

Activity 1: The Debate over Lend-Lease

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Read the following document. As you read, make a list of the key points of the Lend-Lease policy as explained by President Roosevelt.

From Franklin D. Roosevelt's Eighth Annual Message to Congress, January 6, 1941:
<http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=83>

Our national policy is this:

First, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to all-inclusive national defense.

Second, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples, everywhere, who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our hemisphere. By this support, we express our determination that the democratic cause shall prevail; and we strengthen the defense and security of our own Nation.

Third, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom....

Therefore, the immediate need is a swift and driving increase in our armament production.

To change a whole nation from a basis of peacetime production of implements of peace to a basis of wartime production of implements of war is no small task. And the greatest difficulty comes at the beginning of the program, when new tools and plant facilities and new assembly lines and shipways must first be constructed before the actual materiel begins to flow steadily and speedily from them....

I also ask this Congress for authority and for funds sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds, to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations.

Our most useful and immediate role is to act as an arsenal for them as well as for ourselves. They do not need man power. They do need billions of dollars worth of the weapons of defense.

The time is near when they will not be able to pay for them in ready cash. We cannot, and will not, tell them they must surrender, merely because of present inability to pay for the weapons which we know they must have.

I do not recommend that we make them a loan of dollars with which to pay for these weapons a loan to be repaid in dollars.

I recommend that we make it possible for those nations to continue to obtain war materials in the United States, fitting their orders into our own program. Nearly all of their materiel would, if the time ever came, be useful for our own defense.

Taking counsel of expert military and naval authorities, considering what is best for our own security, we are free to decide how much should be kept here and how much should be sent abroad to our friend who by their determined and heroic resistance are giving us time in which to make ready our own defense.

For what we send abroad, we shall be repaid, within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities, in similar materials, or, at our option, in other goods of many kinds which they can produce and which we need.

Let us say to the democracies: "We Americans are vitally concerned in your defense of freedom. We are putting forth our energies, our resources, and our organizing powers to give you the strength to regain and maintain a free world. We shall send you, in ever-increasing numbers, ships, planes, tanks, guns. This is our purpose and our pledge."

When the dictators are ready to make war upon us, they will not wait for an act of war on our part. They did not wait for Norway or Belgium or the Netherlands to commit an act of war.

Their only interest is in a new one-way international law, which lacks mutuality in its observance, and, therefore, becomes an instrument of oppression.

The happiness of future generations of Americans may well depend upon how effective and how immediate we can make our aid felt. No one can tell the exact character of the emergency situations that we may be called upon to meet. The Nation's hands must not be tied when the Nation's life is in danger. We must all prepare to make the sacrifices that the emergency-as serious as war itself-demands. Whatever stands in the way of speed and efficiency in defense preparations must give way to the national need....

What are the main features of President Roosevelt's Lend-Lease proposal?

Activity 1: The Debate over Lend-Lease

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Imagine that it is early 1941, and you are a member of the staff of either the America First Committee or the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. In this role your job is to try to convince the American people either that the Lend-Lease Act would be a dangerous step toward war or a critical measure for national security. Your organization consists of the following:

Opening Speaker (no more than one)

You are the public face of your organization, and it is your job to engage in debate with the speaker on the other side. Read for homework the radio address by Burton K. Wheeler and the Senate testimony of Charles Lindbergh. In class the next day you and the Closing Speaker will meet with members of both your Research Team and your Opposition Research Team, who will brief you on the strengths of your side's argument as well as the other side's weaknesses. Based on the notes that they give you, you must prepare a five-minute statement in which you lay out your case. The debate will take place during the following class session.

Closing Speaker (no more than one)

At the end of the debate you will offer a summary of your side's key points, as well as some rebuttal of the other side's views. Read for homework the radio address by Burton K. Wheeler and the Senate testimony of Charles Lindbergh. In class the next day you and the Opening Speaker will meet with members of both your Research Team and your Opposition Research Team, who will brief you on the strengths of your side's argument as well as the other side's weaknesses. Based on the notes that they give you, you must prepare a five-minute statement in which you lay out your case. The debate will take place during the following class session.

