

Comment

Behind the War

Nazis Maneuver for Winter War

THE BLOODY fury of the battle for Leningrad, Kiev and Odessa has placed the present conflict in Europe, staged on a 1500-mile battlefield, in the grim category with those of Verdun and the Somme in the World War.

Why Hitler and the German general staff set such store by the conquest of the former Russian capital is not evidenced by its industrial importance.

Concentration on Leningrad, at the risk of major reverses in the central Russian front around Smolensk, is required by the German plans for the Autumn and Winter.

The battle of Leningrad has an intimate relation to things to come in the Middle East, as the desert heat of North Africa moderates.

At Leningrad, the Nazis hope to anchor their northern flank for the Winter, while they "dig in" at the center, and throw the might of the German war machine along the shores of the Black Sea toward the southeast.

What is happening before Leningrad, therefore, has to do not merely with German ambitions to defeat the Soviet in the North. It links up with plans for the drive toward oil, the smashing of Wavell's army in the Middle East, and a Winter march to the Red Sea.

The Nazis anchored their southern front in North Africa and Asia Minor, and launched the Summer's attack on Russia. Soon, the Nazis will open up the Winter theater of warfare in North Africa.

Accordingly, news from the Mediterranean and Middle East assumes an importance not generally given to it in the papers.

When recent items from these regions are added together, Turkey appears to be Hitler's next "victim," or "partner," depending on how you look at it.

Thus—the departure from Ankara of Ambassador von Papen; the arrival at the Turkish capital of a German "economic mission," headed by the notorious Dr. Clodius; the assembling of Nazi-supervised forces in Bulgaria, on the frontiers of Turkish Thrace; the sudden mysterious appearance of a Bulgarian fleet with German pocket submarines and former Italian warships; Russia's impending declaration of war on Bulgaria; Bulgaria's demand that Turkey open the Dardanelles to the Bulgarian navy; the projected combined naval and land attack on Crimea; the mysterious disappearance of Russia's Black Sea fleet; the present position of the Russian and British armies in Iran—all these add up to point out that the Nazis have succeeded in working the old tactic again.

These moves preface attack.

Iran's acceptance, a few days ago, of the Anglo-Soviet armistice terms (including

expulsion of Axis nationals); announcement from London that a "powerful" new army has been ferried to Egypt; sudden stepping up of British naval operations in the Mediterranean; the bombing of an American freighter in the Red Sea by Nazi raiders; even the arrival on the African West Coast of American experts to supervise construction of airfields in Liberia, and to expedite the transit of lease-lend bombers from the United States to the Near East; the inauguration of a northern and southern air ferry service from America—all these items form other factors in the equation.

In June, 1941, the Nazis prefaced their attack on Soviet Russia with a peace and friendship pact with Turkey, which succeeded in immobilizing and neutralizing the Turks.

The moment that the Germans elected to drive through the Balkans, their war with Soviet Russia became inevitable.

The juggernaut of blitzkrieg could not traverse the great inland seas without encountering the British navy. Turkey offered the logical land road over which the Nazis could dispatch their notoriously efficient land-air synchronization at the very vitals of the British Empire.

But Hitler, unable to discover whether Turkey and Soviet Russia had a secret alliance, and unwilling to risk attacking Turkey only to find his flank assailed by the Soviets, had to displace Turkey on the Nazi calendar of aggression and conquest.

Now, Soviet resistance, growing British might and expansion of America's war production, have compelled the Nazis to take on the Turks in a Fall operation.

The hope, obviously, is to crash through to the oil supplies of the Middle East, knock out Wavell's forces, and open the flank of the Russian Caucasus.

An expedition to Suez would then be a simple matter.

The one weak spot and dangerous contingency in the whole plan is that the British in Egypt might take the initiative and threaten an invasion of Italy, thus forcing the Germans to reinforce their weak ally.

The Wheat 'Gyp'

REPRESENTATIVE J. Harry McGregor of Ohio charged in the House of Representatives recently that the Roosevelt Administration is permitting 1½-million bushels of wheat to be imported into the United States from Canada under a 9-cent per bushel duty, but at the same time is penalizing American farmers 49 cents a bushel for all wheat raised in excess of quota restrictions.

He asserted he had received a report that under the *Lease-Lend Act*, Government wheat purchased from Canada is being shipped to England.

"I have tried to verify this report," he declared, "but can find no official who wishes to discuss the subject. Therefore, until this report is officially denied, I am considering it to be correct. I am asking you if it is fair to penalize the American farmer for growing a product and at the same time purchase this product from Canada, pay for it with the American taxpayers' money, and send it to England?"

