

A TALK WITH GOV. SALTONSTALL

"We must be friends with all peoples," says this Republican leader, the highest official of the Bay State. Joseph North interviews the governor, and reports on Massachusetts.

YOU cannot jam a journey to Massachusetts, an interview with a governor, and a ride on virtually a troop-train into one page—so my column this week grew into an article. The visit to Boston proved more than rewarding: much exhilarating talk with tanned veterans of twenty-one or so on the New York, New Haven and Hartford train chuck-full of warriors, and an hour's talk with Gov. Leverett Saltonstall. A solid day. Your columnist has said to himself recently that a man must get around. For one reason or another he hasn't lately. The battlefronts beckoned—North Africa, Sicily, Britain, Russia—but there were obstacles. Perhaps there won't be tomorrow. Meanwhile your correspondent decided to see more of the home front. Let's start with a journey to Boston.

You cannot write about America today without noting the trains sliding across America. They're virtually troop-trains, and it does you good to see the stock America has produced. I like too the camaraderie I have seen between civilians and soldiers. Here is the citizens' army; the warriors are the flesh-and-blood of the civilians about them. A warm courtesy earmarks relations, and the boys in uniform act easily, as though Main Street is every part of the country, and they are in the bosom of the family. This I learned on the train: the men on furlough cannot wait to get up the front porch into the door. The family ties are close, the burdens of war have drawn everybody nearer. More often than not the boys I talked with said they are coming home "unbeknownst to Mom." The chunky lad with the service stripes said he wanted to see the look on her face when he walks in. Returned from three continents, the sailor eyed the sunlit beaches of Stamford avidly. "I used to go swimming there, right there where the skiff is." Son of an immigrant Portuguese fisherman, this native-born Yankee pointed out the places where the smelts ran. "Out there, right out there," he said excitedly, "I caught many a fish." You could feel the nostalgic past well up on him. There is nothing like homecoming from battle. Home is sweet even though our warriors cotton to the folk they meet in other parts. I was struck by their warm references to the peoples they had met—the black in Africa, the brown in the Pacific, the white in Britain. The Yank abroad, I thought, sloughs off his provincialism as a halfback rushing onto the gridiron sheds his sweat-shirt.

Governor Saltonstall picked up where the soldiers left off. Father of two sons and a daughter in the service, he told me,

he is waiting for word from his boy somewhere in the Pacific, veteran of Guadalcanal. (He waits for a letter and a Connecticut fisherman waits for a letter. War makes all fathers kin.) You felt you talked with a man to whom the words "my native land" mean a lot. National unity is more than two words in an editorial. Patriot, I felt, there in the governor's office decorated with ancient banners, is a big word, big enough to encompass the six-foot blue-blood whose forefathers came sailing up the James River several hundred years ago, and that fisherman's son whose father got here from a suburb of Lisbon a decade or two back to supply New England with many a ton of smelts, and a strapping boy who fought for his native land on three continents of the world.

ALTHOUGH this trip of mine went up a tiny stretch of the map along the Atlantic seaboard, it underscored the sense I feel of a deep, underlying internationalism among our people which belies the hullabaloo in most of the press. I believe it will be hard to sell our folk an isolationist bill of goods. What these soldiers and sailors feel, what others I have talked to feel, indicate to me that Wendell Willkie was not talking for himself in *One World*. He has his ear to the ground. And Governor Saltonstall, too, is listening. "We must all of us, Great Britain, United States, Russia, and China, pull together to win. *And we must pull together in the postwar world*," Mr. Saltonstall told me. The soldiers and sailors didn't put it in those words. But the sense of it was that. A time like today requiring the utmost patriotism, love of country, brings with it regard for other men's



Gov. Leverett Saltonstall

countries. "The people in my state and from what I see of the Gallup polls nationally," the governor said, "indicate a trend away from isolationism. People are coming to understand that we are part of an inter-related world, and that we cannot stand aloof. And that feeling will intensify after the war is over." I mentioned my talks on the train and the governor nodded. "Eleven, twelve million young men and women will come back from every corner of the world knowing that: that we must be friends with all peoples and that our government, therefore, has a greater world obligation than ever before."