Research Team (at least one)

Your job is to make sure that your organization's speaker has a ready supply of facts and arguments at his or her disposal. To prepare, read carefully for homework the radio address by Burton K. Wheeler and the Senate testimony of Charles Lindbergh, making a list of their key points. In class the following day you will meet with the Opposition Research Team to develop a list of five questions to be asked of the two speakers. You will also meet with your Opening and Closing Speakers in order to help prepare them to develop their opening and closing statements. Give your list of questions to the teacher by the end of class; the debate will take place during the next class session.

Opposition Research Team (at least one)

You are responsible for trying to anticipate the points that the other side will raise in debate. As preparation, read carefully for homework the radio addresses by Tom Connally and James Byrnes, making a list of their key points. In class the following day you will meet with your side's Research Team to help them to develop a list of five questions to be asked of the two speakers. You will also meet with your Opening and Closing Speakers in order to help prepare them to develop their opening and closing statements. Give your list of questions to the teacher by the end of class; the debate will take place during the next class session.

Publicity Team (at least one)

Your task is to present your side's argument graphically, producing flyers to be posted in the room on the day of the debate. These flyers should be both factually accurate and graphically appealing. In order to understand what your side stands for, read for homework the radio address by Burton K. Wheeler and the Senate testimony of Charles Lindbergh. You will have the entire following class session to make your flyers.

Activity 1: The Debate over Lend-Lease

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: The following should be read by the Opening Speaker, the Closing Speaker, and the Research and Publicity Teams for the America First Committee. They should also be read by the Opposition Research Team for the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

Radio Address by Sen. Burton K. Wheeler (D-MT), December 31, 1940:
<http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=1592>

Burton Wheeler, a Democrat from Montana, served in the Senate from 1928 to 1946. Although a staunch Roosevelt supporter in the early 1930s, he broke with the president later in the decade, and had emerged by 1939 as one of the nation's leading opponents of FDR's foreign policy. In late 1940, Wheeler helped to found the America First Committee, whose goal it was to strengthen American defenses while at the same time staying out of any European entanglements.

The views I express to you tonight...are not the views of any international banker, nor are they dictated by interventionists or warmongers.

The thoughts I am about to express are not based upon any fear of wild boasts of American conquest by Stalin, Hitler or Mussolini. I know that neither they nor their ideologies will capture the people of the United States or our imagination to the point that we would adopt fascism, communism or nazism as an American doctrine....

We sympathize with the oppressed and persecuted everywhere. We also realize that we have great problems at home, that one-third of our population is ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clad, and we have been told repeatedly, upon the highest authority, that unless and until this situation is corrected our democracy is in danger. I fully subscribe to this view.

Believing as I do, in this thesis, I cannot help but feel that we should settle our own problems before we undertake to settle the problems of Asia, Africa, Australasia, South America and Europe. As Americans, interested first in America, what is our present stake? Our stakes are our independence, our democracy and our trade and commerce. Every red-blooded American would fight to preserve them.

What is the best way to preserve them? There are two schools of thought. One group feels, as they felt before the last World War, that England is our first line of defense, and that we must go to England's aid every time she declares war, and that some European dictator is after rich loot in the United States, perhaps our gold buried in the hills of Kentucky.

This group wants to repeal our Neutrality Act.... They want to loan our ships, our guns, and our planes, even though it may involve us in the European conflict. They profess to believe it is necessary for the preservation of our country, our religion and civilization. We were told the same things in almost the same terms before the last war.

The other group feels that we should build our defenses to meet any emergency that may arise. But we do not believe that the preservation of the American people depends upon any foreign nation. It is hard for us to visualize a nation of 130,000,000 people so weak that we cannot defend ourselves when our forefathers in the thirteen original colonies, poor, divided and weak, were not only able to conquer an army already in our midst but to build the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

Just as I love the United States so do I dislike Hitler and all that he symbolizes. My sympathy for the British is both deep and genuine and is exceeded only by the depth and sincerity of my Americanism. No anti-British feeling dictates my opposition to the evasion or repeal of the Johnson and Neutrality Acts. I oppose all these because they lead us down that road with only one ending, total complete and futile war. And Mr. William Allen White, chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, agrees that the convoying of British ships by American vessels and the repeal of the Neutrality Acts would mean war for us.