Threats to Rome

ACCORDING to recent news dispatches, there is imminent danger of Rome being bombed in "reprisal for the Nazi attack on Cairo."

Rome has hitherto been spared because it is the center of Christendom and because from it have gone forth all the great influences for Christian civilization. Within its limits is Vatican City—the little State over which the Pope has temporal authority.

"There is no reason for the bombing of Rome, except the motive of revenge," says an editorial in the *Southern Cross*. "It was said that Cairo, which is a holy city to the Moslems, has been attacked and that this clears the way for an attack on Rome.

"While it is a most barbarous practice to bomb civilians in a defenseless city, we have here added a new wrinkle in the plan for defending Christianity. According to British threats Mohammedanism and Christianity are on exactly the same plane. Apparently the Holy City of the Moslems means as much to the world as the Holy City of the Christians.

"The treasures contained in the city of Rome are intimately connected with the titanic struggle that Christianity has made to better the condition of the world. These treasures are intimately connected with the great men of all time who were commissioned by God to spread the gospel of peace and to bring calm over the turbulent sea of human passions . . . Wanton destruction of them will place Mr. Churchill in the same class as Hitler for, war and surging emotions notwithstanding, two wrongs do not make a right."

Oleo for Britain?

A SUBSCRIBER challenges a comment in the August 18 issue relative to the Administration campaign to popularize oleo-margarine for domestic use so that real butter may be shipped to England.

The subscriber, who says he has been a producer of dairy products for many years, voices the complaint that oleo has been unjustly discriminated against by the "dairy trust" which has a strangle hold on the nation's dairy business.

He maintains that "there are more farmers, the country over, whose products find their way into the manufacture of oleo-margarine, than is true of butter," and declares that oleo must have much merit if it has continued to exist "in spite of every handicap, regulation, tax, unfair propaganda, etc."

His point is that increased sale of oleo-margarine will be more beneficial to more farmers than will an increase in butter production, which is concentrated mostly in five Middle Western states.

Now if this correspondent, as he states, has "spent a lifetime as a producer of dairy products," he should know considerably more about the business than those whose only contact with cows is the quart of milk delivered daily at his door.

Consequently we, perhaps due to ignorance, are surprised at the assertion that the production of oleo benefits more farmers than does the production of butter.

Leaving all technicalities aside, however, we still pull for butter.

If the 'margarine is so good, why not send it to Britain and let us Americans consume the butter? The effect on the farmers would be the same.

Comment

Poland Gets Red Double-cross

THE *Weekly Review* of London, which publishes some of the sanest observations on the war and world affairs that can be found anywhere, criticizes the recent Russo-Polish agreement as most inadequate from the standpoint of justice.

Under terms of the treaty Soviet Russia granted freedom to all captive Poles held in Soviet territory.

But, asserts the *Weekly Review*, nothing specific was promised concerning restoration of Polish territory taken by the U.S.S.R. while the Communists were still allied with Nazi Germany.

"We entered this war solely because we had guaranteed Poland's frontiers, and her independence, and Germany had attacked her with no shadow of justification," the *Review* points out.

"Later, as we all know, the Soviet stabbed her in the back and, through this cowardly and wholly unprovoked stroke, obtained not only a large portion of Polish territory, but also some 300,000 Polish prisoners. Moreover, the Soviet treatment of the Poles equalled, if it did not surpass, in brutish cruelty, that meted out to them by the Reich.

"The two brigands of Europe fell out sooner than was expected, and the Communist member of the pair squealed to us (whom it had never ceased to blackguard since the beginning of the war) for help. Clearly before helping such a ruffian, so as to finish off its recent ally, it was elementary that we should have required complete satisfaction for the gross wrongs it had committed against our own very chivalrous and courageous friend."

The very minimum of satisfaction to Poland, the editorial continues, would be amnesty to all captive Poles and restoration of their conquered land. In addition some restitution should be made for the death and destruction dealt out so ruthlessly by the marauding Soviets.

However, in the Russo-Polish agreement, only the first of these requirements has been fulfilled — and that tardily — the *Review* observes.

"Mr. Eden, in his speech informing the House of Commons of what had taken place, was at pains to emphasize that Great Britain had given no assurance as to frontiers. All that he did in that connection was to quote from a speech of the Prime Minister's in which the latter had stated that His Majesty's Government did not propose to recognize any territorial changes which took place during the war, unless they took place with the free consent and good will of the parties concerned.

"Now, that as a general statement by the Prime Minister is admirable, but when it comes to applying it to the country for whose freedom and integrity as a nation we took up arms, something much more positive and precise is needed. Nor is there any good reason why a definite guarantee should not have been given . . .

