Mr. Walter Lippmann said (New York Herald-Tribune, May 7): "It is clear that the net result of the experiment by act of Congress has been to jeopardize the whole principle of American neutrality. But they (the American people) also believe that nations fighting for their existence should not be denied the ancient right to obtain arms. The embargo either by Presidential proclamation or congressional statute is unsound, unworkable and dangerous."

Miss Dorothy Thompson said (New York Herald-Tribune, May 6): "As far as Europe is concerned, the bill did exactly what ought to have been obvious from the beginning -- tied us to British policy. Under the operations of our Neutrality Act we have been simply following the British lead wherever it might choose to go, and therefore put ourselves in a position of giving indirect aid to Franco. Therefore we ought to lift the arms embargo on Spain because it is not the business of the United States to use a so-called Neutrality Act as an instrument of national policy for England, Italy and Germany, with France trailing along now in their wake."

The New York Sun said (February 11): "It aids the strong against the weak and hamstring the United States in the performance of its functions. Recognition of the truth of this denunciation of the law does not require partisanship in the struggle in Spain; it calls only for acknowledgment of the facts."

The Chicago Daily News said (May 2): "When the United States, trying to be neutral, put the embargo on, we virtually helped Franco blockade the Loyalists. In refusing supplies to both sides we suddenly changed the law of nations."

And then again on May 14: "As long as the Neutrality Act stands on the books, we are in danger of being automatically and repeatedly in the position of aiding the aggressor against his victim. In short, the act is un-American. It is neither neutral nor fair. And it is as perilous as it is unnecessary."

The New York Times said (March 20): "It is nothing short of mad folly that we should choose deliberately to handicap, in time of need, those nations which share our deep faith in the democratic system. Repeal of the Johnson Act and the Neutrality
Act ought to be the first step in a policy of far-sighted action to safeguard our own interests in a troubled world."

The New York Herald-Tribune (May 6) editorial, "Spain and Neutrality," said: "... Though hardly likely, it is thus not impossible that the embargoes may be lifted in the present session. If so, they would be lifted primarily because of the heavy and unneutral weight with which they have operated against the Loyalist side... But our neutrality act... has been used from the start as a means of intervening actively in affairs abroad. It was originally applied to Spain, not as a device to preserve us from entanglement in the fighting, of which there has at no time been any serious danger, but as a means of aligning the United States with the British non-intervention policy. That policy is nearly dead, and it would doubtless be preferable if the United States now recovered its freedom of action by abandoning the embargoes."

The New York Herald-Tribune, in an editorial on April 21, said of the Neutrality Act that, in regard to Spain, "its effect is unneutrally to assist Franco."