Remember, if we lend or lease war materials today, we will lend or lease American boys tomorrow. Last night we heard the President promise that there would be no American expeditionary force, but we received no promise that our ships and sailors and our planes and pilots might not at some time within the near future be cast into the cauldron of blood and hate that is Europe today.

Our independence can only be lost or compromised if Germany invades the Western Hemisphere north of the equator. This would be fantastic, as it would require the transportation of at least 2,000,000 men, with planes, tanks, and equipment, in one convoy across the Atlantic. This would require two or three thousand transports plus a fleet larger than our Navy, plus thousands of fighter-escorted bombers.

Such a fleet cannot possibly be available. Certainly it cannot be trained efficiently before our two-ocean Navy is ready. It is not possible for the German Navy to prepare an effective plan for such an invasion which our Navy and Army with our air force cannot defeat. Remember, Hitler has already been seven months in vainly trying to cross twenty miles. If Hitler's army can't cross the narrow English Channel in seven months his bombers won't fly across the Rockies to bomb Denver tomorrow....

The cost of this war will come out of the millions of poor people, the common folk of the world who will toil for generations to pay the cost of destruction. War inevitably means back-breaking debt, blighted lives, bedeviled futures. War means the end of civil liberties, the end of free speech, free press, free enterprise. It means dictatorship and slavery, and the things we abhor in nazism, communism and fascism. It means Stalin or Hitler will have achieved their boasts for a totalitarian world without conquering America....

Regardless of when or who is proclaimed victor in the present war, it cannot last forever. Peace, fleeting though it may be, will eventually come to Europe. At some time in the future representatives of England and Germany will sit around a table. Some time they will agree upon peace, and until that day the world suffers. Each of us, from the President of the United States to the most humble citizen, should exert his every effort for peace now....

I firmly believe the German people want peace just as any people prefer peace to war. And the offer of a just reasonable and generous peace will more quickly and effectively crumble Hitlerism and break the morale of the German people than all the bombers that could be dispatched over Berlin....

The United States is no longer trudging along the road to war. We are running. Some feel that we have gone so fast and so far that there can be no stopping—no return to complete peace except via war. But we are at peace and we can remain at peace if either one of the two lines of action is pursued. First, Americans in greater number must firmly resolve and express themselves that we will fight no offensive war. And, secondly, we can remain at peace if the horrible European debacle of death and destruction ends in the near future.

Though today we stand as close to the brink of war as we stood in January of 1917, some people still oppose a European peace. War-mongers, sordid romanticists, reckless adventurers and some whose sympathies and sentiments are stronger than their reasoning powers would plunge this nation into war. Plunge us into a war from which we would gain nothing. Plunge us into a war that would destroy democracy, that would bring deep harrowing anguish to millions of hearts. And how would they bring this to pass? They would take us in today as they did in 1917....

My friends, it is this satanically clever propaganda that appeals to Christianity, the idealism, the humanity and the loyalty of the American people that takes us into war. It is this that we must resist. It is this that we must cast aside if we truly love our country and democracy. We must remain at peace and dedicate ourselves to effecting peace for a war-torn world....

I do not believe that the great majority of our people are eager to be embraced by war and I call upon them not to be afraid to say so. I, for one, believe the policy advocated by the interventionists is insane and it will lead to total war, and war is insanity... Americans! Do not let yourselves be swayed by mass hysteria. Do not travel again the road that took you in 1917. You hanged [the late Senator] Bob LaFollette [of Wisconsin] in effigy because he opposed war—and lived to repent your action and put him in the hall of fame.... Are the facts of yesterday no longer facts? Has this war a sweeter odor than the last? Don't let yourselves be misled by the so-called notables. Numerically they are few—even though they command the newspaper headlines. But they do not speak for the mass of Americans. They do not represent labor, the farmer, the youth, the mothers or fathers of America. The great mass of our people are inarticulate, but it is time you were heard. You must not be driven like sheep to the slaughtering pens.... America's war ought to be against industrial unemployment and low farm prices.... Let your representatives in Washington know that you have not surrendered the independence of America to war-mongers and interventionists, and God will bless America.

