

# L'ITALIA IN AFRICA

## e la Simpatica Stampa Locale

Sabato, 22 Febbraio—

Da Addis Abeba arrivano telegrammi che trovano molto spazio nella stampa locale, per far sapere che le bombe italiane colpiscono i non militari in Abissinia. L'Imperatore è fortunato perché è riuscito a mettere in pratica la scoperta che fuorvia le bombe dai militari ai civili. Ecco perché l'esercito di Salassie non subisce mai perdite.

Le voci di richiesta di pace dall'imperatore si fanno ogni ora più insistenti e concrete.

La Francia comincia a tremare per le sue colonie in Africa e si raccomanda ai suoi alleati per mezzi di efficiente difesa.

fermate, portando tre tonnellate di materiale esplosivo, con una velocità dalle 218 alle 248 miglia all'ora, il che significa arrivare comodamente a Parigi o Londra, abbandonare il carico e tornare a casa.

Il falso giornalista Van Passeur deve andare in Africa, nel Sudan, per scoprire e far sapere ai lettori del suo compiacente STAR che Badoglio e il Re d'Italia non sono d'accordo col Duce per la campagna in Africa. Quel giornalista e il suo compiacente Editore debbono essere rimbacillati altrimenti non potrebbero scrivere e far stampare di quella roba dopo tante prove di unanime consenso della famiglia Reale e di tutti gli italiani.

L'Inghilterra. "Sapevancelo" anche noi.

Mercoledì, 26 Febbraio—

Un'altra storiella che trova molto spazio nei nostri carissimi fogli locali è che gli abissini abbiano invaso l'Eritrea Italiana. Meno male che non li hanno fatti ancora arrivare in Sicilia o a Roma addirittura.

Le squadre motorizzate nel sud e gli aviatori nel distretto di Dessie hanno attaccato diverse colonne di abissini che tentavano imboscate alle nostre avanguardie.

Visto che la stampa locale ha avuto ordine di zittire sull'argomento italo-abissino, aggiungiamo noi qualche cosa per oggi: diversi gruppi numerosi di indigeni e gruppi di guerrieri si sono arresi al nostro comando giurando sottomissione. Il governo italiano smentisce in modo assoluto la storiella dei nostri 400 soldati as-

# Text of Senator Borah's Address

(continued from page 1)

gained either for the cause of peace or for the cause of humanity, or to our own advantage, by our joining or taking part in another European conflict.

Public opinion was insistent that the government in no way imperil the peace of the United States or involve us in this controversy.

In response to this demand, the government set about to carry out the will of the people. While neutrality has its problems and also its risks and responsibilities, nevertheless, as the people understood it, it meant that we should neither directly nor indirectly take sides as between the belligerent forces. The principle was at least clear to the public.

But adroitly the campaign against neutrality was inaugurated. It was inaugurated by those who insisted that we should take an active part in crushing one of the belligerents. We were told with a tone of condescension that neutrality was a thing of the past; that to be neutral was in fact to be for war; that to be neutral was immoral.

Geneva Appeal Is Criticized.

A statement was put out from Geneva to the effect that a world war was probable and that by reason of our adhering to a policy of neutrality the moral responsibility for such event must rest upon the United States, the logic of the contention being that we must cease to be neutral and become a party to another European war, another war to end war.

We were advised that an aggressor had been found and adjudged guilty, and that all nations interested in peace or in justice to small nations must join in the program of punishment.

It is hardly necessary to say that if a tribunal of which we are not a member can, for reasons either wise or unwise, just or unjust, denounce a nation as an aggressor and then call upon the United States in the name of peace and humanity to assist in punishing the aggressor, once we yield to the demand we shall have forfeited the last vestige of control over our foreign policy and will necessarily become a party to every controversy or war in Europe.

The whole thing is but another method of drawing the United States into every controversy that can arise in Europe. This program was openly or covertly supported by all who favored our joining the League.

Japanese Move Is Cited.

When Japan invaded Manchuria our able Secretary of State, sincere in the cause which he espoused, appealed to the nations dominant in the League for cooperation in the interest of treaty and territorial integrity.

Great Britain, through her accredited spokesman, declared with some degree of bluntness that Great Britain would remain neutral. It thus appears that neutrality was not a thing of the past. It was a living policy, invoked in what was believed to be the best interests of the British nation.

And Great Britain having declared that it was to her interests to remain neutral, under what rule of international sanity or of national responsibility would the United States be justified in insisting that the will or judgment of the American people should be substituted for the will or judgment of the people of Great Britain?

