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LINDBERGH TO STAY SILENT ON AIR DATA

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh will not disclose at America First Committee meetings any confidential aviation and military information he gave to Congress and to army and navy officials.

He made this clear last night as he left for New York after addressing an overflow meeting at the Chicago Arena Thursday night. When pressed to give reasons for his assertion that "America is safe," he replied:

"I have given all the information and facts I have learned to authorities in Washington and I do not see any reason for repeating them at my meetings."

The famous flyer was more communicative about his reasons for joining the America First Committee. He explained:

"I think we are nearing a very great crisis in the affairs of our country and I believe we all can do more by working together than by working separately. I consider the America First movement the most powerful agency to keep us out of war, so I have joined with it."

Col. Lindbergh said he would speak in New York on April 22, but beyond that no definite dates had been arranged.

Just before Lindbergh arrived at American First headquarters in the Board of Trade Building, Representative Hamilton Fish met with M. J. Wauke for a speaking engagement.
THE LINDBERGH SPEECH

Americans do not have to be reminded that Col. Lindbergh is a man of great physical courage. His present efforts to keep this country out of the war are an evidence of his moral courage. He has dared again—this time in his speech at the Arena in Chicago—to speak his mind on the risks of American participation in the war though he well knows that what he has to say is bringing upon him the hatred of the administration in Washington and the calumny of a host of hysterical war shouters.

Col. Lindbergh is in distinguished company. In similar circumstances George Washington resisted the war hawks of his day who cried that this country had a moral duty to fight on the side of revolutionary France against Britain. Abraham Lincoln opposed the Mexican war. Lloyd George's life was imperilled when he spoke against the Boer war. The measure of Col. Lindbergh's courage and poise is found in the fact that he does not trouble to defend himself against those who are seeking to smear him. Unlike them, he continues to carry on the debate rationally, without recourse to invective or personal abuse.

They are calling Col. Lindbergh pre-Hitler the fact of record that his was the first authoritative voice which warned Britain and France of the German preparations for war. Save for him, Britain's preparation would have been even less adequate than it was and Britain's defeat in all probability would be an accomplished fact today. Col. Lindbergh has scorned to answer the smear campaign because he does not want attention distracted from the main issue, which is whether this country shall engage in the war against the will of the vast majority of the people.

His appeal is to reason and common sense. He argues that if we make adequate preparation for defense and do not send all our war machines abroad we have no reason to fear invasion or subjugation. The same considerations which give him confidence in our ability to defend ourselves prompt him to warn America against entering the war in Europe, for then all the advantage will be on the side of the power which dominates all of Europe as we dominate all of America.

At the conclusion of his address Col. Lindbergh put in a few words the alternatives before the American people today.

"We of the America First committee," he said, "ask you to join us in supporting an American destiny for this hemisphere—a destiny not of isolation but of independence; not of reliance upon others but of strength among ourselves; a destiny that knows no fear of any foreign land."

Nobody else has stated the choice so concisely:

Those few words Col. Lindbergh has summarized the platform of America First.
Lindbergh's View on Aviation Is Hit by Aviation Expert

BY FRANK BROTHERS

A Lindbergh "fanboy" and aviation authority of the Jewish faith who many of his followers credit with having founded the world's outstanding aviation industry, has written a letter to the editor of the Chicago Daily News, charging a leading aviation expert with having committed a gross error in his recent article in the May issue of Collier's magazine.

The author of the letter, a former lieutenant colonel in the United States Air Corps, writes that it is "absolutely absurd" for the aviation expert to assert that America's airpower is "not as good as it should be." The expert had cited Lindbergh's single-engine plane, the Spirit of St. Louis, as an example of how the United States could produce planes that are comparable to those of Germany.

The letter states that Lindbergh's planes are "outstanding" and that they have "set many world records." The writer goes on to say that Lindbergh is "a true aviation pioneer" and that his planes have "won numerous races and competitions." He concludes by saying that Lindbergh's planes are "better than any other planes in the world" and that they are "more efficient and reliable than any other planes."
Today's Editorials

Always Belittling!

It seems that Charles A. Lindbergh never loses an opportunity to take a slap at Great Britain. On the other hand, there seems to be no record of the same Mr. Lindbergh, in any way, shape or form, belittling or criticising Hitler and the brutality of the present German nation—in their fourteen separate acts of aggression.

Naturally, if Mr. Lindbergh desires to be anti-British, that is his business; however, he is rapidly losing the respect of more and more loyal American citizens.

If Mr. Lindbergh feels that England committed a great sin by taking up arms in defense against Germany, we would like to hear what he thinks of Hitler's murderous invasion of Poland.

It seems that the least Mr. Lindbergh could do would be to condemn the brutality of Nazism, Communism, and Fascism, and, now that America is committed by the will of the majority to aid Great Britain, to work for a united nation in support of President Roosevelt and our national defense effort.

We are glad that President Roosevelt has faith in the ultimate victory of Great Britain over Germany. We are glad that Roosevelt recognizes the seriousness of the situation and the fact that this war is just as much a war for the preservation of the free people living in our country as it is a war of vital interest to those conquered nations of Europe and the British Empire.

Practically all loyal American citizens realize that the United States cannot afford to let Great Britain lose this war. At this particular time, we cannot long continue permitting Germany to sink and destroy American cargoes destined for the British Isles. It is difficult to believe that our nation can sit back and permit Great Britain to lose either the Suez Canal or control over the Strait of Gibraltar. (Over)

THE BORGER DAILY HERALD

April 25, 1941.
It is true, as Mr. Lindbergh wove us to understand, that our nation is unprepared to meet so formidable a foe as the German war machine. It is because, during the past twenty years, we have listened to propaganda of peace put out by Germany and Russia to the American public while at the same time these two nations were making the greatest possible effort to build what is now known to be the greatest military machine ever operated by one nation against another.

It is also because we attempted to follow a policy of isolation without providing ourselves with the military and economic means of maintaining isolation in any sense except that we refused to accept our joint responsibility of maintaining the peace of the world by joining, and making effective, the League of Nations.

There is good reason to believe that the United States and Great Britain can ultimately defeat Germany and her allies, but we cannot afford to become so optimistic in this belief that we would neglect to promote all of those defense efforts essential to final victory.

There are logical reasons to believe that the Axis powers could, in their own good time, extend their aggression to the Western hemisphere. If American aid to Britain is not too late or too little, it is equally possible that the United States and Great Britain can both isolate the flames of war to the European continent and ultimately defeat the dictator nations on their own soil.

If our English speaking nations have any internal faults in their social, economic or political make-up, they can be corrected in a democratic manner. It is a poor time now to squabble among ourselves with Hitler knocking at the door.

Notwithstanding what may be right and wrong between labor and industry, it is entirely possible that for every man-hour of labor lost as result of strikes in defense industries, ten Americans may die in battle for lack of the materials that should be produced at this time.

If it is true, as Mr. Lindbergh has told us, that Germany can never invade our country, that the cost would be too great, it could equally be true that Great Britain and the United States, allied in the greatest possible war effort, cannot, in our lifetime, dislodge the German conquerors from those fourteen nations of Europe already occupied by German, Russian and Italian military forces.

If it is true that we are unprepared to defend ourselves at this time, it can only be because, after a great deal of democratic debating during the past year, we were slow to put into effect the conscription program and start the machinery to build our weapons of defense, something we should have done (not merely talked about) the minute Hitler and Stalin's forces started their bloody march into Poland.

Since we are actually in this war, the more
complete and effective we make our defense and the necessary offense, the sooner there will be a peace. It may take ten years; it may take twenty years. If the British Isles and the British navy are taken over by Germany, as in the case of France, the war could easily last a hundred years, with the two hemispheres stabbing at each other in an endless campaign of naval and aerial piracy.

The only alternative would be for the democratic people of the Western hemisphere and the people of Australia to submit to the so-called "wave of the future" as dictated by Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini.

There is no question in the minds of loyal Americans but that the United States and England are equal to the situation and that the democratic principles of right, freedom and justice will ultimately prevail, although it will call for a great deal of sacrifice.

This means that we must have a united people. This means that we must help England even if we are drawn into active warfare at this time rather than a few days, a few weeks, or a few months later.

Certainly this is the will of the majority of the American people, and it is doubtful if these same American people will ever again allow isolationists and pacifists to dictate the peacetime defense of our nation. We must win both the war and the victory.
On the Record

Col. Lindbergh Pictured as Rallying Point
For Disunity, the Ally of Hitler

By DOROTHY THOMPSON.

Hitler’s program for the United States is insidious. His first objective is to hold aid to Britain and thus secure a quick and easy victory. The second is to secure our adherence to the new order by an internal revolution, which will put into power anti-British and anti-democratic elements, who whether from fear of war or from love of power or from sincere conviction or from hatred and rebellion against the present condition of our civilization, are prepared to make a Nazi America.

Should this revolution proceed smoothly, by a coup d’etat and the subsequent ruthless suppression of dissenting elements through the use of the armed and police forces of the captured state, whether it should result—a as Hitler believes it will—of the present conflict, the result would be the same from Hitler’s viewpoint. In the case where America would integrate herself voluntarily in the new Germany, in the case where Germany and a rampant Japan would intervene, with arms if need be, on the side of the Nazi revolutionaries. In any case, the aim is to make the United States Nazi and put us in the position of being a Nazi colony of a Nazi world.

What is occurring is world-wide counter-revolution as an instrument of world conquest, and it is in the light of the only two possible choices for America—Nazism or resistance—that Col. Lindbergh’s activities, and those of every one else, must be judged. Col. Lindbergh has name, his popularity, his family, are very important. The question is: What is Col. Lindbergh counselling for America, and what will be the eventual result of what Col. Lindbergh is doing?

The immediate object of the German-American Alliance is to weaken the Government and create public confusion in the most critical moment of history and to stimulate violence in a time when we need to be united and calm. Col. Lindbergh makes a speech advocating the cessation of all aid to Britain. The meeting, in New York, is picketed by those who want aid continued and who are supporting the Government’s policy.

First Taste of Violence

There is nothing new in these counter-demonstrations against speakers for any policy. Every meeting in support of the Government is picketed by opponents. And every speaker and writer who is supporting the administration lives under a constant cold terror. The announcement that this columnist would speak over a local radio station in a New England city brought a threat to the station by telephone that it would be blown up. Sponsors of every meeting in support of aid for Britain are threatened with violence.

Yet until Col. Lindbergh’s meeting in New York, no actual violence had been employed. And this time it was precipitated, not by those who were picketing the colonel’s meeting, but by his supporters, who let fly at the picketers.

Col. Lindbergh’s supporters are violent. They will grow increasingly violent. When our arms production is well under way, there will be another series of strikes in arms plants and there will be sabotage. These will be attributed to Communists agents and, among some of Col. Lindbergh’s supporters, there will be cries for the ruthless suppression of all writers and speakers. If these strikes and counter-strikes will be manifestations of the spirit of fear, rebellion and indiscipline against the Government—

The Picture Clarified

If one adds to Col. Lindbergh’s speeches and writings the words written by his wife, where, in words that parallel the writings of his namesake advocate of American Nazis, Lawrence Dennis, she describes Naziism and Communism as “waves of the future,” the picture becomes clearer. The growing youth movement around Col. Lindbergh, carefully cultivated in American colleges, and the support for Col. Lindbergh of all the rabble-rousing American Fascists, the prophecy of Nazi “Bible” in the “Commentaries” that “the man is at hand” and that the picture closely resembles the composition of forces typical Nazi movements.

Yet I would say to those who picketed the colonel’s meeting: Is this not the way to deal with Nazi methods? The way to set about quickly a solid, consecrated movement of men, women and youth destined to hold fast to the great humane principles of our civilization and to translate those principles into an indivisible, effective, and integrated, fully productive, scrupulously just social order, based on our historic and constitutional aims of forming a more perfect union, and our historic and constitutional aims of forming a more perfect union, and to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

Pickets and strikers are no answer to Col. Lindbergh. Leave methods to his supporters, who initiated them. Strike and sit tight with him. We need calmness, unity and a clear program.

(Released by the Bell Syndicate, Inc.)
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ADD ROOSEVELT

MR. ROOSEVELT SHARPLY CRITICIZED COL. CHARLES H. LINDBERGH AND OTHERS WHO BELIEVE THAT THE AXIS WILL WIN THE WAR AND COMPARED THEM TO THE COPPERHEADS OF CIVIL WAR DAYS.

THESE VIEWS, THE PRESIDENT SAID, ARE HELD BY ONLY A SMALL MINORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. HE CHALLENGED THE PATRIOTISM OF THIS VIEWPOINT AND SAID THAT HE WAS SORRY THAT SO MANY WITH THIS TYPE OF KINZALITY ARE IN POSITIONS OF PROMINENCE TO SPEAK AND WRITE.

FOR HIMSELF AND OTHERS WHO SHARE HIS VIEWPOINT, THE PRESIDENT SAID, THEY ARE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND ARE WILLING TO FIGHT FOR IT. HE DECLARED HE DID NOT WANT TO LIE DOWN AND ACCEPT THE CONQUEST.

HE ASSERTED THAT DURING CIVIL WAR THERE WERE PERSONS WHO BELIEVED THE SOUTH COULD NOT WIN.

HE DESCRIBED AS TYPICAL OF THIS GROUP THE ONE LED BY CLEMENT L. VALLANDIGHAN, A OHIO CONGRESSMAN, WHOSE FOLLOWERS WERE REFERRED TO AS COPPERHEADS.

HE ADDED THAT GEORGE WASHINGTON WAS BESIEGED BY PERSONS WHO WANTED PEACE AFTER VALLEY FORGE.

MR. ROOSEVELT ALSO CRITICIZED THE CONTENTION THAT THERE ALWAYS HAVE BEEN CONQUERORS AND THE ONES TODAY SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY.

4/29 -- R-1153A

ADD ROOSEVELT

IN ADDITION, MR. ROOSEVELT REMINDED, THE U.S. NOW HAS AN INTEREST BASES ACQUIRED FROM BRITAIN WITHIN THE YEAR.

ASKED WHETHER THE EXPANSION OF THE PATROL WOULD NOT PROVIDE WHAT ONE REPORTER DESCRIBED AS A "NICE, SAFE SEA ROAD" TO GREENLAND, THE PRESIDENT ADDED THAT HE HOPED THAT THE ROUTE TO GREENLAND WOULD BE SAFE.