What arguments does Wheeler offer in opposition to Lend-Lease?

Charles A. Lindbergh, testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, February 6, 1941:
<http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=1601>

Best known for having made the first solo flight across the Atlantic in 1927, Charles Lindbergh became increasingly involved in politics in the late 1930s. Lindbergh was one of the founders of the America First Committee, as well as one of that organization's most popular speakers. The following is an excerpt from the testimony that he gave against the Lend-Lease Act before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In the hope that it will save time and add to clarity, I have attempted to outline briefly my reasons for opposition to this bill. In general, I have two. I oppose it, first, because I believe it is a step away from the system of government in which most of us in this country believe. Secondly, I oppose it because I think it represents a policy which will weaken rather than strengthen our nation.

The first point is simply my opinion as an American citizen. The second is closely connected with the development of aviation as a factor in modern warfare. It is this second point, if you will permit me, that I would like to discuss. I shall have to speak with the utmost frankness in order to make my position clear. If my discussion seems materialistic, it is because war is materialistic, and must be met, at least for the moment, with material resources. No one deplors this fact more than I. Possibly if our outlook had been more spiritual during the years of peace, it would not have to be so material today.

And here I would like to say that I have never taken the stand that it makes no difference to us who wins this war in Europe. It does make a difference to us, a great difference. But I do not believe that it is either possible or desirable for us in America to control the outcome of European wars. When I am asked which side I would like to have win, it would be very easy for me to say "the English." But, gentlemen, an English victory, if it were possible at all, would necessitate years of war and an invasion of the Continent of Europe. I believe this would create prostration, famine and disease in Europe—and probably in America—such as the whole world has never experience before. This is why I say that I prefer a negotiated peace to a complete victory by either side.

This bill is obviously the most recent step in a policy which attempts to obtain security for America by controlling internal conditions in Europe. The policy of depleting our own forces to aid England is based upon the assumption that England will win this war. Personally, I do not believe that England will win this war. If she does not win, or unless our aid is used in negotiating a better peace than could otherwise be obtained, we will be responsible for futilely prolonging the war and adding to the bloodshed and devastation in Europe, particularly among the democracies.

In that case, the only advantage we can gain by our action lies in what additional time we obtain to prepare ourselves for defense. But instead of consolidating our own defensive position in America, we are sending a large portion of our armament production abroad. In the case of aviation, for instance, we have sent most of it, yet our own air forces are in deplorable condition for lack of modern equipment. The majority of the planes we now have are obsolescent on the standards of modern warfare. This bill even authorizes the transfer of the equipment that our air forces now possess. From the standpoint of aviation, at least, I believe this policy weakens our security in America....

What we are doing in following our present policy is giving up an ideal defense position in America for a very precarious offensive position in Europe. I would be opposed to our entering the internal wars of Europe under any circumstances. But it is an established fact today, that our Army and our Air Force are but poorly equipped on modern standards, and even our Navy is in urgent need of new equipment. If we deplete our forces still further, as this bill indicates we may, I think we may be in danger of invasion, although I do not believe we are today. If we ever are invaded in America, the responsibility will lie upon those who send our arms abroad.

I advocate building strength in America because I believe we can be successful in this hemisphere. I oppose placing our security in an English victory because I believe that such a victory is extremely doubtful. I am opposed to this bill because I believe it endorses a policy that will lead to failure in war and to conditions in our own country as bad as or worse than we now desire to overthrow in Nazi Germany.

I do not believe that the danger to America lies in an invasion from abroad. I believe it lies here in our own midst, and that it is exemplified by the terms of this bill—the placing of our security in the success of foreign armies and the removal of power from the representatives of the people in our own land.

What arguments does Lindbergh offer in opposition to Lend-Lease?

Activity 1: The Debate over Lend-Lease

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: The following should be read by the Opening Speaker, the Closing Speaker, and the Research and Publicity Teams for the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. They should also be read by the Opposition Research Team for the America First Committee.