Looking ahead into the postwar world, he was eager for anything that would forestall widespread economic debacle. A well thought out public works program would help greatly; he believed that social insurance policies would be beneficial. He had talked with Sir William Beveridge, and felt there was a lot of good in the Britisher's ideas. Unlike some Republicans in Congress who shudder at the mystic, possibly subversive, symbols of Phi Beta Kappa, Mr. Saltonstall felt that "professors in the colleges" — economic authorities — should be working on the question all the time. When I mentioned labor, too, in this respect, he told me he had set up a state committee shortly after Pearl Harbor to ponder these economic postwar issues and he was certain his state would be able to surmount any possible crisis without "injury" to the working people.

MY impression of this six-foot, gangly, low-spoken governor was that of a patriotic conservative; a man who wants a strong America, sovereign, and, in this fight to keep it so, is learning that you cannot succeed without a lot of help. From that Portuguese fisherman's son, for instance. From the riveter, the baker, the brakeman, the stenographer, the schoolteacher. That's a lot to learn in one lifetime for a Republican blue-blood whose early political days lacked understanding of the man at the bench. He seemed to have come a long way. "I've learned a lot," he said. I like to hear a governor say that, particularly a Saltonstall (R., Mass.). A decade or so ago he was generally recognized as a State Street man, a spokesman for the Commonwealth's most affluent bankers. He himself is said to be a millionaire many times over and these facts weighed heavy against him when he began his political career. Massachusetts labor cocked a wary eye at him. But his reelection to the governor's chair last year came with labor's support generally.

"I've learned a lot these past six years," he repeated several times when we touched on the question of labor. "The unions have cooperated loyally with the government in this state": he expressed pride that Massachusetts stands second throughout the country in the number of Army and Navy E awards; that its strike record ranks among the lowest in the nation, perhaps second. He attributed that to the loyal desire of labor and management to submerge their differences for the common goal—victory. He had early appointed CIO and AFL representatives to a victory cabinet, and he has spent a good deal of time trying to convince the unionists that he is their friend, and not a blue-blooded enemy.

He had gained the confidence of working men because he loyally supported the President's program; in fact, was considered one of FDR's staunchest advocates since 1940. "My record shows that," and he indicated that he wanted to see all Americans behind the President and his war program.

All to the good, I thought during the interview. Here was a forward-looking executive, a man "who had learned a lot," and evidenced eagerness to continue learning so that his nation will stay sovereign. This was a Willkie Republican in the flesh: a man whose war record attested to the fact that there are Republicans who don't mean the same thing Herbert Hoover means; a man who talks a different language from Sen. Robert Taft, and the whole caboodle of GOP defeatists in Congress. Yes, he had learned a lot.

BUT education is an evolving process, a never-ending one. And the governor who is learning and recognizes that, may still have some things to unlearn. Some aspects of the picture left me disturbed. I don't know how much Politics—with a capital P—was involved when we discussed the issue of the fifth column, indigenous as well as imported. Detroit, for instance. He said he could not answer for the rest of the country but so far as Massachusetts is concerned, he did not believe there would be any similar trouble there. "Knock wood," he muttered grimly, tapping the beautiful mahogany desk. "We have only a small Negro population and there is no Klan. There was one in 1923 but it has died out. As far as anti-Semitism is concerned, I don't think we have much of a problem there. Jews and Catholics and Protestants are working together very well for the war." What bothered me was that I was apprised of strong Christian Frontist influence in Boston, and I wondered why the governor skirted the issue. He did say that *Time* magazine had run an item about ill-feeling between Jews and Catholics and that he had had the matter investigated, but found little, if anything, to warrant the *Time* statement. Undoubtedly, the majority of Massachusetts—Protestant, Jew



Catholic—were hauling together, but a sinister minority of Coughlinites can wreak a lot of damage. And there's no good in blinking the danger.

Another disturbing fact: I learned later that Governor Saltonstall's speech at the Governor's Conference in Ohio recently did not jibe exactly with his unquestionably fine record of cooperation with the administration. He was never given to baiting the President's domestic program, but at Columbus that crept into his speech. I pondered over it and later queried some political observers in Boston. One explained it in these terms: Saltonstall, he said, has a fine war record. But there is pressure on him to run as a dark horse in case Wendell Willkie doesn't get the Republican nomination. Some of Saltonstall's associates are trying to influence him toward "a safe middle course," to ride high on the popularity of Willkie internationalism, but to show the Hoover crowd that he isn't too far away from them on domestic issues. Thus, perhaps, both sections of the GOP can agree on the governor as candidate.

