican brethren amuse me at times by rising and asking where is all this money going. The shipbuilders are getting it.

We got bids on two battleships not long ago, and, if my memory serves me aright, when the bids were opened there was \$60,000,000 bid for the hull and machinery alone. The President was so infuriated about it and so outraged, or perhaps I should say so irritated, that he ordered the bids withdrawn and ordered the Government navy yards to finish those two ships, the Washington and North Carolina, as I recall their names.

I do not know what they are going to cost, but the other day there was a colloquy on the floor of the Senate in which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Thomas] joined. I think he demonstrated to the satisfaction of Senators in this body that the dollar today will buy much more than it would buy in 1920. Then why should any Senator ask where all the money is going, when a ship is costing three times as much, and the Senator from Oklahoma says that in the case of 784 standard commodities the dollar will buy even twice as much as it would buy in 1920?

We do not need to ask ourselves where the money is going. It is going down the maw of the munition makers. Why fool around with it; why try to gloss it over? If it is not so, then the Senate of the United States should establish another board of inquiry, another body of Senators, made up to inquire where this money is going and to whom, instead of Senators constantly rising on this floor and making political speeches bidding their friends with pontifical and political solemnity to ask the whole world, Where is the money going, where is the money going? The Munitions Committee of this body tried earnestly at one time to get a break-down of prices from private shipbuilders, but we have never been able to get anything out of them. The cold, hard fact remains that ships are costing three times what they used to cost. So Senators might just as well save their breath and not continue to ask themselves or their brethren where the money is going, when airplanes are costing two or three and four times as much as they did.

When every conceivable form of war material is steadily going up in price day by day, and we are not even making what seems to me a forthright effort to recapture the profits with the proper levels of taxation, it seems to me we are rapidly reaching a point where we had better cease to ask ourselves questions. It is a beautiful thing; I believe Socrates taught by asking questions; but I am not certain that the Senate teaches itself or the country or anyone else by asking questions of that kind.

I hope I have not intruded too much on the time of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. No; I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Washington, and I want to say this:

# DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN BACK IN WASHINGTON

Washington has the dollar-a-year men here now. There are more dollar-a-year men in Washington than there are applicants for jobs. You know these dollar-a-year men who serve for patriotism and a few dollars in their pockets on the side. Oh. yes. History will record the same thing that is happening here, that the American taxpayer is paying for these great patriots some of whom are trying to incite war hysteria in this country—the same sort of thing that happened in 1915, 1916, and 1917. We are going to pay for it in that way.

I never thought the time would come when "Honest Harold" Ickes would go to bed with some of them as he has. No: I did not expect those things to happen. The money changers that they were so much afraid of, the financiers

that they were so much afraid of, the Wall Street crowd that they condemned, are back here in Washington on the Government pay roll getting a dollar a year, while their companies are getting millions.

Yes; Mr. Ed Stettinius gets a dollar a year. It seems very generous of him to donate his time; but, at the same time, the United States Steel Corporation, of which he was director of the executive committee, increased its profits from \$1,900,000 in the first 6 months of 1939 to \$36,315,000 in the first 6 months of 1940.

I intend to present to the Senate, when the tax bill comes in, a statement of war profits. Show me the war profiteers and I will show you the individuals who are preaching internationalism, who are preaching this drive for compulsory military training, and are preaching this drive for aid to Britain. They are the ones who are feathering their nests out of the United States Treasury and at the same time calling for American boys to serve at \$21 a month—yes; even \$5 a month in the original bill.

Oh, yes; they will hit the skies if we start to touch their profits, but it is all right to confiscate 100 percent of a boy. He does not have a chance to discuss his profits. He does not have a chance even to protect his own investment; and yet these individuals are here under the New Deal. But I do not care to go into that subject. I have taken too much time already. I want to read to you the statements of various Presidents on the draft.

#### JEFFERSON ON DRAFT

We were supposed to have Thomas Jefferson as the patron saint of our party. This is what Thomas Jefferson said to John Adams about the draft:

In Virginia a draft was ever the most unpopular and impracticable thing that could be attempted. Our people, even under the mon-archical government, had learned to consider it as the last of all oppressions.

Those are the words of Thomas Jefferson on the draft.

What did James Madison say about army rule? The other day some one said James Madison did not say anything about building a military system. Let me quote what James Madison

The means of defense against foreign danger have always been the instruments of tyranny at home. Among the Romans, it was a standing maxim to excite war whenever a revolt was apprehended. Throughout all Europe, the armies, kept under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people. It is perhaps questionable whether the best concerted system of absolute power in Europe could maintain itself in a situation where no alarms of external danger could tame the people to the domestic yoke.

I shall not burden the Senate with a complete statement of the views of Woodrow Wilson. I have disagreed with Woodrow Wilson. I think he was wrong about the World War; but some Senators have discussed Wilson, and I want to put in the RECORD what Mr. Wilson said about it. You will find that he said that the draft "carries with it a reversal of the whole history and character of our polity."

I shall put in the RECORD, without objection, a fuller statement of the views of President Wilson.

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

[Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters, Ray Stannard Baker]

"We never have had, and while we retain our present principles

"We never have had, and while we retain our present principles and ideals we never shall have, a large standing army."

We should be ready to defend ourselves but should not "turn America into a military camp" nor "ask our young men to spend the best years of their lives making soldiers of themselves."

He declared that we were "at peace with all the world," we did not dread any other nation, we were not "jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce." "\* \* we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none."

It was right enough that citizens who were willing to volunteer

It was right enough that citizens who were willing to volunteer should be "made familiar with the use of modern arms, the rudi-ments of drill and maneuver, and the maintenance and sanitation of camps," and that "the National Guard of the States should be developed and strengthened," but to do more than this "carries with

it a reversal of the whole history and character of our polity."

He stood almost where Jefferson had stood more than a century

**DECEMBER 8, 1914.** 

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. HOLT. I realize that I have held the floor a long time, but I have yielded much of that time to my colleagues. I expect the New York Times and some of the other newspapers to say that I am conducting a filibuster. If I were speaking against the regimentation of wealth I would be a statesman, in their estimation; but when I speak about regimentation of boys, that is a filibuster.

#### TRY VOLUNTEER SYSTEM

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] asked me what I would do. I would try the volunteer system and give it an actual trial. It has not been tried in America.

I would first set up a system to give training to air pilots and mechanics, and do that by volunteers, not at \$21 a month. I would give them a chance to have a decent livelihood. Let us develop our mechanized units so that we can meet any invasion. Do not send across the sea the things necessary to train our boys and let our boys train with wooden implements. Yes; I would try the volunteer system first, and the evidence presented here yesterday showed that the volunteer system had not been tried. To the contrary, there has been a definite pressure against the voluntary system. Out of 250,000 boys who enlisted last year, or who asked for enlistment, only 161 were accepted for 1-year enlistments. Then, as I said a moment ago, I would have an opportunity in the Army so that the boys could advance.

One of the great reasons why we have not more volunteers than we have, although the number has reached the quota, is this: Many American boys feel just as I feel, and as many other persons in this country feel, that they are not enlisting in the Army to defend America on this side of the Atlantic. They know that behind the scenes there is a drive to take them once again into an expeditionary force. That is holding back the volunteer system. The American boys know, if they know anything, that there is a constant drive to involve us in the European war and have a second A. E. F. Yes; that is one thing that is holding back the volunteer system. Oh, yes; and they talk about the draft. There is no provision in it which says that the drafted boys cannot be sent to Afghanistan or anywhere else, not for the supposed defense of America, but for the defense of the British Empire as the so-called first line of defense.

# WAS THERE AN ALLIANCE OR UNDERSTANDING?

The boys who might otherwise enlist have the same fear that we had when we passed the resolution in 1938 which asked the State Department for certain information. I want to recall this resolution to the Members of the Senate, and then see if the British Navy is our first line of defense. what we said:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested, if it be not incompatible with the public interest, to advise the Senate (a) whether or not any alliance, agreement, or understanding exists or is contemplated with Great Britain relating to war or the possibility of war; (b) whether or not there is any understanding or agreement, express or implied, for the use of the Navy of the United States in conjunction with any other nation; (c) whether or not there is any understanding or agreement, express or implied, with any nation, that the United States Navy, or any portion of it, should police or patrol or be transferred to any particular waters or any particular ocean. Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby,

That was the resolution passed by the Senate. This is the reply of the Secretary of State. I want to read it to you. He said:

FEBRUARY 8, 1938.

The Honorable KEY PITTMAN.

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,

United States Senate.

My Dear Senator Pittman: My attention has been called to Senate Resolution No. 229, introduced by Senator Johnson of California on January 5 (calendar day, February 7), 1938, and ordered to lie on the table.

Under the terms of the proposed resolution the Secretary of State is requested, if it be not incompatible with the public interest, to advise the Senate in response to three inquiries.

For your your information, and for such use as you may desire to make thereof, I desire to state to you very definitely that in response to point (a) which reads "whether or not any alliance, agreement, or understanding exists or is contemplated with Great Britain relating to war or the possibility of war," the answer is, "No"; in response to point (b) which reads "whether or not there is any understanding or agreement, express or implied, for the use of the Navy of the United States in conjunction with any other nation," the answer is, "No";

When, oh, when, did the English Navy make an agreement with the United States? Was it since 1938? The Secretary of State said there was no agreement, implied or expressed, before that time. I am sure the Secretary of State told us the truth. When was this express agreement of the English Navy to defend us made?

The Secretary of State proceeds:

with regard to point (c) which reads, "whether or not there is any understanding or agreement, express or implied, with any nation, that the United States Navy, or any part of it, should police or patrol or be transferred to any particular waters or any particular ocean," the answer is, "No."

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

To those men in the Senate who say the English Navy is protecting us, I ask when the agreement was made. Did not Secretary Hull tell us the truth in 1938? The President said he was not going to withhold any secrets from the American people. When was this agreement made for the English Navy to defend the United States of America?

It is said it has not been expressed, it was just implied. This resolution also said implied. When was that agreement made? History will record that there has been many an agreement made which we in the Senate and the people of the United States do not know. We will find agreements with the Bullitts, men of that ilk, taking America down the path to war. We are not supposed to know anything about it, we are just Members of the Senate.

I wish to say, as I stated a moment ago, that we will find agreements have been made. I do not believe this conscription is for the defense of the United States, unless we think the defense is across the Atlantic Ocean. I for one do not subscribe to that theory. I want to defend America here on this side. I want the largest army necessary here, and the largest navy here, and the largest air force here, not over Berlin, Paris, London, or any other place.

I know that America's protection lies on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. Are we going to couple our defense system with Europe? Let us make our defense system based on America, not involvement in other continents. Many American boys believe that this Army is being planned for war abroad.

The W. P. A. posters of which the Senator from Michigan speaks say, "Do not talk!" After war starts there will not be any talk. Shall we go into a war for freedom, and give up our freedom at home? Shall we in defense of liberty abroad give up our liberty here? Shall we in waging war against regimentation regiment our own people? Shall we in order to stop Hitler establish Hitlerism here?

# DEFEND THE UNITED STATES HERE

Mr. President, that is not sound. I favor national defense, but, as I stated a moment ago, I do not believe our national defense depends upon England, France, or any other nation in the world. If our national defense depends on England, God pity the United States of America, because Poland's defense depended upon England, and when things grew hot England did not get there. When the defense of France depended upon England and things got hot, England crossed the Channel. When Ethiopia's defense depended upon England, it went down. When Czecho-When Czechoslovakia's defense depended upon England, it fell. Are we going to stand on the same system and depend upon some government that has sold every government down the river?

The English ruling group have looked after England. They realize that their first obligation is to Great Britain. Let us have in America men who feel that our first obligation is to America, and not to any other nation. Let us realize that building up our defense here is the way to protect us and save democracy.

I fight this proposition of conscription because, as I stated once before, it is a challenge to the American way. Under the fear of invasion and under the promoted hysteria, and in order to establish a war mania, we are tearing down 150 years of tradition and establishing in America militarism, which none of us will ever see wiped out. That is why I am opposed to conscription.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 286) to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3354. An act for the relief of Nannie E. Teal;

S. 3710. An act for the relief of James H. Hearon; and

H. R. 10213. An act to permit American vessels to assist in the evacuation from the war zones of certain refugee children. ACTIVE SERVICE FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD, RESERVE, AND RETIRED PERSONNEL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 286, the so-called National Guard resolution, for printing in the RECORD. I shall call it up at the earliest practicable time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

#### SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

Mr. BULOW obtained the floor.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brown in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

# SALE OF CERTAIN STAMPS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bulow] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BULOW. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have a letter under date of August 19 from the Lynchburg News, Lynchburg, Va., bearing the signature of Mr. Carter Glass, Jr., which I should like to read. The letter is as follows:

Dear Senator Danaher: I note with considerable interest in the late dispatches coming over our Associated Press wires today your request for a Senate investigation of Secretary Ickes' acquisition of certain stamps issued by the Post Office Department several years ago. Senator Byrnes is quoted as saying that he had

"the authority of the Secretary" to offer the issue to you "if he will pay face value." Take him up—

#### I am advised by Mr. Glass-

Take him up; and if you don't want to keep the stamps, there are plenty of collectors, including myself, who would be pleased to take them off your hands.

to take them off your hands.

Most collectors have a knowledge of the transaction and also a fair idea of the value of the stamps.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER GLASS, Jr.

Mr. President, in addition I have received several dozen communications, wires, letters, and other messages with reference to the matter from collectors all over the country, expressing an interest in the stamps.

I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from a New York lawyer, addressed to Mr. Ickes, in which he writes that he has sent to Mr. Ickes, with a letter, his check, and asked Mr. Ickes to send the stamps to him in order that he might, thus acquiring them, turn them over to the Librarian of Congress, to be placed in the Nation's collection.

Mr. President, with the forebearance of the Senator from South Dakota, let me take one more moment. Mr. Ickes in a press conference yesterday advised that he is requesting the chancelor of New York University to return to him, Mr. Ickes, the stamps previously donated for the purpose of auctioning them off for the benefit of refugees.