Radio Address by Sen. James Byrnes (D-SC), January 17, 1941:

<http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=1593>

Senator Byrnes, a Democrat from South Carolina, had a lengthy and distinguished career in public service, holding posts in all three branches of the U.S. government at one time or another. During the 1930s and early 1940s he was a close ally of FDR, and a vigorous supporter of his foreign policy. He would later serve as Secretary of State during the Truman Administration.

There is nothing altruistic about the determination of the United States to aid those nations now defending themselves against the forces of aggression. We are moved by reasons more impelling. We know that our own Democracy is menaced by the forces that now seek to destroy those Democracies across the Atlantic. One conquest only whets the dictators' desire for more power. If Great Britain falls, the United States will stand practically alone on the brink of the precipice.

Because of the threat against the security of this nation and hemisphere, a Bill providing aid for Great Britain, drafted not in the White House, but in the Congress, has been introduced. It is apparent that it will meet the opposition of many of those persons and groups who opposed lifting the embargo in 1939 and opposed drafting an Army in 1940.

They argue that the Bill gives to the President too much power. If speed were not essential, we might proceed differently. We might have Congress pass separately upon each step in the granting of aid. But there are four hundred and thirty-five members of the House and ninety-six members of the Senate. From our experience, we know that what is called legitimate debate would cause Congress to consume from thirty to forty-five days in passing each Bill. These delays would be beneficial to Hitler. They might be disastrous to us. If power must be lodged with some person, certainly those of us who believe in Democracy can agree that it should be entrusted to the person recently selected by a majority of the voters of this country to be President and Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy.

Over the radio and from platforms, it is argued that it is none of our business whether Britain stands or falls. If this be true, then it was inexcusable for the Congress to draft men for the Army in time of peace, and unanimously to appropriate millions of dollars for equipment and for a two-ocean Navy. Let us face the facts. The reason we are feverishly working to provide an Army and Navy is to defend ourselves against the Axis powers. If we could be certain that Britain would defeat Hitler we could and would stop appropriating money for military purposes. But we cannot be certain of it. We are certain only that each day Britain holds Hitler we are better able to defend America. If Britain can hold Hitler for a year, we

can hold him forever. Self-preservation, therefore, demands that we now give Britain aid instead of sympathy.

Well meaning people believe that by wishing war away, they can keep war away. Not one of the nations whose people today lie crushed beneath the German war machine wanted war. In the Fall of 1937, I was in Germany. I saw more men in uniform than I had seen since 1918. In many cities I saw marching troops, generally singing, "Germany Over All." In Berlin I witnessed the first blackout rehearsal against air raids. On the streets of London three days later I saw a peace parade. Instead of guns the marchers carried banners, with such inscriptions as "We did not raise our boys for cannon fodder", "Beware of warmongers", "Peace on Earth." They were carried by sincere peace-loving people. But while the British prayed for peace, Hitler prepared for war. As a result, today the women of Britain lift their eyes to the skies in fear as well as prayer, and instead of casualties among soldiers, we read of the slaughter of women and children....

Great Britain is sorely pressed. But Great Britain fights on, and who can say that the gallant spirit of that democracy has not been lifted to glorious heights by the realization that other democracies eventually would realize the true significance of the struggle and would come to Britain's assistance with ships, with planes, with tanks and other materials?

Those who oppose this Bill offer one argument that is designed to strike fear into the hearts of American fathers and mothers. They contend that it will cause us to send American youth to fight in Europe. The President and the Congress of the United States have no intention of sending an American expeditionary force to Europe. Even if we were willing to send men, the Military leaders of Britain say they do not want them....

Admittedly there is danger in any course we pursue. But if we aid Britain, and the theater of war remains in Europe, our own cities will stand intact, stalwart witnesses to the progress recorded by our way of life. Our citizens will sleep amid the serenity that comes from the realization that no bombs will crash through the roof. Our industrial workers will not find it necessary to abandon their machines and take refuge in bomb-proof shelters. Our children will not crouch in terror while hostile airmen hurl death-dealing explosives at their hiding places. So long as Great Britain is able to hold Hitler at bay, America can arm and contribute its share to the all-important task of holding him, without suffering any of the ravages of modern war.

