

# Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Shadow of War, 1933-1941

The epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. . . . There must be positive endeavors to preserve peace.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1937

**Prologue:** The same depression that generated the New Deal at home accelerated the rise of power-hungry dictators abroad: Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese warlords. Congress tried to insulate the nation from the imminent world war by arms embargoes and other presumed safeguards. But when Hitler attacked Poland in 1939, the American people found themselves torn between two desires: they wanted to avoid involvement, but they feared for their future security if they did not get involved to the extent of bolstering the democracies. Under Roosevelt's prodding, Congress repealed the arms embargo in 1939, and the administration gradually took a series of steps that removed any pretense of neutrality. Most Americans—except the diehard isolationists—were willing to risk hostilities in an effort to help the democracies and halt the aggressors. Roosevelt took the gamble but lost when a shooting war developed with Germany in the Atlantic, and when Japan struck a devastating aerial blow at Pearl Harbor.

## A. The Arms Embargo Debate

### 1. Senator Connally Rejects Rigidity (1935)

*By the mid-1930s Hitler was on the rise in Germany and Mussolini was on the loose in Ethiopia. An apprehensive U.S. public was determined to legislate itself out of the next world war by a straitjacket neutrality law. A special Senate investigation launched in 1934 and headed by the notoriety-seeking Senator Nye had left the impression that the manufacturers of arms had dragged the United States into World War I. If Congress would only embargo munitions, the nation would (on paper) keep out of World War II. Senator Connally, the long-haired, string-tie Texan orator who headed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, showed himself unswayed by this logic in the following speech. Did the proposed neutrality legislation provide for true neutrality?*

Is it an expression of neutral ambitions for territorial conquests trying to pursue its own destiny—arms to neither of you," thereby covetous nation, the ambitious n impose its will on a weaker and

Mr. President, that is not neutral declaration which announces that powerful against the weak, the u determination to the President of foreign relations, it becomes a so crisis of that kind?

We cannot now put the United States keep out of war. We cannot by an cast internationally which will fit

### 2. Roosevelt Pleads for Repeal

*Despite Connally's urging, in 1937 made no distinction between launched World War II in September munitions to the unprepared d interest both cried aloud for aid moned Congress into special sessic wrong on two counts. First, the ar; a departure from long-established, bargo and nonintercourse acts di days of averting it. What does thi politician? What did he see as the 1*

Beginning with the founderator the American policy in respect to l been based on international law.

The single exception was the I Wars, when, seeking to avoid inv called Embargo and Non-Interco failure—first, because it brought o was the major cause of bringing u own War of 1812. It is merely recit the policy of embargo and non-i Capitol in which we are assemble

Our next deviation by statute through international law, did not Act of 1935—only 4 years ago—a May 1, 1937, despite grave doubts

# Franklin D. Roosevelt The Shadow of War, 1933-1941

awlessness is spreading. . . . There must be  
endeavors to preserve peace.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1937

depression that generated the New Deal at home accelerated  
y dictators abroad: Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war-  
insulate the nation from the imminent world war by arms  
sumed safeguards. But when Hitler attacked Poland in 1939,  
and themselves torn between two desires: they wanted to  
they feared for their future security if they did not get involved  
ng the democracies. Under Roosevelt's prodding, Congress  
go in 1939, and the administration gradually took a series of  
pretense of neutrality. Most Americans—except the diehard  
ng to risk hostilities in an effort to help the democracies and  
sevelt took the gamble but lost when a shooting war devel-  
e Atlantic, and when Japan struck a devastating aerial blow at

## Subjects Rigidly (1935)

ter was on the rise in Germany and Mussolini was on the  
reversible U.S. public was determined to legislate itself out of  
: straitjacket neutrality law. A special Senate investigation  
headed by the notoriety-seeking Senator Nye had left the  
facturers of arms had dragged the United States into World  
only embargo munitions, the nation would (on paper) keep  
ator Connally, the long-haired, string-tie Texan orator who  
in Relations Committee, showed himself unswayed by this  
sch. Did the proposed neutrality legislation provide for true

ambitions for territorial conquest, the other unprepared, the other weak, the other  
trying to pursue its own destiny—is it neutral to say to those nations, "We shall give  
arms to neither of you," thereby insuring the triumph of the prepared nation, the  
covetous nation, the ambitious nation, the nation which seeks by force of arms to  
impose its will on a weaker and defenseless nation?

