

way to maintain the friendship of our neighbors to the South, I think we should also make it clearly understood that no government in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean South American countries will be tolerated unless it is friendly to the United States and that, if necessary, we are prepared to use force to attain that object.

Instead of what seems to be a sane objective we are on the verge of throwing our treasure and our blood into a European war, with consequences that no one can foretell.

I respect the honest views of honest Americans, no matter how opposed they may be to my own, but there are two matters that I resent: First is the attempt to smear any one opposed to what I might call the majority publicized viewpoint of what we should do in this war. When the editor of a pink New York sheet denounces Col. Lindbergh as the head of the Fifth Column in the U. S., we have reached the summit of mud slinging. You may disagree violently with Col. Lindbergh, you may feel he has made serious mistakes, but you have no right to denounce a courageous, patriotic American citizen as a traitor merely because he disagrees with your views. That is as bad as the Nazis, an attempt to suppress freedom of speech.

The other point I resent is the way the issue is being presented to the American people. We are being edged into the war without the masses' knowledge. We have the anomalous situation of the polls showing a majority of the people favoring a course that is bound to get us into the war, while the same polls show 86% of the same people oppose actual entry into the war. That shows that the minds of the people are confused.

How Wars Are Sold to Us

Many of my hearers were adults at the time of the previous war and were familiar with the propaganda that led up to that war. If you want to know the history of that propaganda and its falsity, read a book by Sir Philip Gibbs with the title of "Now It Can Be Told," in which he admitted the outrageous lies that were perpetrated on the American public. And Sir Philip Gibbs was no German but the leading English war correspondent, knighted by his King. The London Economist in a recent issue said it was only a question of time until American public opinion could be brought to the point where we would actively enter the war.

I believe a majority of the people who are advocating "aid short of war" do not desire us to enter the war. But there are others who do desire us to

enter the war, who are taking the necessary steps to prepare the American people for active participation, who would enter it tomorrow if they dared, who are today in practical alliance with England, and unfortunately they are the people who are shaping our national policy today. You hear in Washington today that we are now in the war. You hear predictions from men, and men who ought to know, that we will actively enter the war within sixty days after the election.

The American people should think this matter through. The course we are pursuing is bound to involve us in the war. You cannot play with fire and not get burned. You cannot have your government, not private manufacturers, transfer its equipment to foreign powers, you cannot have your government in an unofficial alliance with a foreign power, you cannot be a meddler in Indo-China, berate Italy and Germany without eventually involving the nation in war, and if war comes I venture to predict that we will repeat the history of the last war. When the declaration of war was made in 1917 originally it was intended to send only the Navy to the assistance of the Allies.

Man-Power, Too!

Joffre came over in the spring of 1917, told the plight of the French Army after the 1917 spring Champagne offensive, where whole divisions of the French Army mutinied, and implored us to send over a token force, otherwise France would collapse. We sent Pershing and the First Division, about 30,000 men. Then came the impending collapse of Russia, frantic calls for more men, then the great German offensive of 1918 and the rout of the British Fifth Army, more frantic appeals, until finally we put under arms 4,000,000 men, sent 2,000,000 men to France, spent 20 billion dollars and had 150,000 casualties. I need not refer to our treatment by our former allies after the Armistice. They took the loot, we did not even get thanks.

I do not often agree with the editorials on foreign policy in my friend Frank Knox's paper, but there is a recent editorial with which I am in 100% agreement. The editorial quoted two recent speeches by both Presidential candidates in which both pledged themselves never to send American boys to France. The editorial spoke of both these pledges as political bunk and very truly stated that if we entered the war we would enter it to win and, if necessary to win, we would send an expeditionary force—and that is the absolute truth.