

# Appendix

## Premier Churchill's Statement as to United States in World War

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 13, 1941

ARTICLES FROM SCRIBNER'S COMMENTATOR AND NEW YORK ENQUIRER

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, on Saturday night last during the closing of the debate on the lend-lease bill I made reference to a certain quotation attributed to Winston Churchill. Scribner's Commentator of most recent date carries an article by William Griffin, who is publisher of the New York Enquirer, and who was the one who had reported this alleged interview.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the Record the article from Scribner's Commentator, together with three articles which I have appended thereto, appearing in the New York Enquirer, bearing upon the same subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Scribner's Commentator]

WHEN CHURCHILL SAID XXXX OUT

(By William Griffin)

(An excerpt from an interview with Winston Churchill which we quoted in the November Scribner's commentator has caused so much comment that we are now giving an account of this interview and the full quotation)

When Scribner's Commentator asked me for an article on my conversation with Winston Churchill, in which he declared that the United States should have stayed out of the World War, I was glad to accede, because, while our exchange of views has been a subject of comment in Congress and in the press, an adequate account of what occurred between the present Prime Minister of Britain and myself has never been printed.

My meeting with Mr. Churchill took place in London in August 1938. I had taken my wife and children to Europe, in order that, as I stated in press interviews at the time, we might have an opportunity of seeing Paris, London, and other trans-Atlantic cities before they were destroyed by air bombardment in the European war which I then foresaw.

It was my purpose also to consult with some of Europe's leading figures with regard to the international situation, with particular reference to its effects upon the United States, and also to sound out their individual attitudes toward America.

In the course of my tour I conversed with President Albert Lebrun and Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet, of France; George Bernard Shaw; former Premier Ignace Faderewski, of

Poland; David Lloyd George; Ramon de Viera; Lord Robert Cecil, president of the League of Nations Union; and Count Galeazzo Ciano. I was received in private audience by Pope Pius XI, who astonished me by his close knowledge of America. Among his particular inquiries was one concerning former President Hoover, whom he had known personally in Poland when he was papal nuncio there.

As I was about to leave the British capital for the United States I received the following telegram addressed to me at the Savoy Hotel, London:

"Could you come to see me at 5 o'clock at 11 Morpeth Mansions, Westminster, on Wednesday?—Winston Churchill."

I called upon the British statesman at the time and place named, and we had a long conference.

In the course of our conversation I asked him if he did not agree with me that since America had helped England win the World War she should pay to the United States her war debt, amounting to approximately \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. Churchill made this reply: "Legally we owe this debt to the United States, and I agree with you that England should at once pay every penny the United States claims she owes, but England should be allowed, before a final settlement is made, to deduct 50 percent of the cost of all the shot and shell she fired at the Germans from the time America declared war in the spring of 1917 until she actually put troops in the front lines a year later."

I asked Mr. Churchill how much he estimated that deduction would amount to, and he said:

"About \$4,900,000,000."

I answered by saying:

"If the war debt were settled on that basis, the United States would almost owe England money."

Whereupon Mr. Churchill replied that the United States did owe England money, because if the debt settlement was a fair one, then England should be paid interest on the amount that she should be allowed to deduct from the war debt from the time she expended the money until there was a final settlement.

I expressed my astonishment, saying:

"In my opinion, such a settlement wouldn't be very fair to the United States in view of the fact that if we hadn't entered the war England would have lost, the British Empire would have been broken up and today (meaning at that time) England would probably be ruled from Berlin."

Mr. Churchill did not agree with me. He said that he was very enthusiastic about our declaration of war in 1917; that there was no one in England happier over our decision to enter the war on the side of England than he was; but he could see now that our entry had been a great mistake.

"America should have minded her own business and stayed out of the World War. If you hadn't entered the war the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917. Had we made peace then, there would have been no collapse in Russia followed by communism, no break-down in Italy followed by fascism, and Germany would not have signed the Versailles Treaty, which has enthroned nazism in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war, all of these 'isms' wouldn't today be sweeping the continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government, and if England

had made peace early in 1917, it would have saved over 1,000,000 British, French, American, and other lives."

The British statesman said that he could understand it if Woodrow Wilson had put us in the war in 1915, at the time the Lusitania was sunk, but that when Wilson failed to put us in in 1915, when, in his (Churchill's) opinion, we had such a good excuse for going in, he could never understand why he put us in in 1917. Mr. Churchill talked about other topics dealing with the war, and I interposed the statement:

"I think the United States has learned its lesson; and when the next war starts in Europe, we will stay at home and mind our own business."

