

classes except perhaps what may be called the lunatic fringe of our population.

These points of agreement are:

First—The necessity for a strong defense—a strengthening of our army and navy and air force. Our people are practically unanimous on this subject—the only differences are on differences of detail. It is obvious that the richest nation of the world, in a world of force, must make itself impregnable.

Second—The belief that no foreign nation must obtain possession of any part of the two Americas and that the United States must be prepared to defend the North American continent, and at least that portion of the South American continent as far as the Equator. There is some difference of opinion as to whether military and naval protection should go as far as Cape Horn.

Third—Access to our great industrial plant by Great Britain within the limits of the neutrality law—that is, unlimited right of purchase by Great Britain of planes, tanks, munitions of war, raw materials from private manufacturers, provided she can pay for them and provide her own transportation. And this I may add is a very great aid.

Without this aid now being given, England could not long carry on the war, for her supplies of raw materials, her steel making capacity, munitions and plane plants are insufficient for a long major war. Without the production facilities of the United States she would be crushed. Theoretically, Germany is entitled to the same privilege—actually, on account of the British blockade, she cannot use our facilities, but she has no right to complain. I believe the overwhelming majority of the citizens are in accord with these three principles. I know I am.

Here Differences Begin

But it is when we get beyond the third point that opinion diverges sharply. The present administration in power, probably the majority of our editors and columnists, a very influential body of public opinion as represented by the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Britain is in favor of our government turning over some of our flying fortresses, more destroyers, more planes, and merchant ships. Others, even more extreme, favor an outright alliance with Great Britain and a declaration of war on Germany.

Now what are the fundamental arguments for this point of view? They may be reduced to three principal reasons:

First—The totalitarian state with its ideology, with its record of persecution, is repugnant to our ideals and should be destroyed, even if we have to enter a war to accomplish this result.

Second—Our own protection depends on Britain as our first line of defense, and if she falls, we are exposed to the onslaught of a totalitarian combination. Per se, it follows that we must give England all the aid we can, even at the risk of entering the war.

Third—If Britain is defeated, it will be impossible for a free competitive, unorganized and unmanaged industrial system to compete with a totalitarian system.

War Does Not Destroy Ideologies

As to the first reason, you cannot destroy an ideology by waging war on it. The conditions created in Europe by the Versailles Treaty were largely responsible for the rise of Hitler and the Nazi philosophy. The history of Europe for the last 100 years is a story of cruelties, persecutions, injustices. No government was more repugnant to our ideals and ideas than the old Czaristic regime of Russia—it had over many years a series of pogroms, but we remained on friendly terms with Russia. Up to 1917 we had always remained true to the principles of foreign policy laid down by the founders of our country: the policy of keeping aloof from the quarrels of Europe and Asia.

The Communistic regime of Russia under Lenin and Stalin was equally opposed to our principles and was detested by the majority of our people. Nevertheless, we have maintained our relations with Russia, and we have certainly had no idea of making war on that country.

Sentimentalists or Realists?

A nation cannot be a knight-errant. It must be realistic. Great Britain, during her entire history, has been coldly realistic, and her success in building up her Empire has been due to her realism. As individuals we can give vent to our generous impulses or even to our pet hates, but our statesmen, our editors, our moulders of public opinion must consider that it is not their individual fortunes and lives that are to be considered, but those of 130,000,000 of their fellow citizens.

Now as to the second reason—our military defense in the event of a German victory. Our country has gone through a curious transformation of