I don't know if this is true, of course. I hope not. But those words at Columbus are disturbing. Indeed it would be a pity if the hitherto far-sighted governor reversed the track and moved back from the vantage point he has won. For he has a big job in his important state. He has, it is obvious, entrenched himself with the rank and file. No breath of scandal hovers over his administration as it did in previous governors' times. He seems too to have torn himself away from his labor-baiting past; he has always had a good civil liberties record. For all these reasons he is in a strong position to throw his weight around in Massachusetts and influence those among his Republican colleagues who have been voting bad in Congress. And most of the state delegation has done scandalously on the President's domestic program. The governor's friends in labor cite the fact that Allen T. Treadway, Pehr G. Holmes, Charles L. Gifford, all GOP congressmen,

as well as Joe Martin, Republican minority leader in the House, refused to sign the discharge petition for the anti-poll tax bill. (And I might add here that talk persists of a movement in some Republican circles to groom Martin as a presidential possibility.)

Labor here, as elsewhere, is in no mood to temporize with dalliers or obstructors along the road to victory. They like the governor because he is a win-the-war man. They don't like what too many other politicians in the state are up to. So union delegations are making themselves at home in the offices of congressmen. George L. Bates, of Salem, for instance, who flat-footedly opposed every point in Roosevelt's seven-point program, got an earful from a labor delegation. Others are being seen as this is written. There is much censure of the Commonwealth's GOP delegation in Washington for its opposition to the President's domestic program. The three Democrats, McCormick, Curley, and Lane, have generally voted otherwise.

The picture differs somewhat in the state administration, which holds a number of Willkie Republicans. Attorney General Bushnell minced no words during the last elections when he condemned Senator Lodge's isolationism and generally defeatist cussedness. Unfortunately, however, the state legislature is burdened by a strong group of Farley Democrats who oppose FDR's foreign as well as domestic policy. The voice of the Christian Front was heard more than once in the recent session of the legislature. The state is rife with defeatist Democrats—remember, this is the home ground of such worthies as Sen. David Walsh who is quietly up to no good in Boston, lining up as much opposition as he can to the administration's policies. Even the governor's close friend, Christian Herter, the only Massachusetts congressman who voted against Dies, has consistently opposed FDR's economic program.

GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL can be a powerful force counterposed to the enemies of victory; his supporters ask if he has done all he can. His newly won friends in labor and throughout the state generally look to him for leadership. They indicate that he will not retain their loyalties if he seeks to curry favor with the Hoover Republicans and treads softly on vital domestic issues and upon the paramount imperative of this time: national unity for victory. Doubtless there are strong temptations: the presidential bee has done many strange things to strong men. But if Governor Saltonstall is to keep faith with the fisherman's son and his own boy in the Pacific he will march steadfastly along the road he has taken since 1940. "I have learned a lot these past years," he said. His friends hope he will draw the full implications of his lessons: the path toward Hoover is the path toward defeat. JOSEPH NORTH.

WHEN HOOVER BEGINS TO COO

Morris U. Schappes looks at the "lasting peace" proposed by the defeatist Old Guard of the GOP—and finds neither peace nor honor. The meaning of their anti-Sovieteering.

ONE of the most curious phenomena of recent years is the success with which Herbert Hoover, who left the Presidency so ignominiously ten years ago, has reestablished himself as an elder statesman, seer, and eminent patriot. One would have thought that his active and open defeatism prior to Pearl Harbor would have been sufficient to discredit him permanently. Yet the fact is that his dangerous book *The Problems of Lasting Peace*, written in collaboration with Hugh Gibson, was hailed as an important contribution to American thought—and not only by reactionaries, but even in win-the-war circles, including certain liberal quarters. The Book-of-the-Month Club has issued a volume containing the full text of that book side by side with Wendell Willkie's *One World* and the speeches of Vice-President Wallace and Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles. And a conference at which outstanding public figures are represented, the Emergency Conference to Save the Jews of Europe, includes Hoover (together with Hearst!) among its honorary chairmen, though the policies of the ex-President, had they been adopted by our government, would have led to the destruction of the Jews not only in Europe, but in America and throughout the world by the Nazi murder gangs.

No one who objectively examines Hoover's recent proposals on such questions can fail to observe a consistent pattern of obstructionism. For an appreciation of the full meaning of this as in essence a pattern of defeatism it is necessary, however, to examine his most recently published views on foreign affairs.