THEN HE ADDED THAT HE HOPED THERE WOULD BE NO MORE ACTS OF AGGRESSION IN GREENLAND. IT WAS AT THIS POINT THAT HE SAID HE THOUGHT THE AXIS ALREADY MAY BE IN GREENLAND.

THE PRESIDENT WOULD NOT SAY WHAT INSTRUCTIONS HAVE BEEN AS TO WHAT THE NEUTRALITY PATROL IS TO DO IF IT SEES A BRITISH CONVOY ATTACKED.

THE DISCUSSION ON THE NEUTRALITY PATROL EXTENSION WAS INDUCED BY REQUESTS FOR COMMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT ON THE SPEECHES MADE LAST NIGHT BY SECRETARY HULL AND SECRETARY KNOX.

THE PRESIDENT SAID HE THOUGHT THESE CABINET OFFICERS SPOKE FOR THEMSELVES PRETTY CLEARLY AND FOR THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. HE ADDED, IN REPLY TO A QUESTION, THAT THEY SPOKE FOR HIM AS WELL.

WHEN IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT THE SPEECHES INDICATED THAT THE NAVY MIGHT BE USED TO HELP GET WARM AID TO BRITAIN SAFELY, THE PRESIDENT BEGAN HIS DISCUSSION OF THE NEUTRALITY PATROL.
BERLIN.--THE HAMBURGER FREMDENBLATT YESTERDAY CHARACTERIZED COL. CHARLES LINDBERGH AS "A REAL AMERICAN."

IT SAID THAT LINDBERGH "ISN'T AN OPPONENT OF WAR FOR REASONS OF PASSION BUT FROM EURNING LOVE FOR HIS FATHERLAND."

"HE THEREFORE REJECTED AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE WAR ON THE GROUND THAT THE UNITED STATES IS NOT ARMED FOR THE CONFLICT AND COULD NOT WIN IT."

"HE DEMANDS A RETURN TO THE INHERITED CONTINENTAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND THEREFORE, TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE."

4/25--R222P
F. D. R. SMEAR OF COL. LINDBERGH

Speaks Here Tomorrow

Senator Burton K. Wheeler (D., Mont.) will speak tomorrow in the Chicago Arena, 400 East Erie street, at an antiwar rally sponsored by the America First committee.

Seats for more than 8,000 persons will be available in the arena, and the doors will open at 2:30 p.m. Senator Wheeler will speak at 2 p.m. The talk will not be broadcast. The area in front of the building will be roped off to permit 1,000 or more persons to hear the program through loudspeakers.

Parking lots in the immediate vicinity provide space for several thousand automobiles. A special detail of approximately 30 policemen will handle traffic. The arena also may be reached by Grand and Chicago avenue street cars and by north side buses.

BY THOMAS MORROW

[Chicago Tribune Press Service]

SIOUX FALLS, S. D., April 26—President Roosevelt lowers the dignity of his high office by calling Col. Charles A. Lindbergh a "cowardly" foe opposing him. Senator Burton K. Wheeler (D., Mont.) declared tonight in a speech in which he denounced the war-mongering tactics of administrative officials.

The Montana senator deplored from his prepared text, in his address at an America First rally at the Coliseum here, to comment briefly but pointedly on the President's press conference statement in which he placed Lindbergh "in the category of the cowards." It was not called upon to fight for the Union in the civil war.

More than 2,000 persons, almost 8 per cent of the total population of this community of 60,000 factory workers, retired farmers, and business men, heard the senator call to the defense of the country's most famous flyer.

Defend Lindbergh Pledged.

"Herefore, our Presidents have not led the pack to intimidate and to smear those who disagree with them on fundamental issues of government," Wheeler said, adding that packed the hall and echoed his words.

"The President apparently has his temper when any American makes a plea for peace. It is too bad that he has not a belief in courage, a courageous and patriotic America. If America goes to war, I predict that Lindbergh will be one of the first to enroll, and he will not enroll in the purchasing department."

[President Roosevelt, he said, is] a captain in the army air corps, assigned to the procurement section at Wright Field, Dayton, O.,

Senator Wheeler declared that every American who believes in true peace should reject Mr. Roosevelt's smear campaign against every one who advocates doing what he and Wendell L. Willkie promised during their election campaigns.

Replace Baldone Statements.

"Neither he nor his cabinet members dared tell the people that he believed this to be our war," Wheeler said. "If the President had made the baldone statements before enrolling that he is enrolling now, he could not have been elected and he knows it.

"The President is spreading very poor information if he thinks for one moment that the American people are going to follow his
Wheeler Flays Roosevelt for Blast at Lindy
Calls 'Copperhead' Smear Undignified

SIOUX FALLS, S. D. April 30
C.T.P.E.I. — Senator Wheeler (D.), of Montana, declared last night that to "call Col. Charles A. Lindbergh a Copperhead lowers the dignity of the President of the United States."

He referred to a press conference statement in which President Roosevelt placed Lindbergh in the same category as the Copperheads, the Fifth Columnists of the Civil War.

"Shouldn't Lead Smear Pack"

Speaking at the Coliseum, under the auspices of the America First Committee, the Montana Senator told his audience:

"Our Presidents, heretofore, have not led the pack to intimidate and to smear those who disagreed with them on fundamental issues of government.

"The President apparently loses his temper when any American makes a plea for peace. It is too bad that he had to select as his victim, Lindbergh, a courageous and patriotic American. If America goes to war I predict that Lindbergh will be one of the first to enroll, and he will not enroll in the Purchasing Department."

Wheeler ridiculed the assertion of Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox that the European conflict is our fight."

says Hull Makes Foes
Wheeler accused the Administration and State Department of having done everything in their power to make enemies for the United States. He urged his listeners at a mass meeting in the auditorium to disregard the words of Knox and other interventionists and unite for peace.

"Secretary Knox echoed the chant of American warmongers and certain New York bankers with the statement 'This is our fight.' Wheeler asserted, 'This is not our fight. It is to belittle the United States. It is ridiculous and unpatriotic, to say that our destiny is dependent upon the Britons, the French, the Germans, or the people of any other nation."

"We are an independent, land-locked nation. Some high Administration officials seem possessed of a colonial mentality, but the great mass of Americans still recognizes the Fourth of July, 1776, as Independence Day."

The Senator asserted the argument of a military threat to the United States is "an old story that has been thoroughly debunked."

"Likewise," he added, "the warning of an economic invasion is silly."
STRIKES AT LINDBERGH

Colonel's Attorney Says 'He Who Talks Defeatism Is Hitler Ally'

WASHINGTON, April 26 (UP)—Henry Breckenridge, attorney for
Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh, declared tonight in an address before
the American Society of International Law that "he who spreads
the gospel of defeatism is an ally of Hitler."

The society, closing its annual
meeting, re-elected Cordell Hull,
Secretary of State, as its president.
"All those who are not with Hit-
er are against him," Mr. Breken-
ridge asserted.

"Norway had its Quisling; France
has its Laval and the United States
has its equivalent and he who
spreads the gospel of defeatism is
an ally of Hitler."

Other speakers at the banquet
meeting were Carl B. Hambro,
president of the Norwegian Parlia-
ment, and British Minister Sir Ger-
ald Campbell.

Mr. Hambro expressed the belief
that international law ultimately
would prevail but that means what
be found to enforce it. He said the
United States would turn the tide
of the present European conflict.
Colonel Lindbergh's View

The unprecedentedly strong character of official Washington comment was believed to be designed, partly at least, to offset any tendency to regard Britain's position as hopeless. A contention that Britain faced certain defeat was advanced last week by Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh at a New York rally of the America First Committee, a group formed last September to oppose involvement in the war. Colonel Lindbergh not only declared that Britain was beaten but said, "I have been forced to the conclusion that we cannot win this war for England, regardless of how much assistance we extend."

The President replied by listing Colonel Lindbergh with defeatists and appeasers. Thus did the debate between interventionists and isolationists mount to a climax. Never before, save in 1917, had the issue of foreign policy been so bitterly joined or so directly stated. To many observers it seemed the United States last week had reached the crossroads, that the near future might bring decision on the direction in which the nation would next move.
Lindbergh Resigns From Army

NEW YORK, April 29 — Col. Charles Lindbergh, in a letter to President Roosevelt, today announced he is resigning as colonel in the U. S. Army Air Corps Reserve.

He told the President his (Mr. Roosevelt's) remarks in a White House press conference April 26 left him "no honorable alternative to tendering my resignation."

"I am, therefore," Col. Lindbergh wrote, "forwarding my resignation to the Secretary of War."

CALLED A COPPERHEAD

In his April 26 press conference, President Roosevelt criticized Col. Lindbergh and others in this country who express the opinion that the Axis will defeat Britain. He compared them to the copperheads of the Civil War period who persisted in an outspoken defeatist attitude.

The President said he was worry there were people with such mentalities in high places where they could write or talk. He declared Col. Lindbergh and others who think as he does constitute a small American minority.

 Asked why the Army has not dis- assigned Col. Lindbergh to active duty, the President indicated he was uncertain whether the flier had resigned his reserve commission.
Lindbergh Quits As Colonel in U.S. Air Corps

Loyalty Questioned
By Roosevelt, Letter To President Says

By the Associated Press.

NEW YORK, April 25.—Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, in a letter to President Roosevelt, today resigned as a Reserve officer in the United States Army Air Corps.

The text of Col. Lindbergh’s letter follows:

My Dear Mr. President:

Your remarks at a White House press conference on April 25 involving my Reserve commission in the United States Army Air Corps, have, of course, disturbed me greatly. I had hoped that I might exercise my right as an American citizen, to place my viewpoint before the people of my country in time of peace without giving up the privilege of serving my country as an Air Corps officer in the event of war.

But since you, in your capacity as President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief of the Army, have clearly implied that I am no longer of use to this country as a reserve officer, and in view of other implications that you, my President and my superior officer, have made concerning my loyalty to my country, my character and my motives, I can see no honorable alternative to tendering my resignation as colonel in the United States Army Air Corps Reserve. I am, therefore, forwarding my resignation to the Secretary of War.

Takes Action With Regret.

I take this action with the utmost regret, for my relationship with the Air Corps is one of the things that has meant most to me in life. I place it second only to my right as a citizen to speak freely to my fellow countrymen, and to discuss with them the issues of war and peace which confront our Nation in this crisis.

I will continue to serve my country to the best of my ability as a private citizen.

Respectfully,

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

President Roosevelt, at the press conference last Friday, asserted that I was dumb to consider a Nazi victory inevitable andaclassed Col. Lindbergh with appeasers who urged peace during the Revolutionary and Civil Wars on the grounds that those wars could not be won.

Refers to Vannandigham.

Col. Lindbergh’s name was brought into the discussion when a reporter asked why the flyer had not been called into active service, although he held a commission in the Air Corps Reserve.

Replying, Mr. Roosevelt said that during the Civil War numerous foreigners, liberty-loving people, fought on both sides, and that at the same time both sides let certain people go; that is, did not call them into service.

He said the people who were then ignored were the Vannandighams. He explained that the Vannandighams were people who, from 1861 on, urged immediate peace, arguing that the North could not win the war between the States.

Clement L. Vannandigham was a member of the House from Ohio, an 1863 he was arrested for alleged treasonable utterances and banished to the Confederate States. He was known as a leader of the "Confederates."
NEW YORK.—COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH IN A LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TODAY ANNOUNCED THAT HE WAS RESIGNING AS COLONEL IN THE ARMY AIR CORPS RESERVE.

4/28--R914A

ADD LINDBERGH, NEW YORK. LINDBERGH TOLD THE PRESIDENT THAT HIS REMARKS IN A WHITE HOUSE PRESS CONFERENCE ON APRIL 25 LEFT HIM "NO HONORABLE ALTERNATIVE TO TENDERING MY RESIGNATION."

"I AM, THEREFORE," LINDBERGH WROTE, "FORWARDING MY RESIGNATION TO THE SECRETARY OF WAR."

4/28--R915a
REP. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, IN A SPEECH PREPARED FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, SAID PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S COMPARISON OF COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH WITH CIVIL WAR COPPERHEADS DEMONSTRATED THAT THE PRESIDENT!
"ANGER AND INTOLERANCE, RATHER THAN SOBER JUDGMENT, RODE HIM INTO A HARSH AND INACCURATE COMPARISON."

"IF THE PRESIDENT WISHES TO RETAIN SOME OF THE RESPECT WHICH THE PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE FOR A PRESIDENT, HE WILL DO BETTER TO LEAVE THE NAME CALLING TO HIS HATCHET MAN ICKES," HOFFMAN SAID.

"THE PRESIDENT MAKES NO CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL UNITY BY CHARGING THOSE WHO DISAGREE WITH HIM WITH BEING TRAITORS TO THEIR COUNTRY."

4/28--GE539P
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ADD EARLY-LINDBERGH

SHARPLY CRITICAL OF THE FACT THAT LINDBERGH MADE PUBLIC HIS LETTER
BEFORE IT REACHED THE PRESIDENT, EARLY SAID THIS WAS THE SECOND CASE
IN WHICH THE LIEBER MADE PUBLIC A COMMUNICATION TO MR. ROOSEVELT BECAUSE
IT WAS IN THE PRESIDENT'S HANDS.

EARLY SAID THE FIRST TIME LINDBERGH MADE PUBLIC A COMMUNICATION
TO MR. ROOSEVELT BEFORE IT REACHED THE WHITE HOUSE WAS IN 1934 WHEN
THE PRESIDENT CANCELED ALL PRIVATE AIRMAIL CONTRACTS AND TURNED
OVER TO THE ARMY AIR CORPS THE JOB OF CARRYING SUCH MAIL.

"NEWSPAPERS PRINTED A TELEGRAAM ON MONDAY MORNING WHICH HAD BEEN
RELEASED ON SUNDAY AFTERNOON," EARLY SAID. "THE WHITE HOUSE DID NOT
GET THE TELEGRAM UNTIL ABOUT 10 A.M. MONDAY.

"THIS LETTER APPARENTLY IS AN EXAMPLE OF THE SAME PROCEDURE." 
LINDBERGH'S MESSAGE DURING THE AIRMAIL CONTROVERSY WAS A PROTEST
AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION.

Turning to Linbergh's letter of intention to resign from the
Reserve Air Corps, Early said:

"I CHECKED WITH RUDOLF FORSTER (WHITE HOUSE EXECUTIVE CLERK)
ON LINDBERGH'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT. WHILE THE PAPERS PRINTED
IT YESTERDAY, IT HAS NOT YET BEEN RECEIVED HERE.