Mr. President, that is not neutrality; that is a form of unneutrality. That is a form of  
declaration which announces that the United States will take the side of the strong and  
powerful against the weak, the unprepared, and the defenseless. Why not leave that  
determination to the President of the United States when and if, in his conduct of our  
foreign relations, it becomes a sound American policy for him to take a position in a  
crisis of that kind?

We cannot now put the United States into an international strait jacket and thereby  
keep out of war. We cannot by an act of Congress put the United States into a concrete  
cast internationally which will fit all future occasions and solve all future problems.

## 2. Roosevelt Pleads for Repeal (1939)

*Despite Connally's urging, the arms-embargoing Neutrality Acts of 1935 and  
1937 made no distinction between aggressor and victim. When Hitler wantonly  
launched World War II in September 1939, the United States could not legally sell  
munitions to the unprepared democracies, even though U.S. sentiment and self-  
interest both cried aloud for aid to Britain and France. A worried Roosevelt sum-  
moned Congress into special session and made the following dramatic appeal. He was  
wrong on two counts. First, the arms embargo, as purely domestic legislation, was not  
a departure from long-established international law. Second, the Jeffersonian em-  
bargo and nonintercourse acts did not cause the War of 1812; they came within a few  
days of averting it. What does this excerpt suggest about Roosevelt's technique as a  
politician? What did he see as the most dangerous loophole in the existing legislation?*

Beginning with the foundation of our constitutional Government in the year 1789,  
the American policy in respect to belligerent nations, with one notable exception, has  
been based on international law. . . .

The single exception was the policy adopted by this nation during the Napoleonic  
Wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-  
called Embargo and Non-Intercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous  
failure—first, because it brought our own nation close to ruin, and, second, because it  
was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our  
own War of 1812. It is merely reciting history to recall to you that one of the results of  
the policy of embargo and non-intercourse was the burning in 1814 of part of this  
Capitol in which we are assembled.

Our next deviation by statute from the sound principles of neutrality, and peace  
through international law, did not come for 130 years. It was the so-called Neutrality  
Act of 1935—only 4 years ago—an Act continued in force by the Joint Resolution of  
May 1, 1937, despite grave doubts expressed as to its wisdom by many Senators and

ng, 1st sess. (August 24, 1935), p. 14432.

<sup>2</sup> *Congressional Record*, 76th Cong., 2d sess. (September 21, 1939), pp. 10-11.

Representatives and by officials charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, including myself.

I regret that the Congress passed that Act. I regret equally that I signed that Act. On July 14th of this year, I asked the Congress, in the cause of peace and in the interest of real American neutrality and security, to take action to change that Act.

I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the Act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the law of nations—the [arms] embargo provisions. I ask it because they are, in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace.

These embargo provisions, as they exist today, prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory of any completed implements of war, but they allow the sale of many types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general material and supplies. They, furthermore, allow such products of industry [e.g., copper] and agriculture [e.g., cotton] to be taken in American-flag ships to belligerent nations. There in itself—under the present law—lies definite danger to our neutrality and our peace.

### 3. Senator Vandenberg Fights Repeal (1939)

*Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan—vulnerable orator, long-time newspaperman, and author of books on Alexander Hamilton—was a leader of the Republican isolationists and a serious contender for the presidential nomination in 1940. Later, in 1945, he underwent a spectacular conversion to internationalism, and rose to heights of statesmanship in supporting the Marshall Plan for the rehabilitation of postwar Europe. While fighting against the repeal of the arms embargo in 1939, he wrote in his diary that he deplored Roosevelt's "treacherous" and "cowardly" idea that the United States could be "half in and half out of this war." Hating Hitlerism, he felt that the honorable course would be to go in or to stay out—and he much preferred to stay out. In this speech in the Senate against the repeal of the arms embargo, what does he regard as both unneutral and unethical?*

Mr. President, I believe this debate symbolically involves the most momentous decision, in the eyes of America and of the World, that the United States Senate has confronted in a generation.