Thus Mr. Ickes has himself shown his conception of their value. But that does not dispose of the 150 stamps which he still has in his possession, nor does it have reference to those which are outstanding, which have been used in trade for other rare stamps which Mr. Ickes wanted.

So, the whole matter has come to the point where Mr. Ickes has admitted the transaction. I thought Senators ought to know that circumstance.

### SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement setting forth the reasons which to me are all-controlling of the manner in which I should cast my vote upon the question now being considered by this body-that of abandoning the services of the American volunteer and substituting in his stead the conscript soldier. I regard the vote upon the pending measure to be the most important vote I shall ever be called upon to cast in this body. Upon the result of this vote hinges the ultimate destiny of this Republic. The question, plainly and bluntly put, is simply this: Shall we abandon the time-honored traditions of a peace-loving, liberty-loving people for that of military despotism? That is the question in a nutshell. Shall we abandon the system of a volunteer soldiery and force every young man in the country to take military training, become a part of a mighty war machine, and both in peace and war times obey and take orders from a military dictator?

# DRAFT MEANS REGIMENTATION

The proponents of this measure contend that the selective draft is the only democratic way. I do not agree with them. It is contended that we should adopt a program of universal compulsory military training for all young men of the country and then have the Government make the selection as to where and how these men can best serve their country. I am not in accord with that view. That means regimentation of our young men and takes away from them an opportunity to work out their own destiny in a free country. Who is to make the selection? Under the theory of the pending conscript bill some board, some commission, or some dictator is to tell every young man what he is best fitted for and what he must do in the service of his country, and the young man has no choice in the matter.

I agree that in wartime, in actual warfare, there must be a commander whom the others of us must obey, but in peace-time regimentation is repulsive to every concept of a free people. Every boy, when he approaches manhood, has some idea of his own, what he is best fitted for, and what he wants

to do in life. He is better qualified to choose life's calling for himself than is any board, commission, or dictator.

The thing that has made us a mighty Nation is that from the time of its birth up to this good hour this land has furnished every individual citizen an opportunity to work out his individual destiny as he thought best. Because the citizenship of this country have had that opportunity they have written a record of achievement that cannot be duplicated anywhere in the history of the world. We are now asked to turn our backs upon that record of achievement and say to the present citizen, and to the future citizen of this land, "From now on your Government will tell you what you are best fitted to do." I say to the Senate that if we pass this conscription bill we abandon the Government of a free Republic and substitute therefor that of a totalitarian state, which we profess so profoundly to hate. We are told that we must do this to defend ourselves because our volunteer system has broken down, when the fact is our volunteer system has not broken down. Every Senator has hundreds of applications from young men who want to go to Annapolis or to West Point to take special training to fit themselves to defend the flag when the occasion requires. Modern warfare is airplane and mechanized warfare. Give the youth of America an opportunity to volunteer and enlist in airplane and tank service and they will respond by the hundreds of thousands and it will not be necessary to identify them by searing on their backs a conscript brand. I do not want thus to brand citizens of America. I expect to vote for the Maloney substitute, but, regardless of whether or not that is adopted, I will vote against final passage of the bill. I will not at this time vote for any measure that will give power to any board or commission, or to anyone, to determine for the youth of America whether they shall become butchers, bakers, or candlestick makers. I want the youth of America to remain free to select their own life work. If we adopt this universal compulsory military training measure we will be doing the same thing that the Hitler government and the other military powers have been doing for ages, and we will cease to be a free Republic and will become a totalitarian

The people of the United States are for peace and not for war. There is practical solidarity among our people upon that proposition. The advocates of participation in conflict upon European battlefields are few and far between. There, however, is a marked division as to the methods to be used in charting our course for peace. There are those who believe that we should extend all aid to Britain on the theory that Britain is standing between us and danger and fighting the battle for our democracy. I cannot subscribe to that view. We did that once before. Less than 25 years ago, in response to the same kind of a request that is now made of us, we sent our armies across the sea and participated in the power disputes of Europe. The sacrifices we then made are still fresh in the memories of our people. Our soldiers won that war, but the statesmen of France and the statesmen of Great Britain for whom we won it failed to write a treaty of peace that lasted for one generation. If we now repeat those sacrifices, our pay-off will be the same.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE LEADS TO WAR

Of course, Mr. President, we are not satisfied with the way things are going in Europe. Their methods of human government are repulsive to us. Their modes of human life are incompatible with our views. High officials in our system of government in loud voices proclaim from the house tops the viciousness of corporate government, describe how the people of Europe are enmeshed and enthralled, and state that the people of free America will never submit to the rule of Stalin, of Mussolini, or of Hitler. I agree to that. I agree that in our free country we will fight to the last man before we surrender our flag. Upon our own soil we will fight to the last man to keep that flag floating over the citadel of every home, and upon our soil will never permit that flag to bite the dust.

I do not know why we should become so excited about the European situation. The European war is not anything out of the ordinary. Any country that has compulsory military training for its citizens has got to have a war every so often.

There is nothing unusual about that, except perhaps that the tide of battle at the present time is running a little out of form. That is the only difference. No matter how the battle goes, this will not be the last war over there. They have fought many wars before and patched up a peace, but immediately started conscripting for the next war. That is the inevitable result of compulsory military training. No matter how the war goes over there, it will not settle anything. In about 25 years from now they will be at it again; just so soon as they can conscript and train a new generation they will start over again. The military dictators have got to exercise the conscript soldier. The same thing will happen in this country if we pass this measure and create a large military machine. The Army generals who operate the machine will not want it to remain idle.

Mr. President, I cannot see that we are in any danger of attack from Europe, no matter who the victor may be. Whoever may win that war will have all he can do to look after his own country and prepare for the next war. Dictators cannot agree long on a division of power or a division of spoils. If Hitler should win, he would have a hell of a time holding on to his winnings over there and would have no time to take us on.

We are told a great deal about the Japanese. I have heard about threats from Japan ever since I can remember. For more than 50 years I have heard that the "Japanese will get us if we don't watch out." They have not gotten us yet, and, so far as I know, they have never threatened to get us. Japan has its hands full in its own country.

So let us keep our feet on the ground and not become unduly excited about matters that in all probability will never happen.

It must be said that up to this good hour neither Stalin, Mussolini, nor Hitler has made any effort to interfere with our national life. We have proclaimed to all the world that we stand upon the Monroe Doctrine, Arierica for Americans, and will brook no interference. By the same token we ought to permit the people of Europe to say, "Europe for Europeans" without any interference from us and "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." The dictators of Europe will have all they can do handling the affairs of Europe if we let them alone, and they will keep on quarreling among themselves unless we by our wanton interference in their affairs force their dictatorial solidarity to deal with us in retaliation for such interference. I can see no danger of our being attacked by Europe unless we go out and promote an attack. If we let Europe work out its own destiny, we need not become alarmed for our own safety. The first speech I ever attempted to make upon the floor of the Senate was in opposition to involving this country in the power politics of European governments.

STOP MEDDLING IN EUROPE'S AFFAIRS

Mr. President, as a boy I was much interested in the story of old Dog Tray who got into a lot of trouble because of the company he kept and by frequenting places where he had no business to be. Many nations have gotten into trouble and passed from the stage of action because of being overambitious to meddle with other people's affairs. Let us not make that sad mistake. Let us prepare for a proper defense in this war-mad world to meet any eventuality that may arise, but let us remember that the strongest link we can have in our chain of national defense is to mind our own business and not provoke a fight even if some of us have an idealistic ambition to become guardian angels for other peoples. Be a good neighbor but let the good neighbor run his own governmental affairs. Attend to our own business, and we will get along all right. The American people do not again want to engage in a useless foreign war upon foreign soil. We do not promote the peace which our people want by asking them to forget all differences of opinion and unite behind a single program under the avowed, spoken purpose to keep this country out of war, when almost every official governmental act we take brings us one step closer to Armageddon.

On Sunday we pray loud and long for peace and ask God not to involve our country in war, but throughout the week on every working day we do about everything we can think of to bring our country closer to war involvement. On Sunday we are pious; we are neutral. On Monday we forget about our neutrality. On Sunday we take no part in the fight; on Monday we itch to get in. On Sunday we furnish no war material to either side; on Monday we want to turn over 50 battleships to one of the contestants. On Sunday we are holier than thou; on Monday we want to raise the devil. On Sunday we are for maintaining peace; on Monday we want to open up our harbors to service a foreign battle fleet and give everything we have to one of the combatants in an effort to get into the war. On Sunday we are noninterventionists; on Monday we want to intervene. Still we boast about stability of our foreign policy as the only thing that will keep us out of war.

Mr. President, I voted against the confirmation of our present Secretary of War because I want to stay out of war and he wants to get in. That was the main reason. There is another secondary reason why I voted against him. I am a Democrat: the Secretary of War is a Republican. I believe we have many Democrats competent to be Secretary of War; I believe that in a Democratic administration at least half of the Cabinet members should be Democrats. As it is we now only have two real Democrats in the Cabinet, Cordell Hull and Jim Farley. On the last of this month Jim Farley will take a walk out of the Cabinet, and I should not be at all surprised if the Senate should vote to advise the President to appoint a Republican Postmaster General to take the place of Jim Farley in order to show that we are not playing politics in an election year. Well, that just is not my doctrine and I cannot go along with it. I am a Democrat and believe that the Democratic administration should be run by Democrats. I believe that when the people of the country select a Democrat for ringmaster they want the show run by Democrats and not by Republicans. I am a real Democrat and, as a Democrat, I am far more interested in keeping this country out of war than I am in electing any man to the

Mr. President, it is said that Congress alone can declare war and that Congress should remain in session to keep the United States out of war. I believe that the country would have been far better off had Congress adjourned a couple of months ago after it appropriated sufficient funds to provide for a proper national defense. The halls of Congress furnish a forum to make rabble-rousing speeches that keep the country disturbed. If we would adopt a foreign policy of sawing wood and saying nothing, build a proper defense and quit hollering about it, cut out the oratory, including fireside chats, we would get along all right and the country would be far better off.

Mr. President, the people of the country have been flooding every Member of Congress with telegrams and letters to remain in session and keep the country out of war. Congress can pass laws that it thinks will do that, but it has no effective ways of enforcing the laws it passes. Enforcement is up to another branch of our Government. Congress can pass the necessary measures and provide the necessary appropriations for national defense, but to execute the will of Congress is the function of the administrative branch. Congress can pass a Neutrality Act; it can pass an Arms Embargo Act; but it does not seem to have any effective way of preventing the administrative agencies from planning, scheming, conniving, and devising ways and means to get around the act. When Lincoln was a young man he once had a problem about plowing a field. In the field was a large log which had interfered with plowing for many years. Lincoln was asked how he got along with plowing the field and he said, "Fine," and that he had finished the work. "What did you do about the log?" "I did not do a thing about the log. It did not bother me a bit, I just plowed around it." Sometimes Federal administrative agencies are not bothered much with acts of Congress-they just plow

Mr. President, it is written in the Constitution that Congress only shall have power to declare war. The founding fathers when they wrote our Constitution wisely embodied

that provision. But in this modernistic age, under the new order of things, we cannot be handicapped by the Constitution. We devise ways and means to plow around it.

The country is being flooded with paid propaganda that we must give everything we have to England, except men, in order to save ourselves from destruction. If we do that, our men will be forced to follow just as sure as night follows day. We are told that England is fighting for the people of the United States. I cannot subscribe to that view. I believe that the best service we can render to the people of England is to say to their government, "We will not aid you in this war. Patch up the best peace you can and quit the fight." If our Government should say to the British Government, "We will not again come to your rescue as we did before," we would not repeat the sacrifices we made in the World War. If we adopted such a policy, I am convinced it would do more toward restoring peace in Europe than any other thing we could do. Had Poland not relied upon promised help from France and England she would have patched up a peace with the German Reich, there would be a Poland today, and the hell's inferno that now engulfs all of Europe might never have broken loose. The English Government will be able to write better terms for its people into an armistice today than it will be able to write after it shall have sacrificed the flower of its manhood upon the altar of war. The British Government will be able to write a better peace for its people now while the power of its manhood is still a force than it will be able to write after the souls of millions of its heroic people, in a useless sacrifice to satisfy a few men's ambition for power, shall have winged their untimely but everlasting fight to the realms of eternal peace from their war-torn country. No matter who may be the victor upon today's battlefield in Europe, victory will not bring permanent peace to his country. No matter who may write or dictate the peace treaty, it will not last. I do not want my country again to become involved in such a conflict. We can stay out of it if we avoid taking the successive steps which will eventually lead us into that involvement.

I would not be true to myself, nor true to the people whom I have the honor in part to represent in this body, nor true to my country if I violated the conscientious conception of my duty here. I am for peace and not for war. I, personally, have no desire to participate in the constant warfare of Europe. I, personally, would not go over there, and I will not knowingly cast my vote for a measure which I believe will lead the people of my country into a foreign war on alien soil where I myself would hesitate to go.

# MONROE DOCTRINE NOT "A ONE-WAY STREET"

Mr. President, we are told that one of the reasons for the pending conscription bill is that we want to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. We hear a great deal about the Monroe Doctrine and men's minds seem to differ considerably as to just what the Monroe Doctrine is. As I have always understood the Monroe Doctrine, it simply means America for Americans, and that the people of America claim the right to conduct their own governmental affairs after their own fashion, according to their own idea, without interference from foreign powers. In other words, we want to run our own business in our own way; and by the same doctrine we ought to be willing to let the people of Asia and the people of Europe run their business in the manner they desire without interference from us.

The other day the learned and distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Ashurst] aptly stated that the Monroe Doctrine was not a one-way street; that upon it traffic operated both ways, and that both the going and coming traffic was of equal importance in the maintenance of that historic doctrine. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the view of the distinguished Senator. If we want to maintain the Monroe Doctrine in America, we must let the people of Europe maintain it in their own part of the world in such fashion as suits them, without interference from us. Before the judgment of the world, if we want to sustain that doctrine we must come into court with clean hands; if we seek equity we must do equity. No foreign power that I know of has challenged

or threatened the Monroe Doctrine in America. We cannot say as much for our attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine in Europe. If Europe meddles with our affairs it will be in retaliation because we meddled with the affairs of Europe.