Thus early in January, while President Roosevelt was in Casablanca planning offensive coalition action, Hoover issued widely syndicated newspaper articles cautioning us against invading Europe in 1943, warning us against attempting to do "too much too soon." Hitler needed time to rebuild an industrial and military strength that was being drained on the Eastern Front; Hoover was proposing to give it to him.

This past spring the thinking of our nation on the global character and aims of this war of national liberation was vitalized by the publication of Wendell Willkie's *One World* and the speedy sale of more than 1,000,000 copies. Willkie articulated the conclusions that millions in this and other countries had already drawn—that not only is peace indivisible but so is freedom. He added the equally important thought that standards of living are

indivisible, that extreme poverty in any country affects the wealth of all nations, now linked as they are by the world market. The nations united in war against the Axis must be united in battle, in victory, and in peace. And the key to this unity, Willkie emphasized, was our relations with the Soviet Union and the new China.

Almost as if in direct reply, Hoover and Gibson published in *Collier's* a series of four articles entitled "New Approaches to Lasting Peace," which restate and develop the fundamental line of their book. Streaked with the camouflage of platitude, these articles contain within them, in subtle and cautious formulation, the spreading roots of little less than defeatism. If the authors avoid being explicit, their obfuscation makes it even more imperative that critics thinking seriously about the war cut through the fog to the implacable hostility to the war that is at the heart of Hoover's and Gibson's counsel.

FIRST, it must be noted that they do not in any way regard this war as a struggle for the very survival of our country as an independent nation. In their eyes, we are not at war because we were compelled to resist the political, economic, and final military aggression of a Hitler-dominated Axis bent on *world* conquest. They reject the mountainous evidence of the past decade that no country has been able to do business with Hitler without speedily losing its national independence, its territory, its peace, its institutions, its economy, its religious freedom, its labor supply, and the very lives of millions of its citizens. They still insist that we are in this war needlessly because we are international busybodies who refused to allow Hitler to have his way. They put it this way: "If we had been prepared to sacrifice China and had not concerned ourselves to save Europe from military aggression we would not have been attacked at Pearl Harbor. . . . Sometimes one could wish all this were remembered when we are castigated for not doing enough for this nation or that." Is it only an accidental echo of Hitler's line, this charge by an ex-President and an ex-ambassador that our government is responsible for this war? Hoover and Gibson would have us forget what the experience of the nation and in fact of the whole world has taught it: that "sacrificing" China and Europe would not have meant *peace* for the United States—it would have meant subjugation to Hitler's economic control, and the rule of our country by Americans acceptable to Hitler's

ways and ends. In France Hitler found the Laval; in the United States he would have the Hoovers.

Once collective security as proposed by the Soviet Union was rejected, and Hoover's steadfast hostility contributed much to this rejection, our nation really never had a choice between peace or war. The real choice became one between enslavement by the Axis or resistance to it—political, diplomatic, and (when attacked) military resistance. In the political and diplomatic field, our pre-war resistance to the Axis was terribly weak. Suspicion and distrust of the Soviet Union, furthered by masses of misinformation about it, led to the estrangement of our country from this most powerful of allies. During the Soviet Union's war with Finland—an obviously just war as seen in retrospect—Hoover led those American forces that tended to break completely with the USSR. Hoover headed the aid-Finland movement that sent money, food, supplies, and even recruits enlisted to fight in this anti-Soviet crusade. He who rebukes us coldly for not "sacrificing" China and all of Europe to the Axis, and who is cold to the aid we render nations whose self-defense against our common enemy is in our own national interest, also found it intolerable to conceive that one hair of Mannerheim's head might be "sacrificed" to the main bulwark of the United Nations. If we did not go to war with the Soviet Union to "save Finland" it is certainly not because of anything Hoover left undone or unsaid. As it was, despite everything Hoover did, it was Hitler's aggression against the Soviet Union and then against us at Pearl Harbor that jolted our country into recognizing what should have been clear long ago: that we could have neither victory, peace, nor security without alliance with the Soviets.

BUT there is another aspect to this matter of whether we could have done business with Hitler and thereby preserved peace. If the war is our own fault, shouldn't we get out of it at once, by some "negotiated peace"? Certainly an unjust war that is really none of our business is not worth prosecuting. Perhaps before we completely get into the fighting, we should reconsider the cost? How much responsibility is Hoover's for the fact that his admirer, Gerald L. K. Smith, who repeatedly praises Hoover in his fascist magazine, *The Cross and the Flag*, has organized "We, the Mothers of America" to help pull us out of the war long before the national goal of unconditional surren-