In the midst of foreign war and the alarms of other wars, we are asked to depart basically from the neutrality which the American Congress has twice told the world, since 1935, would be our rule of conduct in such an event. We are particularly asked to depart from it through the repeal of existing neutrality law establishing an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. We are asked to depart from it in violation of our own officially asserted doctrine, during the [first] World War, that the rules of a neutral cannot be prejudicially altered in the midst of a war.

We are asked to depart from international law itself, as we ourselves have officially declared it to exist. Consciously or otherwise, but mostly consciously, we are asked to depart from it in behalf of one belligerent whom our personal sympathies largely favor, and against another belligerent whom our personal feelings largely condemn.

### B. The Intervention Issue

In my opinion, this is the road that may lead to it . . .

The proponents of the change veer ours, is to keep America out of the war, and our people. But the motive is obvious, and inevitably invited by the circumstances, Somebody will be fooled—either the wholly pacific, or the foreigners who believe disillusionments would be intolerable fooled—either those at home who expect little.

There is no such hazard, at least to the existing law precisely as we almost intention as recently as 1935 and 1937. In America, in maintaining the arms embargo thus be persuasively conjured.

Therefore millions of Americans are reason for the change, but infinite reason sole objective. I am one who deeply hold side.

*[Despite such pleas, the arms embargo vote was 55 to 24 in the Senate, 243 to*

### B. The Intervention Issue

#### 1. Lindbergh Argues for Isolation (19

*After France fell to Hitler in 1940, interventionists called for a helping hand to The isolationist America First group proclaimed "Nazi-European victory." Boyish-faced, who had narrowed the Atlantic with his of the ocean in his new role as a leader. many's aircraft facilities in 1938, he stated him) could never be conquered in the air which he was a specialist, form some strategic position that he made in this speech 1941. To what extent is interventionism figures were correct? Is his analysis of p*

We have weakened ourselves for our own people, by this dabbling in



## B. The Intervention Issue

No one can make us fight abroad unless we attempt to fight us here if we arm our hundred million people in this nation. Democracy means anything at all is forced into a war against the wisdom we will have proved democracy successful for it abroad.

The time has come when those destined must band together and organize by a minority of our people. This minority voice. But it does not represent the have traveled over this country for hundreds of men and women, and I feel the same way as you and I.

*[Public-opinion polls during the majority of the American people who favored helping Britain even at the cost of about two-to-one support in the presidential voting.]*

## 2. The New York Times Rejects (1941)

The New York Times challenges the editorial that brilliantly states principal points.

Those who tell us now that the tremendous forces sweeping the world lie to their own words in the preface

To a man they favor an enormous what danger would they have us arm and guns, if there is no immediate threat we training the youth of the country racing against time to double and quadruple

No man in his senses will say that American neighbors to the south, and are arming solely for one reason. We predatory Power in alliance with Japan

It has been said, times without Channel he cannot cross three thousand he had not crossed the English Channel Britons, in a heroic resistance, have



**New Neutrality Legislation**  
Dual crises required drastic action.  
(Philadelphia Inquirer, 1939)

concentrating on American defense, we have been forced to argue over foreign quarrels. We must turn our eyes and our faith back to our own country before it is too late. And when we do this, a different vista opens before us.

Practically every difficulty we would face in invading Europe becomes an asset to us in defending America. Our enemy, and not we, would then have the problem of transporting millions of troops across the ocean and landing them on a hostile shore. They, and not we, would have to furnish the convoys to transport guns and trucks and munitions and fuel across three thousand miles of water. Our battleships and our submarines would then be fighting close to their home bases. We would then do the bombing from the air and the torpedoing at sea. And if any part of an enemy convoy should ever pass our navy and our air force, they would still be faced with the guns of our coast artillery, and behind them the divisions of our Army.