Mr. Churchill replied:

"Well, the situation will be different when the next war starts in Europe. You may want to stay out of it, but the long arm of world events will reach right around the American continent, the United States will be dragged in, and you will find yourselves fighting shoulder to shoulder with us in defense of our common democratic institutions."

Before I left Mr. Churchill he asked me if I thought that his views on American participation in the World War and the war debts, and whether we would go into the next war and various other questions, would be interesting to the American people. I told him I felt sure that they would. He then told me he would be glad to write a signed article for the New York Enquirer containing all of the statements he had made to me that day during our conference for \$500; however, he would want me to buy the article as one of a series of 10, and said his price would be \$500 an article. I told him I could not see my way clear to buy 10 articles, but that I would be glad to buy 1 article from him. Mr. Churchill was not willing to agree to this stipulation, and nothing came of his proposal.

When I had my conference with Mr. Churchill he knew that I was the editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer.

Eventually the subject of my interview and the fact that I had a conference with Mr. Churchill in his London home was published in a large number of newspapers in the State of New York and throughout the United States.

In spite of the fact that numerous articles had been printed in the press of the United States and also in the English press from August 1938 to August 1939, no denial was ever made by Mr. Churchill of the statements that I ascribed to him or of the fact that I had such a conference with him.

However, in the latter part of August 1939, when war was imminent and Mr. Churchill was doubtless eyeing the United States as a source of aid to Britain, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin published a telephonic interview with him in which it reported that Mr. Churchill denied he had ever met me or made any of the statements that I attributed to him.

Subsequently I filed suit in the New York Supreme Court against Mr. Churchill for damages in the sum of \$1,000,000, based upon the statements attributed to him as printed by the Philadelphia newspaper. Mr. Churchill's lawyers filed an answer in which they denied, on behalf of the British statesman, that he had ever told the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin that we had not had the conference in London.

The Bulletin's reporter, however, subsequently testified that his conversation had undoubtedly been with Mr. Churchill, and that the Bulletin had accurately printed Mr. Churchill's remarks to their reporter.

Although my suit against Mr. Churchill was instituted in September 1939, and although Mr. Churchill has had three different sets of attorneys representing him, there is at no place in the record any statement by Winston Churchill, the defendant, in which he personally denied having the conference with me in London or that he made the statements I attributed to him.

When filing the necessary papers in connection with his changes in counsel, Mr. Churchill at the same time could have made personally such a denial over his signature for incorporation in the evidence. He did not do so.

It seems clear that Mr. Churchill had attempted to deny his acquaintance and conversation with me in order to avoid possible embarrassment between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, should Britain wish to solicit financial or other aid from the United States during the then threatened war, which has now engulfed Europe.

[From the New York Enquirer of January 29, 1940]

**CHURCHILL TRIES TO DEFEAT JUSTICE IN GRIFFIN'S SUIT**

(The following telegram has been sent by William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, to Hon. ROSS W. RAYBOLDS, United States Senator from North Carolina and member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in reply to a telegram from him as to the present status of Mr. Griffin's suit for slander against Winston S. Churchill, First Lord of the British Admiralty.)

The fantastic maneuvers of Winston S. Churchill to defeat justice in the million-dollar slander suit brought against him by me are anything but creditable to a man holding the position of First Lord of the British Admiralty, or any other position, high or low.

It will be recalled that last summer, shortly before the outbreak of the present European war, Churchill, in a telephone interview with the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, one of America's leading newspapers, denounced as false a declaration made by me that Churchill had stated in a conversation with me in London in 1936 that it was a horrible mistake for America to have participated in the World War; that she should have remained at home and attended to her own business; and that if she had done so, Britain would have made peace with Germany in 1917 and thus saved more than a million British, American, French, and other lives. This statement made by Churchill was to be included in one of 10 news stories that he was trying to sell me for \$5,000.

Not only did Churchill brand as absolutely and viciously false my recital of these facts, he also unreservedly said that he never heard of me.

The report of Churchill's interview with the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, received widespread publicity, both here and abroad.

Naturally, in vindication of my character and reputation as a man, as an American, and as a newspaper publisher, I was compelled to take legal action against Churchill. I filed suit for slander in the New York Supreme Court in the sum of a million dollars and took the necessary steps to attach Churchill's property here.