Mr. President, we hear much about our foreign policy, and how important it is to maintain that foreign policy so that all the world may know just where we stand. It is said that we must have a firm foreign policy to command respect among the nations of the earth-a foreign policy so powerful that dictators will tremble when we speak. For more than a year we argued that our President could not even tell his people whether or not he wanted to run for office again because it would interfere with our foreign policy. For a time we had a Secretary of War who adhered strictly to the time-honored American tradition of nonintervention in foreign wars, and our openly announced foreign policy was one of nonintervention. Suddenly, without warning, he was kicked out, the foremost interventionist of this Republic was made Secretary of War, and overnight our foreign policy became one of intervention. What really is our foreign policy? What is it today? What was it yesterday, and what will it be tomorrow? My mind works rather slowly, and it is very difficult for me to follow the reasoning which would justify the necessity for the many rapid changes in our foreign policy. One day we pass a neutrality act and say that our foreign policy is to take no part in foreign wars to help either side; the next day we modify or repeal it. One day we pass an arms embargo act and say that our foreign policy is that we will not sell powder, guns, and instruments of warfare to fighting nations; and the next day we start scheming and conniving ways and means to get around the act; and the day after that we repeal the act. One day we shout loud and long that we will never vote to send an American boy to fight upon foreign soil; the next day we vote to give our Commander in Chief power to send our home-guard boys to fight anywhere on the Western Hemisphere, but not in Europe. Tomorrow we may vote to send them to Europe.

I have heard many Senators upon this floor declare that they would never again vote to send any American boy to fight upon foreign soil. Yet the other day I saw 71 Senators vote to give power to the President to send even our home guard boys to fight anywhere on the Western Hemisphere, and only 7 Senators voted against it. I am proud to boast that I was one of the 7; and I desire to say that I will never vote to give the President power to send any American soldier to fight in a foreign land until after Congress has declared war. I mean what I say when I make that statement. Nobody knows what our foreign policy will be tomorrow. I do not even know what it is today. I know what it ought to be today; I know what it ought to have been yesterday, and I know what it ought to be tomorrow. Our foreign policy should be to quit meddling in the power politics of Europe. We should attend strictly to our own business, with an eye single for the good of the people of this Republic, and let other nations conduct their own internal affairs as they see fit.

WE MUST NOT REPEAT 1917-18

Nations, like individuals, should benefit from experience. Our country has had one sad and costly experience in meddling in Europe's affairs. We must not repeat that experience. I have lived a little past man's allotted time of three-score years and ten, and the road which I have traveled has perhaps been that of the average man. I have never had a fight with any man in my life, and therefore have never been licked. I have seen many opportunities when I could have stuck my nose into the other fellow's business and got it smashed; but by attending strictly to my own affairs I have avoided that difficulty. We, as a Nation, should keep our nose out of Europe. We have no business there. We cannot settle anything there. If the people of Europe want to live under dictators, that is their affair; if they want to fight among themselves, let them fight. If we do not want any government of Europe messing in our affairs, let us not mess in theirs. If we follow that policy we shall be reasonably safe and the storm clouds will clear up without much danger to

us. The best foreign policy we can have is to forget about our ambitions to dictate the power politics of the world, and attend strictly to our own knitting. If I had my way, not only would we stay out of Europe, but I should not "monkey around" very much south of the Equator in the Western Hemisphere. We should probably be much better off if we were to confine our Monroe Doctrine to the North American Continent and let the South American nations run their affairs in their own manner. Be a good neighbor, but let the good neighbor run his own household.

The other day the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Pepper], in his argument for the passage of the bill calling the National Guard into the military service of the Nation, called attention to the fact that the recent Habana meeting of the nations of the Western Hemisphere expressed the view that some of the South American countries are a little doubtful as to the real purpose of our good-neighbor policy; that they are a little skeptical as to our preparedness to engage in war; and that some of the South American countries have the idea that we are entirely unprepared to defend ourselves, and we are promoting the good-neighbor policy for selfish reasons, to get them to rake our chestnuts out of the fire.

If they have such an idea, perhaps we had better retreat a little in our attempt to enforce our Monroe Doctrine upon them. After all, South America is a great agricultural region and our foremost competitor for world trade in agricultural products. The standard of living of many of its people is not comparable to our own, and few of them speak our language. Its governmental policies and traditions are not in harmony with ours. Perhaps we should be better off if we were to apply our Monroe Doctrine to our own country and our own possessions and let it go at that, and not become involved by taking in too much territory.

It may be said that there was a time when nations could live alone and get along, but that under our modern civilization that cannot be done. The people of the United States are fortunately situated and are a fortunate people. We are better able to sustain ourselves without contributions from other nations than are any other people on the face of the earth. We can survive for a long time without contributions from anyone. When most other nations have gone war mad, I am not so sure but that the best thing we can do is to stay at home and, if necessary, live on hominy, beans, and spinach until the storm blows over, until crazy men have destroyed one another, and abide the time when it is safe for decent men to walk the earth.

Mr. President, the passage of the pending measure providing for universal compulsory military training for the people of this Republic will put us into the war-mad parade as certainly as night follows day. Conscript the youth of this Nation and put them in a war machine and war will inevitably follow. Pass this measure and we turn our backs upon the greatest tradition of our country and destroy the boast of a free people. What has made us a great people? What has made us a mighty nation? Why is it that citizenship in the United States is the most valued in all the world? Why is it that our flag-the Stars and Stripes-is the cynosure of the eyes of all the earth? That flag was made great and powerful not by a conscript soldiery, but by humble volunteers. The volunteer soldier makes the best soldier on the face of the earth. When Israel Putnam left his plow in the furrowed field and marched away in order that he might attend the birth of a nation he initiated the spirit of the American soldier, and that spirit has persisted throughout our history. Today this country has more than 50,000,000 Israel Putnams who will leave their plows in the furrowed fields and answer the bugle call to repel the invader in defense of their flag. We destroy patriotism and love for the flag when we sear the volunteer soldier with a conscription brand.

The pages of history record the achievements of many people, many races, and many nations since Adam and his descendants took up their march. Nowhere upon the pages of history in all the tide of time is there any record of achievements comparable to our own. We are told that there was a time when to be a Roman was to be greater than to be a

king; yet there came a time when to be a Roman meant to be a vassal and a slave. It took Rome a thousand years to reach her golden age of glory, and half as long to die. It took centuries of bloodshed, toil, and carnage to sow the seeds of a republican form of government in the isles and valleys of Greece, culminating in the constitutional reforms of Cleisthenes. The poet has said:

The isles of Greece! The isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung,
Where grew the arts of war and peace,
Where Delos rose, and Phoebus sprung!
Eternal summer gilds them yet,
But all, except their sun, is set.

Mr. President, the English people boast that for 1,000 years no invader has set his foot upon the sacred soil of their beloved isles. It took many generations and many centuries of time to build the great British Empire; in fact it was builded for so long that today she has no memory of the inception of whatever is good in her traditions and in her laws.

Why is it that this Republic of ours in the short space of 150 years has not only become the greatest but the most beloved land in all the world? We do not boast of our achievements in conquest. We are not a warlike people. We boast of our achievements in peace and not in war. The greatness of this Nation is builded upon that immortal document penned by the hand of Thomas Jefferson, in which he first announced to humankind that all men are created free and are entitled to equal rights and opportunities, and that all men stand equal before the law. That was a new doctrine upon the earth. That doctrine attracted the emigrant from every land under the burning sun. Those emigrants and their descendants builded this mighty Republic in the short space of 150 years. Most of them came to this land of equal opportunity, the land of the free, to get away from laws similar to the one we are now asked to impose upon their descendants—a soldiers' conscription law forcing the citizen of this free Republic to join in bloody warfare with other nations in a war-mad world.

My father came to this land of the free from Germany a little before he reached the age when Germany would have conscripted him as a soldier and forced him to devote the best years of his life in training for a soldier's job-to kill and shoot other people. I dare say most of the other immigrants came here for the same reason—to get away from military dictatorships. The would-be power lords of Europe are now engaged in their usual occupation of war. The military dictators in Europe are in a struggle to see who shall boss the people of that part of the world. These military dictators were made possible only because of universal compulsory military training laws. They were created through the power of enforced conscription. While we are at peace with all the world and have no quarrel with any foreign people and while our sovereignty has not been threatened by anyone, we are asked to abandon our time-honored tradition of a free people and force all our citizens into compulsory training. We are asked to pass a conscription law and adopt the same policy which has made dictators possible in Europe and for centuries has bathed that continent in human tears and human blood.

CONSECIPTION MEANS DICTATORSHIP

We are told that we must enact a conscription law to keep our Government out of totalitarian hands. If we pass this universal compulsory military training bill the days of the Republic will be numbered, and our boasted freedom will soon pass into a historic memory. Pass the conscription bill and create a mighty military machine among a free people and we shall have dictatorship. Pass the conscription bill and we shall create an army Frankenstein which a free people cannot control. Pass the conscription bill and it will bring on totalitarian government, and dictatorship will soon be here.

I am an old man.

My race is almost run. For more than 70 years I have lived a happy life among a free people. I am glad my father left the land which gave him birth that he might escape the iron hand of military rule and that he permitted me to be born under the Stars and Stripes and live my life among a

free people. I am thankful that in this, the evening of my life—my twilight hour—I am given an opportunity to raise my humble voice in the Senate of the United States against the passage of a measure which would spell the doom of this Republic. I cannot be consoled by the thought of some of my colleagues, expressed on the floor of the Senate, that it is only an emergency act to tide us over an emergency, when no national emergency exists. I hope and pray that there are enough Senators to maintain our time-honored traditions, and that during peacetime we may trust the defense of our country to the volunteer soldiers who have made such an enviable record during the 150 years of our national life.

Mr. President, under the so-called New Deal we have departed many times from traditional policies. We have tried many new experiments. I voted for most of them. Most of them were good. Some of them were bad. None of them was fatal; but let me beg of the Senate not to try this New Deal experiment of discharging the country's volunteer defenders and putting in their places a conscript soldiery, striking a death blow at the foundations of the Republic. Let us not take that fatal step. There is no threatened national emergency except an imaginary one.

Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that the only present emergency in this country is the coming national election, and that is not at all dangerous unless we adopt the proposed military program. The election of a President of a free people is not an emergency. It may be an emergency for the candidate, but not for the people. The candidate may feel that the salvation of the country depends upon his election; but that is not so. We have at least 100,000 citizens in this country who would make good Presidents, competent to guide our ship of state safely, even upon a tempestuous sea. So long as we are a free people, even if we should make a mistake in the selection of a President, we can correct that mistake in 4 years; but if we join the military nations of the earth, pass a conscription law, force all our young men to take military training, and make them obey Army commanders, the same thing will happen in this country which has happened in many other countries. The military power will become supreme; and if that happens a free people may not have many more chances to elect a President. Let us not take that chance; let us not take the fatal step. Let us not conscript our manpower into the Army and join the war-mad parade.

Mr. President, it may be that this is the beginning of the fulfillment of the prophecy of many centuries ago, when the human race was young in respect to its ultimate destiny. Perhaps the four horsemen—War, Famine, Pestilence, and Death—have started their prophetic ride. Perhaps three of those horsemen are Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler. We must hope, trust, pray, and see to it that the fourth horseman shall not be a President of the United States. I do not believe that day is at hand.

The human race in its march of destiny has fought many wars. Many days were dark, gloomy, and terrible, when hope almost disappeared. During the ages many men have undertaken the conqueror's task. No one has ever succeeded. No one man or no race of men has ever conquered the world; and let us be assured that none will ever do so. Hitler may for the moment strike terror to human hearts. But his day will end as the days of all conquerors have ended; and the blackness of a dismal night will end in the glorious dawn of a new day, as has always happened in the Creator's appointed time.

We know that will happen. We know that the black war clouds which now engulf the earth will in due course pass away. We know that our country can escape the hurricane unless we commit it to the storm. Let us forget about the quarrels among ambitious men seeking world power and devote our efforts solely to the preservation of this Republic. Let us not commit the destiny of a free and liberty-loving people to the rule of military despots by the passage of the conscription bill.

I pray to Almighty God that the bill will not pass. I hope and pray that the United States, my native land, will remain

a free Republic and that our flag and all it stands for may continue to float over every home. I hope and trust and pray that in the land where I was born and where I have lived a long and happy life, in the land which I have played my humble part in helping to build, my children and my children's children, and their children, may enjoy the same blessings of liberty I have enjoyed, and that they and their descendants may remain a free people in this great Republic.

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Yesterday I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the Army Recruiting News, the official magazine of the Army, two or three pages had been deleted from a certain article. General Marshall today issued the following statement:

Marshall said that an article in the August issue of Army Recruiting News telling of excellent progress in the voluntary enlistment program had been suppressed without his knowledge.

Marshall said that an unidentified person connected with the publication in New York had advised with a subordinate official of The Adjutant General's office here, who directed that the page be deleted on the grounds that it did not conform to the policy of publishing only actual data and no opinions.

One of the statements in the deleted page said that the Army recruiting program is "progressing at an excellent rate."

Marshall said that the action constituted suppression, and that he was amazed at the "very unfortunate" judgment displayed in the matter. He said he had told the Senate Military Affairs Committee yesterday that in the last week reported, the number en-

mittee yesterday that in the last week reported, the number en-listed is something over 8,000, the largest we have ever had.

If I may be pardoned for just a moment-

Mr. DAVIS. Go ahead.

Mr. WHEELER. I have great respect and great admiration for General Marshall; but does anybody believe it to be possible that some subordinate in The Adjutant General's office suppressed an article written by the Chief of Staff for the Regular Army magazine? I repeat, can anyone imagine some subordinate suppressing a statement by the Chief of Staff? Who was it that could suppress such an article? Who was it that would dare to suppress such an article? Would anybody dare to suppress an article by the Chief of Staff except the Secretary of War himself?

The letter I referred to yesterday, which gave me this information, said that the writer had it upon the most reliable information that the article was suppressed by the Secretary

of War himself.