On the other hand, if we fail to aid Britain and next summer the British should succumb to Hitler's assaults, and the British fleet fall into the hands of Hitler, all this will be changed. With the German fleet in the Atlantic and the Japanese fleet in the Pacific every individual, every institution in this hemisphere, will be in peril. We should stand alone, friendless, in a world ruled by madmen. If that day should come and Hitler's armies invade Canada, there would be among us those who would argue that it was none of our business, and we should not by opposition endanger American lives. If Hitler should invade Mexico they would argue that it was not our war, and that some years ago the Mexican government was unfriendly to us, just as today they argue that a century and a quarter ago we were at war with Britain. We can credit them with good intentions, but to please them, we cannot sacrifice the lives and liberties of the American people....

The blood of heroic Americans need not be shed. Humming machines in American factories can and will enable Britain to hold the enemy and give us time to arm. This is a cause in which capital and labor can unite whole-heartedly. This is a cause which can be won if America does its duty. All democracies made the same error while this storm was gathering. All of us delayed too long in perfecting our

defenses. Many nations are paying in bondage for this error. Great Britain was unprepared, but the sheer heroism of its people has stood off Hitler's armies for long months. We cannot let Great Britain down. If we do—Hitler may never let us up.

What arguments does Byrnes offer in support of Lend-Lease?

Radio Address by Sen. Tom Connally (D-TX), February 17, 1941:
<http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=1594>

Senator Connally, a Democrat from Texas, was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a key supporter of FDR's international policies. After the war, he was instrumental in bringing the United States into both the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

There has been disseminated through the press and over the radio much misleading information respecting the provisions and the effects of the Lease-Lend Bill. It has been charged that it constitutes a blank check to the President and that Congress abdicates its authority.

Let us see just what the bill does authorize the Executive to do. It first defines "defense articles" as any weapon, munition, air craft, vessel, or boat; or any other commodity or article for defense. The bill then provides that the President may "when he deems it in the interest of national defense" authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other government department to

manufacture or otherwise procure any defense article for the government of any country "whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States", and "to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to any such government any defense article". However, it is specifically provided that no such disposition of a defense article shall be made by the President "except after consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, or both". The Congress will control the purse strings....

I want to emphasize that before the President may extend aid to any government, he must make a specific finding that the defense of such country is "vital to the defense of the United States". When it is remembered that the President must also consult the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, or both, it may be clearly perceived that the action taken will be in truth and in fact in the defense of the United States itself....

In the face of these limitations and restrictions, the charge that the bill confers unlimited power upon the President is overwhelmingly refuted.

There is nothing in the bill which modifies the Neutrality Act with respect to merchant vessels going into combat or war zones. It has been widely asserted that the bill would have that effect. That is a misconception.

There is nothing whatever in the bill authorizing the employment of convoys of merchants' ships by Naval vessels. Under the Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief of the Navy and Congress has no control over that power except through the denial of appropriations.

It has also been asserted that the measure is a war bill. No declaration of war can be made by any agency of the government except Congress. It is the intention of Congress to keep the war away from our shores—to make it impossible for conquerors and ambitious totalitarian masters, flushed with victory, and having at their command all the resources of Europe, to push their conquest into the western hemisphere.... The purpose of this bill is to make secure forever this hemisphere as a sanctuary of freedom into which no alien conqueror shall ever set his accursed footsteps. This morning's press carries a story of a conspiracy in Mexico directed by Nazi influences. No "new world order" shall, by the sword of conquest, be established in the continents of America.

To those who oppose the bill, I pose the question: If we follow your wishes and defeat this bill, what shall then be our course? Shall we do nothing? Shall we close our eyes to the tide of conquest which has already engulfed peaceful and neutral nations and condemned to enslavement their people? Shall we close our ears to the oft-proclaimed plans of the dictators to establish a "new world order"? Shall we close our minds to the coarse and brutal scorn with which Hitler and Mussolini speak of democracy? Shall we permit the rattle of sword and the roll of cannon to drown our own determination to defend and protect and preserve democracy and the western world?