During the 4 months that have elapsed since this suit was instituted Churchill has never denied having made to the Philadelphia newspaper the monstrous statements upon which the suit is based. He has, how-

ever, ardently striven to prevent me from obtaining redress, by all manner of specious technicalities, attempting to divert the Supreme Court of the State of New York of jurisdiction over him, which has already been obtained, and thereby thwarting justice.

A great deal is involved in this case against the First Lord of the British Admiralty.

Churchill has not alone cruelly wronged me but has also ungratefully and ruthlessly affronted the United States of America, the Nation which he and his government are now working day and night to drag into the present European war, for the salvation and aggrandizement of the British Empire, just as he and his government labored to beguile it into taking part in the World War.

The case is universally recognized as a national issue of the first consequence and its tremendous importance is attested by the eagerness with which it is being watched in both Houses of Congress, and the forthright manner in which I have been upheld in addresses by you and other leading Senators and Representatives in our National Legislature.

As has been pointed out, the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia is a very prominent American newspaper. Had its interview with Churchill in which my suit originated been false, Churchill would have owed it to himself, not to speak of me, to disavow it in the strongest terms.

He has not disavowed it. He has allowed it to stand, with all the injury it inflicts upon me, and instead of disavowing it has sought to bar the man whom he has wronged from vindicating himself in open court upon American soil.

In order to accomplish this outrage against justice, Churchill has had recourse to obstructive tactics which have no bearing upon the merits of the case and are designed solely to save him from the consequences of his slander by the operation of legalistic hide-and-seek.

For instance, to cite one of his thrusts, he has raised the question of how it is to be proved that it was actually his voice which was heard over the telephone by the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia. The utter absurdity of this maneuver is shown by Churchill's rigid refusal to disclaim the interview with the Philadelphia newspaper—the easiest thing in the world to do, if it is untrue, and a thing which, in honor, in law, and in conscience it is incumbent upon him to do. But he steadfastly refuses to disavow the interview—for a reason which is perfectly obvious.

So far his wriggings have availed him nothing. The progress of the case shows conclusively that our American courts may be relied upon to treat Churchill's strategy with the scorn it deserves, and that an American citizen need have no fear of being denied the redress, by due process of law, which I seek.

In rejecting the motion made by counsel for Churchill to set aside the warrant of attachment of his property here, for the purpose of depriving me of the means of bringing him before the bar of justice, Supreme Court Justice Wasservogel declared, in admitting as evidence an affidavit from Carl W. McArdle, of the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia, confirming his telephonic interview with Churchill:

"The court is constrained to receive this affidavit, and reading it in conjunction with the other papers submitted in support of the warrant believes plaintiff has sufficient facts to support his cause of action. Under the circumstances the motion to vacate the attachment is denied."

Still persisting in his endeavor to have the suit quashed on technical grounds, and unwilling to come into court and confront the issue squarely, Churchill has appealed from Justice Wasservogel's decision to the appellate division of the supreme court.

His whole course of action evinces a maximum of contempt for our American courts and our American sense of justice.

And this is typical of the British attitude toward the United States and things American. They still seem to think that the United States is a British colony and that our laws are not to be considered seriously. Witness the present interference with the United States mail by British authorities.

What does Winston S. Churchill, First Lord of the British Admiralty, desire our American courts to do?

He desires them to deprive a brutally wronged American citizen of the right to exact amends from the foreigner who has injured him.

If he were to succeed it would mean that a British subject can slander a citizen of this Republic and destroy his character and reputation without fear of the consequences, and that the courts of our land do not protect our citizens in a case of this kind.

Churchill, if he did not make the statement to the representative of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, could have denied it months ago. That would be a defense to the action. Or if he did make the statement and he claims his statement is true, he could plead truth, which also would be a defense to the action. But Churchill contemptuously refuses to concede that a court of our land should pass on a suit in which he is a party.

It does not take a profound knowledge of the law to perceive that no American, be he the President of the Republic or the Governor of one of our sovereign States, or any other citizen, could utter against an American the statements of Churchill, an alien, and escape with impunity. Churchill, as can be seen, wishes to induce our American courts to grant him a status (to place him above the law) which these courts justly refuse to accord a wrong-doing citizen of this land.

