

Behind the War

Not All Europeans Want Our 'Liberation'

AN ANGLO-AMERICAN alliance to defeat Hitler, followed by an Anglo-American armed peace for world freedom and economic security, is the essence of the Roosevelt-Churchill joint declaration.

The announced aim is to defeat Hitler; but the secret agreements on how to do it are much more important than the generalized and idealistic peace program.

Like political platforms and campaign pledges, world peace programs have never been faithfully observed by the victors. Moreover, neither President Roosevelt nor Prime Minister Churchill has authority to commit his respective country to the political and economic changes involved in their mutual pledges.

The United States Congress, as restricted by the *Constitution*, and the British Parliament — not to mention the various Dominion parliaments — alone can ratify the pledges.

Of course, Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt did not pledge freedom and sovereignty for colonial peoples. But, since the exiled governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and others, are "allies" of the British, it was necessary to "wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Thus, President Roosevelt underwrites President Wilson's colossal blunder — the division of Europe into many small sovereign States.

Now there is a widespread American belief — to some extent demonstrably false — that the peoples of all the small countries of Europe ardently desire the defeat of Nazi Germany. This belief has been nurtured by optimistic reports about the success of the "V" for victory campaign.

To create the impression that the United States is fighting with Britain and Soviet Russia a "war of liberation" on behalf of "enslaved populations" is, of course, desirable propaganda. But, like much propaganda, however effective in attaining its immediate objectives, this piece may turn out to be a destructive and disillusioning boomerang.

This is evident from two considerations which are incontrovertible:

First, it is true but not pleasing to realize that through the length and breadth of continental Europe there are many people wholly opposed to Nazi methods and ideology but who, nevertheless, do not want to see Germany defeated by any new Anglo-American-Soviet Russian *entente*.

These peoples realize that both American and British governments — if not their peoples — are sympathetic to Communism and are co-operating wholly with the Russian Soviet regime. These peoples naturally resent any Communist attempt to "liberate" them.

In the second place, it is to some a painful fact but nevertheless true, that Hitler's "New Order" is now becoming stabilized in large areas of Europe. In those areas whole communities are acquiring a vested interest

in the changes which have been made, quite regardless of the terrible measures taken to effect them.

These changes cannot be undone without creating a chaos which would certainly be protracted — unless Americans are willing to assist in policing thousands of square miles of European frontiers during the transition, and to underwrite the cost of destroying Germany's "New Order" and of creating a substitute order of Mr. Roosevelt's "four freedoms."

Interventionists will characterize these observations as "defeatist" (if not actually "pro-Nazi"); but they are facts which Americans cannot afford to overlook — especially since Great Britain, the United States and Soviet Russia are expected to be allies in war and in peace.

Under the terms of the *Lease-Lend Act*, the United States is committed to aid Britain and Soviet Russia in their war efforts; and, by the Roosevelt-Churchill agreement, America is now pledged also to join the Anglo-Russia alliance and to assist Soviet Russia in reconquering Finland, the Baltic States, Poland and Roumania.

Before, and not after, such commitments are made is the time to consider their feasibility and desirability. So, even though we may be castigated as "defeatist," if not worse, we are going to consider and to discuss the propositions.

Free discussion is not suspended. There has not been, as yet, an actual declaration of war by the United States Congress.

The nations of Europe must be divided into arbitrary groupings for the purpose of considering the attitude of their citizens towards the National Socialism of Germany and the "New Order."

Thus, in one group of countries — composed of nations which maintained their neutrality during the last war but which in this war have been overrun by Germany — there is undoubtedly a large majority

Sassoon's British State

AT A RECENT luncheon of motion picture executives, in the Sam Goldwyn studios in Hollywood, Sir Victor Sassoon said:

"It is now so obvious to the business men of the world that a Federal Union of England and the United States is necessary that it hardly bears discussion.

"England must come into the democracy of the United States with full rights of statehood!"

The Sassoons are among the five most important international Jewish families in the world. Their private opium monopoly has given them virtual control of China and India.

The above words manifest the international political thinking of the Sassoons.

of people who hope for Germany's defeat, disarmament and dismemberment.

In this group are Norway, Denmark and Holland. A powerful Nazi-minded minority now rules these countries as "puppets" of Germany and the dissident majority hesitates to launch a revolution, because revolution would only deepen the depression already dug by war and conquest.

All citizens of Norway and Denmark, however, fear Soviet conquest far more than German occupation.

Hollanders, too, see the possibility of their country being sovietized, if Germany is conquered by Russia and Germany's Communists seize control of the Berlin government.

There is a second group of conquered countries where feeling against Germany runs high but where there is also a strong minority reconciled to collaborate with Germany's "New Order" — willing to be incorporated in the "New Order" for Europe and Asia, and anxious to accept a negotiated peace rather than see the war prolonged indefinitely, with destruction and devastation certain eventually to result in the annihilation of all order.

In this group, our foreign commentator places Belgium, France, Greece and, perhaps, Poland.

Russia, rather than Germany, is the hereditary enemy of Poland, notwithstanding the fact that the Polish government in exile is presently allied with Britain and Soviet Russia.

France and Poland are disillusioned with Communist-minded governments which prepared their nations for collapse and their peoples for subjugation.

A third group of countries, which have so far maintained their neutrality, is divided in sentiment; but for ideological and political reasons has become more pro-German since Hitler turned against Communist Russia.

This grouping is composed of Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

The reasons for these nations' antagonism to Soviet Russia and Communism are obvious. Spain, of course, suffered from a civil war created by Russia's Comintern and carried on by international Communists.

Dr. Salazar of Portugal thwarted Red revolution in his country by setting up his Christian Corporate State.

