

DUMBARTON OAKS vs. ALBANY

By **THE EDITORS**

THERE is a lameness and hypocrisy about Mr. Dewey's plea for small nations that completely reveals the piddling size of the man and the brand of politics he plays. First, with resounding fanfare the Republican factotums announce that the issue of world organization and security cannot be a partisan affair but is the concern of the whole nation. Then they produce a foreign affairs plank which mocks this attitude and exposes what the men who run the Republican machine really have in mind. Whether it be Hoover or Colonel McCormick blowing fire through the editorial nostrils of the *Chicago Tribune*, the intent of the dominant group in the Republican Party is to make the United States the solar center of world politics with Uncle Sam wielding the big stick over the heads of other states. This is by and large the classical position of the Republican Party, the party of American imperialism. It began with McKinley and reached a high point under Hoover. It thwarted international collaboration among nations, large and small, and sought to divide the world in order to rule it. And the fact that that policy almost made us the pariah of the earth is now to be completely forgotten—or at least Dewey hopes that the country has so short a memory that it will not recall the attacks made on a world community of nations by a Senator Lodge or the Republican outbursts of temper against collective security, lend-lease, and a dozen other matters which spelled the difference between victory and defeat.

Mr. Dewey now charges that because the four leading Allies have the major responsibility for ordering the future of world security, such leadership would be tantamount to coercion and the "rankest form of imperialism." This is arrant nonsense and it becomes even greater nonsense in view of the fact that Dewey himself proposed in September 1943, such imperialist instruments as an exclusive Anglo-American alliance in opposition to a four-power understanding. And more, Dewey has on two occasions taken sly digs at the commit-

ments which the President made at the Teheran meeting. At no time has he had a good word for Teheran whose fulfillment would impede the "rankest form of imperialism" espoused by so many of the eminent in his party's leadership.

And among these eminent is John Foster Dulles behind whose skirts Mr. Dewey is now hiding. This is characteristic Dewey acrobatics similar to his stunt of letting Governor Edge of New Jersey inform the country of how Dewey feels about international cooperation. Moral cowardice has had no better example than these Deweyisms. As for Dulles, all his pretensions to liberalism cannot hide the fact that since he is Dewey's close adviser on foreign affairs he too is responsible for the Republican candidate's outrageous statement of last week. It would hardly be far-fetched to assume that Dulles had more than a hand in its formulation. And the egregious cheek of both Dulles and his protege in Albany is that both men take the attitude that the government must account to them for what happens at the Dumbarton Oaks meeting. In typical partisan fashion they set themselves up as though they were an independent de facto state and executive department to whom Washington is responsible.

HAVING pulled a first-rate political boner with his stupid statement, Dewey attempted to get Wendell Willkie's support in order to make it appear that Willkie approves Dewey's position. But Willkie's frigid reply is indicative of how deep are the differences between them—differences which involve fundamental policy toward our Allies and postwar international organization. Willkie makes it clear that he was not consulted by Dewey when the latter prepared his statement with Dulles acting as amanuensis, but more important, he strongly implies that the "issue" of small nations is being used to endanger the success of the Georgetown meeting. Unlike Dewey, Willkie is willing to wait until the meeting is over before he enters into any public discussion. And

although Willkie will have met with Dulles and given Dulles his opinion, it is more than apparent that this does not represent his endorsement of the Republican foreign policy plank or of Dewey's candidacy.

WHERE has Mr. Dewey been all these past months? Not only has he not been talking but quite obviously neither has he been reading. For any reading of the Moscow Agreement, the Connally Resolution, and the President's recent memorandum on a world organization shows that the rights of the smaller powers have been kept well in mind. The Moscow Agreement to which we are bound sets forth the "principles upon which the four governments agree that a broad system of international cooperation and security should be based. Provision is made for the inclusion of all other peace-loving nations, great and small, in this system." The Connally Resolution reads in part: "that the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security." And the President's memorandum of last June 15 made it clear that "the maintenance of peace and security must be the joint task of all peace-loving nations" and that he was "not thinking of a super-state with its own police force and other paraphernalia of coercive power."

These three quotations prove that Dewey is simply talking through his hat and that he has other motives separate from his tender solicitude for small nations. His outburst on the eve of the Allied meeting in Georgetown is in effect an act of sabotage. He bases his charges on "recent reports" and fails to identify the source of these rumors, although we are quite certain that their origin is in Mr. Dewey's head as well as in the heads of those around him who see that the President's forthright approach to the problems of world secur-

ity will take a good many votes away from the Republican candidate. There can be no doubt that the yearning for a lasting peace is best expressed in Mr. Roosevelt's policies, while the ambiguities of the Republican position have shown that Dewey is utterly untrustworthy of steering America's future. So Dewey, who is unwilling to offend the Werner Schroeders and Colonel McCormicks and Herbert Hoovers, manufactures a "small nations issue"—an issue which is pretty safe and of the same category as the protection of widows and orphans.

