

File 6-43(2)/39
22

Administration Policy Of 'Practical Defense' Upheld by Pittman

Senate Foreign Relations
Chairman, in Forum
Speech, Hits Fear

Senator Key Pittman of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, spoke last night on "Our Foreign Policy" in the National Radio Forum, arranged by The Star and broadcast over a Nation-wide network of the National Broadcasting Co. The text of his address follows:

I am here tonight by invitation of the National Radio Forum, sponsored by The Washington Evening Star, to discuss the subject—"Our Foreign Policy." It is the most vital question now pending for determination by the American people and their Congress.

It will be unfortunate, indeed, for the future safety and welfare of our country if our citizens fail to give substantial support to their Government in the administration of our foreign policy. This support will not be obtained unless our citizens study the fundamental principles underlying the policy, and are not distracted in their thoughts and actions by local situations, race prejudices, political partisanship, demagoguery, or propaganda suspicion aroused by inflammatory headlines with regard to insignificant incidents.

There are only four fundamental foreign policies of governments. These policies may be stated as follows:

1. A policy based upon conquest of territory and domination of the lives of the nationals of other nations through military force or the threat of the use of military force.

2. The policy of appeasement.

3. The policy of defense. This policy includes the protection of a country's territory, and the rights of its nationals throughout the universe. It holds that such protection shall be accomplished, first, through every established, peaceful instrumentality; second, through every legal resistance to encroachments upon the integrity of a nation's territory and the rights of its nationals; and third and lastly, through the use of physical force if every other means has failed, to successfully defend its territory and the rights of its nationals.

Fourth Policy Is Isolation.

4. The last of the four policies, which some governments have practiced, is the policy of isolation.

I shall very briefly discuss, first, this latter policy, as, unfortunately, in spite of the history of its uniform puerility, it is urged by some of our citizens—even by men and women of prominence.

The people of a country, through their government, can isolate themselves for a time by refraining from taking any part in world affairs. They cannot, however, by this action impose isolation upon any other country, nor can they prevent any other country from violating their isolation. We have so many recent examples of peoples and their governments attempting to protect their territory and their peace and safety through the doctrine of isolation that the impracticability of the policy is self-evident.

Austria, since the World War, adopted and practiced a policy of isolation. Behold Austria! Ethiopia practiced the policy of isolation. Note the condition of Ethiopia. Czechoslovakia, under the rules of the League of Nations, practiced the policy of isolation. Czechoslovakia's territory has been divided up, its government destroyed and its spirit of democracy annihilated! Witness China. No people and no government ever practiced more sincerely the doctrine of isolation! They interfered with no other government and no other people. They made no preparation for defense, relying upon their peaceful attitude, the treaty promises of other governments and their pronounced and practiced policy of isolation.

Let us now return to the policy of conquest and domination through military force and the threat of the use of military force. This policy has been adopted and is now being practiced by the governments of Germany, Italy and Japan, three of the most powerful military governments in the world. These governments are absolutely controlled by arbitrary and ruthless dictators: Germany by Hitler, Italy by Mussolini and Japan by a small military clique.

Statements Serve as Guide.

What are the intentions of these military dictators? Do their policies constitute any threat to the safety of the United States? We can only determine these questions by a study of the statements and the actions of these military dictators. Time does not permit me to read the numerous statements of these dictators. They have been published time and again. They have all ridiculed democratic forms of government. They have even pitied our people in the United States because, as they allege, our Government is too weak and cowardly not only to protect our citizens and our institutions from abroad, but even to protect our peaceful citizens from lawlessness at home. They have defied the League of Nations, the nine-power treaty and every instrumentality that governments have set up to protect the integrity and the rights of small governments against unjust domination and conquest and for the preservation of peace among all nations.

The statement does not require confirmation to those who read. Great Britain and France urged that there should be arbitration with regard to the Sudetenland. Was this agreed to? No. Hitler had 1,000,000 soldiers on the border of Czechoslovakia. He had more airplanes than France and Great Britain combined. He and Mussolini had twice the capacity for production of airplanes of Great Britain and France. Hitler refused to arbitrate the justice of his demands. Why? Because Great Britain and France had discovered that Hitler had a dominating military force in the air and on land.

Could there be any more perfect demonstration of rule by force than the determination of the conference at Munich? This also clearly exposes the puerility of the power of appeasement. Hitler was not uneasy. The British government in 1932 abandoned the policy of defense and adopted the policy of appeasement. It has practiced such policy of appeasement ever since, without accomplishing anything for ultimate peace, but on the contrary to the encouragement and aid of the

ambition of the dictator governments, which ambition, unless obstructed, inevitably will lead to the most disastrous war in all history.