"I READ IN THE PAPERS THAT HE IS RETURNING HIS COMMISSION.
THIS LEADS ME TO WONDER IF HE IS RETURNING HIS DECORATION TO MR.
HITLER."

ASKED WHETHER MR. ROOSEVELT WOULD CONSIDER LINDBERGH'S
RESIGNATION A LOSS TO THE AIR CORPS, EARLY SAID THAT STIMSON'S
ACTION, WHEN AND IF THE RESIGNATION IS RECEIVED, WOULD PROVIDE A
FINAL VERDICT.

"FROM WHAT THE PRESIDENT INDICATED LAST FRIDAY," EARLY SAID,
"HE (LINDBERGH) WOULDN'T HAVE ANY DUTIES EVEN IF HE CONTINUED TO
HOLD HIS COMMISSION. NOW THERE IS A COMMISSION THAT SOMEONE ELSE
CAN HOLD."

4/29--R1121A

65- 11449-A
STEPHEN T. EARLY, SPOKESMAN FOR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, SAID TODAY THAT COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH'S MANNER OF SUBMITTING HIS RESIGNATION FROM THE ARMY AIR CORP RESERVE "LEADS ME TO WONDER IF HE IS RETURNING HIS DECORATION TO HITLER."  
4/25--R1055A

ADD EARLY-LINDBERGH
AEROT CHARGE FOUR YEARS AGO, LINDERG, VISITING BERLIN, WAS AWARDED THE ORDER OF THE GERMAN EAGLE BY FIELD MARSHAL GOERING.
WITHOUT DISCLOSING WHETHER LINDBERGH'S RESIGNATION WILL BE ACCEPTED BY SECRETARY STIMSON, EARLY SAID THAT THE AVIATOR'S LETTER ANNOUNCING HIS INTENTION HAS NOT YET BEEN RECEIVED AT THE WHITE HOUSE.  
4/29--R11A

65-11449-A
The Roosevelt-Lindbergh Episode

Viewed in the light of the emergency confronting the country, the Roosevelt-Lindbergh episode, that has ended in the latter tendering his resignation as a reserve officer, is greatly to be regretted. At a moment when the nation should be closing ranks and uniting all its forces for defense, this conspicuous example of cleavage is set before the people.

In justice to the colonel it must be frankly agreed that the President committed the first error. The press interview in which Mr. Roosevelt attacked Col. Lindbergh as an appeaser, comparing him to the "Vandals" of the Civil War, was most unfortunate from every point of view. It was jaunty where it should have been serious, vague where it should have been specific, and personal where it should have avoided name calling and discussed the issue.

But the tendency to take an intensely personal attitude toward those who disagree with him has long been one of Mr. Roosevelt's besetting weaknesses. It formed, indeed, one of the central reasons why this newspaper so strongly opposed his re-election. Despite such opposition, widely shared, he was re-elected. He is the President of the United States in the present crisis, and, as we have repeatedly urged in these columns, it is the patriotic duty of every American to unite behind his leadership as the only possible means of saving the American way of working, living and thinking.

Free debate of public issues is part of that way and, must, of course, be preserved. If the President, by his personal attack upon an effective opponent, was hoping to end such debate, his comment was doubly wrong. Col. Lindbergh was most certainly justified in replying to this aspect of the attack and in stressing the issue of free speech.

In our judgment, however, nothing that the President did justified Col. Lindbergh in seeking to resign his commission as a reserve officer. Each President is, for the time being, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. But the loyalty of our soldiers, sailors and airmen runs to no individual. They serve the Republic itself, and it is precisely in such emergencies as the present that the nation most urgently needs its reserve officers. In whatever fashion the nation can best speed its defenses—whether by equipping Britain as a first line of defense or by keeping materiel at home—there will always be a shortage of skilled airmen.

It is the example which Col. Lindbergh has set which seems to us so regrettable. In a difficult hour like the present many groups of people, for a score of different reasons, will inevitably criticize and oppose an Administration. Such is their right. But one's right to debate political issues cannot be permitted to compromise one's duty to serve the nation. This high obligation rests upon business men and workers—to co-operate with the government in the defense program. It rests upon the youth to accept military training as a first duty of citizenship. As the months pass it will bear more and more heavily and directly upon every one in the nation.

This loyalty salutes a flag that is no man's private signal. No resentment toward any individual should weaken or confuse it.
AN UNHAPPY INCIDENT

President Roosevelt spoke impetuously last Friday when he went back three-quarters of a century into the bitterness of a Civil War to find a disparaging epithet for Charles A. Lindbergh. Mr. Lindbergh in turn shocked those who believe him to be a loyal American—though a sadly mistaken one—by his pertinacious reticence in relinquishing his commission in the Army Air Corps reserve.

No evidence justified the President’s comparison of Mr. Lindbergh with Clement Vallandigham, who was banished to Confederate territory because his words, spoken in a military zone during active operations, were thought to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Nor is any American, from private to general officer, in service or on reserve, big enough to take the position that he will not serve his country because he has been, as he believes, unjustly reprimanded by his Commander-in-Chief or any other superior.
Colonel Lindbergh

Axis propagandists have played up Col. Lindbergh's remarks for all they are worth, not only in the press of Germany and Italy, and in the satellite nations of the European continent, but in Latin America as well. Writing from Quito, Ecuador, for instance, Harold Callender, of the New York Times, declares that Col. Lindbergh's utterances and those of his wife "have been widely reproduced in the pro-German press in South America," and that he "again makes the first pages of all newspapers with statements like those the Germans and pro-Germans have been making."

This is very disturbing news at a time when our national policy rests upon continental solidarity. In undermining a declared national policy, and in making himself the spokesman of a point of view which gives such valuable aid and comfort to the enemies of mankind, Col. Lindbergh has taken a very considerable responsibility upon himself. What makes his position all the more vulnerable is that with all his plain speaking of the last two years he has never voiced a syllable of protest against Nazi actions which have outraged civilized opinion. This is something to ponder over.

Equally astonishing is the fact that, while saying that the downfall of Britain would be a tragedy for us, he takes such a negative position as an amateur policy-maker toward preventing it.

Now, in pique over a remark made on the subject of defeatists by President Roosevelt at a recent press conference, Col. Lindbergh has resigned his commission in the Army Air Corps Reserve. The rightness or wrongness of his action is a subsidiary matter, though it might be pointed out that had he been called into active service, as has happened to so many other reserve officers, he could not have been able to make the speeches he has been making. Our main concern is that this action, too, will be seized upon by Axis propagandists to persuade their gullible dupes that the United States is a Nation divided within itself. Thus the colonel continues, unwittingly or unwittingly, to be the most effective ally of the Axis standpoint on the war in this country. It is not the least tragic aspect of the situation that he is so firmly and so honestly convinced that in so doing he is rendering patriotic service to the Nation.
COL. LINDBERGH REPLIES TO MR. ROOSEVELT.

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has resigned as a colonel in the United States Army Air Corps Reserve. He sent his resignation to the secretary of war and explained why he did so in a letter to Mr. Roosevelt. To Mr. Roosevelt the colonel said he had hoped he might exercise his rights as an American citizen to place his viewpoint before the people of the country in time of peace without giving up the privilege of serving his country as an air corps officer in the event of war.

"But since you, in your capacity as President of the United States and commander-in-chief of the army," Lindbergh wrote, "have clearly implied that I am no longer of use to this country as a reserve officer, and in view of other implications that you, my President and my superior officer, have made concerning my loyalty to my country, my character, and my motives, I can see no honorable alternative to tendering my resignation as colonel in the United States Air Corps Reserve."

Mr. Roosevelt told the reporters last week that Col. Lindbergh had not been called for active service because the army had no place for Vollandhams. Vollandham was a northern traitor in the Civil War. Mr. Roosevelt's remarks in stigmatizing Col. Lindbergh as a traitor to his country must have been resented by all fair minded people and by everybody who was not unbalanced by passions.

No man of honor could submit to such reflections upon his loyalty and upon his character and, as Col. Lindbergh said, he had no alternative. He was forced to resign, and the air corps having refused to take advantage of the services of America's most intelligent and best informed aviator now loses him, at least for the duration of this precarious peace. It may be that Mr. Roosevelt has made it impossible for Col. Lindbergh to serve his country as he desired, even in time of war.

These are costly consequences to flow from intemperate and unjust remarks. Mr. Roosevelt's habit is to question the character of any citizen, no matter how devoted, who opposes his foreign policy. He endeavors to close debate by calling the opposition silly, uninformed, dishonorable, and treasonable. The country is at peace, in theory, if not in fact. The rules of conduct which apply in wartime are not imperative now. It is, rather, imperative that there should be full and free discussion of issues before decisions are made.

Mr. Roosevelt's practices in trying to stop this discussion fall short of continental European practices only in lacking the secret police, the neighborhood spy, and the concentration camp.

Col. Lindbergh has the congressional medal of honor. That is another reply to Mr. Roosevelt.
On the Record

Lindbergh Pictured as a Human Who Would Play Superman to Bring Homeric Tragedy on U. S.

BY DOROTHY THOMPSON.

HOUSTON, Tex., April 26—Col. Charles A. Lindbergh should have resigned from the Army Reserve a long time ago. As an officer he is bound to support his commander in chief, who is the President of the United States. To refuse to do so is mutiny, and to refuse to do so in peace is insubordination. The duties of an officer, like the duties of a soldier, are discipline and obedience before his superiors. The spectacle of an Army officer publicly agitating against the policy of his commander in chief and of the Secretary of War has long been a painful one. The President's own comment at his press conference on April 26 apparently led the colonel to take the step he should have taken some time ago.

But insubordination, in the exact and literary meaning of that word, is the clue to Mr. Lindbergh's unhappy and tragic personality. Mr. Lindbergh is a man who cannot endure to be subordinate—cannot endure to be in an inferior or equal position to any other human being. In his personality, a personality compounded of natural tendencies, childhood conditioning and youthful glory, lies the clue to an understanding of his actions. It is important to try to understand him, because Mr. Lindbergh is not finished as a public figure. He has hardly begun.

Before he has finished he intends to rewrite American history, according to a pattern that has no roots in the American past. He intends to put himself on a pinnacle of power higher than any stratosphere into which he has ever flown. If I am sure of anything in this life I am sure of the ambition of Mr. Lindbergh. Curiously enough, the American people created the man who now thinks of himself as THE man. For the American people first made of a good aviator a superman.

Mr. Lindbergh's desire to be superior, to do what no one before him had ever done, to be unique, is indicated by his whole history. He had an unhappy childhood in a divided family. He saw his father, who was a rebel against the trend of his times, persecuted for it. He was unpopular with other boys. He conspicuously lacked the social sense that makes a boy or a man a "good fellow."

In a sensitive and ambitious nature, this creates the desire to "show em." Young Lindbergh did show em. He was neither a remarkable aviator nor a remarkable aeronautical engineer. His contributions to the science of aviation have been considerably less than those of numerous of his fellows. This does not detract from his accomplishment which was the result of rigorous, even cruel, self-discipline.

He trained himself by hunger, watchfulness, hardship to do a dangerous and difficult thing, and did it. Also, he did it first. A few months later another flyer, now practically forgotten, made a more sensational flight under more difficult circumstances—Clarence Chamberlin. But the first hero already occupied the stage.
Cant's Come Down to Earth

The response to Mr. Lindbergh's deed was a wave of love. Lindbergh was adored. For many people there is no price too high to pay, no future too hazardous to be lived for their fellowmen. Yet Mr. Lindbergh did not know how to return this love—how to accept it, with gratitude, how to requite how to be humble before it. He did not know how to "come down to earth." What was given him—the adoration of millions—he threw it back on his face. It was explained that he was "too "hated publicity." Did he? People usually get what they deserve in life, and the Right Man was recognized and crowned as the Right Man

From year to year, we have observed, therefore, the strange spectacle of a man who hates publicity, inevitably doing the most spectacular things. I pass over the tragic Hartman case, the publicity about which was announced in this column as a blot on American life. Yet, this Nation was renowned for its heartfelt sympathy over the tragedy of the Lindbergh infant. And it was an American who committed the crime, but a German and curiously a German of Nazi sympathies. Again the Nation offered Mr. Lindbergh its love, and again he refused it. Because to accept the love and sympathy of one's fellow men was a level with one's fellows, Mr. Lindbergh shook the dust of America off his feet

England offered, and gave him, the complete privacy that he claimed to long for. Did he keep it? He did not. He could not continue for any more than a few months. Suddenly he had become a biologist, experimenting with one of the world's most conspicuous scientists, Dr. Alexis Carrel, on an extremely daring and profound problem—the "artificial heart," an attempt to keep a heart alive by circulating blood through tissues removed from the body.

Again Sets Himself Apart

Mr. Lindbergh had not gone at biology in the hard way, by which ordinary mortals must enter science, step by step. He had been ushered into Dr. Carrel's laboratory from the airplane and at once. And almost simultaneously with the news about this new activity, it was announced that he might take up residence in Paris—announced in the midst of the world's press that had happened in Western civilization for about a century

Again, his attitude was one to set him apart from other men. In that world of the hard score, who make their own morals and their own laws... the world proclaimed by Nietzsche, and sympathized with by Dr. Carrel... the world of those superior to humanity... the world which has let loose upon this earth death and destruction and chaos... the world that plants its flag on the Acropolis—dreadful symbol of the fact of the age of light imperishably associated (as is anything imperishable) with the names of Aristotle, Dostoevsky, Plato, Socrates, Pericles. The most significant thing about the meeting was, that at the beginning of the year 28, was again the refusal of Lindbergh to accept competition under conditions imposed on other men.

Again, his meeting had to be something apart, superior, different, insubordinate. It was a huge public meeting, and no one was allowed to boo or hiss or express a dissenting emotion.

The Superman of the Machine age is what the world of brotherly affection has been and is fighting—fighting in the East, in the West, in the Dutch fields, and in the Greek mountain pases, and in the Libyan desert, and in the Chinese cities, and in London, where the churches tumble into rubble. The new Superman is he who identifies himself with the soulless machine.

Beware of him, wherever you see him. Beware of the man who accepts a superior, for such a man cannot accept an equal. He is to meet with him as an Homeric tragedy, and if his life is Homeric, only his admirers to make Homeric tragedy for his country and for his age.