Japan was a member of the League and the World Court. It is also true that Great Britain was a member of the League and the World Court.

Thus both nations, in disregard of the terms of the covenant, sought a higher and more controlling covenant, and that was what was deemed national interests. It was not in the interest of Great Britain to invoke the terms of the covenant against Japan.

Holds League Ideals Ignored

The whole proposition was decided precisely upon the principles which would be controlling if no League of Nations existed. It was determined, not in the interest of world peace, but in the interests of the nations concerned.

It has been the established policy of Great Britain through the centuries to move the British navy to that point on the globe where disturbance seemed to menace British interests. Without that policy Great Britain and that vast empire would break in pieces overnight.

It has also been her policy, when

her interests were not affected, to remain neutral.

For myself, I do not criticize her policy. It is Great Britain's policy, determined and sustained by the people of Great Britain.

I would not send special writers, or lecturers, or beloved dignitaries of the church over to Great Britain to tell her that she should change her policy; that by remaining neutral while Japan was in Manchuria she was standing in the way of world peace and betraying the cause of humanity; that, if war ensued, the responsibility must rest with Great Britain.

Now, the scene changes because national interests change. Italy, no doubt somewhat advised but apparently not sufficiently advised by the Manchurian incident, invaded Ethiopia.

Say Britain Puts Interest First.

Here British interests were directly affected. The British Navy moves to the scene of danger. There is no longer neutrality because it is not to the interests of the British Empire to have neutrality. There is an aggressor in this instance because the interests of Great Britain are vitally affected.

Again, I say, that Great Britain had a right to, and whether she had the right to or not, she did act in accordance with what she believed to be her national interests.

Neutral in one instance; unneutral in another! Both for the same reason—national interests.

To state the matter more specifically, nothing the United States could have said, or done, apparently would have had the slightest effect upon the neutrality policy of Great Britain in the Manchurian affair.

Neither the integrity of China nor world peace, or both combined, weighed one iota in the scale against what she declared to be her interest—shall I say selfish interest—or rather, the welfare of the people of Great Britain as the people of Great Britain saw it.

Furthermore, the impression was left with Japan, which still strongly obtains, that the United States was not so much interested in treaty integrity as she was in thwarting the ambition of Japan while Great Britain was her friend.

Concedes Rights of British.

Our first effort to sustain the principle upon which the League is supposed to rest, the integrity of treaties, ran athwart the neutrality policy of the power without whose navy the League exists only in name.

And if the United States and Japan should have a serious controversy—which I do not anticipate—is there a person credulous enough to believe that we would not have a further exhibition of the morality of neutrality?

On the other hand, when conditions arose closer home which seemed to threaten the interests of Great Britain, she moved with her usual celerity and courage, and, clothing her strategy in the habiliments of humanity and peace demanded that the world, including the United States, should move with her.

Now, do not misunderstand me. I am conceding her right to be neutral in the Manchurian affair and unneutral in the Ethiopian affair.

But I deny her right, or the right of any group of nations, to brand the United States as favoring war or as pursuing a course selfish or immoral in adopting a policy of neutrality as against the Italian and Ethiopian controversy, or any other controversy in Europe.

Sees Renewed Propaganda.

When the people of the United States determined to remain neutral in the Italian-Ethiopian war and when they determine, as they will, to remain neutral in all European controversies, they will be acting in harmony with what they believe to be our national interests—that which determined the policy of Great Britain in Manchuria and Ethiopia and which has determined her policy through the centuries.

In staying out of this controversy and in remaining neutral, we were consulting exactly the same interests from our viewpoint that Great Britain was consulting when she determined to take part in the controversy, that is, national interests.

In the light of this record, and in the light of the movement of all nations, the charge that the United States, in adopting a policy of neutrality, is standing in the way of world peace or occupies the position of an immoral and selfish nation, is the most transparent piece of propa-

ganda that has afflicted this country since the World War.

And let us bear in mind that, while as to some things which tend to interfere with our policy of neutrality, the nation may deal with them through legislation or through administration.

But against the selfish forces of propaganda, parading under the livery of all wise or humanitarian garbs, only the vigilance and poise of the people can protect us.

Propaganda Called a Racket.

Just what part propaganda had in drawing us into the World War we can not with accuracy say. But we know it was very great. Propaganda is never absent in any great international emergency; indeed, in any emergency, foreign or domestic. It is a profession. It is more than a profession; it is also a racket.

Something could be said, and perhaps should be said, about the plan of rendering judgment against a nation supposed to be an aggressor. Edmund Burke declared he knew of no way by which to draw an indictment against an entire people. A way has now been found, not only to indict but to try and convict an entire people.