When Japan challenged the indictment of the League of Nations and the opinion of the world in 1932, and continued her conquest of Manchuria (a part of China), the policy of appeasement of Great Britain was expressed by Mr. Simon when he yielded to Japan on the promise that Japan would not interfere with the open-door policy in Manchuria and the commerce of Great Britain. Of course Japan never intended to maintain the open-door policy in Manchuria, and did not maintain such policy. On the contrary, through a fiction of local self-government, Japan has practically excluded the commerce of all countries—except her own—from Manchuria.

Again, when Mussolini undertook his unprovoked conquest of Ethiopia, the British government, with absolute influence over the League of Nations, composed of over 52 nations, after actuating them to assert the policy of the League of Nations, retreated under the policy of appeasement. Ethiopia was conquered. Hitler advanced and fortified the Rhine, and Great Britain, under the policy of appeasement, did nothing. Hitler conquered Austria without battle, and Great Britain yielded under the policy of appeasement. Czechoslovakia, whose territorial and political integrity were guaranteed by Great Britain and France and 52 other nations, was yielded to the military domination of Hitler under the policy of appeasement.

The policy of appeasement has accomplished nothing for ultimate peace. The policy of appeasement has accomplished nothing for justice and liberty. The policy of appeasement has been but a process of surrender and retreat before military force, with the abandonment of every treaty and every promise of protection to the independence of small countries and the liberty of peoples. May we say, however, in support of the policy of appeasement that it has postponed a few days the execution of the victims?

The policy of appeasement has not only been unsuccessful and ultimately destructive, but has been immoral. It is evident that no person can die but once, and the period of life is limited, and that it is far better that he die a few days earlier for Christianity, justice and liberty than that he live a little longer in cowardice and degeneracy.

Hitler told Chamberlain that he was only interested in the borders of the Sudetenland. A few weeks later he changed the borders of Czechoslovakia in many other particulars. He declined to permit the borders of Poland and Hungary to be joined. Why? Because every student of history knows that he intends to preserve an alley through which he can conquer Ukraine.

Does any one doubt that Hitler has in his program the domination of Ukraine? In fact, does any one doubt that Hitler has the domination of Siberia in mind? If so, simply read his book, "Mein Kampf." He is moving eastward at present. Is he succeeding? Hasn't Hungary joined his alliance? Hasn't Hungary been compelled to discharge Imre, its anti-Nazi premier, and place in his stead a Nazi premier? Did not the policy of appeasement of Great Britain surrender to the mercy of Hitler not only Czechoslovakia but Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Turkey? What is there to stop his domination, if not conquest, of these countries? What can Holland and Denmark do with regard to the demands of Hitler, in view of Hitler's dominating military force and policy and the policy of appeasement of Great Britain?

For the time being, we will pass Mussolini. He has militarized Italy to the fullest extent. He has a tremendous military force. He is by force of circumstances—and may continue to be—in the Berlin-Rome-Tokio axis.

How about Japan? Any student of history knows the fixed policy of Japan. It has been announced too often to be misunderstood. It is the domination of Eastern Asia, including the islands of the Pacific. It is a domination based upon military power. These assertions have been made by many students of history and by me on the floor of the Senate many times. Every statement and every act of the militaristic clique of Japan justifies these conclusions with regard to their intentions. They are today challenging not only their sacred agreement with us, with China and other powers to preserve and protect the political integrity of China, but they are violating their solemn agreement with us for equal opportunities in China of our citizens with the subjects of Japan. They are now taking possession of and fortifying the island of Hainan, only 700 miles from the Philippine Islands. These fortifications will control the commerce of the Far Western Pacific. They have by word and act ignored, repudiated and challenged their sacred agreement under the nine-power pact. They have through their military authorities and otherwise informed us definitely that there is a new order in Eastern Asia, and that we are out of the picture.

This is the history of the acts, at least, of the dictator powers. Their intent to dominate the world is evident to any unbiased thinking person. Well, how can this affect us is asked by even those who have the right to be called statesmen. It must be evident that at the present

time there is nothing to stop the conquest of Europe and Asia by the three dictator powers. Does that affect us? I pass the question of our islands in the Pacific. I pass the question as to whether after their conquest they would directly attack the United States. The question is, would they attempt to dominate the Latin American republics? Some may say "Why should they?" Others may say "No." As a matter of fact, the broad areas of Latin America with its vast resources of natural wealth can not be overlooked by

ambitious dictators. That might be a presumption. As a matter of fact, we know that the three dictatorial powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, are increasing their populations and influence in Latin America. We know that these dictatorial powers are through every means, monetary, financial and political, preparing for the domination of Latin America.