(Dedicated by the Daily News, Inc.)
The Lindbergh Affair: A Double Error

ONLY by flying non-stop back from Paris could Charles A. Lindbergh have achieved as much publicity as he did on Monday and Tuesday when he seized the opportunity to become a martyr, an opportunity handed him by the President.

That is the tactical error committed by a President who was wise enough during his campaign to refrain from so much as mentioning his opponent's name.

That was only an error of strategy; but there was a deeper error of principle:

By using the power of his office to silence Lindbergh, and by implication, to force his resignation as a Colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve, President Roosevelt has sent a shudder of fear through all those qualified experts who would like to tell the American people that we are building OBSOLETE combat planes.

With very few exceptions, the men who are qualified to criticize technical aspects of our defense production, are either in Army or Navy Reserve; or they have been called into active service; or they hold a defense job in Washington; or they are trying to land a government contract.

Critic Driven to Cover

In other words, if the idea gets around that the President is going to crack down on anybody who dares express a contrary opinion to the "official view," then the only way we can find out that we are making the wrong kind of tanks and combat planes is to lose a big battle and the lives of hundreds of American boys.

That brand of folly in high places cost France her independence as a nation, it made Nazi war prisoners of 3 million French soldiers. De Gaulle tried to tell France that tanks were needed to stop Hitler—all he got for his trouble was a price on his head; and the penalty France pays for not listening to him: is slavery.

America has a martyr, too. His story has been told here before. Repetition is appropriate. It is the story of "Billy" Mitchell, Chief of the A.E.F. Air Force and first American to fly a combat plane over the German lines.

"Billy" Mitchell fought, and died for the reforms in U.S. Aviation that even the fall of France have not yet brought about.

In February, 1925, approaching a climax of his crusade for an independent Air Force, General Mitchell told the House Military Affairs Committee that the War Department was "quite incapable of creating, handling or administering air power in an efficient manner."

That honest indictment brought General Mitchell the kind of crack-down Lindbergh got—he was demoted in rank to a Colonel and shifted to an "exile" post in Texas.

Stupid, Unjust, Criminal

He kept slugging for the truth; and got a court martial. Thirteen generals tried him. Those generals should be hauled up now and shamed publicly for their verdict. It stands out in U.S. history for stupidity and injustice. Read it:

"We ask the dismissal of the accused for the sake of the Army, whose discipline he has endangered and whose fair name he has attempted to discredit. We ask his dismissal for the sake of those young officers of the Army Air Service whose ideals he has shadowed and whose loyalty he has corrupted.

"Finally, we ask it in the name of the American people, whose fears he has played upon, whose hopes he has fomented, whose confidence he has beguiled and whose faith he has betrayed."

And now The Mirror asks Mayor LaGuardia to erect a memorial to "Billy" Mitchell at LaGuardia Airport, a memorial to the best friend "those young officers of the Army Air Service" ever had.

And The Mirror calls for more "martyrs" to volunteer to carry on Billy Mitchell's crusade, to carry on questioning, his indicting of the Brasshats who are holding back U.S. Aviation.

And if they want ammunition for their questioning, here it is:

"Why is the P-40 fighter plane, BACKBONE of the..."
The White House spokesman was sharply critical of the fact that the aviator-isolationist made public his letter before it reached the President, and recalled another letter chapter in the Roosevelt-Lindbergh relations where a similar episode occurred.

This was in 1934 when the President canceled all air-mail contracts and ordered the Army to fly the mails as a result of scandalous ocean and air-mail revelations before a Senate investigating committee headed by present Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black.

Prompt Made Public

Lindbergh then sent a sharp protest to the White House and released it to reporters before he got to Mr. Roosevelt. This breach of White House etiquette was protested at the time.

Yesterday the spokesman said:

"Lindbergh's letter has not been received here.

"In 1934, newspapers printed a Lindbergh telegram on Monday morning which had been received on Sunday afternoon. The White House did not get the telegram until about 10 a.m. Monday. This is a sample of the same procedure."

The Mr's letter arrived by registered mail, about two hours later. The postmark was Huntingdon, Pa., where Lindbergh now resides, but the time of mailing Monday was not decipherable, the White House announced.

The spokesman said significantly before Stimson's decision was that "from what the President indicated last Friday he (Lindbergh) wouldn't have any duties, even if he continued to hold his commission. Now there is a commission that someone else can hold."

With the determination of the President thus fixed that Lindbergh in his present frame of mind would not be available for the new Army now shaping up, Lindbergh apparently decided not to adopt a dog-in-the-manger attitude about the resignation. At any rate, the veteran Secretary, a military man who earned the title of colonel and ordinarily a stickler for the rules—gave the aviator his wish within 24 hours after it was expressed.

Stimson's Verdict Closed

Asked whether Mr. Roosevelt would consider Lindbergh's resignation a loss to the Air Corps, the White House spokesman replied that Stimson's decision..."
Lindbergh
(See map on Picture Page)

We regret extremely that the War Department has accepted Charles A. Lindbergh's resignation as a colonel in the U.S. Army Air Corps Reserve. The nation, especially at a time like this, ought not to lose the services of so valuable a man.

Lindbergh tendered his resignation because the President, at last Friday's press conference, called him a copperhead; or, in effect, a traitor.

We can understand Lindbergh's feeling, that he had no other honorable course than to resign his reserve commission. And we can understand how the President, having for eight years carried successive burdens of national depression, prelude to World War II, and World War II itself on his back, would feel irritable toward anybody who disagreed with him on a matter which he deemed vital to the interests of this country.

For all that, this is no time to lose Lindbergh's actual and potential services to the United States. We don't now consider his politics and his views on U.S. involvement in this war; we're thinking only of his value to this country as a great aviator.

Attempts have been made lately to smear Lindbergh not only as an isolationist, but also as an allegedly punk flyer who had one enormous stroke of luck which he has been capitalizing ever since. This is simply a false picture of Lindbergh the aviator.

In the primitive days of mail flying, Lindbergh was so daring a mail flyer that he had to bail out four times in peasoup fog over dangerous terrain.

The 33-hour New York-Paris flight May 20-21, 1927, was no flying fool's leap in the dark. It was made in a Ryan monoplane whose construction was supervised by Lindbergh; and it was preceded by a test flight from San Diego to New York which beat the then solo transcontinental record.

Flying Wizard

In 1924, Lindbergh was graduated from Brooks Field at or near the head of his class. He was one of the only four men in that class designated as fit for pursuit plane flying.
In the year following the Paris flight Lindbergh made
expertly navigated air tours of the United States and good-
will flights to Mexico, Central America, South America,
and the West Indies. He followed this up by mapping
most of the present routes of Pan American Airways. He
has been for years technical adviser to Pan American and
T.W.A.

With his wife, the former Anne Morrow, Lindbergh in
1931 flew “north to the Orient,” meaning to Japan via
Canada, Alaska, and Siberia; a sensational achievement for
those days. In 1933, the flying Lindberghs made what
amounted to a world tour by airplane.

After Lindbergh had made government-chaperoned
inspections of the Russian and German air forces, he
reported that the Russian air force was greatly overrated,
and that the German air force was very strong and
growing more so.

This made all the Russia-lovers and many of the liberals
in this country hopping mad. They didn’t get any less mad
when Lindbergh turned out to have been right about the
German air force. It was then that the attempts to smear
him as a traitor bought with a Hitler medal had their
birth. The Russia-lovers will doubtless be madder still if
he is some day proved right about the Russian air force.

At the same press conference at which he called Lind-
bergh a copperhead the President remarked about a New
York Daily News editorial (“Concerning Conquerers,”
published Wednesday, April 23) that he

**His Majesty’s**

**Opposition**

He was sorry that people who could write
such a dumb editorial were in such high
places that they could write or talk like
that at all. Well, it’s our business to take it as well as dish
it. We try to accept such presidential reproaches with re-
spect, while continuing to disagree with the President when
we feel like it.

Lindbergh’s case is different, though. He is a flying
wizard, a master in all departments of aviation. Maybe
he’s too old (39) for combat flying, but he would be
invaluable on some big desk job connected with our air
forces in time of war.

And he is a leader of a rather large body of American
thought—the isolationist group. He would be called a
principal member of His Majesty’s Opposition if we were
in England—which we may be soon—and would have com-
plete freedom of speech, at least up until the time we were
actually in the war.

---(Copyright, 1941, News Syndicate Co., Inc.)
Clipping from the
Richmond Times Dispatch
5-6-44

Mrs. Norris and Lindbergh

THE subject of Lindbergh is getting
pretty tiresome to everybody. President
Roosevelt exceeded the proprieties
in his remarks concerning the ex-colonel,
when he compared him to the notorious
Vandemark, and if Lindbergh was
going to resign his reserve commission,
he should have waited until the letter of
resignation reached the President, before
giving it to the press. But the particular
phase of the controversy on which we
desire to comment at the moment, is
Kathleen Norris’ defense of the flyer,
published in this newspaper on April 30.

Mrs. Norris sought to answer some of
the statements made by Dorothy Thompson
about Lindbergh the preceding week.
With most of Mrs. Norris’ statements,
which were general in character, we are
not here concerned, but with one of
them, we are. It was where she said
that Miss Thompson had manufactured
an account of a riot outside the New
York hall in which Lindbergh spoke on
the night of April 23.

Mrs. Norris admits she was inside the
hall at the time, and that she is relying
upon the testimony of “two friends” who
could not get in, and who say “they
milled about in a street crowd that was,
they said, always good-natured and well-
headed by the police.” She calls upon
Miss Thompson to “give us further par-
ticulars of a street fight that no new-
paper reporters or policemen observed,
and of which eyewitnesses saw nothing.”
In view of the graphic account of riot-
ning outside the hall which many news-
paper reporters gave in their papers
next morning, this is an astonishing posi-
tion for Mrs. Norris to take.

The Associated Press stated that “men
and women were kicked and beaten and
several were knocked unconscious when
about 100 men and women appeared
bearing signs denouncing Lindbergh.
They were attacked by the crowd.” The
New York Times stated that “several
hundred persons from the crowd first
boomed and then attacked the parade,
knocking down the pickets, tearing up
their placards and breaking the wooden
staffs to which the placards had been
fixed.”

In view of the grotesque inaccuracy
of Mrs. Norris’ statements on this
readily verifiable bit of fact, how much
credibility is she entitled to in her more
general statements concerning Lind-
bergh’s attitude?
Lindbergh encourages Nazis: Woll

By JERRY LYNN

"The utterances of Charles A. Lindbergh give more encouragement to Germany than anything any American has said since the beginning of the war," Mathew Woll declared today.

"Lindbergh's statements are a moral blow to England," the third vice president of the American Federation of Labor, told a convention of the Workmen's Circle, made up of representatives of Jewish fraternal societies, in the Morrison hotel. "Every word of the appeasers which minimizes the effects of totalitarian victory is a word of encouragement to the Nazis.

Socialists Repudiated

"Invasion of this country already has begun, with Nazis, Fascists and Communists sending their agents to spread doctrines of anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, anti-trade unionism and do all in their power to split the country into minorities," Woll charged.

"The convention rules committee refused a request that a representative of the Socialist party address them because of the appeasement of Norman Thomas, it was explained.

Speaking at Mantle hall last night, under sponsorship of the Charles H. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions, Woll said that organized labor today faces the gravest hour in its history.

Woll declared that free labor can not possibly survive if the totalitarian nations are victorious in the present struggle, but added that the fate of labor would still be in the balance even if the democracies triumph.

Threat to Living Standards

"Regardless of which side wins in the conflict, the world will be impoverished," Woll stated. "It is essential that we give thought now to the post-war period.

"The problems which we will have to face in that post-war world will be much more difficult than the ones which confront us today. An impoverished Europe will be a threat to the standards of living which we now are trying so hard to maintain.

"Labor will have to meet that threat and play its part—an important part—in the preservation of the democratic ideal," Woll said. "It is too early to completely visualize events yet in the making, but you can be sure labor's attitude never will be one of defeatism."

He charged that selfish interests have misled upon the war emergency as a means of placing undue stress on the severity of defense industry strikes in the hope of settling public opinion against organized labor.

Actually, Woll said, only 2,422,061 man-days of labor had been lost because of strikes in the first quarter of 1941 and 2,728,260 of that total were in strikes against companies with anti-union policies.

Labor Against Hitler

"He banded a left hook on the CIO by pointing out that 2,119,986 of the total man-days lost were the result of strikes called by CIO unions and only 136,568 man-days went up the chimney in AFL strikes.

"Demands upon labor to maintain the status quo are grossly unfair," Woll said. "We asserted more cooperation will be forthcoming from labor through voluntary and amicable support of the defense program than that secured through harsh regulatory measures and fear."

"Labor is as anxious as any group that we not will become involved in this war," Woll said. "But no one with eyes to see and a mind to think has any doubt of the Nazi threat toward the rest of the world. Labor here as in Great Britain will make sacrifices to defeat Hitler's plans."
SENATOR BALL ANNOUNCED THAT HE WILL MAKE A SPEECH IN MINNEAPOLIS SATURDAY NIGHT WHICH HE DESCRIBED AS "AN ANSWER TO CHARLES A. LINDBERGH."

BALL SAID HE WOULD MAKE HIS SPEECH IN THE SAME AUDITORIUM AT A NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY RALLY. THE SPEECH, HE SAID, WILL BE FROM 8:30 TO 9:00 P.M. (CST) AND WILL BE BROADCAST BY CBS.

1945--R: 1397
FIVE YEARS LATE.

In their attempt to build up Charles Lindbergh as an infallible prophet of military events, his admirers put great emphasis on his report, late in 1938, on the impressive size and strength of the Nazi air force. It is emphasized repeatedly that he tried to tell the British that they were hopelessly outclassed in the air, and that the British refused to listen to him. Lindbergh was right in 1938, his admirers reiterate; ergo, he must be right today.

There can be no challenge to the declaration that Lindbergh was right in 1938; but what he tried to tell the British people was already old stuff. A man named Winston Churchill had been telling them about Germany's rearmament program for more than four years. He had been telling them in speeches and in newspaper and magazine articles, many of which were published in the United States as well as in Britain.

In November, 1934, speaking to his constituency, Churchill warned that "Germany, rearming secretly, illegally and rapidly, will have overtaken us before another year has passed." A fortnight later, on Nov. 17, he asserted that it was necessary for Britain to make herself the greatest air power in the world in order to avert another war. Periodically, during the years between 1934 and 1938, he tried to arouse the British public to the menace of Nazi rearmament, and to goad the government to action. Compared to his efforts, the voice of Lindbergh was tiny and inconsequential.