As I said, I have great respect for General Marshall, I can appreciate General Marshall's situation. It would place him in a very difficult position to say that the Secretary of War had suppressed an article by him; but the fact is that it was suppressed, and anybody who is familiar with the Army knows that some subordinate official of The Adjutant General's office here in Washington would not dare for one moment to suppress a statement by the Chief of Staff.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from

Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was wondering if the Senator from Montana had been successful in securing a copy of the article which was deleted from the magazine.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not. The only thing I have is the statement which was issued by General Marshall.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Has the Senator made inquiry as to whether or not the article is procurable?

Mr. WHEELER. The only statement I have made is the one I made on the floor of the Senate, in which I stated that I felt that the whole pages that were deleted ought to be furnished to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a result of the statement made by the able Senator yesterday, at which time I was here and heard him, I am wondering if as yet there has been any offer from the War Department, or the publishers of the official magazine, to provide the Senator with a copy of the article, or the data for the 2 pages that were deleted.

Mr. WHEELER. None whatever.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Montana let me see the matter he has put in the RECORD?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly. I hand it to the Senator. Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Montana professes great respect and admiration for and confidence in General Marshall, and then he reads an article by General Marshall and proceeds to say that it does not speak the truth. He has great admiration and respect for a man whom he accuses here on the floor of the Senate of telling something that is not true.

Mr. President, I do not know who deleted the article. I do not know what the article was. It seems that it is claimed that 8,000 recruits were obtained for the Regular Army in 1 week. All right. They got 8,000 in a week. They say they need 800,000 under this bill. There are only 52 weeks in a year. Five years from now we shall have a pretty fair little Army.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Davis] has the floor. I am just using it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hughes in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. Mr. LODGE. Every month 12,000 men go out of the Army because their enlistments expire.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. Of course, there is a turn-over in the Army, and, as the Senator says, 12,000 men leave the Army every month.

Mr. President, I am shocked by the terrible crime which has been committed by someone in The Adjutant General's office-deleting a page in this announcement. Think of it! The fact that we are going to get 8,000 men a week has been withheld-8,000 a week, 52 weeks in a year, 400,000 a year. We shall get about 400,000 the first year at the rate of 8,000 a week, if I still know my arithmetic. We shall get 400,000 this year, and in the meantime 12,000 will go out-was that 12,000 a month, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. Twelve thousand a month.

Mr. CONNALLY. At that rate we should be like the man crawling out of the well, who crawled up 3 feet and fell back 2 feet. [Laughter.] We should get in 8,000 a week, which would be 32,000 a month, and we should lose 12,000 a month, so we should get a net increase of 20,000 a month. That would be 240,000 the first year, and 240,000 the second year; so at the end of 1942, would it be, or 1941-

Mr. BARKLEY. Nineteen forty-two and a half. Mr. CONNALLY. At the end of 1942½ we would have what the Army says they want by next April.

That important information has been kept from the country. If the country knew that, they would be against this bill, because they do not want any army until after the war is over.

Mr. President, what I rose to say was that I really am surprised that the Senator from Montana should accuse General Marshall of making a false statement. He did not use the word "false," but he said he quoted General Marshall, who says that a subordinate in The Adjutant General's office did this thing, and then he proceeded to say that everybody knows that somebody else did it. I am willing to take the word of General Marshall until we get better evidence than the suspicions of the Senator from Montana. If the Senator from Montana will make an affirmative statement about something that he knows about, I shall accept it; but I do not propose to put into this RECORD on mere suspicion falsification of a solemn statement of the Chief of Staff of the Army, this man for whom the Senator from Montana has such lofty respect and admiration. I do not admire anybody who goes

around telling falsehoods, whether he be Chief of Staff, or Secretary of War, or Senator.

I take it upon myself to resent for General Marshallthough he is no particular friend of mine—the unwarranted insinuations made by the Senator from Montana.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me. Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad, and I know that General Marshall will feel highly pleased and gratified, that he has such a distinguished gentleman as the Senator from Texas to resent any statement which might be made in the Senate about anything.

What I stated was that I did have great respect for General Marshall and I do have great respect for him, but I called attention to what the general himself said. He calls attention himself to the excellent progress in the voluntary enlistment program that has been suppressed without his knowledge. He deplored the fact that somebody cut it out, and he further said that some unidentified person connected with the publication in New York had advised with a subordinate official of The Adjutant General's office here who directed that the pages be deleted on the ground that they did not conform with the policy of publishing only actual data and not opinions.

I repeat, can it be imagined that some unidentified official in the Army would delete something that was inserted by the General Staff? What was the opinion of the Chief of Staff? His opinion apparently was that they had done a great job and that the program was going forward.

The Senator criticizes or ridicules the idea that 8,000 was the largest number ever enlisted in the history of enlistments in the Army. I say that is a thing the Army should be proud of, the fact that they had the largest number in 1 week that has ever been enlisted in history. It must be remembered that that is on a 3-year basis and on the basis of \$21 a month. We have already adopted an amendment raising the pay to \$30 a month and already in the bill there is a provision for 1-year enlistments. So I say that the 1-year enlistment upon the \$30-a-month basis, with an opportunity for a young man to advance after he gets into the Army, will be an incentive to men to enlist. I do not know of any intelligent person in the Army who would not say that if we gave the soldiers a chance to learn something, and paid them \$30 a month, with an opportunity of advancement, we would not get more enlistments. I do not know of anyone who would say that unless, perchance, it might be my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana permit a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly. Mr. BARKLEY. We can all use figures which are admitted to be correct in behalf of our own position on many subjects. Yesterday it was declared that during July there was a net increase in enlistments of 23,000, and when we subtract about 12,000 a month who go out, the net increase in the Army for July was about 11,000.

We can use these figures according to our own viewpoint of them. But admitting 8,000 net enlisted in 1 week, it would amount to about 32,000 a month, and if there were retirements from the Army it would take 3 months to raise the Army to the 375,000, which is its authorized strength, but if we subtract from the 32,000 a month the 12,000 who go out, we have a net of only 20,000, which means that it would take about 5 months at the same rate to complete the enlistments necessary to fill the Army to 375,000 men.

In his remarks a moment ago, the Senator said that while General Marshall might not have known anything about the deletion which took place in New York after some subordinate had conferred with some other subordinate in The Adjutant General's office-I presume the publication was printed in New YorkMr. WHEELER. I assume so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the Senator to intimate that he did not believe that could have been done without the Secretary of War knowing about it. If the Senator has any information which leads him to form such an opinion, or which would justify the suspicion that, although General Marshall knew nothing about this deletion, the Secretary of War himself knew about it and connived at it and consented to it or procured it, he should tell the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. I was very much surprised, but the information which came to me was that this had been

deleted from 27,000 of these official papers.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was the number of the publica-

Mr. WHEELER. That it had been deleted from 27,000. I could not believe it until I checked it up. It was stated it was deleted because of the fact that it contained a statement by General Marshall, and it was said it was deleted on authority from Secretary Stimson.

I then checked it up and found these pages had been deleted out of 27,000 copies. I found that to be a fact.

General Marshall's statement bears out the second statement made by the person who gave me this information, and the only thing remaining which has not been definitely proved is that Mr. Stimson ordered it. I did not say that General Marshall made a false statement when he said that some subordinate did it. That may be the honest opinion of General Marshall, and that does not mean that when he made the statement that some subordinate did it, he had all the facts, any more than when I say that my opinion is that Mr. Stimson ordered it done, I have all the facts. I have made no statement that General Marshall lied, and I would not make any statement to that effect, and the inference put upon my statement by the Senator from Texas, in my judgment, is entirely unjustified. I stated that it was inconceivable to me that some subordinate officer would delete from the official Army magazine a statement and a letter, if it was a letter, or an opinion, or a statement of fact, which was put in there by the Chief of Staff himself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of all that, there cannot be any doubt that the number of men who have been enlisted has been made a matter of public knowledge every week. It was testified before the Committee on Military Affairs, it has been given out in the press, and any Senator can call The Adjutant General over the telephone and ascertain how many men are in the Regular Army every day of the year. So that unless there was some expression of opinion aside from the mere recital of fact, I do not see how it would have been to the advantage of anyone to delete two pages, or any number of pages.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. Facts are the facts, wherever they are

Mr. WHEELER. I agree. I cannot conceive why the pages should be deleted. In view of what has happened, I think we should have the pages which were deleted, and I am sure the Senator can get them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator gives me credit for a power I do not possess. I do not know where they are. I do not know who has them. I have no more authority over them than has the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senate has a regular order of procedure, but it is not following it. The Chair does not know whether the Senator from Pennsylvania has yielded or whether he has not.

Mr. DAVIS. I yielded to the Senator from Montana for a question, and I am very happy always to yield to the very distinguished leader of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There may be no objection. but the Chair insists that the rules be followed.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall not quibble about the number of men who have enlisted or how many leave the Army every month. I do not know whether or not 12,000 leave every month. But the figures which I understood had been given to the Senate

covered not merely the new enlistments but the net new enlistments in the Army. I may be in error with reference to that, but that statement was made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me it is immaterial how many men enter the Army or leave it, so far as the evidence before this body is concerned. What is material is that when the Army fixed a quota for a given month, it had in mind how many would leave the service and it had in mind how many it needed, and up to date every quota the Army asked for has been filled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair insists Senators follow the rule.

Mr. WHEELER. I thought I was following the rule. The Senator from Pennsylvania has yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is whether he continues to yield.

Will the Senator yield? Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Does that satisfy the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not exactly.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask again, Mr. President, will the Senator vield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Now that we have followed the correct procedure with reference to debate, I wish to say that, of course, what the Senator from Massachusetts said is correct. The question is, Have the Army quotas been filled? The answer is that they not only have been filled but in recent months they have been filled in less time than had been expected. The Army has gotten more men in less time than ever before in the history.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not think the Army will have any trouble in filling the quota at any time, if it adheres to the policy of 1-year enlistments.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hughes in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Montana makes reference to the Senator from Texas as being "the distinguished Senator," with a sneer in his voice.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; the Senator from Texas can read a sneer just as far as he can see one.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well; if the Senator wishes to interpret it in that way-

Mr. CONNALLY. I make no claim to being distinguished. I would rather be a plain, ordinary Senator who tries to stick to the facts.

I rose awhile ago to suggest that the Senator from Montana, according to my opinion, without any warrant, has in effect said that General Marshall had made a false statement. I wish to read a statement. If I understood the Senator from Montana a while ago—and I am standing very close to him, and if I am in error I want him to correct me—he said that General Marshall had written an article, and that article was supposed to be published in the Recruiting News, and that someone had deleted a portion of that article. Is that true?

Mr. WHEELER. That is my understanding. Mr. CONNALLY. Well, is it true?

Mr. WHEELER. That is my understanding.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said it was a fact. I am not talking about understandings. I want facts now. We are dealing with a very serious matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, if the Senator—
Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator has some little fellow who calls him out into the cloakroom, or out yonder, and

whispers to him so and so, and then he comes in on the floor of the Senate and states it as a fact. I should like the RECORD to show it, or if he has documentary evidence I should like him to present the documentary evidence.

When a Senator makes a statement on the floor he is sup-

posed to make it on his responsibility as a Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I am making it as— Mr. CONNALLY. All right, he did. I have the article

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator has reached the point where he can read a sneer upon my face, or a sneer when I say something to him, then I do not care to get into an argument with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, the Senator is not going to get into an argument with me, because that is exactly what the Senator from Texas said; he not only can read a sneer on the Senator's face but he can see one.

Mr. WHEELER. All right.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us get to the facts. The Senator from Montana said that General Marshall wrote an article. That article was supposed to be published in the Recruiting News. And while he makes that statement he holds in his hand this supposed newspaper report. Let us see what is in that. Let us see whether it says anything about General Marshall writing an article. I am talking about facts. I am not talking about gossip. I am not talking about whisperers of supposed facts who are trying to poison the minds of the public about these publications.

I will read all this. If I do not read it correctly the Senator from Montana is sitting close to me and he can correct me.

The article refers to some other matters—a press release I suppose from the War Department-but here is what it says about General Marshall on this particular matter:

Marshall said that an article in the August issue of Army Recruiting News telling of excellent progress in the voluntary enlistment program had been suppressed without his knowledge.

It does not say anything about who wrote the article. It does not say that Marshall wrote it. It does not say that a subordinate in the Adjutant General's office wrote it. It does not say that the Secretary of War wrote it. It says an article-

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas vield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not have the floor. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Davis] has the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair again objects to Senators proceeding in the way they are proceeding, and asks Senators to follow the rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania please yield temporarily to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that he is, I think putting a very unfair construction upon what I said. I may have said that General Marshall wrote the article-

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator say that or not? Mr. WHEELER. I think probably I did. I do not recall. Mr. CONNALLY. I think everybody else thinks he did, too.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not going to get into an argument with the Senator from Texas.

I wish to say to the Senator very frankly that when I read the statement by General Marshall objecting to this newspaper story, I assumed from what he said there himself that it was an article by himself. I may be mistaken, but I still think that the Senator will find that the article that was deleted was an article, or words, by General Marshall himself. Of course, I do not have the article, but I will venture the assertion that if you can obtain a copy of the article it will show that General Marshall wrote it, and that it was deleted. Of course, I have not seen the article. I assumed from what

General Marshall himself said about its being deleted, and about its suppression, that it conformed with my views. If the Senator wants to get into a controversy with me over whether I said that it was an article written by General Marshall or whether it was written by somebody else he is welcome to do so.

I wish to say to the Senator that there is no one calling me up on the telephone, no one giving me any gossip. The information came to me from a very reliable source, and if I may say so to the Senator, from one of the most reputable men in the press gallery.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was satisfied that the Senator got it-The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Penn-

sylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania please yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not mean to charge that there was any particular spot where the Senator got it, but I knew, after I read this article, which he held in his hand, that he did not get it from the War Department, and I naturally concluded that he got it somewhere else, and he now says that he got it somewhere else. He did not get it from the record; he got it from somebody talking in his ear like this [illustrating]. [Laughter in the galleries.] I do not know who the man was, but the Senator does.