Of course, this penetration into Latin America does not become pertinent, and will not become pertinent until and unless these totalitarian powers have obtained sufficient domination in Europe and Asia to permit them to move in force against Latin America. Any reasonable man will say that that is possible. Any reasonable man would say we should protect against such possibility.

We hear pacifists say we will defend our own shores, but we will fight nowhere else. Will we fight against the threat to our own shores? Where does the threat start? Are we to wait until a fleet lands its marines on the Atlantic and Pacific and its airplanes bomb our cities? Are we to wait until military forces are established on our borders and airplane bases established that may freely bomb the Panama Canal, before we act? Are we to pursue the policy of appeasement and surrender and retreat before the threat of war, until our own country has been made the battleground of a foreign invader, and our aged and our women and children are bombed from the air?

I assert that no patriotic American citizen will agree to such a cowardly, unpatriotic and disastrous policy.

And what is our foreign policy in the circumstances? I have attempted to state it in the third policy. The President, in his message to Congress, clearly stated our policy, as I have attempted to restate it here. We will enter into no entangling alliances. We will be prepared, singly and alone, to

successfully defend our country, its institutions and our citizens. We will not aid a government whose policy is based upon conquest and military domination. We will not refuse the oppressed governments any aid that we may legally give them, short of war. We will prepare, without alliance, to defend our Government, its institutions, its people and their rights against any illegal and unjust attacks. We will, unafraid, resist any encroachments upon the rights of our citizens under any treaties with us by every legal means at our command short of war, relying upon this power which in my opinion is sufficient and will avert war. We are not frightened, however, by the circumstances that this resistance may cause some other country to declare war upon us.

In the first place, that declaration would be both absurd and futile. No country can successfully attack our shores. In the second place, our people are not cowardly. While they hate war they are not afraid to die for Christianity, morality, justice and liberty. Many a mistake has been made in past history by not letting dictator governments know this on the spot. They probably would never have moved. That we will die, however, for these things we consider worth more than life, we know. And possibly we will preserve peace, by telling people who do not understand these things, what we intend to do and will do.

There is a propaganda going

through this country today that would be despicable except that it is pitiful—preaching the doctrine of fear; fear that if we assert our right to enjoy religion, morality and justice and our right to liberty that we will be forced into war.

We are told that the legal things that the President has done to date are leading us into war as we were led into war in 1917.

The situations in 1917 and today with regard to our foreign policy are entirely different. Prior to the World War our people, our President and our Congress asserted the rights of our citizens to enjoy the freedom of the seas under the accepted rules of international law. That law was definite as to neutrals having a right to trade with neutrals. Neutrals had a right to trade even with belligerents. No ship of neutrals could be destroyed when trading with neutrals; no ship of a neutral could be destroyed even when trading with a belligerent and even if carrying contraband of war, without first making provision for the safety of those on board the ship. Both sides in the World War denied neutrals their right under international law. The only difference was that one side did not destroy lives, and the other did.

President Wilson protested against the violation of our neutral rights for months and months, and then came the final order of the German government, which read as follows:

"Under these circumstances Germany will meet the illegal measures

of her enemies by forceful preventing, after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean, all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England, from and to France, etc., etc. All ships met with in that zone will be sunk."

Remember that the line of this zone was hundreds of miles out in the Atlantic, and unmarked, and excluded the neutral ships of the United States from all the neutral countries in Europe. Between February 1, 1917, and the day of the declaration of war by the United States, on April 6, our merchant ships were destroyed in that zone without notice, with the loss of the lives of 73 of our citizens.

The people of this country chose war. The President of the United States was impelled to ask for a declaration of war, but it was the Congress of the United States under the Constitution, and the Congress alone, that declared war. Congress could have refused to declare war. It didn't. Look back over the record vote and you will find that only a few in each House voted against it.

Today the foreign policy of our Government has been modified by the neutrality act passed by Congress and approved by President Roosevelt. In effect it modifies, if it doesn't abandon, our right to the freedom of the seas under international law.

We will not now permit any arms, ammunition or implements of war

cannot lead us into war. Every member of Congress is an elected representative of American citizens. Never in the history of the United States were such representatives more responsive to the will of their constituents. This is right and in accord with our form of representative Government. Congress, under the accepted policy of our Government, will not lead us into war.

Why further impose upon the credulity and the fear of our citizens? Why join in the policies of appeasement or isolation that have not made for peace but for war throughout the world? Why not wholeheartedly support the honorable, peaceful and practicable policy of our administration? Every patriotic citizen will!