I have been ruthlessly injured by this foreigner. And this foreigner has the temerity to seek to deprive me of redress in the courts of my own country. My character and reputation as a man, an American, and as a newspaper editor and publisher are one of my greatest assets. Let it be said right now that whatever obstructive tactics Churchill shall resort to, I will never desist until I shall, by proper means, have obtained vindication.

If our position were reversed, if I had outrageously wronged Churchill and he were suing for satisfaction in the English courts, it cannot be thought for one moment that I would be permitted to escape with the impunity which Churchill now seeks against me in the courts of my own country.

This whole situation is so revolting to the American sense of decency and fair play, and the case presents such a grave national issue, that you and other outstanding men in Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike—have unreservedly upheld me in my demand that Churchill either substantiate or disavow his statements.

To you and them I am most deeply grateful.

When Winston S. Churchill's maneuverings have been exhausted he will be a much wiser and sadder man. Our American courts can with confidence be depended upon to guarantee that Churchill will have to face the music and suffer the penalty of his atrocious slander upon the editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,  
Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

[From the New York Enquirer of February 17, 1941]

**GRIFFIN CITES CHURCHILL'S FAILURE TO DENY UNDER OATH STATEMENTS CHARGED TO HIM**

William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, issued the following statement today:

"My attention has been drawn to a press release of the British Embassy in Washing-

ton denying "on the authority of the Prime Minister" the truth of a declaration made to me in London by Mr. Churchill, in 1938, concerning the British war debt to America and America's participation in the World War.

"Because of a trans-Atlantic telephone interview with Mr. Churchill published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin in September 1939, wherein he denied having either talked with me or ever heard of me, I filed suit against him in the New York Supreme Court for \$1,000,000 damages.

"The suit has been pending since September 1939, and during that period Mr. Churchill, in his answers thereto, has never denied on oath the truth of the statements I attributed to him, but has ducked and dodged, dodged and ducked.

"The very latest dodge in the case is the denial made to the press by the British Embassy 'on the authority' of Mr. Churchill.

"On the other hand, I have attested, by sworn affidavit, the truth of the statements I attributed to Mr. Churchill.

"America's well-being and my own honor and reputation are at stake in my suit against the British Prime Minister. It will take more than unsigned press denials from the British Embassy to explain away Mr. Churchill's ungrateful and bitterly anti-American conversation with me at his home in London in 1938, wherein he declared that this Republic should have minded its own business and stayed out of the World War, and asserted that our requiring Britain to pay off her war loans to this country was unjust.

"Mr. Churchill's friends are ever ready to smear as un-American any citizen who seeks to prevent Uncle Sam from repeating in 1941 his entry into the World War.

"The British Prime Minister has an excellent record as a long-distance fighter against Hitler and Hitlerism. I, too, have fought the Nazi dictator and his system of despotism. But while Mr. Churchill has always preferred the long-distance method of attack, I went right into Hitler's Chancellery at Berlin, on the eve of the outbreak of the present war, and spoke my mind with true American fearlessness in denunciation of Hitler's diabolical anti-Semitism and wanton disregard of international right and justice.

"I am sure that the members of the Hitler hierarchy to whom I addressed my words will not soon forget them.

"I was not a bit surprised when the Hitler Government issued a ukase barring the New York Enquirer from Germany. That ukase is still in force—and I love it.

"Neither Mr. Churchill nor any of his 'smear men' in this country has had the courage to go right into the Nazi tiger's headquarters and give voice to his detestation of Hitler and Hitlerism.

"That Mr. Churchill's anti-American declaration of 1938 has come back to plague him in 1941 is neither my fault nor the fault of anyone save the British Prime Minister himself.

"The unsigned mysterious so-called denial sent out by the British Embassy in Washington would not blind Churchill in a court of law, either in England or here. Could it be that this alleged denial was made in the way it was on advice of counsel?"

[From the New York Enquirer of March 3, 1941]

#### CHURCHILL'S PRAISE OF HITLER IS WARNING TO UNITED STATES

"I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations." (British Prime Minister Churchill, November 11, 1938.)

There was consternation in some capitals when public announcement was made of the sealing of the recent compact between Bulgaria and Turkey. The latter country had

been regarded as inflexible in its attachment to Britain, while the former was known as a devoted collaborator with Germany.

It cannot be denied that Turkey's about face is a bad blow to London, and London's precipitate dispatching of Foreign Minister Anthony Eden on a special mission to the Turkish capital, is perfectly understandable.