In a syndicated newspaper article dated September, 1937—a year before Lindbergh's report—Churchill declared: "As an independent Conservative member I felt bound to give the alarm, when five years ago, the vast secret process of German rearmament, contrary to treaty, began to be apparent."

Eight months previous he had written: "Still more difficult it is to guess how much the [British] Air Ministry will spend. The more they can spend the better. If they could spend three times as much this year, we should be far safer and happier, and there would be more chance of Britain being able to play an effective part in preserving peace."

During all those years, while Churchill was trying vainly to inform the world of the menace of Nazi airpower, Germany—and some of the same elements who now attempt to build up Lindbergh as a prophet—were denouncing him as a "warmonger," a "hysterical alarmist."
SEE LINDBERGH CANDIDACY

Capital Rumors Say He Plans to Run for House Seat in 1942

Special to the New York Times.
WASHINGTON, May 16—Reports were circulated today in Republican circles in the House that Charles A. Lindbergh was preparing to re-establish his voting privileges in the Sixth district of Minnesota, in order to run next year for the seat his father held from 1897 to 1917.

Mr. Lindbergh was represented as wanting the opportunity to enter the House to make his voice felt in foreign policies.

The incumbent for the district, Representative Harold Knutson, succeeded the late Mr. Lindbergh when he left the House to seek unsuccessfully election to the Senate.

"I think Mr. Lindbergh would be a valuable addition to Congress," said Mr. Knutson. Mr. Knutson recalled that last year he offered to step aside to permit Mr. Lindbergh to run for the office. When the aviator declined, Mr. Knutson went on to win by the largest majority of his career, about 31,000.

Mr. Knutson and Mr. Lindbergh hold similar views on foreign policy, both being non-interventionists.

Mr. Knutson, while asserting that Mr. Lindbergh’s presence in the House would be a “valuable addition,” said he would not make any announcement concerning his own political aims.

65-11449-R

CLIPPING FROM THE N.Y.TIMES

DATE MAY 17 1941

FURNISHED BY N.Y. DIVISION
EP. HAROLD KNUTSON SAID TODAY HE WOULD "LIKE TO SEE CHARLES A.
LINDBERGH IN CONGRESS," BUT HAD NEVER DISCUSSED THE POSSIBILITY THAT
THE NON-INTERVENTIONIST AVIATOR MIGHT RUN FROM HIS DISTRICT NEXT
ELECTION.
"I CAN'T MAKE PLANS THAT FAR AHEAD," KNUTSON SAID. "BUT I AM SURE
THAT WE WOULD WELCOME MR. LINDEERGH'S RETURN TO TAKE AN ACTIVE PART
IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN MINNESOTA AND WILL FIND A PLACE FOR HIM IF HE
DOES."

KNUTSON SAID HIS STATE REQUIRED ONLY SIX MONTHS RESIDENCE FOR A
PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE.
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This Changing World

Dispossessed Kings of Other Countries Becoming Problem for Great Britain

By CONSTANTINE BROWN

The British government is wondering what to do with the many kings and other heads of state who are seeking "safety" in the British capital. For the time being, besides the Queen of Holland and the King of Norway, the heads of most of the fallen countries from Europe are lodged in or near London.

To these two more are expected to be added within the next few weeks: The King of Yugoslavia and the King of Greece. The former is known to have taken refuge in Jerusalem. He is still there according to the latest reports received by the State Department. But as the fighting grows hotter in that section it is probable that the British high command will urge King Peter and his government to move to a safer place. Whether it will be London—under the constant bombardment of the German planes—or possibly some other place in the British dominions, is not known here.

The same thing applies to King George of Greece, who is with the government in Crete—a Greek territory. Yesterday's attack on that remaining important island which still flies the Greek flag makes the safety of the king doubtful.

According to information received here, it is likely that the German parachutists who landed in Crete are only an advance guard sent out to test the defensive strength of the forces defending Crete. If they are followed by more parachutists a short war is going to develop there and it would be unsafe for the Greek monarch to remain in the midst of fighting.

Italy Has Lion's Share of Yugoslavia

While Greece has remained a rump state with a Nazi officer in command of the country, Yugoslavia has been broken up in small states.

The Bulgars, the Hungarians and the Rumanians have all obtained large or small slices of what used to be Serbia.

The Italians are taking the lion's share. Besides the territories which they are going to annex outright, a puppet kingdom, Crota, under the scepter of the son of the King of Italy, has been created for the benefit of II Duce. The new king, the Duke of Spolieto, who has been imposed by the victors on the Croatian people, is familiar with the former Yugoslav court. He represented his father at the state funeral of the assassinated King Alexander of Yugoslavia. The present ambassador of Crota at the Quirinal planned the murder and the new Premier was the muscle man who hired the murderers and supervised the physical assassination of the Yugoslav monarch.

Travelers returning from South America—be they North Americans or Latin-American—will be asking the same question as they land in the United States. Have the Lindbergh speeches the same devastating influence in the United States they have in the Southern Hemisphere? These men, whether they are officials, tourists or businessmen, have the same tale to tell. Each speech by the former colonel has been so power-ful it destroys the work done during six months by those who strive to bring a close co-operation between the republics of the two continents.
Implicit Faith in Lindbergh

The Lindbergh speeches naturally are reported verbatim by the news agencies to the Central American and South American newspapers. Because of the prominence of the flyer they are given big display. They fit in with what our neighbors are told by the Axis agents—the inability of the United States to fight because we are so late in getting ready for war. The general conclusion is that it would be foolish for the Latin-American governments to tie up with a country which cannot defend itself—much less its friends and associates.

When Americans who are sent to South America to spread the gospel of the unity of the Western Hemisphere tell the story of the efforts of the United States and its surprising results, their tale is believed at first; then it is discounted by the newsman since Lindbergh is far better known and trusted than what is so frequently described as "the hangers" or the "traveling salesmen" of the American Government. Even nationals of the various republics who have spent some time in this country and say honestly what they have seen and believe are not trusted. They are being accused as becoming infected with American propaganda. Nobody in the Southern Hemisphere can understand why an American is distinguished and popular as the aviator should prove conclusively—that is how Lindbergh's speeches are interpreted—that this country is defenseless if it were not 100 per cent true.

Many Americans from both continents have returned to Washington in the last few weeks and are wringing their hands over the devastating effects of Mr. Lindbergh's speeches. When asked what the best remedy of the situation could be they seem to think that nothing short of Lindbergh's flying over to disavow his own speeches would help the situation.

The Latin-Americans are politically minded. They discount what politicians say—they know their own brand. But they do believe implicitly what a professional man of Lindbergh's position tells the world.
Judge Assails Lindbergh For Criticism Of Foreign Policy

In Charging Grand Jury at Opening of U. S. District Court Term; Says Lone Eagle Voices No Condemnation of Hitler But Attacks Roosevelt

While charging the grand jury at the opening session of the May term of Federal court at Charleston this morning, U. S. District Judge Alva M. Lumpkin strongly condemned Charles Lindbergh for criticizing the president's foreign policy and congress' efforts to extend aid to England.

He charged the Lone Eagle as being a show of "gloom" and of seeing his name in print after making speeches criticizing the nation's foreign policy that is designed to help the democracies preserve freedom for the world.

The judge said Lindbergh was ready to criticize the president and the congress but that he took little time to criticize Hitler and Mussolini for "ruining the continent of Europe.

"You say that we have freedom of speech in this country, but I'll tell you that no man should be allowed to attack our government especially in these days when we are carrying on in the Mediterranean, more than 1,000 miles from our shores," said Judge Lumpkin as he referred to the home of the H. M. S. battleship cruiser Hood.

The judge's arraignment of Lindbergh came after he told the grand jury that one of the bills of indictment being presented to it involved charges against a Berkeley county man of failing to return the questionnaire sent out by a selective service board.

THE CHARLESTON EVENING POST
Charleston, S. C.
May 26, 1941
Woolcott Sees Lindy 'Working for Hitler'

BOSTON, May 26 (N. Y. News) Alexander Woolcott, playwright, critic, and actor, in a radio address tonight charged that Charles A. Lindbergh and his supporters in the America First Committee, "whether they like it or not, whether indeed that is any part of their purpose, are working for Hitler . . . ."

"Have you any doubt, any doubt at all, that Hitler would have been glad to pay Lindbergh an immense amount, millions, for the work he has done in the last year?"
Lindbergh and the Tribune

A Tribune headline over a story about Lindbergh:

F. D. R. and Nazi
Aims Are Same!
Says Lindbergh

This is not Lindbergh's idea alone. It's the Tribune's, also. Editorial on Dec. 11, 1940, the Tribune expressed the identical viewpoint. The Tribune said that Hitler and Roosevelt "think alike, and given a free hand would reach the same goal."

At Philadelphia, Lindbergh said:

"Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to a new leadership?"

What does Lindbergh propose? American policies are traditionally made by officials elected by the people. Those elected officials are the leadership. What new policies? Who will make the new policies and who will pick the new leadership? We pick national leadership here by ballot under the Constitution. Does Mr. Lindbergh know another way?

Does Lindbergh suggest something similar to a plan in the minds of anti-Lincoln saboteurs who met during the Civil war in a conspiracy to turn Lincoln out because they didn't like his policies and his leadership?

Speaking in Chicago in April, Senator Wheeler said:

"President Roosevelt may have the power—IF THE ARMY AND NAVY OBEY HIM ..."

Lindbergh suggests a force higher than government by the people through their elected servants; Wheeler hinted at mutiny.
Lindbergh’s theme was that “President Roosevelt was himself advocating world domination by his policies although the President was accusing Hitler of that aim and if our frontier lies on the Rhine, then the German frontier rests on the Mississippi.” The fruits of such a policy, said Lindbergh, will be “war between the hemispheres which may last for generations.”

President Roosevelt has not advocated world domination by the United States; on the contrary, he has opposed domination by Hitler. The three-party agreement among Germany, Italy and Japan is a definite compact for world combine to allot to each nation “its proper place” and the President’s answer, in the old tradition of this land, is that we ourselves will have something to say about our proper place.

It was not the President, but Mr. Willkie, who said that our frontier is on the Rhine, and the Tribune and Lindbergh supported Mr. Willkie after he said it. It was Mr. Hitler who said that there is a war between the hemispheres.

At Philadelphia, Lindbergh was quoted that the President “says it is our business to control the wars of Europe and Asia, and that we in America must dominate the islands lying off the African coast.” Mr. Roosevelt never said we must control wars in Europe and Asia. Discussing the islands in the Atlantic in his fireside chat, he applied the Monroe Doctrine. And until this episode the Tribune has stood for the Monroe Doctrine. Now the Tribune speaks sightly in the “danger of attack upon the United States from some other continent several thousand miles away.”

On June 19, 1940, the Tribune said:

“The United States . . . has vital interests which it must defend in the Caribbean, with further commitments through the Monroe Doctrine in South America. The islands, both native republics and European possessions, lack means of defending themselves. The United States must furnish any military force operating in this area.”

So the Tribune has admitted the danger of an attack thousands of miles away, but now it calls the President’s program to resist such an attack “absurd.”

At Philadelphia, Lindbergh said that a survey of the “interventionists” on aviation would be interesting. “I would like to know where they were when I was advocating a stronger air force for America and England.”

Not only interesting but tragic in its connotations for the safety of America is the record through seven years of the Tribune in opposition to a stronger air force for America. In 1934, experts who advised a stronger air force were dubbed “alarmists” by the Tribune. It swooped editorially upon Igor Sikorsky, airplane builder, and Frank Hawks, pilot in the last war, who testified before a congressional committee to support army and navy proposals for an air program much as Lindbergh proposed. The Tribune:

“Mr. Sikorsky describes enormous bomb carriers in the model of the larger passenger planes now being built and announced their ability to blast whole cities in.” This is trash repeatedly discredited.

... men who are real experts and not politicians, propagandists or dreamers have repeatedly stated exaggerated estimates of armchair warriors and international theorists.

So there’s where the Tribune was.

“I could find very few people interested in aviation when the German air force was being built,” explained Lindbergh. All through the period, and long after it, the Tribune said that military aviation as Lindbergh and our army experts were advocating before Congress was “in the racket and the Congress” was to go in for the traditional infantry because aviation is only “an auxiliary arm.”

Even after the experience in Spain and France kept up its anti-aviation crusade. When President Roosevelt sent a defense message to Congress in January, the Tribune ridiculed it with the statement that Mr. Roosevelt saw “dangers which were not perceivable to any one else.”

The Tribune couldn’t hear or see Lindbergh in the Tribune’s own words, Mr. Roosevelt was also.

And as late as March 18, 1940,—just a little more than a year ago, the Tribune said: “Our own interest that this country suspend its purchases of military naval aircraft.”

Lindbergh’s views on military aviation never the Tribune. Sen. Wheeler’s opinions on national affairs never the Tribune. But that the “interventionists” on the FBI are right up the Tribune’s alley. The Lindbergh-Tribune combination destroys the integrity of the credibility of the users of words.

For instance, this from the Tribune’s common fireside chat:

“There is no desire whatever in this country to desire other people. We do not believe that we prove the quality of our civilization by taking liberties with others.”

The Tribune thus pictures the United States as an aggressor, or potential aggressor, to malicious gullible. In such abuse of words is the sabotage of national a time of national emergency.
WASHINGTON CITY NEWS SERVICE

Atlantic City.—Solicitor General Biddle last night denounced as "flabby thinking" Charles A. Lindbergh's contention that America might not be able to preserve its democracy if it goes to war. Addressing the National Conference of Social Work, Biddle said, "A sense of history should forward us against the continual repetition of the theme that war always brings the sacrifice of liberty and resolves into dictatorship."
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Answering Lindbergh

To the New York Herald Tribune:
A magazine article some weeks ago, Mr. Lindbergh called for a new government, and in his reply the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, made a statement that he did not agree with.

The basis of Mr. Lindbergh's new government was that the United States should be a democracy, with the executive and legislative powers in the hands of the people. Mr. Wilson disagreed with this, saying that a democratic government would be too slow and inefficient.

To the New York Herald Tribune:
Mr. Lindbergh's plans for the new government were based on the idea that democracy is the best form of government. However, Mr. Wilson said that democracy is not always the best form of government. He cited the example of Great Britain, where the monarchy and parliament have been successful in running the country.