Mr. President, that is not the point. So far as the argument on the pending bill is concerned, I do not care anything about whether the Army got 5,000 or 8,000 or 10,000 men. The point I am making is that the Senator from Montana is trying to cast aspersions on the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War is no friend of mine especially; he is, however, an officer of the Government, and I think he is trying to do his duty—I hope he is—in his own way, just as well as the Senator from Montana is performing his here. I accord the Senator every right to his opinion, and to his voice, and to his speaking, and to his insinuations, and to all that.

Now, let us see what the article says. I cannot call to the floor the newspaperman who told the Senator all this gossip. Why does he not put it in his newspaper, instead of going around and whispering to the Senator from Montana, and having the Senator use and make the statement on the floor of the Senate, as if it were the truth and the fact? If the Senator wants to vouch for what the newspaperman told him, and make it his own, that is all right.

Let us go on with this article and see whether General Marshall wrote it or not. He may have written it. I do not know what the general has written, but he does not say in this article that he wrote it.

Marshall said that an unidentified person connected with the publication in New York-

Somebody connected with the publication in New Yorkhas advised with a subordinate official of The Adjutant General's office here, who directed that the page be deleted on the grounds that it did not conform to the policy of publishing only actual data and no opinion.

One of the statements in the deleted page said that the Army recruiting program is "progressing at an excellent rate."

I assume that, because that was a comment which might be construed to the effect that they were getting all the men they wanted, it was a violation of the rules of the War Department to express any opinion whatever, good or bad, but simply to give the number of men that had enlisted. I assume that to be the case, and I think General Marshall, when he said that, meant that.

Marshall said that the action constituted suppression, and that he was amazed at the "very unfortunate" judgment-

"Very unfortunate" is in quotations. I want to be accurate. I am invoking accuracy in others, and I want to be accurate myself-

Judgment displayed in the matter. He said he had told the Senate Military Affairs Committee yesterday that in the last week re-ported, the number enlisted is something over 8,000, the largest we have ever had.

That is the language of General Marshall.

That is what the Senator from Montana held in his hand. He held it in his hand to impress the Senate with the fact that he had the authority for the statement in his hand. It was like a lawyer holding a lawbook up and trying to make the court think that the lawbook substantiated his position. So the Senator held this press release in his hand and he

Everybody knows-any man with intelligence knows-that no subordinate in The Adjutant General's office would cause this thing to be deleted.

Well, General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the Army, said a subordinate in The Adjutant General's office had caused it to be deleted. But the Senator from Montana says either that General Marshall is not intelligent, or that he made a false statement, because that is what General Marshall said.

Let us see about The Adjutant General's office. I do not know anything about the Recruiting News. I never saw a copy in my life. However, the Senator from Montana yesterday put into the RECORD a statement about the Recruiting News. It seems that he is quite familiar with the Recruiting News. He read the following into the Record yesterday:

Recruiting News. United States Army, War Department, Recruiting Publicity Bureau, United States Army, Governors Island, N. Y. Official business.

In other words, this publication is published by The Adjutant General's office. If it is published by The Adjutant General's office, what is more natural than someone in The Adjutant General's office should say what shall go into it and what shall not? Some editor or publisher may put something in it which the authorities in the Washington office do not think ought to go into it. Who is to delete it except the Washington office? It sponsors the publication. Continuing:

Penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, \$300. Published by direction of The Adjutant General. August 1940. Volume 22, No. 8. In this issue: Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson; A. E. F. Commander (Ballou); First Army maneuvers.

Mr. President, I submit that there is nothing mysterious about this matter. The Senator from Montana says that everyone is bound to know that the Secretary of War himself caused the deletion. What right has the Senator from Montana to make that sort of statement? Where is the documentary proof that the Secretary of War did it?

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

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. In the name of accuracy, if the Senator wants to be accurate

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to be accurate.
Mr. WHEELER. I did not say the Secretary of War did it. I said there was only one person who could have done it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the Senator's statement. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Davis] for continuing to yield.

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the statement of the Senator from Montana. He corrects me. He says that I want to be accurate; and I do. He says that he did not say that the Secretary of War deleted the article. Of course, he cannot say the Secretary of War deleted it. Nobody can say that except the Secretary of War and the man with whom the Secretary communicated. The Senator says that he did not say that the Secretary of War did the deleting; but he says that there is only one man in the world who could have ordered it deleted. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I said.

Mr. CONNALLY. He says that only one man in the world could have caused it to be deleted, and that man is the Secretary of War.

What about that statement for accuracy? What about that statement for shrewd maneuvering of words and ideas? In other words, "I do not say that the Secretary of War deleted the article, but I do say that the only person on earth who could have deleted it is the Secretary of War; and I further say that it was deleted."

The Senator from Montana mentions no name. He is like the man who was playing poker in a little group in which there was a one-eyed man. They all had their six-shooters

on, and this player detected that the one-eyed man was cheating. He reached around and drew out his 45 ivory-handler six-shooter and said, "I am not going to mention any names, but if that So-and-So who is cheating does not stop, I am going to shoot out his other eye." [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to make a few remarks, because I was unable to do so last Tuesday in a colloquy with my colleague [Mr. GUFFEY].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator to yield, but he has been very patient-

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida, provided I do not have to yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that Senators who obtain the floor ought to have it called to their attention that under the rule they may not yield to other Senators to permit them to make speeches or statements without losing the floor. I do not wish to invoke the rule against any Senator, but I am asking Senators themselves to observe it. If the Senator desires the Senator from Florida or any other Senator to make a speech, he ought to yield the floor and permit the Senator who makes the speech to obtain the floor. That is the rule. The Senator would have no trouble in obtaining the floor again if that is his object: but certainly Senators who have made the rules ought to observe them. I must deprecate the custom, which has grown up in the past few days, of Senators obtaining the floor and holding it indefinitely, permitting other Senators to interrupt and make long speeches while they stand silently. I hope that not only the Senator from Pennsylvania, but all other Senators, will keep the rule in mind and try to observe it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is familiar with the rule. It has not often been observed. Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania

is familiar with the rule. The Senator from Kentucky, who is also familiar with it, has been more generous in yielding

than I have ever been while I have held the floor.

I know that the matter to which the Senator from Florida wishes to address himself is important. It is a question of personal privilege. I believe in the right of free speech. I believe in giving a man an opportunity to speak on a question of personal privilege. I yield the floor for the Senator to express himself on a matter which is very personal to him. While I may not agree with what he says, he has the right to express himself. I yield the floor to give the Senator from Florida the right to express himself on a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is not asking the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield the floor. The Chair asks whether or not the Senator from Pennsylvania yields to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida will accept the floor at such sacrifice on the part of the able Senator from Pennsylvania, I should like to have the assurance that the Senator from Pennsylvania will be able to speak thereafter. I say this because of the fact that under one of the practices of the Senate-which is not objectionable-three or four Senators whose names are now noted at the desk wish to speak; and naturally I presume they have some disposition to speak during the afternoon. If some other opportunity presents itself, I shall be just as well satisfied to speak at that time. I do not wish to ask any sacrifice on the part of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the statement by the Senator from Kentucky and in view of the fact that the Senator from Florida asks the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield for a speech, the Chair thinks it would be better for the Senator from Pennsylvania to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, as I suggested a moment ago, I take this opportunity to express myself on the question of an amendment which I offered last Tuesday and which I propose to offer today.

I have sought in every possible way to maintain the free institutions of America. I have recognized that some degree of regulation by the Government is necessary in certain fields of labor and industrial activity. My vote has registered from time to time my belief in these matters. We are now faced with the urgent problems of national defense, and we are attempting to work out a satisfactory solution of our needs within the framework of the accepted way of American life. Personally, I wish to uphold in every possible way the customs and traditions of a great free people.

Our devotion to duty, inspired by the work and worth of those who have gone before us, must not waver. Death and disaster become of little consequence compared with national defeat or the failure of our individual duty. We stand ready to stand by America and to do our very best in behalf of our beloved Republic. We shall not all agree as to what methods should be used in national defense. Representatives of the people in Congress will be criticized. Public men are always criticized. It is impossible to please everyone. The best that we can do is to hold to the right as we see the right and to leave not the slightest question mark concerning our loyalty and devotion to our country.

I have voted for the vast appropriations made to meet the urgent need of our country for additional defense measures. The tremendous sweep of these proposals, calling for the modernization of our Army, Navy, and Air Service, inherently carries the obligation to find trained men to utilize the mechanized improvements which will be made. Unquestionably, we shall require more men in the military branches of the Government. These will be needed as soon as they can be mustered into the service in an orderly and efficient way.

The Senate has already passed a measure providing for the further training and preparation of the National Guard and the Reserve officers of the Regular Army. When they have been given necessary training they will then be prepared to provide leadership for new recruits. We cannot afford unnecessarily any delay in recruiting these forces. However, we should not make the mistake of bringing recruits into the service before there are sufficient officers to train them or satisfactory arrangements to house them properly. Winter will be coming on before large numbers of men can be recruited. Surely these men should not be called out before they can be suitably housed and clothed.

Mr. President, I have listened with great admiration to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Maloney]. I have been deeply impressed by his splendid spirit of patriotism. He has shown an enviable desire to encourage the free spirit of our country. Coming, as I do, from a foreign land and mingling all my life with men of varied races and creeds I have a deep sympathy with any measure which will permit the solution of our national defense problem in a way that will most accord with our free institutions. If, through the voluntary method proposed, the required number of men are not obtained, there will be no loss of time in achieving the necessary result through the induction into service of such a number as have not volunteered to serve. There is not therefore any clear-cut issue before the Senate as to voluntary enlistment or compulsory training. The chief difference is one of emphasis and the question of timing. In any event, I believe provision should and will be made for the national defense needs of the American people; and universally there has been made clear from one end of the country to the other that our people are determined to protect our shores.

Mr. President, I wish to express my hearty approval of the amendment offered by my colleague providing clerical exemption. I voted for it. In discussion with Senator Guffey I sought to have the term "seminarian" included in the language of his amendment and believed that this had been satisfactorily arranged. I was prepared to offer an amendment to the amendment for this purpose, but was called from the Chamber just prior to the time when I had expected to offer it, and so my amendment was not considered.

At this time I am offering an amendment to the Maloney substitute measure to S. 4164, embodying the principle of clerical exemption as passed by the Senate yesterday and including the word "seminarian."

Mr. President, the word "seminarian" refers to a young man preparing himself by professional studies in a theological seminary. It is comparable to the term "divinity student." In order that there shall not be any possible confusion in the interpretation of the law I am asking that the word "seminarian" be included.

Mr. President, I wish also to say a strong word in behalf of deferred exemption for all young men who are preparing themselves in colleges and technical schools in the closing period of their courses. I should regard it as nothing less than tragic for the course of a young engineer, technical student, or other professional student to be interrupted in the last few months prior to the completion of his work and the date of graduation. I am glad to see that a deferred status is provided for young professional men and college students

under 24 years of age in Senate bill 4164.

In behalf of clerical exemption I wish to state my conviction that special care is necessary for the maintenance of religious culture. Religion is the finest flower of the free spirit. It is not derived from the edicts of man, but comes from the spirit of God. In countries where freedom has been put on the scaffold religion has been the first to suffer. A Germany, weakened in its religious culture, became the prey of Hitler. A Russia, maimed in its traditional religious life, became the prey of communism and Stalin. Religion and freedom go hand in hand. When the voluntary spirit of religion suffers all the liberties of mankind lose their place. For this reason we do well when we give special protection to our clergy in the event of war. It is universally recognized that war has a withering effect on the voluntary spirit, the spirit of liberty. And as a people who wish with all our hearts to maintain liberty we are right in doing as was done in the World War when clerical exemption was freely granted.

Contemporary experience in Europe has shown that not only are the ranks of the clergy depleted by death or sickness in war, but many ministers of religion have given up their profession, having had unfortunate experiences while connected with the military forces of their respective governments. This makes clear how necessary it is that clerical exemption looking to the protection of organized religion in our own land shall now be maintained. I say "maintained" advisedly, Mr. President, for this is the American tradition, growing out of our experience in the World War.

If divinity students and seminarians are not exempted many of them will not return to their studies after they have been interrupted. This will be a blow to religion. To injure religion in time of crisis is to cripple an element which contributes most to patriotism, unity of action, discipline, and national morale. To make divinity students and seminarians subject to draft would make toward the closing down of divinity schools and seminaries. This also would be a blow to religion. Experience abroad has shown that a great number of divinity students do not return to their seminaries after their training has been interrupted, and those who do return come back with minds badly confused and deplorably demoralized.

Mr. President, Senate bill 4164 includes a provision that all persons claiming exemption because of conscientious opposition to participation in war in any form shall be listed on a register of conscientious objectors at the time of their classification by a local board and when so registered shall be at once referred to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. Such exemption has been granted in the past to various religious denominations and their adherents. There is an increasing demand for such exemption.

Mr. President, the strenuous duties of national defense are before us. Sacrifice and hardship will be required of all of us. I am not asking special consideration for persons of religious faith with any thought of providing an easy escape from social duty or civic obligation. All of us as American citizens are expected to do our very best to uphold our free institutions. It is my profound belief that any person who asks exemption from combatant duty should seek some form of national service in which the last full measure of devotion can be given to our beloved country.

Mr. President, in the midst of the present world confusion our thought is distracted from the spiritual realities of life. Yet we should not forget that when these horrible days of war and bloodshed have passed we shall have increasing need for our free institutions of worship and the sacred shrines of religion. George Eliot has said, "The reward of one duty well performed is the parent of another." So it is, and when a man returns from enlistment his very best chance for rehabilitation is found in the guidance of his local church. This we must not forget. And if a local church is to be maintained in the community to which he shall return it will be necessary to support and uphold the clerical leadership by which it is carried on. Some sweet hymn, some word of prayer, some memory of earlier days of peace and blessedness will thus serve to guide the harried minds of this war-torn generation to the safe havens of spiritual consolation. As the golden sunflower always turns its face toward the sun so man turns his face, his thoughts, his energies, his hopes and his deepest aspirations to the Source of Life and Light from which he comes. It is in this spirit that I favor the American tradition of clerical exemption which has been written into the legislation now before us.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

MATTER OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE UPON HAVING BEEN HANGED IN EFFIGY BEFORE THE CAPITOL FOR FAVORING THE SERVICE ACT AND AID TO ENGLAND SHORT OF WAR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, yesterday I had the unique experience of being hanged in effigy in front of the Capitol of the greatest democracy of the world. I think perhaps it might be considered something of a compliment to the stability of our institutions for this information to reach the dictators abroad, because I can hardly imagine a member of the German Reichstag being hanged in effigy in front of the building of that Assembly in Germany.

