perts" of a few weeks' standing appear to agree with him. Among the complaints against the Western powers are their failure to send a large air fleet to Poland, their reliance on leaflets instead of bombs in raids on Germany, and their unwillingness to launch an immediate full-blown offensive against the Westwall. Reinforcement of Polish air strength would have meant the dispatch of a large number of long-range bombers without the assurance of adequate ground forces for their service and without the protection of fighting squadrons. The Allies have not yet caught up with Germany in the manufacture of planes and at this early stage in the war cannot afford to dissipate their air forces. Reluctance to start bombing military objectives behind the German lines is also understandable. Such bombings must inevitably cause civilian casualties and produce an adverse effect in neutral countries. Moreover, they would almost certainly increase rather than diminish the strength of Hitler's domestic position. The decisive factor in this war may well be the undermining of German morale, and so long as the Nazis refrain from aerial warfare leaflets may do more good to the Allied cause than bombs. Finally, military strategists of experience rejoice that the French army is not repeating the dashing and dangerous tactics with which it entered the last war. To have hurled all available troops against the German lines in an effort to make a quick break through would have been to court disastrous defeat. In modern warfare patient organization, dull as it may seem, is the essence of strategy when the strength of opposing forces is evenly divided.

* * *

THE COMMON INTEREST OF THE AMERICAN republics was never more evident than in the Pan-American Conference on Neutrality which opened last week in Panama City. Despite intensive Nazi propaganda accusing the United States of desiring to establish protectorates over them, the Latin American countries appear to be convinced that Germany is the main source of danger in this hemisphere. Plans for the defense of the neutrality of the Americas are being framed on this unstated assumption. The most spectacular proposal, said to have met wide support among the delegates, calls for the creation of a 300-mile-wide "area of primary defense" around the Western Hemisphere in which all belligerent activities—notably submarine warfare—would be prohibited. Schemes have also been suggested for a joint naval patrol of South Atlantic and South Pacific waters. Trade problems growing out of the disruption of European markets are likewise on the agenda. The occasion is one of great opportunity and greater responsibility for the United States. If this country is prepared to aid in the defense of the Latin American republics and to tide them over the period of economic dislocation caused by the outbreak of war, it will be in a position to expand its trade materially. And in the process it will be strengthening the defenses of the Western Hemisphere against the inroads of totalitarianism.

* * *

WITH ORGANIZED MINORITIES DELUGING Congress with letters in opposition to lifting the arms embargo, the unorganized majority had better get busy and do some letter-writing of its own. We do not often urge our readers to write or wire their Congressmen and Senators, but we think there is grave danger that pressure groups for the embargo may do serious damage unless general opinion makes itself felt. The best way to keep America out of war is to hasten a Franco-British victory by selling arms to the Allies. The letters expressing a contrary opinion seem to be coming largely from organized peace groups and the pro-Nazi and pro-Nazi elements led by Father Coughlin. That Berlin is taking a hand directly or indirectly seems clear. On the other hand, the peace organizations under Communist influence which could have been counted on a few weeks ago to fight for lifting the embargo have gone "dead" on the issue under the influence of the Russo-German pact and the Communist Party's new "imperialist war" line. It is still a war against fascism, despite Mr. Chamberlain, and anti-fascists should urge repeal of the embargo.

* * *

THE STRIKE OF AMERICAN SEAMEN FOR special compensation for duty in war zones has been settled, temporarily, by a partial granting of the strikers' demands. Among the requests granted were a 25 per cent increase in pay, a $150 allowance for clothing and other personal effects lost as a result of the war, and continuing pay in case of internment by a belligerent nation. No action was taken on the seamen's request for a special monthly war bonus or the protection of war-risk insurance. The government's role in the strike was anything but a happy one. Captain George Fried, supervising inspector of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, allowed actions to be brought, under federal statutes, charging the strikers with "unlawfully disobeying the commands of their captain," an offense punishable by suspension or cancelation of their sailing certificates. Although the charges were "ended" as part of the settlement, the incident is bound to leave a permanent scar on waterfront relationships. Nor is the settlement likely to be a lasting one. The extra pay can hardly be considered adequate compensation for the risks these men are called on to take. Should a few American ships be sunk by submarines, the dispute would arise again in aggravated form. Early passage of the revised neutrality law barring American ships from belligerent zones would ease the situation, but it would be unsafe to assume that submarines will confine themselves to zones laid down in an American law.