Naturally, we Americans do not like the Turco-Bulgarian pact, because it is just what Hitler wanted. However, it has vastly more significance than that for us, for it is a warning to the United States of America to keep at a safe distance from the maneuverings and plottings of Old World statescraft.

Things have come to a deplorable pass in this land when the official standard of patriotism, which the powers-that-be on the banks of the Potomac and their journalistic and other condottieri in every section of the Republic are brutally intent on imposing upon the American people, is devotion to Britain, not to our own motherland, America.

Now is the time for every citizen to show where he stands—whether on the side of America or on that of the Empire from which America won her liberty of thought and action as an independent nation in the days and nights that tried men's souls.

It is a crime against God and country for any American to admit that to uphold this Nation is to be anti-British. The British rightfully uphold Britain at all times. Who has ever heard of a Briton being called anti-American because he always stood up for his own country?

It is the pressing duty of all our people to rally around the American standard, the hallowed banner of the Stars and Stripes.

The Turco-Bulgarian agreement is one more convincing proof that there is not a country in the Old World—the Old World with whose destiny our Government seeks to merge that of this proud Republic—upon whose sincere, reciprocal friendship America can rely.

How eternally right was the Father of Our Country when he recorded these words in the imperishable script of his Farewell Address:

"There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. 'Tis an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

Those who, with nazified ruthlessness, are trying to wipe out American patriotism and substitute therefor devotion to Britain, are proceeding on the arbitrarily established and hollow principle that the interests of America and Britain are one and inseparable, that both countries must stick together, and that both countries can implicitly rely upon each other's fidelity.

Let us delve more deeply into this all-important subject.

Only last March, France and Britain were vowing their never-ending friendship, unity, and cooperation in war and in peace. Today they are enemies, enemies with an unfathomable bitterness for each other.

The Anglo-French alliance of March 1940 are no longer governed by the Damon and Pythias relationship which they extolled a year ago. One has made a surrender which she swore she would never make. The other, angered by her ally's defection, has committed acts of war against her, including a food blockade, which have inflamed the defeated partner and created a cleavage between Paris and London which will not disappear in our day or for long thereafter.

Our internationalists are swearing before God and man that on no account will the Damon and Pythias relationship which, they tell us, controls the ties that unite America and Britain, be weakened by any earthly or non-earthly force. Identically the same thing was being proclaimed last year concerning the unity between France and Britain. It

is deceptive and tragic to expect that the unnatural and treasonable linking of this Republic with Britain can either be stable or beneficial to Uncle Sam.

In harmony with the grand old principles of diplomatic jugglery, it has been announced that as a result of the visit of British Foreign Minister Eden to Turkey, everything has been set right between London and Ankara. Gullible Americans, whose country is being lied into war, will, of course, believe this tale, spread abroad for their benefit, in order to lighten the task of our war seekers. But Americans who are not prone to be deceived by such fairy tales know that, thanks to pressure from Soviet Russia (avowed ally of Nazi Germany) and other factors, the relations between Turkey and Britain are anything but prepossessing, as far as Britain is concerned.

When Turkey denounces her newly signed pact with Bulgaria, Hitler's Balkan partner, sensible Americans will see some evidence of Turkey's resuming her teamwork with Britain.

But Turkey has no intention of abrogating her pact with Sofia.

With regard to the Eden mission to Turkey and its announced results, let it be recalled that on May 29, 1940, President Ismet Anouu, of Turkey, declared of Franco-Turkish relations:

"An agreement in principle has been reached, and after a solution of the Hatay problem no power will be able to compromise or destroy the accord between us. The Turkish and French Nations are linked together by fate and possess the means to defend themselves."

How ironic today is the Turkish President's affirmation concerning the links uniting France and Turkey and the ability of both nations to safeguard themselves.

Before a month had gone by France was prostrate under the weight of the Nazi war machine, and the "indissoluble" ties that bound Britain to that country were no longer in existence. Under the caption "The Anglo-French tragedy," the New York Times said editorially on June 26, 1940:

"The British, on their side, have ample cause for bitterness; the French, on theirs, can complain with truth that too few British divisions were at their side. Mr. Churchill admitted yesterday that the British had not endured equal trials or made an equal contribution in the field. But for the friends of both Britain and France, it is harrowing to watch the present duel of reproaches and recrimination between London and Bordeaux. The breach between Britain and France is the last refinement of cruelty in a war that has already produced more than its share of horror."