I think perhaps the incident indicates one of the great qualities of our country-namely, its respect for the freedom of individuals in the expression of their sentiments and in the free exercise of their own desires and aspirations. For myself, I wish only that I was as meritorious as those illustrious men and women in history who have been hanged in effigy.

I look across the aisle now into the benign countenance of one of the greatest men America has ever produced. There have been times when he, I believe, if I recall history aright, has had that experience. I refer to that most respected and eminent Member of this body, the one whom the people of the United States of America, I believe, without exception, revere and love, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris]. If I ever approach a small part of the stature of that great man, I shall count my life happily and fully spent.

Mr. President, I recognize that in this great democracy there are honest and conscientious differences of opinion even about small matters, let alone about very vital matters. Knowing Americans as I do, I know that Americans can differ perhaps more violently than any other people in the world; and when the Congress as well as the country is being agitated by one of the most fateful issues that ever pulsed through its Halls and its conscience, I should expect that there would be division in sentiment, but that in no way relieves any of us of an obligation to be steadfast in his own convictions and to urge them to the very limit of his ability.

What I regret is that there have been instances, no doubt. in which persons unintentionally have been made the victims of sinister and designing forces who claim not the benefit of an honest conviction but the right in a free country to destroy the land that has given them refuge and hospitality. The tragedy of it is that sometimes we do not know when we are being made the instruments of sinister forces, designed to accomplish not good but evil, and we sometimes do not know when the effect of a given act will be good or bad.

I have before me, for example, a poster which was sent to me by a lady in Florida. This is simply one of a number of such posters she has observed and sent to me. She says that at a given place somebody puts up propaganda of this type to be observed and to be read by persons who frequent the place when it is carefully deposited.

There is a cartoon at the top which shows Wall Street as pushing America's youth toward an Army camp or a labor camp. Then the text below the cartoon says:

Are you between 18 and 31? If so, you are about to be shoved into the Army unless you kill the Burke-Wadsworth conscription

The Burke-Wadsworth bill means Hitlerism for America.

Then over in the left-hand column the text says:

GERMANY UNDER HITLER

Young men are torn from their jobs, their families, and sent to the army and labor camps.

All men and women are drafted into industry at wages and hours decided by Hitler.

Total war preparation is followed by war.

Then over on the right it says:

UNITED STATES UNDER CONSCRIPTION

Young men are torn from their jobs, their families, and sent to

the Army and into labor defense.

All men and women are drafted into industry at wages and hours decided by Wall Street

"Total war preparation" is followed by ? ? ?

Then the text says:

Defeat the Burke-Wadsworth bill!

Write today, to Senators Pepper and Andrews. Your protests have held up passage until now. Demand that they kill this bill completely.

Viewed upon its face alone, one might say, "Yes; there is the expression of a conscientious sentiment that is harbored in the hearts of people in this country-mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters; but down a little bit below appear these words:

Issued by:

The Communist Party of Florida.

Albert Lopez, chairman. A. W. Trainor, secretary.

For information about the Communist Party, write: . O. box 1013.

Miami. Fla.

Is that an expression of a conscientious sentiment harbored in the heart of a frightened mother, or is that the sinister influence from Moscow across the sea, reaching into our own land, trying to paralyze our own defense for their own and not our gain?

So, Mr. President, there are instances in which persons have been unwittingly, no doubt-just as certain persons are unwittingly the carriers of deadly germs-the carriers of pernicious propaganda that tends to destroy the body politic and the body economic and the body national here upon this continent.

I shall not call the name, but I hold in my hand the envelope of a United States Senator-and I have another from another Senator-now a Member of this body, disseminating a speech he has made upon this subject. What do I see? Down here in the left-hand corner is something that is foreign to the franked envelope of a United States Senator; something which, so far as I know, is not disseminated by any of the officials at the Capitol, or in the document room, or by any other agency in relation to a Senator's duties. What does it say? It appears to be stuck on the envelope. It is in red, white, and blue colors. It is a stamp, rectangular in design, and this is what it says:

No foreign wars. Make Europe pay war debts. No war loans.

Then, Mr. President, I pick up another cartoon. It shows Uncle Sam looking out over a vast expanse of water, and on the other side of that expanse of water from Uncle Sam is the pudgy figure of one who is identifiable as John Bull; and these are the words which are issuing from the mouth of Uncle Sam. The cartoon says:

Yes, sir, John; they would make a mighty nice down payment

Then, hanging from the right arm of Uncle Sam is a little placard saying:

The billions that England owes America.

Then, down below, the text goes on to quote the desirability of the United States being the sovereign owner of the British possessions on this side of the water.

Mr. President, it is all right for anybody conscientiously to advocate the payment of war debts. Many honorable and able men and women have advocated that policy; but at a time when the question of the transfer of some destroyers to Great Britain is involved and uppermost in official and public minds, at a time when the platform declaration of President Roosevelt and of the Republican nominee for the Presidency that we shall lend all material aid to the Allies is uppermost in the public mind, when we are considering this bill in the United States Senate, is it not a subject of a little curiosity that a campaign should be launched under the slogan, "No loans to the Allies; make the Allies pay their war debts," and particularly pointing the finger of scorn at John Bull for being delinquent in a financial obligation?

Mr. President, a little bit ago reference was made to the fact that an honorable and able man who has been high in the esteem and affections of the people of the United States recently made an address at Chicago. Certain comment was made pro and con upon that address. Some of us deplored it. I am reading now from the Washington Daily News of Monday, August 5, 1940. This is the headline: "Lindbergh heads third party, Rome hears. Flier called leader of 'True

Americans.'

And then appears a dispatch from Rome. Of course, Colonel Lindbergh did not send the dispatch. Of course, he did not write what was published in the Rome newspaper, but I am reading about the effect on the other side of the water of the address which was made by that able colonel, who has to a remarkable degree enjoyed the confidence and the esteem of the people of this country.

I pick up the newspaper P. M. of Monday, August 19, 1940, and I read across the headlines these words:

Klan and bund cheer Lindbergh as they kiss under fiery cross. They unite first time at Jersey rally; endorse "fifth column" work, call for whispers against war.

And on the front of that publication is a huge fiery cross beneath which it is said that the representative of this klanwhich prostitutes the name of one better than that at another period in our Nation's history—and the bund came together at nightfall to attest to an affection for these principles which originate not in conscientious hearts in the United States of America, but in sinister places beyond the seas.

With further reference to the address which was made at Chicago by Colonel Lindbergh, I now read from the Herald Tribune of August 5, 1940. The heading is:

"GERMAN HOUR" TO BE PUT OFF AIR IN CHICAGO-PROGRAM WHICH SUMMONED LISTENERS TO LINDBERGH'S TALK CALLED UNACCEPTABLE

CHICAGO, August 5.-The directors of radio station WHIP, of Chicago, notified today the Einheitsfront, or United Front organization, also known as the German-American National Alliance of Chicago, that the station would not broadcast the daily "German hour" program of the alliance after next Saturday.

Doris Keane, secretary of the Hammond-Calumet Broadcasting Corporation, owners of WHIP, wrote to Paul A. F. Warnholz, director of the German-American National Alliance, Inc., that "this action is taken because the 'German hour' as now being presented is of such controversial nature as to make it unacceptable to many leading Americans.

"In view of the present national emergency growing out of the international situation, we believe whole-heartedly in promoting American solidarity and unity."

The "German hour" broadcast on Friday and Saturday nights and The "German hour" broadcast on Friday and Saturday nights and yesterday morning had summoned all members of the Alliance to attend yesterday afternoon's "keep out of war" meeting, at which Col. Charles A. Lindbergh was the principal speaker. Henry Jonhk, official announcer for the Alliance radio program, after reading a "pressing summons to all members and to all listeners to the United Front radio hour to do their duty by attending the great mass meeting in Soldiers Field," remarked, "None dare or should fail."

The German-American National Alliance succeeded the German-American Bund as the leading disseminator of Nazi propaganda in

The German-American National Alliance succeeded the German-American Bund as the leading disseminator of Nazi propaganda in the Chicago area. Its broadcasts have defended the "oppressed" German-American minority and in plain words warned listeners to join the Alliance now so that when the "oppressed minority" is in control of the Nation they may not be considered enemies. Although the programs have stressed heavily the American allegiance of the members of the Alliance, those urging aid to the Allies in their fight with Hitler have been called warmongers and otherwise attacked. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, it is known, has been keeping a close watch on the program and on the Alliance.

"The German hour" has been on the air daily since last February. The Alliance has kept its weekly payments of about \$400 for radio time paid up 2 weeks in advance. The programs have been about

99 percent in the German language.

It could not be learned whether the Alliance plans to seek another radio outlet for its program after it goes off the air on WHIP

I am the last man in the country who would intimate, let alone charge, that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh was in any purposeful collusion with an iniquitous group like that. Nevertheless, every one of those agencies took occasion to find aid and comfort in his remarks and to make them the great attraction to their people to gather, to further their aims in a sinister way which he in a conscientious way endeavored to

Mr. President, the same German-American alliance wrote a letter, on a date which is not disclosed, but which came to Hon. JED JOHNSON, Representative in Congress from Oklahoma. which reads:

[German-American National Alliance, Inc. (Deutsch-Amerikanische Einheitsfront), address: Post-office box 492, Chicago, Ill.] Hon. JED JOHNSON.

United States Representative of Oklahoma,

Washington, D. C.

Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: We attach hereto a list, recording the voting of the Members of the House of Representatives in matters of the Bloom fake neutrality bill. We have tried to correctly set forth therein the vote of each Member and would appreciate to have you check the list concerning your vote. If an error or omission has taken place, kindly so advise us, so the we may change the list accordingly, before we give it national publicity through the various channels open to us. In the event of a special session of Congress and further voting on the matter of neutrality by the House of Representatives, we shall revise the list according to the vote then given, before giving it wide circulation. Permit us to state that we are aiming to pledge all of our members and members of all organizations which are or may become affiliated with us to assist in preventing by lawful means any person from ever again holding a public office, by lawful means any person from ever again holding a public office, who votes for the enactment of legislation or termination of existing laws, as a result whereof the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war would be permitted in the matter of the present European

We are convinced that such action on part of Congress would lead us into the present European war, which is of no concern to our

Is that a conscientious mother, is that a disturbed father. is that a fond sister, is that a devoted brother, is that an American who loves the land in which he was privileged to be born, or who came to claim it as a haven and a refuge from the tyranny of an old and odious world?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, what organization is that?

Mr. PEPPER. It is signed, "Very truly yours, German-American National Alliance, by Paul A. F. Warnholtz, chairman of committee on public affairs."

Mr. LEE. Is that the same organization about which the Senator was reading the article which showed that they were in collusion with Colonel Lindbergh, trying to get them an audience?

Mr. PEPPER. It is the same organization.

Here is another publication which ties in with the others, and I am sure there is not a Senator on this floor who does not every day receive a book or a little magazine like the one I hold in my hand, published at 17 Battery Place, New York. This issue happens to be dated July 22, 1940. On the outside is a picture of the railway car in which the armistice was signed during the World War, and in which the recent Hitler "kindly" armistice was signed, if I may so designate it. This proceeds to tell about the battle of France and about the campaign, and contains a great many pictures and like things effectively to present its point of view.

Mr. President, I have here a publication which I am sure

was sent to the Members of the Senate. It is entitled "The 'Fifth Column' Is Here," by George Britt. I have not read the book and do not know what it contains, and I do not know a thing about Mr. Britt, but I do know that apparently he gives the first complete revelation of a foreign army within the United States, four times as large as the Regular United States Army. It tells where the "fifth column" is, who its members are, how it is organized, what it wants here. It is Hitler's blueprint for the United States, Mexico, and South America.

I also have here the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, August 20, 1940. I read:

"Fifth column" dangers. Traitors vital factor in many Nazi vic-

There is an article headed by Col. William J. Donovan and Edgar Mowrer, and I read from it the following para-

HITLER SAID THIS

"We need armies. But we shall not use them as in 1914. place of artillery will in the future be taken by revolutionary place of archiery will in the future be taken by revolutionary propaganda, to break down the enemy psychologically before the armies begin to function at all. The enemy people must be demoralized and ready to capitulate before military action can even be thought of. \* \* \* Mental confusion, indecisiveness, panic, these are our weapons. The history of revolutions \* \* \* is always the same: The ruling classes capitulate. Why? Defeatism: They no longer have the will to conquer."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gibson in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Just for a short observation.

Mr. PEPPER. Before the Senator makes a statement, I may say that I wish to make a relatively few remarks. Heretofore I have found myself led, by the kindness and courteous action of my colleagues, into a general colloquy, when several Senators make speeches. I do not want to trespass upon the Senate's time longer today. If the Senator will confine his query to a question, I shall gladly yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. It is a very kind observation, I assure the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Of course, the Senator knows that he and I do not see eye to eye upon many matters with regard to our present foreign policy, but I thoroughly agree with the Senator in his observations here this afternoon. I think he is doing his country a real service by pointing out this sort of thing, which I think all of us deplore. I think the Senator from West Virginia yesterday did his country a service by pointing out similar propaganda on the other side. The Senator from Missouri, I believe, has a resolution pending which would result in the appointment of a committee to investigate this kind of thing. I believe the Senator from Florida should join forces with the Senator from West Virginia and some of the rest of us in having an investigation of all of this propaganda, including the particular matter the Senator has so ably pointed out on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for his observation, and I will say that I have already drafted, and have ready for offering to the Senate, a resolution which approaches the same subject, and particularly addresses itself to two categories of this sort of thing. The first one is the possible and probable abuse of diplomatic and consular privileges by the agents of foreign governments. The second is the activities of organizations in this country whose membership is made up of American citizens who are either wittingly or unwittingly, without registration, beng made the victims of some foreign power's efforts to undermine the institutions and morale of this country.