In fact the best protection the small nations can have is an indestructible unity among the four great Allied powers. Without this unity the small powers become pawns of large ones in which the sole beneficiary is an aggressor such as Germany. Furthermore, it is the four powers who by their effective conduct of the war make possible the return of the small nations' independence and sovereignty and give them the opportunity to live again in dignity and peace. More than one naturalist has observed that squirrels cannot be expected to do the work of elephants and it is the great powers, because of their industrial and military resources as well as their democratic outlook, who must shoulder the burdens of an international system to safeguard the peace.

UNLIKE many newspapers which have been speculating high and handsome about the exact plans which the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR will submit at Dumbarton Oaks, we have not the faintest idea what these plans are. But it is obvious even from a cursory reading of the more reliable newspaper reports that while there are differences of opinion as to details, the common denominator of the thinking in London, Washington, and Moscow is that no security system can be sustained unless the major responsibilities are carried by them with the smaller nations playing a role adequate to their size and resources. Any other scheme is utopian. And in this connection what must be constantly borne in mind is that not only did the League of Nations fail because absent throughout its history was the United States, and for more than a decade the Soviet Union, but it failed also because of the fantastic requirement of unanimity which permitted veto by small powers acting in behalf of aggressor powers.

These are stern facts and they are more and more impressing themselves

on the world's peace-loving peoples. The small nations are not being ignored. Their place will be as collaborators working on the principle that there is such a thing as leadership among equals. Judging from Secretary Hull's statements this principle will more or less guide the Dumbarton Oaks conference on which the world's eyes are focused. It is an historic meeting involving the future of many generations of Americans. And not even Mr. Dewey, for all his attempts, can thwart the overwhelming national desire to see it succeed.

The AFL and the Election

THERE is more than meets the eye in Governor Dewey's refusal to write a special Labor Day message requested by some officials in the American Federation of Labor. He also declined an invitation to address the AFL convention in New York state this week. In both instances, he was "too busy." That, at least, was the public reason. But what, many ask, are the real reasons?

Can they be the following? That the overwhelming majority of the AFL membership, as labor generally, stands four-square for Roosevelt, and therefore the open and covert Dewey supporters within AFL ranks find it hard to deliver the goods? Mr. Dewey would discover it pretty embarrassing to stand before rank-and-file labor judgment on the issues of this campaign: i.e., orderly reconversion premised upon an economy of abundance, genuine international collaboration based upon full understanding between the major Allies?



The Little Man at Albany

The trend of AFL labor toward Roosevelt is a definitely established fact: it is manifested by the recent actions of the Chicago AFL and elsewhere, most notably the New Jersey *Labor Herald*, the state body's official organ. In Chicago, the top body sent a letter of guidance to 1,000 affiliated local unions with the recommendation "that labor support the reelection of President Roosevelt so that we may not change our pitcher when we are winning the game." And the letter urged the affiliates to remember the many, progressive social measures enacted under the present administration, measures "which have been demanded by labor for generations." The *Labor Herald* severely criticized AFL leaders for their policy of "political disarmament and labor division."

We believe these are among the reasons impelling President Green to the sensible proposal that the federation's seven million members vote this year; that they establish AFL political action committees on a state and local basis to guarantee that the vote is there on November 7. Mr. Green, however, clung to the AFL's old neutrality formula in his message. He makes the term "non-partisan" synonymous with neutrality. We trust that the current session of the Executive Council in Chicago will clarify his words. The CIO, too, is operating on a *non-partisan* basis, which did not prevent it from making itself sufficiently clear on its choice of the presidential candidates. It is backing President Roosevelt and his running mate with all the energy at its command, because they are the best candidates offered by *either* party. Non-partisanship is not synonymous with paralysis: it does not mean standing frozen on the sidelines and keeping mum about candidates. It means what labor and all democratic sections of our people expect it to mean—i.e., to choose the best man regardless of party label, and then go all-out for his election. We hope the AFL leaders will take that into consideration this week, for full mobilization of labor behind Roosevelt is essential for victory in November. Workingman's votes will be decisive in the decisive states.

Strikes and Wages

A CHARACTERISTIC of the commercial press (some ninety percent of which is engaged in the dangerous game of partisanship on behalf of Governor Dewey), is the outrageous manner in