The United States is better situated from a military standpoint than any other nation in the world. Even in our present condition of unpreparedness no foreign power is in a position to invade us today. If we concentrate on our own defenses and build the strength that this nation should maintain, no foreign army will ever attempt





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

### 3. FDR Pledges No Foreign War (1940)

*During the hotly contested third-term campaign of 1940, the Republican candidate, Wendell Willkie, harped on Roosevelt's broken promises. The president's reelection, he charged, would spell war by April 1, 1941. Smarting from this attack, Roosevelt replied as follows in a memorable Boston speech, which later came back to plague him. Inasmuch as Willkie himself later dismissed his own prediction as "a bit of campaign oratory," was Roosevelt bound by this campaign pledge, regardless of subsequent circumstances?*

And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance.

I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

Yes, the purpose of our defense is defense.

*[In previous speeches Roosevelt had ordinarily followed the no-war pledge with the words "except in case of attack." To blunt the force of Willkie's accusation, he now left out the qualification. When asked why he was going to do so, he replied somewhat lamely, "It's not necessary. If we're attacked, it's no longer a foreign war."]*

## C. The Lend-Lease Controversy

### 1. FDR Drops the Dollar Sign (1940)

*A serious student of history, Roosevelt was determined to avoid the blunders of World War I. The postwar quarrel with the Allies over debts lingered in his memory as he groped for some means of bolstering the hard-pressed British without getting involved in a repayment unangle. Keeping his new brainstorm under his hat until his triumphant reelection over Willkie—he might have lost if he had revealed it before then—he outlined his scheme at one of his breezy, off-the-cuff press conferences. How did he propose to eliminate the root of the debt difficulty?*

<sup>3</sup>The New York Times, October 31, 1940 (speech of October 30, 1940).

<sup>1</sup>The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1940 Volume (1941), pp. 606-608.

way. It is the resolute determination of British arms. Were Britain lost, the Atlantic would no longer be an obstacle—broad highway for a conqueror moving westward." not need to attempt at once an invasion of continental France this country in deadly danger. We shall be in deadly sea power fails; the moment the eastern gates of the fortress; the moment we are compelled to divide our oceans simultaneously.

ts [German, Italian, Japanese] outmatch our own: they are in fleet in every category of vessel, from warships and submarines.\* The combined Axis air strength will own if Hitler strikes in time—and when has he failed to of Europe will have at his command shipways that can twenty conquered nations to furnish his materials, the oil us engines, the slave labor of a continent—bound by no g on a forty-hour week—to turn out his production. prestige of a victory over Britain, and who can doubt that the ocean, would be the prompt appearance of imitation

Latin-American nations, forced to be on the winning ing for admission to the Axis? What shall we do then? bors, send armies to fight in the jungles of Central or of outraging native sentiment and turning the whole we sit tight while the area of Nazi influence draws ever nd a spreading checkerboard of Nazi airfields provides es that may choose to bomb our cities? us time, what kind of "time" would we have at our

ual dangers for this country as well as physical dangers angers to the mind and heart as well as to the body and

minating Africa and Asia through his Axis partners, it the United States to live an untroubled and successful e the arch-enemy of all he stands for: the very citadel of he hates and scorns. As long as liberty and freedom here would be constant risk for Hitler that our ideas he conquered countries which he was bending to his uld be forced to harry us at every turn.

ves would be poisoned every day by challenges and at Nazi agents would stir up anti-American feeling in that Nazi spies would overrun us here; that Hitler ries of lightning diplomatic strokes—alliances and our will; in short, that a continuous war of nerves, if against us?

equal to the sum of all their parts. There are different languages munition, different types of maneuvers, and so forth.





**Hands Across the Sea**  
FDR extends a fist to Hitler and a hand to Britain through lend-lease. (Orr in Scottish Daily Record [Glasgow], 1941)

It is possible—I will put it that way—for the United States to take over British [war] orders, and, because they are essentially the same kind of munitions that we use ourselves, turn them into American orders. We have got enough money to do it. And thereupon, as to such portion of them as the military events of the future determine to be right and proper for us to allow to go to the other side, either lease or sell the materials, subject to mortgage, to the people on the other side. That would be on the general theory that it may still prove true that the best defense of Great Britain is the best defense of the United States, and therefore that these materials would be more useful to the defense of the United States if they were used in Great Britain than if they were kept in storage here.