If I am not misinformed, the consular staff of a certain power in the United States has been doubled, trebled, and quadrupled, if not more greatly increased, and that refers to the known number of representatives it has here.

The people of the United States have not forgotten Von Bernstorff or Von Papen, and they have not forgotten the Zimmermann note. They have not forgotten the statement made by the consul at New Orleans about the United States, and they have not forgotten a man named Westrick, who came here as the acknowledged agent of the German Government, and unfortunately his home became the retreat, if not the refuge, of men who went there to participate, perhaps unwittingly, but to participate, in the furtherance of his sinister designs. I am glad to know that public opinion and business morality in the United States was so high and patriotism so strong in the hearts of our people that they forced the resignation of the president of one of the big corporations of this country because he furnished an automobile to that man, and had, perhaps unwittingly, but nevertheless effectively, been a cloak for the guidance of his movements in his own country, which that man was here to destroy.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is high time for us to have regard for the sources of the sentiment which pertains to the great issue which is now throbbing through the hearts of our people and our Nation.

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

Mr. MINTON. As further evidence of the propaganda of the Nazi Government, I noticed in today's PM an article to this effect.

Merely by printing postage stamps the Nazi Government is flooding the United States with tons of propaganda at little cost to itself, but at heavy expense to the American taxpayers.

It is done in this way: Under the International Postal Union rules, which provide that the nation of origin, from which the mail comes, receives the postage money, and the nation to which the mail goes distributes it without cost, all Germany has to do is to print stamps and place them on this propaganda with which it is flooding the mails of the United States today. That is done just for the mere cost of printing a stamp and sticking it on the mail over in Germany; and we pay the bill.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. On the point of the consularships being used in this country as the headquarters for dispensing propaganda, I wish to read only a paragraph from an article published in this afternoon's Daily News, Thursday, August 22, 1940, under the heading:

Conceivable that biggest "fifth column" is in the United States.

I read this paragraph:

Often they publicly mix in the policy of the countries to which they are accredited. Thus, the famous Capt. Max Wiedemann, general consul in San Francisco, was publicly congratulated by order of the Fuehrer in Berlin for his work in preventing the American Senate from accepting Mr. Roosevelt's modified neutrality legislation in July 1939.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that is a good and vivid illustration. There was not any Senator on this floor, of course, who voted against the amendment of that law, who had any contact with this German consul, but nevertheless he was one of the stones thrown into the lake of public opinion which agitated the currents of that body, which did reach the United States Senate, and was taken by conscientious Senators as a truthful expression of the sentiment of Ameri-

Of course, it is not a new thing for the Senate to be the victims of such propaganda, but, Mr. President, it is now being carried on upon a scale and with a deviltry and shrewdness that we have never seen or dreamed of before in our whole history.

Our whole country is literally honeycombed-I am led to believe—literally honeycombed with these cells of espionage that are everywhere, that attract everything that might perhaps fall into their sinister trap. Everything finds its way by some serpentine but expeditious course back to the German chancelry, there to become a part of their characteristically thorough knowledge of the countries upon which they have their sinister design.

Mr. President, an honest man is at a disadvantage when he is dealing with a thief. A peaceful man is at a disadvantage when he has a controversy with a murderer. A people bent upon its own mission and its own work, envious of nobody, trying to conquer nobody, wanting to live and let live, to be an honor to the earth and reflect something of the example of the Master whom they honor, is having to deal with the most sinister and vicious and destructive force that has been seen in the history of the human race.

Mr. President, what some of us-be it with or without excessive zeal-have been trying to do is to make our people aware of the fact that this Hitlerism of today is no ordinary thing such as we have read about in history. He is not even another Napoleon. With all of Napoleon's genius, with all of his greatness, with all the magic of his mind. I think Hitler towers above him like a great monument almost beside a stone which lies at its feet. It took Napoleon years to conquer Europe. It took Hitler a few weeks. There has never been anything like the way he has molded all the nations into an industrial and economic and intellectual entity. Napoleon just placed his brothers upon thrones; to a little degree he infiltrated his own ideas into the philosophy of the conquered nations. He made some improvements in conditions where he went. But there has never been anything like the way this mind of Hitler has encompassed the mastery of the whole world, and step by step, with unparalleled German thoroughness, has brought his dream into a hideous reality.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield. Mr. BURKE. I would speak a word of warning to my friend, the Senator from Florida. He has just stated that Hitler, in his judgment, was a greater man than Napoleon. I, after being in Germany in 1938, and seeing the very things developing that the Senator has so ably pointed out, ventured upon my return to make some remarks upon the strength of the reorganized Germany; and although I did not use the words myself, they were put in my mouth, that I had said that Hitler was a greater man than Bismarck. Since that time there are those, as late as the hearings before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on the pending bill, who have said that this man who would say anything of that kind, is pro-Hitler.

So I am warning the Senator that when he says Hitler is a greater man than Napoleon, he may make the headlines as one of the real friends of Hitler in this country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I were so charged. I would hold up this very colorful picture that was carried in the Post of this morning of my being hanged in effigy by the ladies who have come to complain of my conduct in this crisis, as some evidence of the fact that I was not on the side with them and Hitler.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I will say that even that would not clear the Senator because, as the Senator will recall, when we had this battle here about the amendment of the Neutrality Act. I think I went as far as any Senator in denouncing everything for which Hitler stands, but that did not sink into the consciousness of Norman Thomas or any of those who wanted to discredit those who were trying-not to sound a foolish alarm, but to say that the time had come when America must prepare itself and prepare itself adequately.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for those suggestions.

Mr. President, not only do I say what I have just said about my appreciation of the very great ability of Hitler, but I attribute a very large part of the military success of the German Army to Hitler's personal influence and personal command. I do not believe the German Army leadership would have had the courage to have been unorthodox enough to have taken some of the earlier chances that Hitler, by being a dictator, ventured to take. I think his genius is exceeded only by his daring drive for his scheme, which stretches out before his unrivaled imagination.

I think Hitler was born one of these great genii who happen to have been twisted with the sentiments of deviltry instead of goodness, but it seems that nature atoned with his ability for his depravity. His viciousness is perhaps the best evidence of his greatness, because the size and the magnitude of the dastardly deeds he has accomplished could hardly have been conceived of by any other human being.

So, Mr. President, that is the daring man who in Ludecke's book, I Knew Hitler, speaking about the democracies, says this:

will I be able to arm Germany before they get onto me and strike at me with a preventive war?

This is Hitler speaking.

That depends largely, I suppose, on whether they-

Talking about England, France, and the United Stateshave the leadership and guts to strike.

Daring for him, but he knew there was not any daring in the democracies to which he referred.

Mr. President, as we look back down through the vistas of history we see the perceptible beginnings of great movements. But to their contemporaries in their early stages they must have been invisible, or they would have protected themselves against them. They grew from nothingness into reality, and from imperceptibility into magnitude, and finally into colossal stature, so that they came to dominate the thinking and the lives of men.

This Hitler movement is very much misunderstood by some people. They think it is simply another government-another power-extraordinary, a little bit, perhaps, but not different in kind from governments which have come into reality heretofore. They think it does not represent any new kind of government, any new thing, nothing sui generis, as we lawyers say.

Let me read a few marked passages in a book called They Wanted War. It is a book written by a newspaper man named Otto D. Tolischus, who had been for years stationed in Berlin, and a couple of years ago was awarded the Pulitzer prize for the merits of his writing. In the book review of this book in the newspapers that are current it is referred to as a conservative book, and he is spoken of as a conservative writer.

On page 9 of the book, he says:

He is a new conqueror whose dreams outdistance the ambitions of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon and envisage not only the conquest but also the revolutionary transformation of the world.

When we go a little further we appreciate what he means by the revolutionary character of Hitler and his movement. In another chapter in the book the author says that we cannot understand national socialism unless we understand the great musician, Wagner. Hitler is a devotee of the Wagnerian music and the Wagnerian motif. Every year he goes to the Wagnerian festival and makes it glamorous by his presence. He is its chief and most valuable patron. He draws for his inspiration not upon current sources of inspiration and knowledge, but upon the early days of the Germanic peoples. His god is not Jehovah, the living God of the Christian, above the skies. It is Wotan, the god in mythology who dwelt upon some cold, isolated mountain top in the realm of mythological Germanic gods. His companions are not the ones who inhabit a Christian heaven, but the gods of the realm of vague mythology. Out of the past of merciless revenge and retribution, relentless atonement and principles of destructivity, imperceptible to the Christian conscience, come the beginnings of his doctrine and philosophy.

The writer goes on to say:

Like Machiavelli's The Prince, Hitler's work is amazing for the bold frankness with which it casts aside all moral considerations in the interest of political expediency, on the principle that the end justifies the means. "Success," he writes, "is the only earthly judge of right or wrong," a dictum reiterated by thousands of Nazi speakers, led by Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels, the Minister of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda. Force, terror, battle, conquest, "one-sided assertions," racial hatred, and racial egoism are thus lumped together with mysticism, patriotism, and social justice as equally acceptable means of rallying the masses to the Nazi standard. standard.

The book-

He is speaking of Mein Kampf, the big black book which Hitler wrote with his own hand, telling the whole world what he proposed to do.

The book accepts only the "manly virtues," and if it gives any recognition at all to ethical or moral values, such as humani-tarianism, charity, justice, and fair play, or to the social ameni-ties, such as manners and moderation, it does so merely to evaluate them as available means in the political struggle, especially in relations with foreign nations. For the rest, it repudiates these virtues as attributes of weaklings, bourgeois Philistines and decadent aristocrats. "Get hard," is its motto, and "get hard"

is the slogan that is being hammered daily into millions of German souls.

Later the author says:

Baldur von Schirach, the Reich youth leader, summarized the essence of Hitler's book most succinctly when he said: "Our religion is Germany."

A little later, on page 24, he says:

In his book, Hitler represents hardness and moral imperviousness as the only political method that can achieve success, and he bases this conclusion on his view of the world and human nature.

bases this conclusion on his view of the world and human nature. It is the view of a man who never got over the war.

Born of the war, with its throw-back to the law of the jungle, this view sees the world as permanently a jungle in which herds of humanity, called nations or races, fight for feeding grounds in a catch-as-catch-can struggle in which the individual is nothing and the herd is everything, in which all rules and niceties are suspended, and in which might is right. To that view the book is rapidly persuading a nation of 67,000,000. But it is also the view of the professional war veteran, who in some countries is satisfied with a bonus, and in others demands nothing less than the whole country like Mussolini and Hitler.

On page 39, he says:

The theme song of the German legions is: "Today we own Germany, "Tomorrow the whole world."

On page 41, the author says:

Starting with the conquest of Germany itself under the "temporary slogans" of breaking the Treaty of Versailles and fighting bolshevism, Hitler proceeded to the unification of the German race and has now proclaimed as his next goal the consolidation of the European continent, with Germany as its protector. (Hitler's New Year proclamation and January 30 speech; Rosenberg's Danzig speech, April 16, 1940.)

But even that was recognized as a mere "temporary slogan" beyond which already was rising the next, whose import may be gleaned from the following statements of Hitler himself:

"A state which, in an age of racial pollution, devotes itself to cultivation of its best racial elements must some day become

cultivation of its best racial elements must some day become master of the earth," he wrote in Mein Kampf, which today is the bible of National Socialist Germany; and, barring half-hearted imitations elsewhere, Germany is so far the only country devoting itself to that task.

"We all sense," he also wrote, "that in a far future mankind may foce well-week the become many to the property of the sense of the sense," he also wrote, "that in a far future mankind may foce well-week the become many the sense of the sense."

face problems which can be surmounted only by a supreme master race supported by the means and resources of the entire globe."

And how these problems are to be solved is indicated by his view

of the rise of the Aryan, whose destiny Germany has taken into her keeping.

"As conqueror," he wrote in the same book, "the Aryan subjected to himself lower humans and regulated their practical activity under his command according to his will and for his aims. By leading them to useful if hard work he not only spared the life of the conquered but perhaps also gave them a lot that was better than their former so-called 'liberty.'"

# A little later he says:

It is pertinent to subject the situation facing the United States in case of a German victory over Great Britain to cold-blooded analysis. Such analysis must proceed from three fundamental analysis. considerations.

First, which is self-evident, is that all National Socialist slogans invoked in the war against France and Britain apply with redoubled invoked in the war against France and Britain apply with redoubled force against the United States. According to its own vociferous proclamations, National Socialist Germany is pitting "blood against gold" in a fight against "decadent democracy" and "rapacious plutocracy," depending on a free economy and world trade, in order to substitute for them a new world order based on national and international "socialistic" planning under authoritarian governments and a peace guaranteed by German arms.

A second consideration, long overlooked but now also evident, is that nower dynamics of authoritarian states have their own

A second consideration, long overlooked but now also evident, is that power dynamics of authoritarian states have their own law of action, which is determined by opportunity rather than by any individual will—even the will of Hitler, who is a prisoner of the forces he unleashed. In contrast to the Western post-war mentality, which envisaged a world stabilized by paper treaties, power politics abhors a power vacuum and enters it—in Europe as in the Far East. Under the hammer blows of the German armies in France the world again was shocked into a realization that the only dam against power is more power—even if that entails the risk of war. entails the risk of war.

The third and most important consideration is that National Socialist Germany wages "total war," in which military might, economic warfare, and moral disintegration of the prospective enemy play equally important roles.

Again, on page 44, the author points out:

Such an "anti-Versailles" would first of all involve total disarmament of all the defeated countries. That would leave the German Army supreme and beyond challenge by any power or

combination of powers in the world. But it might and probably would also involve surrender of the Allied navies to victorious Germany, as Germany was compelled to surrender her Navy to the victorious Allies in 1918.

That would put Europe's strongest navies on one side of the United States and an allied Japanese Navy on the other side. Added to them would be the strongest air fleet in the world. Both would far surpass any defenses that America or all the Americas could create in years. Moreover, an "anti-Versailles" must be expected to include complete redistribution of Europe's colonies and dominions—redistribution between Germany and, at least for the moment, her temporary allies. And it must likewise be expected to include confiscation of all foreign investments of France and Britain, as Germany's foreign holdings were confiscated in 1918. Moreover, National Socialist Germany has developed its own technique for acquiring ownership of industrial and other resources of conquered countries. The result would be a complete change in the political and economic control of Europe and Africa, much of Asia and Oceania, and presumably Australia.