"It is our avowed purpose to defeat the Prussian armies and to wrest from Germany all the territory which she has occupied by force; and this applies equally to her recent ally, Soviet Russia. If the latter, to save her skin, is now forced to fight on our side, her crimes remain and must be expiated. She, too, must disgorge all the territory she has swallowed."

That statement of purpose, of course, is a most proper one. All of Winston Churchill's pious pronouncements about safeguarding rights of small nations against aggressors are pure balderdash if the government of Great Britain permits Soviet Russia to keep one mile of stolen territory.

Why, then, was there no specific territorial guarantee in the Russo-Polish agreement?

Can it be that Great Britain already realizes the possible consequences of a Soviet-British triumph over Germany?

Can it be that she knows a victorious Soviet Russia will demand a high price for her services in crushing the Nazi hordes?

And does Britain appreciate the power and influence that a triumphant Soviet would employ to expand its sphere of domination?

Whether that is Britain's reasoning or not, it well might be, for if Stalin's Red armies should be instrumental in crushing Hitler, it is certain that the Communist appetite for world revolution would only be whetted. The Marxism of Soviet Russia would supplant the Naziism of Germany as the dominant power on the continent of Europe.

By what means would Britain prevent it?

With the downfall of Hitler and the collapse of the German army, Communism would step in where Naziism was driven out. The disintegration, confusion and chaos in Germany and German-dominated nations would surely pave the Soviet way, for Communism thrives on such conditions.

At best, Britain could choose to turn against its present ally and fight another destructive war, but the result would be complete physical and economic exhaustion, if not humiliating defeat.

Pin Feathers

THE FABLED Yankee shrewdness which used to "trim old John Bull's whiskers" isn't doing so good this generation.

Six American pilots who went to England and trained on the understanding that they were to get \$250 to \$350 a month have walked out on the deal.

Came the first pay day and they found they were expected to fight Nazis for \$3.10 a day.

When the American fliers kicked they were told that this was the standard remuneration and that, furthermore, they had agreed to it. Their "applications" were shown them and the boys readily admitted their signatures but confessed that they "had not read the fine print."

Future applicants for the American Eagle Squadron will be rigidly interviewed by a British Selection Board in Washington, D. C.

Britain is trapped in the middle of an ugly situation which at the moment gives little promise of improving. Having accepted Soviet Russia as her ally she is forced to play a game in which her own rules are flouted, in the hopes that somehow, after the final whistle has blown and her team-mate has brought victory, she can talk him out of the prize.

But just yet, as evidenced by the Soviet-Polish agreement, Britain does not wish to disillusion her team-mate by talking too much.

Russian People Doomed to Suffer

WIN, lose or draw, the people of Russia have little to look forward to insofar as the prospect of freedom, prosperity and happiness is concerned.

By nature the great mass of Russians are apathetic and fatalistic about the turn of events in their own country, although the Red Army has shown a fighting determination to resist the Nazi war machine.

The Red government has been able to continue in power principally because the Russian people are disposed to take an abnormal amount of "pushing around" without resorting to physical resistance.

They endured czarist slavery and abject poverty for centuries and they have lived under the thralldom and famine of the Communist commissars. Still there was no general, popular uprising; instead there was sullen sabotage against the Soviet regime.

The Russians are not a revolutionary people. History and geography have not given them a chance to emerge from primitive agricultural life into a modern, highly industrialized nation.

That is why Lenin, Trotzky and Stalin were able to establish and perpetuate the Communist regime. The Russian revolution, effected by a select few, succeeded because the masses of Russians did nothing, and a vast network of espionage and terrorism quickly put down any show of spirit.

Although the Soviet government has made some strides toward industrializing and de-Christianizing the U.S.S.R., those who know Russia and Russians are convinced that the vast, sprawling nation is impervious to such a transformation.

Lenin came to recognize that before he died. Trotzky refused to believe it and was exiled. Stalin probably is aware of it, because, despite years of starvation, mass murders, class liquidation, confiscation of property, and enslavement of workers the Russian people, generally, have not been converted to the Soviet way of life.

Would victory over the Germans change their attitude? It is doubtful. But, neither would it supply any impetus for overthrowing the Red regime, for even in victory the lethargic Russians would be further impoverished by the destruction and the costs of war.

Whatever the outcome of the present conflict, therefore, the suffering of the Russian people will be intense.

Their only hope is for the rise of new leaders to oust Stalin and his godless clique from power and inaugurate a Christian government which recognizes that the State exists for the people — not the people for the State. Merely to state the hope is to emphasize its present hopelessness.