Now, what I am trying to do is to eliminate the dollar sign. That is something brand new in the thoughts of practically everybody in this room, I think—get rid of the silly, foolish old dollar sign.

Well, let me give you an illustration: Suppose my neighbor's home catches fire, and I have a length of garden hose four or five hundred feet away. If he can take my garden hose and connect it up with his hydrant, I may help him to put out his fire. Now, what do I do? I don't say to him before that operation, "Neighbor, my garden hose cost me \$15; you have got to pay me \$15 for it." What is the transaction that goes on? I don't want \$15—I want my garden hose back after the fire is over. All right. If it goes through the fire all right, intact, without any damage to it, he gives it back to me

### C. The Lend-Lease Controversy

"I was glad to lend you that hose; I says, 'How many feet of it were there?' 'All right, I will replace it.' Now, if shape.

In other words, if you lend the end of the war, if they are intact—been damaged or have deteriorated come out pretty well if you have them.

*[After the United States entered U.S. forces were credited to their account. Lend-lease was over \$50 billion, less was involved in the final settlement.]*

### 2. Senator Wheeler Assails Lend-Lease

*Like the interventionists, Roosevelt large-scale military aid was crucial to the isolationist opposition that the Act to Intervene in World War II forced Act Further to Promote the Defense law virtually pledged the United States to provide military supplies for those in K. Wheeler of Montana, "a born isolationist. In the following radi*

The lend-lease policy, translation wholly sympathetic to the future of America, and it c

The lend-lease-give program plow under every fourth America.

Never before have the Americans bounteously and so completely of has the Congress of the United States tional law. Never before has this foreign affairs. Never before has t this Nation of its defenses. Never t abdicate.

If the American people want government and if they want war gress, as is the wont of President Approval of this legislation n

says, "How many feet of it were there?" I tell him, "There were 1,000 feet of it. In days, "All right, I will replace it." Now, if I get a nice garden hose back, I am in pretty good shape.

In other words, if you lend certain munitions and get the munitions back at the end of the war, if they are intact—haven't been hurt—you are all right. If they have been damaged or have deteriorated or have been lost completely, it seems to me you come out pretty well if you have them replaced by the fellow to whom you have lent them.

*[After the United States entered the war, supplies provided by foreign countries to U.S. forces were credited to their account as reverse lend-lease. The total value of U.S. lend-lease was over \$50 billion, less some \$7 billion in reverse lend-lease. Some cash was involved in the final settlement of accounts.]*

## 2. Senator Wheeler Assails Lend-Lease (1941)

*Like the interventionists, Roosevelt believed that the salvation of Britain through large-scale military aid was crucial for the defense of the United States. But so strong was isolationist opposition that the proposed lend-lease act could not be entitled "An Act to Intervene in World War II for the Defense of Britain." The official title was "An Act Further to Promote the Defense of the United States." As finally passed, the new law virtually pledged the United States to the full extent of its economic resources to provide military supplies for those who were fighting aggression. Fiery Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana, "a born prosecutor" who had run for vice-president on the left-wing La Follette Progressive ticket of 1924, was one of the most vehement isolationists. In the following radio speech, how prophetic is he?*

The lend-lease policy, translated into legislative form, stunned a Congress and a nation wholly sympathetic to the cause of Great Britain. . . . It warranted my worst fears for the future of America, and it definitely stamps the President as war-minded.

The lend-lease-give program is the New Deal's Triple-A foreign policy; it will plow under every fourth American boy.

Never before have the American people been asked or compelled to give so bounteously and so completely of their tax dollars to any foreign nation. Never before has the Congress of the United States been asked by any President to violate international law. Never before has this Nation resorted to duplicity in the conduct of its foreign affairs. Never before has the United States given to one man the power to strip this Nation of its defenses. Never before has a Congress coldly and flatly been asked to abdicate.

If the American people want a dictatorship—if they want a totalitarian form of government and if they want war—this bill should be steamrollered through Congress, as is the wont of President Roosevelt.