To the New York Herald Tribune:
Mr. Lindbergh's ideas for a new government were well-received by many, but they were met with criticism by others. Some felt that his ideas were too radical and that they would lead to chaos.

To the New York Herald Tribune:
Mr. Lindbergh's plans for a new government were based on the idea that democracy is the best form of government. However, Mr. Wilson said that democracy is not always the best form of government. He cited the example of Great Britain, where the monarchy and parliament have been successful in running the country.

American Interests

To the New York Herald Tribune:
In his article, Mr. Lindbergh stated that the United States should be a democracy, with the executive and legislative powers in the hands of the people. Mr. Wilson disagreed with this, saying that a democratic government would be too slow and inefficient.

To the New York Herald Tribune:
Mr. Lindbergh's ideas for a new government were met with criticism by others. Some felt that his ideas were too radical and that they would lead to chaos.

To the New York Herald Tribune:
Mr. Lindbergh's plans for a new government were based on the idea that democracy is the best form of government. However, Mr. Wilson said that democracy is not always the best form of government. He cited the example of Great Britain, where the monarchy and parliament have been successful in running the country.

To the New York Herald Tribune:
Mr. Lindbergh's ideas for a new government were met with criticism by others. Some felt that his ideas were too radical and that they would lead to chaos.
Biddle Assails Lindbergh Talk

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., June 3

(S.P.)—Solictor General Francis Biddle last night denounced as "flabby thinking" Charles A. Lindbergh's contention that America might not be able to preserve its democracy if it goes to war.

Addressing the National Conference of Social Work, Biddle said, "A sense of history should forewarn us against the continual repetition of the theme that war always brings the sacrifice of liberty and resolves into dictatorship."

He recalled that Lindbergh had said in his New York address May 23, "If we go to war to preserve democracy abroad, we are likely to shed by losing it at home."

"But our democracy has survived five wars, and it cannot be very deeply rooted in us if fighting for it will destroy it," Biddle said.
Should The FBI Take Action?

Is it not time for Federal authorities, notably the FBI, to take decisive action in regard to Mr. Charles Lindbergh?

The right of free speech has in no way been abrogated by the President’s Proclamation of a Declaration of Unlimited Emergency, and yet his action was a clear call that this is too critical a period for the luxury of internal dissension. All the arguments pro and con have been debated and aired for many months and it is no secret where the majority opinion lies.

Lindbergh has taken one step past his privilege of free speech and stepped openly and flagrantly into the realm of treason and political chicanery. One sentence alone in his speech in Philadelphia on May 9 will serve as an example. I quote: “Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to a new leadership?”

On the one hand, Lindbergh belittles the Administration for not following what he considers to be democratic principles, and on the other he openly requests his dubious followers to change leaders. And by what methods? The sinister implication is only too clear.

Up to now, some persons might have had reason to suppose that Lindbergh was a sincere patriot, only a pacifist who sincerely hates war and violence, ready to join the defensive forces of the Nation as soon as the elected President of all the people indicated that necessity. But now he appears fully revealed to even the most simple-minded as an exponent of the Nazi scheme of things, pledged to carry out, and not unwittingly, the principle of Hitler’s statement in “Mein Kampf,” to wit, that “it would be easy to produce dissension and rioting in the United States at the right moment.”

By asking for a change of leaders, Lindbergh has laid himself open to arrest on a charge of treason and incitement to revolution, and one, hope that our Government will no longer hesitate to take him in hand, and forget the fears that such action might make a martyr of him.

It is my belief that American citizens such as Lindbergh do more harm than even the cleverest German spy or saboteur. The same goes for Messrs. John T. Flynn and Senator Burton K. Wheeler, all of whom have expressed the same idea, namely, “Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to a new leadership?”

The answer of the majority to this query is: “It is time to cure the maggot from the apple.”

NEW YORK CITY, June 4.
Should The FBI Take Action?

Is it not time for Federal authorities, notably the FBI, to take decisive action in regard to Mr. Charles Lindbergh?

The right of free speech has in no way been abrogated by the President's Proclamation of a Declaration of Unlimited Emergency, and yet his action was a clear call that this is too critical a period for the luxury of internal dissension. All the arguments pro and con have been debated and aired for many months and it is no secret where the majority opinion lies.

Lindbergh has taken one step past his privilege of free speech and stepped openly and flagrantly into the realm of treason and political chicanery. One sentence alone in his speech in Philadelphia on May 9 will serve as an example. I quote: "Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to a new leadership?"

On the one hand, Lindbergh rates the Administration for not following what he considers to be democratic principles, and on the other he openly requests his dubious followers to change leaders. And by what methods? The sinister implication is only too clear.

Up to now, some persons might have had reason to suppose that Lindbergh was a sincere patriot, only a pacifist who sincerely hates war and violence, ready to join the defensive forces of the Nation as soon as the elected President of all the people indicated that necessity. But now he stands fully revealed to even the most simple-minded as an exponent of the Nazi scheme of things, pledged to carry out, and not unwittingly, the principle of Hitler's statement in "Mein Kampf," to wit, that "it would be easy to produce dissension and rioting in the United States at the right moment."

By asking for a change of leaders, Lindbergh has laid himself open to arrest on a charge of treason and incitement to revolution, and I, for one, hope that our Government will no longer hesitate to take him in hand, and forget the fears that such action might make a martyr of him. It is my belief that American citizens such as Lindbergh do more harm than even the cleverest German spy or saboteur. The same goes for Messrs. John T. Flynn and Senator Burton K. Wheeler, all of whom have expressed the same idea, namely, "is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to a new leadership?"

The answer of the majority to this query is: "It is time to core the maggot from the apple."

CHARLES WOLFE.

New York City, June 4.
SPEECH DISTORTED,
LINDBERGH HOLDS

Says New Leadership Appeal
Referred to Interventionists,
Not Impeachment Plea

SCORES PRESS TREATMENT

Asserts Philadelphia Remark
Was Removed From Context
—Denounces Opponents

Charles A. Lindbergh denied emphatically yesterday that he had referred to President Roosevelt when he appealed for a "change in leadership" in his speech for the America First Committee in Philadelphia on May 30.

He declared that the "change in leadership" reference was directed at interventionists—"the leadership of the Opposition which we [the nation] have been following in recent months," and added:

"Neither I nor any one else on the America First Committee advocate proceeding by anything but constitutional methods.

Mr. Lindbergh gave that explanation in a telegram to William E. Moore, managing editor of the Baltimore Sun. His elucidation of the statement that provoked a storm of criticism by those who thought it suggested "revolution" or impeachment of the President follows:

"In reply to your telegram of June 4, my reference to the need for new leadership applied to the leadership of the interventionists which the nation has been following in recent months.

"This is obvious if you read the paragraph of my Philadelphia address in which I asked, "Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to new leadership?" In many press reports my question was removed entirely from its context.

"Neither I nor anyone else on the America First Committee advocates proceeding by anything but constitutional methods. It is our opposition (the interventionists) which endangers the American Constitution when it objects to our freedom of speech and expression.

"Under the Constitution, we have every right to advocate a leadership for this country which is non-interventionist and which places the interest of America first. This is, in fact, the primary objective of our committee. We believe that a non-interventionist and fundamentally American leadership is of vital necessity to the security and welfare of our country."

Mr. Moore's telegram follows:

"Since you recently began using the phrase that the America First organization is 'seeking new leadership in Washington' it has been noted that other foremost speakers for the America First cause are using the same phrase. Governor La Follette used it here in his speech last night (Thursday). The Sun would be glad to print your explanation of the meaning of this phrase and how a new leadership could be set up under our constitutional form of government before the next election."

A representative of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, who assumed that his group was embraced in the "opposition" or interventionists cited Mr. Lindbergh, said that the committee would make no comment until it had found time to consider the Lindbergh explanation.
Lindbergh Denies He Hinted At Overthrow of Government

New York, June 9—Charles A. Lindbergh, spokesman for the America First Committee, said today that any statement that his recent speech in Philadelphia was directed toward President Roosevelt was untrue.

Lindbergh said that his call for a "change in leadership" was aimed at interventionists—the leadership of the opposition which we (the Nation) have been following in recent months.

"Neither I nor anyone else on the America First Committee advocates proceeding by anything but constitutional methods. It is our opposition (the interventionists) which endangers the American Constitution when it objects to our freedom of speech and expression. Under the Constitution, we have the right to advocate a leadership for this country which is non-interventionist and which places the interests of America First. This is, in fact, the primary objective of our committee. We believe that a non-interventionist and fundamentally American leadership is of vital necessity to the security and welfare of our country."

Lindbergh's remarks were made in reply to a telegram from William E. Moore, managing editor of the Baltimore Sun, received at the committee's office which said:

"Since you recently began using the phrase that the America First Organization is seeking new leadership in Washington, it has been noted that other foremost speakers for the America First Committee are using the same phrase. Gov. La Follette used it here in his speech last night (Thursday). The Sun would be glad to print your explanation of the meaning of this phrase, and how a new leadership could be set up under our constitutional form of government before the next election."

Lindbergh replied:

"In reply to your telegram of June 9, my reference to the need for new leadership applied to the leadership of the Interventionists which has been following in recent months."

"This is obvious if you read the paragraph of my Philadelphia address in which I said, 'Is it not time for us to turn to new policies and to new leadership?' In many press reports my question was removed entirely from its context. Neither I nor anyone else on the America First Committee advocates proceeding by anything but constitutional methods. It is our opposition (the interventionists) which endangers the American Constitution when it objects to our freedom of speech and expression. Under the Constitution, we have every right to advocate a leadership for this country which is non-interventionist and which places the interests of America First. This is, in fact, the primary objective of our committee. We believe that a non-interventionist and fundamentally American leadership is of vital necessity to the security and welfare of our country."
LINDBERGH RETREATS.

After an awkward delay, Charles A. Lindbergh has been forced to take cognizance of widespread public criticism of his recent remarks anent a "change in leadership" for this country. He now denies that any of his utterances along this line were directed against the President. He says that his call for new leadership was aimed at "interventionists," at the "leadership of the opposition which we (the nation) have been following."

The explanation is weak. Nearly all of Lindbergh's pronouncements in recent months have been directed specifically, at some point, against Mr. Roosevelt. He has repeatedly insinuated that the President is the ringleader of a war party bent upon leading the people, by subterfuge, to their own destruction.

"Neither I nor anyone else on the America First Committee advocates proceeding by anything but constitutional methods," he says. But he said nothing about constitutional methods when advising his following, in a recent article, that "you and I and people like us" must "take the reins in hand."

It seems obvious that Mr. Lindbergh is crawling. He has been forced to beat an undignified retreat from a dangerous position. Nevertheless, we consider his disavowal of treasonous intent a hopeful sign of the growing force of an aroused public opinion. Let us hear, next, similar disavowals from Senator Wheeler and others who have preached the "new leadership" text. Lindbergh attempts to speak for them, also. But, of course, he cannot do that. The others must speak for themselves.
Lindbergh Asked
To Speak Here
On July 1

America First Group
Sends Bid, Reserves
Auditorium

Charles A. Lindbergh and
United States Senator David
Worth Clark of Idaho were in-
vited today by telegram to ad-
dress a mass meeting in the
Civic Auditorium here the night
of July 1.

The wires were signed by John
J. Taheny, northern California
director of the America First
Committee.

Taheny said the Auditorium
already had been reserved for the
meeting.

FOLLOWS CONFERENCE
Taheny's action followed a
conference here last night of
leaders of all chapters of Amer-
ica First in this section of the
state, it was announced.

The conference was addressed
by Earl C. Jeffrey of Chicago, na-
tional organizer for America
First, who said both Lindbergh
and Clark had agreed to speak
in San Francisco, providing a
satisfactory date can be ar-
granged.

ONE DIFFICULTY
Principal difficulty lies in the
fact Lindbergh restricts himself
to one speech a week, and the
fact many other cities, including
Oakland, Seattle, Portland, Salt
Lake, Spokane and Tacoma, are
bidding for his appearance.

Jeffrey left by plane today for
Hollywood, where he will confer
with Lindbergh and Clark, who
speak in Hollywood Bowl Friday.
Air Power Bar
Invasion of U. S.
Lindbergh Says

Flier, in Hollywood,
Denies New Weapons
Increase Our Peril

By the United Press.

HOLLYWOOD, June 21.—The
weapons of modern warfare make
America less vulnerable to invasion
than ever before, Charles A. Lind-
bergh declared last night in an
address before an America First
meeting in Hollywood Bowl.

The noted aviator charged that
the two chief contentions of inter-
ventionists are fallacies: (1) that
modern warfare makes this coun-
try more vulnerable to invasion
and (2) that the best way to de-
defend America is by defending Eng-
land.

Neighboring More Vulnerable.

"While the developments of mod-
ern warfare have increased the
vulnerability of nations within a
hemisphere to each other, they
have decreased the ability of one
hemisphere to attack the other
successfully," he said.

"The development of aviation
made France and England much
more vulnerable to Germany than
they were before, but aviation
makes it more difficult for Europe
to attack America, or for America
to attack Europe, than it has ever
been in the past."

Increases Landing Hazards.

"In fact, the developments of
this war indicate that aircraft may
make it impossible for an enemy
force to land on our American
cost, regardless of how strong
that force may be."

The flier pointed out that the
European war shows warships suf-
fer heavy losses whenever they
come within striking distance of
enemy aviation.

Mr. Lindbergh urged his listen-
ers to "put your support behind
a negotiated peace" as an alterna-
tive to "a Hitler victory or a pro-
strate Europe, and possibly a pro-
strate America as well."

Sees Races Lacking.

He said that "no matter how
many fighting planes we build in
America and send to England, it
is not possible to base enough
squadrons in the British Isles to
equal in striking power the squad-
rons that Germany can base on
the Continent."

"What we really are being told
is that the best way to defend
America is by attacking the rest
of the world—and sending our
soldiers across the Atlantic Ocean
and across the Pacific Ocean to
overcome the armies of Germany,
Italy, Japan and possibly Russia,
France and Spain as well," he said.

Nearly two hours before Mr.
Lindbergh began speaking the
Bowl was filled to its 30,000 ca-
pacity and people still were strug-
gling in maneuvering for standing
room.
Shores of U. S.
Safe--Lindy

20,000 Hear Flyer
In Hollywood Bowl
(Text of Lindbergh speech on
Page 10.)