The American people are united behind the program for national defense. The Congress, with the enthusiastic approbation of the American people, has appropriated billions of dollars for the strengthening of our Navy and for the increase of the Army and for the expansion of our air forces. Why the expenditure of all of these billions if there is not a threat to our safety? Why the sacrifice of all this treasure if there be not a pressing, a challenging and a menacing danger to our security and safety? Whence does that danger come? Whence are our liberties threatened? Do we fear Great Britain? No thrust is poised from that quarter. Do we fear conquered Norway or subjected Denmark or enslaved Holland or crushed Belgium? Is our safety threatened by prostrate France? Where are those who say that

the United States is in no danger, that it is invulnerable to attack, that no hostile force can assail or attack us? If that be true, why do we arm? Why do we build up a mighty Navy, mightier and stronger than any that in the long stretch of history has ever unfurled its flag upon the far-flung seas? If there be no danger, why do we call to the colors the young manhood of the nation?

There is danger. There is real danger. The cold-blooded dictators, intoxicated by conquest, with their ambitions fanned to fury by the lust for power and mastery of the human race, and backed by the most powerful and relentless military machine known to the annals of war, threaten the security and safety of democracies everywhere. They await only the moment of their choice to strike down freedom and constitutional government wherever they may exist on the face of the globe. This bill is America's answer to their challenge. We propose to keep the war away from our shores. We propose to preserve our own freedom and that of the western world.

Those who would do nothing complain, and say they oppose any grant of authority to the President. Legislation must depend for its execution upon executive or administrative authority. Under the Constitution, the President is Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy and is in charge of the conduct of our foreign affairs. It is impracticable for Congress to execute the powers or functions of the bill. It follows that its execution must be entrusted to the President. No one would give such powers to a Cabinet Officer. The Supreme Court could not execute it; Congress, the legislative branch, could not execute it. In normal times, when we want to build a battleship, Congress appropriates and authorizes the Executive authority to have it built. There is the method here adopted. In ordinary times when the air force is increased, Congress appropriates and the Executive is authorized to procure planes. Why should that system be discarded? There is no other practicable or reasonable system. The pending bill does not repeal the Neutrality Act of 1939. But the neutrality or peacefulness of a nation has no effect whatever upon the ambitions of the Axis powers. Neutral and peaceful Norway was cruelly overrun, its sovereignty ravished and its people enslaved. Peaceful and neutral Denmark, peaceful and neutral Holland and Belgium now lie crushed and broken under the heel of foreign dominion....

The British fleet, still master of the seas, if conquered or destroyed would open the Atlantic to Axis naval and air power upon Central and South America and the western world. It may be said that Great Britain has promised not to surrender her fleet. But Hitler has not promised not to conquer it. There is no prophet who can command events beyond the horizon.

As an essential step in our own national defense, to aid Britain in holding the line until we can be more adequately and thoroughly prepared, to keep the war away from our own shores, to furnish supplies and munitions and thus save calling of men to defend our own soil, to oppose and resist the establishment of world dictatorship and the destruction of free government in order that military masters may not establish a "new world order" on the ruins and ashes of liberty, I am supporting the Lease-Lend Bill. The voice of America demands that we act now. We must not wait until the invader sets his footsteps upon our soil or challenges us upon the sea and in the air.

What arguments does Connally offer in support of Lend-Lease?

Activity 2: The Drift toward War

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Use the interactive timeline “America on the Sidelines: The United States and World Affairs 1931-1941” [<http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/neh/interactives/neutrality>] to examine the major events in Europe during 1941. For each event read the overview, then, on a blank map of Europe, mark the locations that are shown on the map to the left. When you are finished, click on “Select a Course of Action.” This will produce a menu of options on the right-hand side of the page; select the one that you think the Roosevelt administration actually chose. After you have chosen the correct option, read the paragraph at the bottom of the page before moving on to the next event. For a deeper understanding of these events, read the materials that appear when you click on the line “Click to read a contemporary document.”

When you have finished, use what you have learned to write a five-paragraph essay in response to the following question:

“Isolationists claimed that U.S. aid for Great Britain would increase the likelihood of actual American involvement in World War II. Internationalists claimed that it would make U.S. intervention less likely. Based on the actual events of 1941, which do you think was closer to the truth, and why?”