Approval of this legislation means war, open and complete warfare. I, therefore,

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in *Congressional Record*, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (speech of January 12, 1941). Appendix, pp. 178-179.

to Britain through lend-lease. (Orr in Scottish

hat way—for the United States to take over British e essentially the same kind of munitions that we use an orders. We have got enough money to do it. And em as the military events of the future determine to ow to go to the other side, either lease or sell the the people on the other side. That would be on the rove true that the best defense of Great Britain is ates, and therefore that these materials would be United States if they were used in Great Britain than

is to eliminate the dollar sign. That is something tically everybody in this room, I think—get rid of

ration: Suppose my neighbor's home catches fire, e four or five hundred feet away. If he can take my th his hydrant, I may help him to put out his fire. him before that operation, "Neighbor, my garden ay me \$15 for it." What is the transaction that goes arden hose back after the fire is over. All right. If it t, without any damage to it, he gives it back to me se of it. But suppose it gets smashed up—holes in o have too much formality about it, but I say to him,



ask the American people before they supinely accept it, Was the last World War worth while?

If it were, then we should lend and lease war materials. If it were, then we should lend and lease American boys. President Roosevelt has said we would be repaid by England. We will be repaid, just as England repaid her war debts of the first World War—repaid those dollars wrung from the sweat of labor and the toil of farmers with cries of "Uncle Shylock." Our boys will be returned—returned in caskets, maybe; returned with bodies maimed; returned with minds warped and twisted by sights of horrors and the scream and shriek of high-powered shells.

Considered on its merits and stripped of its emotional appeal to our sympathies, the lend-lease-give bill is both ruinous and ridiculous. . . .

It gives to one man—responsible to no one—the power to denude our shores of every warship. It gives to one individual the dictatorial power to strip the American Army of our every tank, cannon, rifle, or anti-aircraft gun. No one would deny that the lend-lease-give bill contains provisions that would enable one man to render the United States defenseless, but they will tell you, "The President would never do it." To this I say, "Why does he ask the power if he does not intend to use it?" Why not, I say, place some check on American donations to a foreign nation? . . .

I say in the kind of language used by the President—shame on those who ask the powers—and shame on those who would grant them.

*[Talk of "plowing under every fourth American boy" spurred Roosevelt into declaring at his press conference of January 14, 1941, that this was "the most untruthful, the most dastardly, unpatriotic thing that has ever been said. Quote me on that. That really is the rottenest thing that has been said in public life in my generation." What measure of truth was there in Wheeler's charge?]*

### 3. Hearst Denounces Aid to the Soviet Union (1941)

*The fateful lend-lease bill became law in March 1941. Three months later Hitler treacherously attacked Stalin, his co-conspirator in the nonaggression pact of 1939. Isolationists rejoiced that the two arch-menaces would now bleed each other white and thus reduce the danger of U.S. involvement. Catholics expressed relief at the weakening of the atheistic menace of Soviet Russia. Roosevelt, however, fearful that the Russians could not stem Hitler's mechanized might, promised them lend-lease aid and ultimately delivered supplies worth \$11 billion. The Hearst press here expresses distaste for "Bloody Joe" Stalin as a bedfellow. To what extent were its apprehensions justified by events?*

If we are fighting totalitarianism as a foul principle and oppressive policy, why in the name of high heaven should we not desire to see the two totalitarian powers exterminate each other and destroy not only the principle but the practice of despotic government?

If we are citizens—or subjects—of a genuine democracy and if we are devoted to the ideals of democracy, and honestly desirous of preserving and perpetuating those

### D. War in the Atlantic

ideals, why should we not desire other? . . .

Is our free country piling up d taxation, rushing headlong into nat and shipping our war materials to spread it over all of Europe, includ own America?

We may not think that this is v doing with our Bolshevik alliance that outstanding fact.