Does any one doubt that Hitler has in his program the domination of Ukraine? In fact, does any one doubt that Hitler has the domination of Siberia in mind? If so, simply read his book, "Mein Kampf." He is moving eastward at present. Is he succeeding? Hasn't Hungary joined his alliance? Hasn't Hungary been compelled to discharge Imreedy, its anti-Nazi premier, and place in his stead a Nazi premier? Did not

ambitious dictators. That might be a presumption. As a matter of fact, we know that the three dictatorial powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, are increasing their populations, their influence in Latin America, and know that these dictators are through every financial and political

through this country today that would be despicable except that it is pitiful—preaching the doctrine of fear; fear that if we assert our right to enjoy religion, morality and justice and our right to liberty that we will be drawn into war. The legal things done to date we were

How again? of history knows the history of Japan. It has been announced often to be misunderstood. It is the domination of Eastern Asia, including the islands of the Pacific. It is a domination based upon military power. These assertions have been made by many students of history and by me on the floor of the Senate many times. Every statement and every act of the militaristic clique of Japan justifies these conclusions with regard to their intentions. They are today challenging not only their sacred agreement with us, with China and other powers to preserve and protect the political integrity of China, but they are violating their solemn agreement with us for equal opportunities in China of our citizens with the subjects of Japan. They are now taking possession of and fortifying the island of Hainan, only 700 miles from the Philippine Islands. These fortifications will control the commerce of the Far Western Pacific. They have by word and act ignored, repudiated and challenged their sacred agreement under the nine-power pact. They have through their military authorities and otherwise informed us definitely that there is a new order in Eastern Asia, and that we are out of the picture.

This is the history of the acts, at least, of the dictator powers. Their intent to dominate the world is evident to any unbiased thinking person. Well, how can this affect us is asked by even those who have the right to be called statesmen. It must be evident that at the present

time there is nothing to stop the conquest of Europe and Asia by the three dictator powers. Does that affect us? I pass the question of our islands in the Pacific. I pass the question as to whether after their conquest they would directly attack the United States. The question is, would they attempt to dominate the Latin American republics? Some may say "Why should they?" Others may say "No." As a matter of fact, the broad areas of Latin America with its vast resources of natural wealth can not be overlooked by

in before the policy of surrender and retreat before the threat of war, until our own country has been made the battleground of a foreign invader, and our aged and our women and children are bombed from the air?

I assert that no patriotic American citizen will agree to such a cowardly, unpatriotic and disastrous policy.

And what is our foreign policy in the circumstances? I have attempted to state it in the third policy. The President, in his message to Congress, clearly stated our policy, as I have attempted to restate it here. We will enter into no entangling alliances. We will be prepared, singly and alone, to

successfully defend our country, its institutions and our citizens. We will not aid a government whose policy is based upon conquest and military domination. We will not refuse the oppressed governments any aid that we may legally give them, short of war. We will prepare, without alliance, to defend our Government, its institutions, its people and their rights against any illegal and unjust attacks. We will, unafraid, resist any encroachments upon the rights of our citizens under any treaties with us by every legal means at our command short of war, relying upon this power which in my opinion is sufficient and will avert war. We are not frightened, however, by the circumstances that this resistance may cause some other country to declare war upon us.

In the first place, that declaration would be both absurd and futile. No country can successfully attack our shores. In the second place, our people are not cowardly. While they hate war they are not afraid to die for Christianity, morality, justice and liberty. Many a mistake has been made in past history by not letting dictator governments know this on the start. They probably would never have moved. That we will die, however, for these things we consider worth more than life, we know. And possibly we will preserve peace, by telling people who do not understand these things, what we intend to do and will do.

There is a propaganda going

to be shipped to any belligerent country or to any neutral country for reshipment to a belligerent country. We will not permit any products of the United States to be shipped to a belligerent country by a citizen of the United States. The title must first be transferred to a foreigner. The President is authorized to prevent our ships from engaging in commerce with belligerents. Our citizens are prohibited from traveling upon belligerent passenger ships.

President Wilson did not and could not lead us into war in 1917. President Roosevelt, under the approval of our Government and the Neutrality Act, has no intention to lead us into war and cannot lead us into war. Every member of Congress is an elected representative of American citizens. Never in the history of the United States were such representatives more responsive to the will of their constituents. This is right and in accord with our form of representative Government. Congress, under the accepted policy of our Government, will not lead us into war.

Why further impose upon the credulity and the fear of our citizens? Why join in the policies of appeasement or isolation that have not made for peace but for war throughout the world? Why not wholeheartedly support the honorable, peaceful and practicable policy of our administration? Every patriotic citizen will!

LOTS
Sale
D's—No Alterations
Final
S At B
From