Americans, your country is headed for war, a globe-embracing war, a war that will swallow up every dollar you have, destroy your liberties, and beggar you and your descendants. Your country is being led to war as an ally of Britain, upon whose attachment it is folly to rely. History, recent and remote, tells us clearly that America cannot have faith in the disinterested and unflinching loyalty of any European or other nation. Are you, the citizens of the land of Washington, going to permit your country to be involved in the gigantic and criminal war gamble for which she is being prepared by the devotees of Benedict Arnold who are contemptuously Hitlerizing you in your National Capital?

Our war seekers, in addition to their yearning to see America openly at war as a partner of Britain, are outdoing themselves in their anxiety to ally this Republic with Soviet Russia, a power already in alliance with Nazi Germany.

The alliance between "red" Moscow and "brown" Berlin is a case of birds of a feather roosting together, and what damnable birds they are.

Our own State Department, however, is laboring with zealous constancy to oust "brown" Berlin from the roost, and perch the American Eagle side by side with "red" Moscow. A dispatch from Washington, February 24, declares:

"Diplomatic conversations between the Soviet Union and the United States are not going as well as usual from all indications today. Whether this points to a fundamental coolness in relations could only be conjectured, but it was considered significant, if not serious, that Russia now suspects the good faith of the United States in the negotiations."

"In any event it may mean that British pressure is having its effect in shutting off American goods from Russia, at least in any volume."

"On the surface it appeared to some diplomats that one explanation for the sudden coolness might be found in the fact that, after a period of increasingly cordial discussions, Russia failed to discourage Germany from penetrating the Balkans. This area has been a subject of concern here ever since Reichsfuehrer Hitler's winter campaign of diplomacy in Europe was undertaken."

Our State Department, so anxious to spill American blood and bankrupt Uncle Sam in order to establish godliness, democracy, and international fraternity on a world-wide scale, is a magnificently persistent worker in the cause of bringing Uncle Sam into an alliance with Josef Stalin. We quote a Washington dispatch of February 27:

"Diplomatic conversations looking to an improvement in relations between the United States and Russia were resumed at a long discussion late today between Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, and Constantin A. Gurnansky, the Soviet Ambassador."

"There were many questions to be taken up, it was explained, but no details were announced. Further discussions are to be held."

Americans, if you deserve to be saved from war, if you deserve the precious legacies of freedom and opportunity which the statesmanship, blood, and patriotism of your fathers won for you, you will arise, and, with a voice that will shake your National Capitol, inform your legislative servants that you will not have war, that you will remain steadfast to the Washingtonian doctrine of non-involvement in foreign feudsings, that you will not condone treason, but that, on the contrary, you will punish it with relentless justice, as the Father of his Country, from his sacred tomb at Mount Vernon, silently implores you to do.

Prime Minister Churchill, of England, as shown in his own words, extolled Adolf Hitler on November 11, 1938, less than a year before the present war began. These words constitute a warning of exceptional value to the American people. If they heed them and the other danger signals that are before their eyes, they will save themselves and their country many trials and sorrows.

WILLIAM CHAFFIN,

Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

### A Unified Air Force

SPEECH  
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 14, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are spending billions of dol-

lars on national defense, yet, in my humble opinion, we will never be in a position to adequately defend this country until we have a unified air force. We promised the people of this land that we would build up our defenses to where this country could defend herself against any foe or combination of foes that might be sent against us.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I am inserting an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

Major Seversky is recognized as an authority on the tactics and strategy of aerial warfare. He is an outstanding aircraft designer. He lost a leg in an air crash in the World War, shot down 13 enemy planes, and was wounded many times.

He invented the first fully automatic bomb sight and has made many improvements in navigation instruments. For the last 10 years he has designed and manufactured planes for the Air Corps.

Major Seversky holds many speed records, having won the Harmon Trophy as 1939's foremost airman. He is amply qualified to speak on this subject.

I therefore take great pleasure in inserting his statement at this point.

The matter referred to follows:  
WHAT WE MUST HAVE A SEPARATE AIR FORCE  
(By Alexander P. de Seversky, Major, United States Air Corps Special Reserve)

In Europe today a flaming scroll bearing a military message of tremendous import is being unrolled before our eyes. That message is ominously clear: Europe, once proud navies venture forth in peril of destruction from the skies; and, plainly for all to see, the air has become the decisive arena of combat.