No country which fights for R since Bolshevism is the basest anc civilization of Europe since the ti

No country can truthfully cl freedoms when it is supporting racy—a tyranny where all the fo ranny with no liberty, no opportu

### D. War in the Atlantic

#### 1. Framing the Atlantic Charter

*Roosevelt finally met with Pri of Newfoundland in August 194 ments, common defense, and the that for Roosevelt—the head of a the prime minister of a belligeren action." The most spectacular of Charter, which in 1942 became t the old Wilson Fourteen Points ( hope to the victims of the dictator "wartlike action"?*

. . . The President of the Ur Churchill, representing His Maje together, deem it right to make policies of their respective cou future for the world.

First, their countries seek nc Second, they desire to see nc Expressed wishes of the peoples Fourteen Points; in part Points v Third, they respect the righ

ild lend and lease war materials. If it were, then we should  
oys. President Roosevelt has said we would be repaid by  
l be repaid, just as England repaid her war debts of the first  
dollars wrung from the sweat of labor and the toil of  
e Shylock." Our boys will be returned—returned in cas-  
odies maimed; returned with minds warped and twisted  
: stream and shriek of high-powered shells.  
s and stripped of its emotional appeal to our sympathies,  
th ruinous and ridiculous. . . .  
ipensible to no one—the power to denude our shores of  
ie individual the dictatorial power to strip the American  
on, rifle, or anti-aircraft gun. No one would deny that the  
provisions that would enable one man to render the  
t they will tell you, "The President would never do it." To  
he power if he does not intend to use it?" Why not, I say,  
an donations to a foreign nation? . . .  
age used by the President—shame on those who ask the  
e who would grant them.

r every fourth American boy" spurred Roosevelt into  
ice of January 14, 1941, that this was "the most untruth-  
riotic thing that has ever been said. Quote me on that.  
ing that has been said in public life in my generation."  
ere in Wheeler's charge?]

### the Soviet Union (1941)

became law in March 1941. Three months later Hitler  
his co-conspirator in the nonaggression pact of 1939.  
wo arch-menaces would now bleed each other white  
of U.S. involvement. Catholics expressed relief at the  
ace of Soviet Russia. Roosevelt, however, fearful that the  
mechanized might, promised them lend-lease aid and  
with \$11 billion. The Hearst press here expresses distaste  
fellow. To what extent were its apprehensions justified

ism as a foul principle and oppressive policy, why in  
ld we not desire to see the two totalitarian powers  
roy not only the principle but the practice of despotic

ts—of a genuine democracy and if we are devoted to  
nestly desirous of preserving and perpetuating those

other? . . .

Is our free country piling up deficits, bleeding its citizens white with confiscatory taxation, rushing headlong into national bankruptcy, shoveling out our wealth abroad, and shipping our war materials to alien nations to bolster up Bolshevism in Russia to spread it over all of Europe, including Britain, and to breed it and broadcast it in our own America?

We may not think that this is what we want to do, but this is exactly what we are doing with our Bolshevik alliance, and no smoke screen of fine phrases can obscure that outstanding fact.

No country which fights for Russia can claim to be honestly opposed to tyranny, since Bolshevism is the basest and bloodiest tyranny that has disgraced the supposed civilization of Europe since the time of Ivan the Terrible.

No country can truthfully claim to be crusading for democracy and the four freedoms when it is supporting a tyranny which is the most evil enemy of democ- racy—a tyranny where all the four freedoms have been brutally suppressed—a ty- ranny with no liberty, no opportunity, no morality, and no God.

## D. War in the Atlantic

### I. Framing the Atlantic Charter (1941)

Roosevelt finally met with Prime Minister Churchill in deepest secrecy off the coast of Newfoundland in August 1941. Major items of discussion were lend-lease ship- ments, common defense, and the bating of Japanese aggression. Churchill later wrote that for Roosevelt—the head of a technically neutral state—to meet in this way with the prime minister of a belligerent state was "astonishing" and amounted to "warlike action." The most spectacular offspring of the conference was the unofficial Atlantic Charter, which in 1942 became the cornerstone of Allied war aims. An admixture of the old Wilson Fourteen Points (see p. 230) and the New Deal, it held out seductive hope to the victims of the dictators. What aspects of the Atlantic Charter come closest to "warlike action"?

. . . The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned [i.e., self-determination, one of Wilson's Fourteen Points; in part Points V and XII of the fourteen];

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government