HOLLYWOOD, June 20 (U.P.).
The weapons of modern warfare make America less vulnerable to
invasion than ever before. Charles A. Lindbergh declared tonight in
an address before an America first mass meeting in Hollywood
Bowl.

Officials of the Bowl estimated the attendance at 20,000 persons,
capacity of the open-air theater. Lindbergh, prior to making his
address, viewed the audience from the wings of the stage and ex-
pressed satisfaction at the large crowd which had come to hear
him. Senator D. Worth Clark (D.) of Idaho, and Novelist Kathleen
Norton

The aviator charged that the two chief contentions of interven-
tionists are fallacies: (1) That modern warfare makes this coun-
try more vulnerable to invasion; and (2) that the best way to de-
fend America is by defending Eng-
land.

"While the developments of modern warfare have increased
the vulnerability of nations within
a hemisphere to each other, they
have decreased the ability of one
hemisphere to attack the other
successfully," Lindbergh said.

"The development of aviation
made France and England much
more vulnerable to Germany than
they were before, but aviation
makes it more difficult for Europe
to attack America, or for America
to attack Europe, than it has ever
been in the past.

"In fact, the developments of
this war indicate that aircraft
may make it impossible for an
enemy to land on our Ameri-
can coast, regardless of how
strong the force may be."
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The Falln Prophecy

That exception is Charles A. Lindbergh. Up to this writing Mr. Lindbergh has maintained a cautious silence. It may be that he is only taking a well-breathing spell. On the other hand, it may be that something the President said in his proclamation of war has shocked Mr. Lindbergh into realizing that perhaps he didn't know all the answers after all.

After charging that Russian troops were deployed along the German frontier in such a manner as to menace the Reich, Hitler said:

"Thus these recent British-Soviet Russian co-operative operations intended mainly at the tying up of such powerful forces as the Red Army, that radical conclusion of the war in the west, particularly as regards airpower, could no longer be reached for by the German High Command."

It is the emphasized phrase which is of especial interest — to no one more so than to Charles A. Lindbergh. It is in the field of comparative strengths of the British Royal Air Force and the Nazi Luftwaffe where Mr. Lindbergh has assumed the role of supreme expert. Only seven weeks ago, at St. Louis, Lindbergh told an American first rally:

"The claim that the American and British air forces alone and in aircraft will soon exceed German production is not true..."

"The idea that England, with her aviation, can equal Germany's strength in the air by 1943 or 1944 is a complete fallacy. No matter how many planes we build in America and send to England, we cannot make the British Isles stronger than Germany in military aviation."

It is a great pity that Adolf Hitler did not know this. He needn't have attacked Russia at all, obviously, if he had only known his own strength. But somehow the Fuehrer was worried "particularly as regards aircraft," not in 1942 or 1943, but in 1944. The statement was in 1944.

"The German High Command probably has a reasonably accurate assessment of the relative strength of Luftwaffe and the RAF. It may be given in accordance with Lindbergh's own information — perhaps even a little higher than the time, what matters to Lindbergh is that the Luftwaffe be down on the Germans is still against all the evidence."

"But it is not yet known to what extent the Luftwaffe has been weakened by losses in the Russian campaign."

"The only air force in the world which is suffering the losses is ours. That's the way it is."

"The German High Command doesn't need the British invasion to compile their losses because the American invasion may be a tremendous blow."

"They have proven that a surprise air attack can have tremendous effect."

"The invasion has proven that a surprise air attack can have tremendous effect."

"Hitler is making such incredible statements in the present one predicting that a British defeat 'will not actually benefit American foreign trade' because our chief concern will be that the German invasion has already been postponed.

"The invasion has proven that a surprise air attack can have tremendous effect."
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"The invasion has proven that a surprise a
may be that he is only taking a breathing spell. On the other hand, it may be that he is temporarily unmanned by his realization that perhaps he doesn't know all the ropes after all.

After escaping that, the next thing that the German High Command probably has a meticulously accurate assessment of the relative strength of the Luftwaffe and the RAF. It may be even as accurate as Lindbergh's own information—perhaps more so! And then, with this being the case, what seem to be the weaknesses in the American defense are still to be down on the job, even if only to an extent.

Hitler's double as to his ability to gain air superiority over Britain, has caused him to launch upon a desperate and reckless adventure. The very least that we can profit by this new move is to gain some precious time in which we can raise our aircraft production to new highs. That's the great opportunity before us. We mustn't miss it because of the weak defenses of a minority who would have us simply fold up because we're facing a tremendous task.

Time has proven Ben Wheeler to be a false prophet. It has proven Lindbergh to be a false prophet. It has led Ben Nye into making such irresponsible statements as his recent one predicting that a British defeat "might actually benefit American foreign trade" because our chief competitor—England—would be out of the picture.

As President Roosevelt pointed out recently, no nation in all history has ever lost democracy by fighting to preserve it. Each nation, after nation has gone down by a plow because a disdained and ubiquitous cause more treasured than the liberties men have strong but tyrants by centuries of struggle.

The free men worthy of this cause have the answer to make to the threat of despotism, and it is the answer offered by those who see the iron of man's self-government.
Lindbergh Leads
Fascist Youth,
Dr. Bohn Charges

Camp Tamiment, Pa., June 22—
Charles A. Lindbergh was assailed as "the leader of the Fascist youth of the United States" by Dr. Frank Bohn, chairman of the German-American Congress for Democracy, in an address before the conference of the Tamiment economic and social institute here today.

Dr. Bohn, son-in-law of Daniel L. Boker, former Secretary of Commerce, made this charge in connection with the prediction that "isolationist and appeaser" forces in this country would seek to utilize Hitler's attack on Soviet Russia as a means of hamstringing American aid to England by painting Hitler as "the savior of the world from Bolshevism."

"Hitler's attack on Russia is an aphrodisiac for the greatest propaganda offensive in history," Dr. Bohn said.
Lindbergh Leads
Fascist Youth
Dr. Bohn Charges

Copyright by New York Times
Camps Treatment, Pa., June 30.—Charles Lindbergh was assailed as "the leader of the Fascist youth of the United States" by Dr. Frank Bohn, chairman of the American Congress for Democracy, in an address before the conference on the Talmudic economic and social institute here today.

Dr. Bohn, son-in-law of Daniel G. Roper, former Secretary of Commerce, made this charge in connection with the prediction that "isolationist and appeaser" forces in this country would seek to utilize Hitler's attack on Soviet Russia as a means of hamstringing American aid to England by painting Hitler as "the savior of the world from bolshevism."

"Hitler's attack on Russia is the springboard for the greatest propaganda offensive in history," Dr. Bohn said.
Lindbergh Leads Fascist Youth,
Dr. Bohn Charges

Copyright by New York Times

Camp Tamiment, Pa., June 28—Charles A. Lindbergh was saluted as "the leader of the Fascist youth of the United States" by Dr. Frank Bohn, chairman of the German-American Congress for Democracy, in an address before the conference of the Tamiment economic and social institute here today.

Dr. Bohn, son-in-law of Daniel C. Roper, former Secretary of Commerce, made this charge in connection with the prediction that "isolationist and appeaser" forces in this country would seek to utilize Hitler's attack on Soviet Russia as a means of hamstringing American aid to England by painting Hitler as "the savior of the world from Bolshevism."

"Hitler's attack on Russia is the springboard for the greatest propaganda offensive in history," Dr. Bohn said.
Lindbergh Assails Soviet As U. S. Ally

By the Associated Press

San Francisco, July 1.—Charles A. Lindbergh told an antiwar mass meeting tonight: "I would a hundred times rather see my country ally with England, or even with Germany with all her faults, than with the cruelty, the goliathness, and the barbarism that exist in Soviet Russia."

"An alliance between the United States and Russia should be opposed by every American, by every Christian, and by every humanitarian in this country," Lindbergh said in an address prepared for a civic auditorium meeting sponsored by the America First Committee.

"The America First Committee has never accepted Communists or Fascists in its membership," he said. "We have never changed our policy in this respect. We accept no foreign way of life, and no foreign ideologies. We reject them all."

"But the idealists who have been shouting against the horrors of Nazi-Germany are now ready to welcome Soviet Russia as an ally."

"They are ready to join with a nation whose record of cruelty, bloodshed, and barbarism is without parallel in modern history."

Issues Confused

Lindbergh's talk was broadcast over the National and Mutual networks.

"The longer this war in Europe continues, the more confused its issues become," he said. "When it started, Germany and Russia were licked up against England and France. Now, less than two years later, we find Russia and England fighting France and Germany, the murderous and plunderers of yesterday are accepted as the valiant defenders of civilization today, and the valiant defenders of yesterday have become the wicked aggressors of today. Finland and France are now our enemies; Russia our friend. We have been asked to defend the English way of life, and the Chinese way of life."

"Are we now asked to defend the Russian way of life? I ask you, is the Russian way of life our way of life? Are we now to be responsible for the policies of Stalin as well as for those of Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek?"

"Two weeks ago, the Interventionists were accusing the America First Committee of associating with the subversive influence of communism. Now, I suppose it is our turn to ask whose meetings the Communists attend."

"Judging from Europe's record, if we enter this war, we can't be sure whether we will have Russia or Germany for a partner by the time we finish it. We don't even know whether we will end up with France or England on our side. It is quite possible that we would find ourselves alone fighting the entire world before it was over."

"The only sensible thing for us to do is to build an impregnable defense for America, and keep this hemisphere at peace."

WINTER before last, when Russia was fighting Finland, the Interventionists demanded that we send a plausible aid to Finland. Now, when Russia is fighting Finland again, they demand that we send all possible aid to Russia.

"The murderers and plunderers of yesterday are accepted as the valiant defenders of civilization today, and the valiant defenders of yesterday have become the wicked aggressors of today. Finland and France are now our enemies; Russia our friend. We have been asked to defend the English way of life, and the Chinese way of life.

"Are we now asked to defend the Russian way of life? I ask you, is the Russian way of life our way of life? Are we now to be responsible for the policies of Stalin as well as for those of Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek?"

"Two weeks ago, the Interventionists were accusing the America First Committee of associating with the subversive influence of communism. Now, I suppose it is our turn to ask whose meetings the Communists attend.

"Judging from Europe's record, if we enter this war, we can't be sure whether we will have Russia or Germany for a partner by the time we finish it. We don't even know whether we will end up with France or England on our side. It is quite possible that we would find ourselves alone fighting the entire world before it was over.

"The only sensible thing for us to do is to build an impregnable defense for America, and keep this hemisphere at peace."
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Lindbergh Assails
Russia as Worst
Possible U. S. Ally

Tells Peace Rally
He Is Ready to Fight
For American Defense

By the Associated Press.
SAN FRANCISCO, July 2—
Charles A. Lindbergh, denouncing
Russia and European entangle-
ments, pleaded for "an independent
destiny for America" amid pro-
longed applause at an overflow mass
meeting sponsored by the America
First Committee here last night.

The crowd filled the 12,000 seats
of the Civic Auditorium before the
meeting began and overflowed into
the streets where they listened to
outdoor loudspeakers.

The audience roared its loudest
approval when Mr. Lindbergh de-
clared:

"I would a hundred times rather
see my country ally herself with
England, or even with Germany
with all her faults, than with the
cruelty, the Godlessness and the
barbarism that exist in Soviet
Russia.

"But there is one thing upon
which we can agree, upon which
we are not divided, and that is
that we are ready to fight for
America if the need should ever
arise."

Mr. Lindbergh responded with
engaging grins to the ovation which
greeted him and his wife, the for-
er Anne Morrow, as they took
their places on the platform with
other speakers: Author Kathleen
Norris, Actress Lillian Gish and
Senator Worth Clark of Idaho.

But his mouth wore grim lines
when he spoke of "interventionist
propaganda," commenting:

"A refugee who steps from the
bargain and advocates war is ac-
cknowledged as a defender of freedom.
A native-born American who op-
poses war is called a fifth col-
umnist."
Lindy-Assails
Soviet as Ally

Americans Oppose
Red Creed, He Says

SAN FRANCISCO, Calif., July 1 (E.T.P.E.)—Charles A. Lindbergh
told an anti-war mass meeting ton-
night that America should not ally
herself with any European coun-
try nor fight for any way of life
except our own, but worst of all
would be an alliance with Russia.

"I would a hundred times rather
see my country ally itself with
England, or even with Germany
with all her faults, than with the
cruel, the godless, and the
barbarism that exist in Soviet
Russia," the noted flyer declared.

"An alliance between the United
States and Russia should be op-
posed by every American, by every
Christian, and by every humanit-
tarian in this country."

Lindbergh's address, delivered at
an America First meeting in the
Civic Auditorium, was broadcast
ever a nation-wide radio network.
Senator Worth Clark (D.), of
Idaho, and Actress Lillian Gish
also spoke on the program.

"The America First Committee
ever has accepted Communists
or Fascists in its membership,"
Lindbergh said. "We accept no
foreign way of life and no foreign
ideologies. But the idealists who
have been shouting against the
horrors of Nazi Germany are now
ready to welcome Soviet Russia as
an ally. They are ready to join
with a nation whose record of
cruelty, bloodshed, and barbarism
is without parallel in modern his-
tory."

"America is not likely to enter
the war, Lindbergh asserted. If the
people understand the facts be-
hind the interventionists' prop-
aganda and refuse to be misled by
intentionally aroused confusion.
Sees War Issues Confused

Lindy Prefers ‘Even Nazis’ to Reds as Ally

SAN FRANCISCO, July 2 — Charles A. Lindbergh told an America first rally of 12,000 persons last night that he would rather the United States ally herself “even with Germany” than with Russia.

“I would a hundred time rather see my country ally herself with England, or even Germany, with all her faults,” he said, “than with the cruelty, the Godlessness and the barbarism that exists in Soviet Russia.

“An alliance between the United States and Russia should be opposed by every American, by every Christian and by every humanitarian in this country.”

The speech was broadcast nationally. Hundreds of persons, unable to crowd into the auditorium, stood outside listening to the talk from loudspeakers.

Mr. Lindbergh said Russia and Germany would have been at war two years ago if British and French “intervention” had not forced the war onto them. Now the issues of the war are in complete confusion, he said.

“Winter before last, when Russia was fighting Finland, the interventionists demanded we send all possible aid to Finland,” he said, “Now, when Russia is fighting Finland again, they demand we send all possible aid to Russia.

“The murderers and plunderers of yesterday are accepted as the valiant defenders of civilization today; and the valiant defenders of yesterday have become the wicked aggressors of today.”