This procedure does not concern us except in so far as it may be used as an inducement in a new guise to our mixing in the political affairs of Europe. When we see the plan applied to one nation and not to another and realize that in both instances the controlling forces were political, that national interests and national ambitions directed the course in each instance, we must readily perceive that an aggressor is not one who has broken a covenant or attacked a small nation, but one which has transgressed the zone of interests of some other nation.

Sees War in Collective Action.

The judgment of such a tribunal, when thus secured, is either a futility or justification for war, as we now well know. Whatever may be the machinery or whatever may be the plans of European nations to deal with each other, it is not for us to inquire as to their wisdom, or unwisdom, but it is perfectly evident that the forces which dominate are the same under whatever name they may be called into action.

While I have no purpose to discuss the subject in detail tonight, I could not subscribe to the theory that collective action against the supposed aggressor means peace. It inevitably means war unless the nation is too weak to resist, and then it means oppression.

It is confusion worse confounded to talk about employing force against a sovereign state as a state employs it against a citizen or subject. When the framers of the Federal Constitution were discussing the question of employing force against a sovereign state in the execution of a judgment of the Federal Court, it was Hamilton as I remember, who declared it was madness.

The United States, in pursuing a course of neutrality, not only consults and serves the interests of her own people, but under no reasonable rule of international conduct can be regarded as doing injustice to other people.

Would Avoid Racial Antipathies.

To declare that such a course is immoral is unworthy of its authors. We should be neutral. We should remain free from European controversies.

We have our own problems. They are distinct from the problems abroad. A democracy must remain at home in all matters which affect the nature of her institutions. They are of a nature to call for the undivided energy and devotion of the entire nation.

We do not want the racial antipathies or national antagonisms of the Old World transplanted to this Continent, as they will be should we become a part of European politics. The people of this country are overwhelmingly for a policy of neutrality. And we can not be neutral and unneutral at the same time.

We want the American way and we are entitled to have it unmoled. The people in the end will see that we have it.

Quotes "Farewell Address."

The American people will again stand united behind the admonitions of the great man who speaking to coming generations with a wisdom more than human, said:

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible."



A GINEVRA—Le ballerine sanzioniste fanno la scena finale per attirare l'attenzione degli uomini libertini i quali sono stati adunati in quel teatro per assistere alla commedia. Molti di quegli uomini sono entrati al teatro col passo gratuito.

Parla Salomone: il TELEGRAM di Toronto, ci dice che la richiesta fatta dall'imperatore Salassie per mettere l'Abissinia sotto il mandato della Lega è impossibile perché il saltinbanco Robinson MacLean ha con sé i documenti che negano tale possibilità. Sapete in che consistono tali documenti: una FALSA lettera scritta a macchina in francese dallo stesso imperatore, e da lui firmata, in data 13 NOVEMBRE 1935. Capite? Con una lettera del novembre scorso si smentisce una richiesta che sarebbe stata fatta il 18 o 19 febbraio 1936. Roba da matti.

Abbiamo detto lettera falsa perché Salassie non sa scrivere con la macchina; perché Salassie non conosce il francese che parla molto male e scrive peggio ancora; perché la firma può essere fatta da un bambino che ancora non riesce a tenere in mano la penna; perché tale lettera scritta da Sua Maestà il Re dei leoni e amico dell'Inghilterra non sarebbe stata scritta su un pezzo di carta da salumiere; perché tutte le storie che ci ha raccontato e ci seguita a raccontare MacLean sono sempre state fandonie da saltinbanchi.

Un'altra storia ridicola è quella che il Duce avrebbe ordinato a 500, 000 soldati di ritornare ai campi altrimenti la produzione della terra procurerà la fame dei nostri sudditi.

Le nostre truppe hanno avanzato di altre 12 miglia nel nord senza bisogno di sparare colpo di fucile.

Gli italiani occupano Aderat, 20 miglia a sud di Macallé.

Il Senatore Borah degli Stati Uniti, ha attaccato l'Inghilterra per la sua "insidiosa campagna" contro la neutralità degli Stati Uniti.

Lunedì, 24 Febbraio—

I pappagalì di Melinda St. seguivano a scrivere editoriali per affermare che l'Italia non ha ancora guadagnato una battaglia importante contro l'Abissinia. E il pubblico credulone seguita a leggere certa roba da... cani.

Arrivano le prime notizie non ufficiali della cattura di Amba Alagi dalle truppe del maresciallo Badoglio. "By by" Salassie!