In view of this indisputable fact, I pose two simple but vital questions:

1. Are the men responsible for America's defense program sufficiently aware that the airplane is the dominant weapon of the future?

2. Are they spending America's defense billions, and guarding the safety of our people, with intelligent vision of this new role of air power?

It is imperative that these questions be canvassed frankly and fully, before our program for national defense becomes congealed in obsolete and ineffectual patterns.

The dominant role played by air power in Europe today gives only the merest hint of its complete ascendancy in the future—the future for which we should be diligently preparing right now. While we solemnly debate a two-ocean navy the increasing range and striking power of aerial warships promises to reduce all navies to a secondary role within the very 5 years that it will take to complete our new naval program.

The tactical reach of bombers has been raised from 1,000 miles to 7,800 miles in the last 5 years—an advance of 690 percent. Right now our Douglas B-19 can fly to Europe and back with 39,000 pounds of explosives. This is a true dreadnaught of the air, but unfortunately we have only one of them. Any nation possessing a fleet of such bombers could quickly end all question as to the ability of aircraft, single-handed, to win decisive victories on land or sea.

Within the next 5 years we shall witness a further step-up in bombing ranges to 25,000 miles. This, equaling the earth's circumference, is a mere 283 percent advance on present ranges. Germany is already racing furiously toward that goal; her gigantic Kurier, capable of a 10,000-mile range, is in

production, and she is desperately retooling to turn out machines with ever-increasing range and bomb load. Soon the Atlantic and the Pacific will be no wider than the English Channel for the nation which dominates the skies. Within 5 years we can bomb any spot in any nation—or be bombed by it in any part of our anatomy.

To America the lesson of all this is brutally clear: Unless we are to risk destructive onslaughts by enemy air power, we must completely revise our thinking in matters of national defense. No longer dare we rely on the leadership of old-line strategists who, reared in cavalry tactics and infantry maneuvers, still think of military aviation in terms of yesterday, as only an adjunct to armies and navies. In the name of common sense and common safety we must begin now to prepare our aviation for tomorrow. And the first step is the establishment of an independent air command, possessing the imagination and audacity to wage all-out war in the air, and operating on terms of equality with the Army and Navy.

I have studied, as far as I am aware, all recent attacks on the idea of an independent air force, whether emanating from official or unofficial quarters. The common denominator of all the objections is the claim that the United States has built a fairly creditable air force under the aegis of the two older services.

The rebuttal is simple. It is that at present the United States has no air power at all. We have a miscellany of war planes but no air power. We have an effective naval air arm, plus an amorphous mass of Army aircraft. Neither of them nor the two together constitute air power.

No matter what the departmental "brass hats" affirm or deny, the present war discloses one basic principle of air power—no land or sea operations are possible where control of the air is in the hands of the adversary. Dunkerque is a superb demonstration. The withdrawal operations there were accomplished primarily because the British had established local superiority in the air. British Spitfires and Hurricanes, masters of any German pursuit plane by reason of a mere 25-mile-per-hour margin, were able to control the air over the channel; without such control the evacuation would have been a shambles. This supremacy, however, applied only within a radius of 150 miles—the effective range of land-based British pursuit planes.

This same local superiority accounts for Hitler's inability hitherto to invade England. The battle of Britain is an almost perfect laboratory case of pure air warfare. Out of it one blood-red fact emerges: Hitler cannot invade Britain so long as a swift British fighter command maintains its margin of superiority in the skies over the British Isles.

In the light of these facts, no one contradicts the assertion that America needs a vast number of planes. We have the inventive genius and the productive power to turn them out. But the unvarnished truth is that we are not likely to get the kind or quality of planes we need while our air program is in the hands of men unconsciously loyal to their own older services and shackled by the red tape of military tradition.

The leather medal for all-time futility should go to those who keep up the argument about the relative merits of naval power and air power. The battleship, the admirals are fond of emphasizing, is still master of the sea. It is, beyond the range of aircraft, just as the lion is still master of the jungle. But it's an abandoned jungle. Who pays any heed to lions when crossing by airplane overhead? True, sea power is still our chief defensive reliance, and will remain so until we achieve an adequate air armada. It would be dangerous to switch from an old form of national defense before a new one is perfected. And even when the transformation is com-