Sen. Worth Clark (D. Idaho) denied to the meeting that England is defending the United States.

“She is fighting for trade, gold, commerce and the perpetuation in power of her ruling classes,” he said, “and so likewise is Germany.”
AID TO RUSSIA CRITICIZED BY LINDBERGH

By Lindbergh, who addressed the meeting, was criticized by Senator David Worth Clark of Idaho, author Kathleen Norris and actress Lillian Gish.

"The longer this war in Europe continues, the more confused its outcome will become," Lindbergh said. "But now we declare that it is the United States declared that it is the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic...

The address to the meeting indicated that the United States was not going to be content to remain on the sidelines while the rest of the world faced the mounting dangers of war.

The speech was well-received by the audience, which gave it a standing ovation.

Lindbergh ended his address by saying, "We must remain united and determined to stand against any force that threatens our freedom and way of life."
Man Is Machine
To Lindbergh, Friend Writes

By International News Service

New York, July 2—Charles A. Lindbergh's admiration for the Nazi way of life is not strange, because he never learned that people do not react like machines, says Harry Bruno, former close adviser and friend of the flier, in an article entitled "What's the Matter With Lindbergh?" in the current issue of the American magazine. Lowell Thomas is co-author of the article.

Bruno and his partner, the late Richard Blythe, represented and counseled the Lone Eagle in his relations with the public before and after his historic Atlantic flight.

Recalling his past association with Lindbergh, Bruno writes:

"There is one trait of his character which I believe goes far to explain his attitude, as well as the reaction of the public. This is his isolation from the camaraderie of other men."

He Resented the Press

Bruno and Blythe first met Lindbergh at Curtiss Field, Long Island, May 12, 1927, when he was just an obscure young mail pilot, and they worked with him in the period of his greatest acclaim. Bruno adds:

"But neither of us ever felt truly near him. We were his friends, but never his buddies. Didn't think he ever had a buddy."

Lindbergh, says Bruno, resented the press with a kind of cold fury, and it took the best efforts of his advisers to restrain him from maintaining a feud with the newspaper.

Continuing, Bruno says:

"This attitude toward the press, I think, is a partial explanation of his admiration for the Nazi machine. Because he resented publicity, he resented the freedom of the press. And, since freedom of the press is a tenet of democracy, he came to distrust democracy. So Lindbergh accepted the Nazi suppression of free speech and a free press as rather a virtue than a fault."

He Turned on the People

Bruno adds:

"He never learned that people do not react like machines. His admiration for a new order that tries to make machines out of men is therefore not so strange."

Bruno labels as "bunk" recent talk about "the sickle and ungrateful public, which makes a hero of a man and then turns on him."

"It's not the public that is ungrateful today. The ingratitude is Lindbergh's. The people did not turn on him; he turned on the people. The man they had set up as an ideal turned traitor to all he represented in their minds. ...

... he has done treason to the faith and love and affection of the vast majority of his countrymen. And his countrymen, more in sorrow than in anger, ask only, 'What's the matter with Lindbergh?'
DEFENSIVE WAR.

The Lindbergh thesis can be reduced to very simple terms. The "Lone Eagle" professes to believe we are stronger alone than in any possible combination of friends or allies. He assures us we can make ourselves "invincible," simply by arming at home and ignoring what happens abroad.

This is the theory of the "defensive," made popular after the last war, and now completely discredited by Hitler's campaigns.

Those who promulgated this theory, mainly in connection with the illusory disarmament debates at the League of Nations, not only were unfamiliar with military history, but also did not understand even the last war. In that war, the Central Powers knocked out Serbia, Belgium and Russia, and took a third of France, by attacking. They very nearly destroyed the French and British armies in 1918 by a series of vast and violent attacks. They were themselves defeated, from July 18, 1918, on, by a series of equally vast and violent attacks, conducted by the tired French and British, in conjunction with large fresh forces from the United States.

There is only one sure way to win a war. It is to defeat and destroy the enemy's armed forces, or their will to fight, by carrying the war to them with the utmost skill and vigor.

If Lindbergh, Nye, Wheeler, Norman Thomas and the Chicago Tribune had their way, we would have stopped material aid to Britain and China long ago. This action could have had but one result—the speedy defeat of Britain and China, accompanied by the setting up of "New Order" governments there, co-operating with Hitler. The only remaining obstacle between Hitler and his dream of world domination would then be the United States.

Some isolationists feel confident, apparently, that in these circumstances we would be able to make a deal with Hitler ourselves, and thus avoid trouble. But in the face of the events of the last two years, only a fanatic would risk the security of our country on any such possibility.

The odds are at least 10 to 1, on the contrary, that we would have an enforced showdown with Hitler, ending in war.

Does anyone believe we could win such a war simply by guarding our own shores, while Hitler sank our ships, bombed our coast cities, and made such inroads as he could in South or even Central America?

There would be only one way for us to win such a war. We would have to carry it, sooner or later, to Asia, Africa or Europe, or perhaps all three, with the object, finally, of destroying our adversaries' main forces and breaking their will to fight.

With advance bases both in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and particularly with Britain for a base in Europe and Africa, and China or even Siberia for a base in Asia, this would be a feasible operation, especially with China, Britain and Russia still in the ring, still fighting. Without such bases, and such outlying support, the task would be vastly more difficult. Knowing that only the offensive can finally win, must we be reduced to the necessity of fighting a wholly defensive war?

We deny, therefore, the Lindbergh thesis. To our mind, it is not only utterly false, but perversely misleading and extremely dangerous. No embattled nation has ever been, or ever will be, stronger by itself than with the cooperation, and help of friends and allies. This is elementary. And it seems more than a little strange that any sensible man should even contest it.
'HAVE YOU QUIT BEATING YOUR WIFE

COL. LINDBERGH says: "I would a hundred times rather see my country ally herself with England or even with Germany with all her faults, than with the cruelty, the godlessness, and the barbarism that exists in Soviet Russia."

In that statement, we think, the Colonel indulges in a device familiar to the practitioners of courthouse oratory—the "have you quit beating your wife?" technique. He implies things which the facts neither connote nor demonstrate to be true—that those Americans who see Germany as the greatest menace to the safety and security of America, and who welcome the diversion created by Russia's entry in the war, must by that token and of necessity ally themselves spiritually or intellectually with Communism. His second implication is that America has no choice but to ally herself either with Nazism or Communism.

America does not have to make a choice between Communism and Nazism. The fact is that America has already made her choice—made it two years ago—and it is neither Communism nor Nazism. When Russia allied herself with Germany, that was the signal for the war to start. England went in against Germany and her ally Russia. And when England went in, America made its choice. America took sides with Britain against both Germany and Russia—against both Communism and Nazism. America has remained steadfast on that election. American public sentiment stands today where it has stood for two years. It is against Hitler and Nazi world conquest. It is for Britain and for whatever will prevent that conquest.

So far as justice and decency and humanitarianism are concerned—so far as the rights and privileges of individuals are concerned—there is no distinction between Communism and Nazism. We do not prefer Nazism to Communism or Communism to Nazism. We want defeat of dictatorship and of conquest.

When—and with a faint "if"—Germany conquers Russia and breeds Nazism to Communism, we wonder with what tolerance will Col. Lindbergh then view that spawn?
Lindbergh Follows Nazi Line—Ickes

By United Press

NEW YORK, July 15—Interior Secretary Ickes charged last night Charles A. Lindbergh has offered the American people the “Nazi party line” in interpreting events leading to the Russo-German war.

He said “it was clear Lindbergh did not have his cue” when he first was asked to comment on the Nazi invasion of the Soviet. Nine days passed, during which the Nazi Party line was worked out and the official Nazi propaganda was handed out to Hitler mouthpieces and fellow-travelers all over the world,” Ickes said.

“Then arose the knight of the German eagle and offered this Nazi Party line to the country. . . . He said Hitler had gone to war against Poland because British and French faced him to. He said Hitler had been forced to attack France and Britain because—believe it or not!—the British would not permit him to attack Russia.”
Lindbergh Aids Hitler, Impedes U.S., Ickes Says

Tells France Forever Rally Flyer Never Applauds Democracy

NEW YORK, July 14 (U.P.)—
Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes said tonight that "all of Lindbergh's passionate words are to encourage Hitler and to break down the will of his fellow-citizens to resist Hitler and Nazism."

Addressing a rally of "France Forever" organization of Free Frenchmen in America, Ickes asserted that "the Lindberghs" as cheerers-on of Hitler when the latter was an ally of Russia actively help communism.

"Knight of German Eagle"

"Lindbergh," he said, "now denounces communism because it defends itself against the aggression of Hitler, but I have never heard this Knight of the German Eagle denounce Hitler or Nazism or Mussolini or fascism.

I have never heard him raise his voice for any of the raped countries of Europe, not even for France, where, for a long period he collaborated with Dr. Alexis Carrel, who is reputed to be a Nazi sympathizer, in developing an artificial heart. I could tell ex-Colonel Lindbergh where he could really locate an artificial heart with the aid of an X-ray machine."

Ickes added that he had "never heard Lindbergh say a word for democracy itself."

"No," he continued, "all of Lindbergh's passionate words are to encourage Hitler and to break down the will of his own fellow citizens to resist Hitler and Nazism."

Ickes spoke of Lindbergh in calling upon Americans to take a lesson from the fall of France, asserting that "Goebbels' lying words did more to destroy French democracy than Hitler's marching soldiers."

"They strive with might and main—these American Laval's and Quillings—to paralyze our will and undermine our confidence," he said.

"Other steps to avoid the fate of France have already been taken, he continued, pointing to the occupation of Iceland, which he said "will become another of our great bases, where our armed forces will do their part to keep Hitler out of America and thereby help to isolate him on the Continent of Europe."

"Our Golden Chance"

While he repudiated "communism no less than Nazism," Ickes said "Hitler's unexpected attack
on Russia is a golden chance of which we must take full advantage.

"While Hitler is busy waging his wanton war with Russia—despite his solemnly plighted word—we must utilize every moment to increase our production, step up our output, and swiftly pour the resources and materials of war into Britain."

The rate of airplane manufacture has been increased "greatly," he said, and "in the last 12 months the output of machine tools has doubled."

Ferries in Russian Defeat

"Garand rifles have trebled," he continued. "Minor naval craft under construction rose from 64 to 407 in the last year. We are now producing six times as much powder as we did a year ago. We are manufacturing 11 times as many tanks as we did a year ago. And all this is only a start."

"If Hitler should conquer Russia," Ike asserted, "it would not be a defeat of communism; it would be a world-shaking victory for Nazism" in which Hitler would acquire enormous military stores and resources, step aid to China "so that Japan would be free for new reckless adventures in Asia and in the Pacific," and, "if he should control Siberia, Hitler would become a menace to nearby Alaska and threaten our Pacific Coast and outlying islands."

"A victory over Russia would give him incalculable prestige in South America and it would also encourage our own defectors, appeasers and Fascist fellow travelers."

"In other words, the defeat of Russia would mean a nightmare for us and for Britain."
Lindbergh a Nazi Spieler Says Ickes

New York, July 14—Secretary of the Interior Ickes charged tonight that Charles A. Lindbergh was a mouthpiece of the Nazi Party line in the United States, speaking at a Bastille Day meeting at the Manhattan Center, under the sponsorship of the France For Freedom organization. Lindbergh had waited for his views on the breakup of the Nazi-Soviet pact and the German attack on Russia. The speech was perhaps the most bitter ever made by Lindbergh by a member of the inner circle of the Roosevelt Administration.

Referring scornfully to the Nazi guillotines, who pour ink on the truth in order to blacken it, and freedom, once again the voice of freedom, once again, had broken his silence, pledge and treacherously attack his Russian ally, former Col. Lindbergh was asked what he thought of it. "Terminally, very unusual development." It is something that required profound analysis. It was clear that Lindbergh did not have his cue. Nine days passed, during which the Nazi Party line was worked out and the rest...
Lindbergh Writes President Demanding Ickes Apologize

Declares He Received Nazi Decoration While Serving American Embassy

By the Associated Press.

NEW YORK, July 17—Charles A. Lindbergh today advised President Roosevelt that he had no connection with any foreign government, that he received a German decoration while serving the American Embassy and declared that he had a right to an apology from Secretary of the Interior Ickes for certain "statements and implications."

Saying that he wrote as an American citizen, Mr. Lindbergh, who recently resigned as colonel in the Air Corps Reserve, wrote:

"For many months and on numerous occasions, your Secretary of the Interior has implied in public meetings that I am connected with the interests of the foreign government, and he has specifically criticized me for accepting a decoration from the German government in 1936."

"Mr. President, is it too much to ask that you inform your Secretary of the Interior that I wasdecorated by the German government while I was carrying out the request of your Ambassador to that government?"

Is it unfair of me to ask that you inform your Secretary that I received this decoration in the American Embassy, in the presence of your Ambassador, and that I was there at his request in order to assist in creating a better relationship between the American Embassy and the German government, which your Ambassador desired at that time?"

Secretary Ickes in a radio address here Monday night asserted that Mr. Lindbergh's "passionate words are to encourage Hitler and to break down the will of his own fellow-citizens to resist Hitler and Nazi-ism." He criticized the flyer's attitude toward the Nazi invasion of Soviet Russia and referred to Mr. Lindbergh as "the knight of the German eagle."

"Mr. President," Mr. Lindbergh said in his letter which he made public from his home at Lloyd Neck, Huntington, N. Y., "If the statements of your Secretary of the Interior are true, and if I have any connection with a foreign government, the American people have a right to be fully acquainted with the facts. On the other hand, if his statements and implications are false, I believe that I, as an American citizen, have a right to an apology from your Secretary."

"Mr. President, I give you my word that I have no connection with any foreign government. I have had no communication, directly or indirectly, with any one in Germany or Italy since I was last in Europe, in the spring of 1939. Prior to that time, my activities were well known to your embassies in the countries where I lived and traveled. I always kept in close contact with your embassies and your military attaches, as the records in your State Department and War Department will show.

"Mr. President, I willingly open my files to your investigation. I will willingly appear in person before any committee you appoint, and there is no question regarding my activities now, or at any time in the past, that I will not be glad to answer."

"Mr. President, if there is a question in your mind, I ask that you give me the opportunity of answering any charges that may be made against me. But, Mr. President, unless charges are made and proved, I believe that the customs and traditions of our country give me, as an American citizen, the right to expect truth and justice from the members of your cabinet."
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