Secondo le informazioni arrivate oltre Oceano, l'Italia per la fine di quest'anno avrà pronti 5,500 aeroplani, una buona parte dei quali capaci di percorrere 1800 miglia senza

Chi legge lo STAR di oggi deve assolutamente domandarsi se sogna o è divenuto matto. Il titolo a capo pagina dice: "La linea italiana tagliata e centinaia uccisi dicono gli etiopici". Leggendo poi il contenuto dello scritto non si parla che di vittorie italiane su tutti i fronti ed in tutti i settori, con la distruzione di migliaia di abissini. Queste noi le chiamiamo frodi per i lettori che disgraziatamente acquistano quel foglio e si fermano alla lettura dei soli titoli.

Descrivendo le vittorie italiane il falso giornale aggiunge: "passeggeri arrivati dall'interno dell'Etiopia riportano che l'imperatore soffre per aggravato male di cuore per le gravi apprensioni della situazione militare nei vari distretti. Dicono che egli è divenuto l'ombra di sé stesso e soffre d'insonnia. Il suo dottore svedese gli somministra continuamente dei calmanti. "Pazzi, pazzi e falsi.

Nel suo scritto Van Passeur asserisce nuovamente il falso quando si riferisce ad alcune notizie inviate dal Conte Ciano a Roma, dall'Africa, quando lui (Van Passeur) si trovava a Roma. Sempre falso perché questo bell'imbusto, che trova un editore compiacente, da anni non va in Italia.

Mussolini si rifiuta di approvare qualsiasi convenzione navale fino a quando l'Inghilterra mantiene le sanzioni. Bene. Anzi, benone.

Martedì, 25 Febbraio—

I giornali non arrossiscono perciò si divertono a pubblicare e... ripubblicare (sembra strano ma tutti i giornali locali hanno ripetuta la notizia due o tre volte. — Parola d'ordine!) l'uccisione di 400 soldati che si trovavano in chiesa per ascoltare la messa a Askum. La notizia è falsissima e ciò spiega l'ordine di ripetere.

Il Duce non scherza. Per combattere le sanzioni sembra deciso a chiudere i porti italiani e il transito a tutti i mezzi di trasporto delle nazioni sanzioniste. In conclusione: l'Italia fa da sé.

Le sanzioni dell'Inghilterra stanno producendo straordinari effetti ai suoi sudditi. Un gruppo di 60 negozianti britannici si è costituito in lega per domandare che il loro governo gli rimborsi le gravi perdite che subiscono con l'aver cessato il commercio con l'Italia. Allora chi perde è proprio

sassinati mentre ascoltavano la messa e prende in ridicolo tutte le affermazioni della stampa per il fatto che le piogge impediranno le operazioni militari in avvenire.

Giovedì, 27 Febbraio—

Una rivelazione che fa restare a bocca aperta: dietro investigazioni fatte dall'On. Steven, nella Camera Canadese, risulta che nella Lega delle Nazioni vi sono 21 (diciamo ventuno) nazioni che non pagano le loro quote quali membri, per un importo complessivo di 19,347.987 franchi in oro. Chi ha pagato questi 20 milioni di franchi? Come hanno avuto diritto al voto le nazioni arretrate coi pagamenti? Per far parte della Lega e votare "yes" basta solo che l'Inghilterra sia soddisfatta?

L'Italia ha protestato ufficialmente col Canada per l'applicazione delle sanzioni.

Il capo della Somala Gherras, Hassan Gababa, si è arreso alle armi italiane con tutti i suoi guerrieri. Lo stesso hanno fatto nella vallata River Dawa Parma.

Informano da Londra che le fabbriche inglesi hanno venduto all'Abissinia, da Ottobre a Gennaio ultimi, munizioni per l'ammontare di \$48,711. A queste non sono inclusi fucili, armi automatiche e pezzi di artiglieria. (Saranno solo le pallottole dum-dum. n. d. r.)

L'Italia minaccia di denunciare il patto di Locarno e il patto italo-francese. Ne sarebbe tempo!

L'affetto del TELY per l'Abissinia gli fa anche intestare un editoriale "Ethiopia Inhabitants..." senza che dell'Etiopia ci fosse neppure l'odore nello scritto.

Notizie dell'ultim'ora assicurano che l'imperatore Salassie è rimasto ferito seriamente ed un dottore svedese è accorso al suo letto in aeroplano.

L'Inghilterra viene fuori con un nuovo giuocchetto: vorrebbe fare l'accordo navale con tutte le grandi nazioni, ma separato con ciascuna di esse. Troppa sincerità?