#### Listen to this:

The economic consequences to America of such an upheaval are equally obvious. It would put America's entire foreign trade, not only with Europe but also with the rest of the world, completely under the control of Germany and her allies. That trade, it may be argued, amounts to less than 10 percent of America's total production; but under America's method of production that 10 percent often determines profit or loss. True, America produces many things which even a totalitarian world would still need. But the things that world would need would be American raw materials, such as oil and cotton. In markets for finished goods employing profitable labor America would find the competition of a consolidated Europe, behind whose salesmen stood the military might of Germany.

## On page 46 the author says:

For America the more or less world-wide adoption of this system would entail a further development of still immeasurable consequences—namely, demonetization of gold. With such a development the \$19,000,000,000 gold hoard in Kentucky would be reduced to trinket value. In such a case it might be doubted whether America's foreign investments would be worth the paper they are written on. Difficulties of America's financial imperialism already are the subject of mocking comment in the German press.

#### He says further:

This would leave the United States alternative courses. This Nation could adopt an autarchic planned economy of its own and live mainly on its own resources within the confines of its own borders and militarize itself to the limit to assure its safety. But there can be little doubt that planned economy goes hand in hand with authoritarian government, and so this course might mean an end of America's political democracy.

mean an end of America's political democracy.

To adopt the alternative might be to court economic catastrophe of still inconceivable dimensions, with social and political upheavals, and possibly make America ripe for the invader. German proposals for new and more "organic" organization of the United States already are at hand. According to all National Socialist commentators, the American people are not a nation but a conglomeration of undigested racial units. According to Colin Ross, much-traveled German author, whose views are widely disseminated in Germany, the vertical division of the United States into Federal States is purely artificial and should be replaced with horizontal organization according to racial groups. Such horizontal organization already has been introduced by Germany in Czecho, Poland, and Slovakia. It goes without saying that in these subject countries the German racial organization deminates.

There is much more, Mr. President, but only with that will I detain the Senate at this time.

I will read a letter which came to me a few days ago from a citizen of France. It is merely signed "A Frenchman," so he did not expect to get any credit for whatever information he might furnish and, likewise, neither did he expect to make himself detectable by the Gestapo for sending out of France the message his letter contains. He says:

There ought to be no pity for them-

## He is talking about the Germans-

From Hitler to the last of his soldiers they are bandits and monsters. About a week ago at our station a train of Belgian refugees arrived (they were still neutrals then). There were three demented women; one who had left Belgium with six children arrived weeping and shouting that three of the others had been killed in the course of the trip by bombs and shells on the platform of the station where the train had stopped. She had to leave them dead on the platform when the train left.

Again the same day a lady, this time a rich one, arrived in front of one of the hotels of our little village, holding on her knees her little by 4 years old killed. Her auto was riddled with bullets. The refugees are shelled in the ditches by the roadside as they rest while eating until they are all killed.

It is monstrous. The official orders are to kill women and children.

So, Mr. Senator, continue your campaign in order to avenge all these unfortunate people.

Mr. President, a prominent lady in my State wrote me a letter a few days ago in which she referred to a conversation with a person who had just come over from Great Britain. Senators can believe the story or not; I am simply relating it as it was told to me by my friend. She said the lady who came from Great Britain went to one of the prison camps in Great Britain where some young German soldiers were interned and engaged in conversation with a young German prisoner less than 20 years of age, a bright-eyed, clear-faced youth who looked like a human being and not like a monster. She said, "I hear that there were instances where the tanks rode down and the machine guns of the airplanes mowed down refugees on the highways." He admitted that he was in a front tank where that sort of thing happened, and he said, "Lady, I vomited all the time it was going on, but what could I do? There were 20 or 30 tanks right behind me, and it was Hitler's orders."

In his book, Mein Kampf, I could show the page where Hitler says, "Make war horrible; that is humane." So they hunted the refugees out in the ditches; they pushed them out in the fields so they could slay them. They bombed the railway centers where there were refugees fleeing from neutral countries. They did every dastardly, inhuman thing a bestial flendish mind could conceive to make human beings suffer and frighten them with the heinousness of their acts.

A little while ago we listened to the declaration of the new ally that joined the German conquerer. They have never been timid about the expression of their objectives.

On the contrary, everybody remarks about the effrontery with which they have disarmed their enemies by making frank statements. It is a known fact that Hitler says that if you will tell a big-enough lie it is safe because nobody will believe it. So, joining with this leader in that kind of a campaign, Mussolini says to the world, "I am not going into this war because of some wrong that has been done me by France or Great Britain or Belgium or Holland or Norway or Denmark or Poland"—there was no border incident; there was no Treaty of Versailles; there was no wrongdoing; but Mussolini said, "This is a phase of a world revolution; it is a fight of the have-nots against the haves"; and, with an effrontery a bandit would blush at, he says, "We want loot, and," he added, "gold."

Mr. President, who has the loot in the world and who has the gold? The French Empire, the Dutch Empire, the Belgian Empire, the British Empire, and the United States of America. That is where the rich resources are; that is where the arable lands are; that is where the good climates are; that is where the mineral resources are; that is where the gold is. They have not abandoned gold as the standard of world commerce. Even Hitler would not think that he could turn back the tides of thousands of years of civilization. Men in the jungle will take gold. The Indians, who never saw a white man, would take gold. It has something that puts lust in the eye of the one who sees it, and makes men and women give their souls for it. People will still take gold for their goods in every savage or civilized land under the sun and the stars. Hitler knows that; Mussolini knows it. They are not abandoning gold. They are saying, "We are going to take our share of the world's gold, not by trade and commerce but by conquest," on the theory that might, according to their philosophy, is right.

So they are not merely threatening that; they are doing that. There is no Europe any more. We awaken sometimes and wonder if it has been a nightmare through which we have lived. We pick up a newspaper and look at a map, and say, "Last night a horrible dream came into my mind; it led me to believe that there was no France any more." Another says, "I dreamed that dear Belgium was dead." Another says, "A nightmare led me to believe that Holland had been ravaged and that all the small countries of Europe, safe, comfortable, and complacent a little while ago, are now dead as death can be." Then, when he looks at the daily newspapers, when he

reads the magazines and books, and when he sees the tears that fall like rivers over waterfalls out of the eyes of the anguished, weeping sufferers, he comes to the sad conclusion that it is not a fancy but a horrible fact.

So here in the United States of America, where we have lived all these comfortable, complacent years, where we have been blessed as God has seldom blessed a people, not only with a natural inheritance but with an isolation from the dangers of war—now we have come to live in a new world, different from any world our forefathers lived in, more dangerous than any of them ever dreamed of—a world that is a part of a rebred revolution.

What are we to do? Are we going to sit here as if we were dealing with economics upon the hypothesis that the machine age does not exist? What happened to the old hand agricultural age, what happened to the old hand industrial age when the machine age came along? Those who stood out against it were destroyed; those who stood out against every great revolution were eventually encompassed. Are we to be described? Are we to be encompassed? Are we to let the scales close our own eyes and the shackles restrain our own acts?

We have been debating here for 2 or 3 weeks the question of a selective-service bill. We either are in an emergency or we are not. If those who sense an emergency are wrong, they should be booed and booted out of the country. If they are right, in the name of God, how can we go to sleep one night, let alone a month, without making some real beginning upon the Nation's defense and preparation?

Is peace so dear and life so sweet, as Patrick Henry said, as to be purchased at such a price? What is the matter with us?

Mr. President, we look back now at the Chamber of Deputies in what was France. They debated; they haggled; they equivocated; they controverted; they hesitated, and they "politicked" a little, they thought of the next election, and they lost dear France.

Stanley Baldwin may or may not have been right. He was thinking more about liberalism and a certain custom and social aspect than he dared to think about the British Empire. He dared not say to Britain, "You must arm till it hurts; you must pay till it pains. I will take your factories; I will take your labor; I will take your sons; and I will put them in a front line that will blast back into the darkness of a Hitler Germany any force that dares to threaten thooble institutions of English life and its dear citizenry, for which, as its leader, I have a statesman's responsibility." He did not have the courage to do that. The Conservative Party won the election and nearly lost the British Empire.

Mr. President, I belong to the dominant party, and I am proud of it. I say that the Democratic Party might equivocate on this question of getting ready for war, and wait until we have been given 4 years' blanket authority, and then have a power we would exercise as we saw fit. I thank my God that we had a greater courage than that. The President of this country is not just a candidate for office. He has in the palm of his hand and heavy upon his conscience and sad heart the responsibility for the destiny of the most glorious nation the eye of Diety has ever seen in the eons of eternity. It is not a question of whether the volunteers would come in in 60 days or not. At one time I thought about offering an amendment providing we would let them have 60 days in which to volunteer. When I reflected upon that I was so ashamed of myself that that sentiment had ever been harbored in my mind that I wanted to repudiate it at the first opportunity. It is not a question of having an army or not in some remote time. It is a question of indicating now that we will to defend ourselves against any foe, wherever the origin of his force.

If we are not willing to make up our minds that we are facing a new kind of a war and a new kind of a world, then I venture to predict, sadly, that we are going to lose that kind of a war and our kind of a world. We cannot let a man stand up in the trenches or on a field of battle with a rifle when another man has a tank. Brave infantry cannot withstand the dive bomber, and feeble artillery, the long range, destruc-

tive cannon of modern warfare. Nor can a divided people, uncertain of its course, not quite determined about its policies, defend itself against the religious fervor like that of the young soldiers of Germany who, arm in arm, threw themselves singing into battle.

I read a story of a German boy who was carried from the field to a little hospital, and who was about to die. He motioned to a nurse to bring him something. The nurse thought he wanted something out of his purse, which she opened up. He nodded. Then she looked into the purse and saw the picture of an elderly man and woman, and thought they were his mother and father and that that was the view he wanted to have before he closed his eyes in eternal sleep. But when she started to draw the pictures out he shock his head. Then she looked further into the purse and saw there a picture of Hitler, which she took out and gave to him. He took it in his shaking hand and, as he looked at it, a smile beamed upon his countenance and he passed away.

Do we have that fervor for our country? Do our youth say, "I feel that way about my country?" There are some who do, thank God, and then we have some pitiable instances where others have a contrary faith.

What can we do now to make this democracy perceive itself in the light of these dangers, and to awaken itself in the face of this threat?

It is only fair to say that a great, demoniacal figure rises from the regions below to challenge God in the heavens above. The pagan joins issue with the Christian. Old Wotan, of Germanic mythology, challenges the deity of a living Christ. Bad contends, in the arena of men's consciences with good, and all the vile and the beastly spirits challenge the right of the beautiful and the noble sentiments to live in the worlds of men's dreams and ideals.

We are deciding now what is to live and who is to live in this world, I believe if we will open our ears to the voice of America, if we will but heed the command of a brave Nation we cannot mistake the message which says, "Americans, your destiny leads you inevitably and bravely ahead."

Americans can neither hesitate nor fail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] to the amendment of the committee.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot conclude the consideration of the amendment today, and I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gibson in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported favorably the following nominations:

Claud R. Wickard, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Agriculture; and

Paul H. Appleby, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the post-masters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed.

That concludes the calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, August 23, 1940, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 22 (legislative day of August 5), 1940

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
Stewart G. Anderson, of Illinois.
Irven M. Eitreim, of South Dakota.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Scott Lyon, of Ohio.
W. Horton Schoellkopf, Jr., of Florida.
Harry H. Schwartz, of California.
Bromley K. Smith, of California.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
Oscar S. Straus, II, of New York.
John L. Topping, of New York.
Livingston D. Watrous, of New York.

Samuel H. Wiley, of North Carolina, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Carroll L. Wilson to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, vice Nathanael H. Engle, resigned.

## WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Russell S. Hummel, of Virginia, to be Work Projects Administrator for Virginia, effective as of August 15, 1940, vice William A. Smith, deceased.

Appointments in the National Guard of the United States general officers

To be Brigadier General, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States

Brig. Gen. Harold Holmes Richardson, Adjutant General's Department, Colorado National Guard.

To be Brigadier Generals, National Guard of the United States

Brig. Gen. Thomas Colladay, Michigan National Guard. Brig. Gen. John Watt Page, Texas National Guard.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22 (legislative day of August 5), 1940

## POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Lela Tate, Adamsville. Henry N. Jordan, Chatom. Lois M. McCurdy, Flomaton. Sister Mary Teresa, Holy Trinity.

#### RKANSAS

Jewell Coxsey (Mr.), Alpena Pass. Robert C. Grubbs, Eudora.

MISSOURI

Cleo O. Smith, Carthage.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fred Hollingsworth, Killdeer.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

#### MARINE CORPS

Alfred H. Noble to be colonel.
Harry B. Liversedge, to be lieutenant colonel.
Lewis B. Puller, to be major.
Lionel C. Goudeau, to be major.
Lawrence Norman, to be major.
Paul A. Putnam, to be major.
Lee N. Utz, to be major.
Dale H. Heely, to be second lieutenant.
Theodore Gooding, to be chief marine gunner.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. A. Zeller, pastor of St. Joseph's Catholic Church of Denver, Colo., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of eternal light and truth, bow down Thine ear to our humble supplications. Send forth Thy spirit upon us this day that we might fulfill the obligations which Thy wise providence has imposed upon us. Outside of Thee there is naught that is not frail and false. Dispel the doubt frailty breeds. Dispel the weakness which selfishness breeds. Send forth Thy spirit to light the path to what is right and just. Give strength to our hearts to do whatsoever accords with Thy infinite wisdom and justice. Direct our minds and hearts so that our efforts today may help prosper this great people whom Thou hast chosen for Thy blessings of peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3354. An act for the relief of Nannie E. Teal; and S. 3710. An act for the relief of James H. Hearon.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the special orders of today I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an article from Collier's Weekly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therewith an excerpt from an article in the Highland Reporter under the nom de plume of Erasimus Bluegrass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein certain statistical data from the Bureau of Government Reports on three counties in my district, and I make a similar request as to two other counties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.