Sweden naturally fears Soviet aggression, for Russia has ever regarded Sweden with a covetousness unsatisfied, because of Sweden's quasi-alliance with Germany.

Switzerland has long been bothered by the activities of the international Communists emanating from its key cities; and Switzerland's geographical position makes it imperative to collaborate with Nazi Germany.

A fourth group of States consists of nations more or less created by the *Treaty of Versailles*, wherein the hitherto dominant majority has been ousted and is implacably anti-German; but where important minorities, strange as it may seem, regard themselves as liberated by the Nazis and hence desire a German victory.

In this category are Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

These nations actually fear a Russian-American-British victory; for such a victory

(Continued on Page 9)

Comment

(Continued from Page 8)

would mean for them either "another Versailles" or the creation of a Pan-Slavic federation under the domination of Communist Russia.

These "Versailles States" were created in the main to act as buffers, to dismember Germany and Austria, and to submerge Teutonic minorities in Slavic majorities. Naturally, the minorities fear any Anglo-American peace which promises to "re-establish the Versailles nations," according to their former inequity.

The fifth class of nations is represented by Hungary and Bulgaria. They were allies of Germany in the last war and hence suffered in the subsequent peace treaties.

Because they are now allies of Germany, they expect that in the event of Germany's defeat they will again be dismembered and again punished by enslavement to Communist Russia.

Italy can be put in the same classification; for, although Italy was not an ally of Germany in the first war, yet Italy did not receive the territorial rewards promised by the Allies for her betrayal of the *Triple Entente*. The Italians realize that in the event of a German defeat Italy will be stripped of all territories and colonies and reduced to the status of a vassal nation.

Finally, there is the group of States invaded and conquered by Soviet Russia, made up of Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Roumania. To all members of this group — and Poland also might be added — a German victory over Russia is of ultimate importance.

The terms of the new Anglo-Russia agreement make it imperative that Germany shall not be defeated by Britain and Russia. The victory of Germany would guarantee these nations' independence and sovereignty, since most of these nations are now fighting with Germany against Red Russia.

Thus, in non-German Europe there is a strong sentiment for a Nazi victory and this classification takes into account political currents and ideological cross-currents which condition national psychology.

The sentiment in favor of Germany is by no means confined to "Quislings" and "Fifth Columnists." The opinion in these nations is that Germany must not be defeated and Britain must not be defeated: but, above all, Communist Russia must not win!

On the whole, European opinion favors a negotiated peace between Britain and Germany which will result in assuring future control over Red Russia. Hitler's recent war against Stalin did not create this sentiment: but did increase it.

This will quickly become more apparent as the Soviet armies crack under the power of the Nazi offensive and as new governments, acceptable to the inhabitants, are established in the Western portion of the U.S.S.R.

Response to the peace offensive will be found also in America, but not in its war-mongering cliques nor its New Deal administration. If the Russian campaign ends in a smashing victory for the Nazis, Americans will have to decide whether to continue the war for world control with its doubtful

outcome, or accept a compromise peace with at least superficially reasonable settlement of the economic rivalry.

An Anglo-American peace would doubtless be heaven for some nations compared to Nazi tyranny. But many neutral nations, no less than enemy nations and colonial peoples, distrust Anglo-American interest and power.

As history records, this distrust is both reasonable and logical.

Furthermore, American ideologists will have to realize that other peoples have a right to choose their form of government — even though they may not prefer the democratic-republic form — and that the *imposition of democracy by force would constitute a violation of divine and human rights*.

Furthermore, all nations and all peoples can not be forced to accept an arbitrary American version of somebody's "four freedoms" — for some of these nations into which Mr. Roosevelt wants to import "four freedoms" already possess more freedom than does America, the proposer!

The people of Europe judge American democracy and these "four freedoms" which they do not know, from the empire-democracy and imperialism of Britain, or the totalitarian terror and Communist "freedoms" of Russia, which they do know.

The United States has assumed in this alliance all the bitterness which Britain's colonists feel toward the island empire, and all the hate which Russia's serfs feel toward the Communist Soviet State of Dictator Stalin.

Europe's peoples have heard of the Anglophilism and pro-Communism of America's administrators. Americans must reflect that, perhaps, Europe's and Asia's peoples have as much love and respect for Americans as the closer peoples of South America, who so often point out that the United States thinks of South America only in the hour of need and then thinks that South American loyalty can be "purchased through dollar diplomacy" and "Yankee imperialism."

For the record, also, we might consider what English statesmen have said about Hitler — at a time when it suited their purpose to be frank and not "diplomatic." These quotations can be checked by reference to the *Congressional Record* (Aug. 4, 1941, page 6827).

Winston Churchill said: "I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war, I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations."

And our recent propaganda visitor, Lord Beaverbrook, said: "We certainly credit Hitler with honesty and sincerity. We believe in his purpose, stated over and over again, to seek an accommodation with us and we accept to the full the implications of the Munich document."

The late Lord Rothermere said with reference to Hitler: "There is no man living whose promise given in regard to something of real moment I would sooner take. He is simple, unaffected and obviously sincere. He is supremely intelligent."

Our own war-mongering advisers in the administration persist in representing English statesmen as unanimous in condemnation of Hitler as a man whose word cannot be believed. The record shows that English statesmen did not uniformly say that.

It is, perhaps, useless to add that these observations are not "pro-Nazi" but *solely in the interest, once more, of telling the whole story!*



—From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch

American Unity: How to Get It

RIGHT NOW is the "time to clamp down on the *Bill of Rights*," declared one of the speakers on a recent Sunday round-table of the Chicago University.

"His colleagues," reports the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "whistled in amazement!"

"It is regrettable," a *Post-Dispatch* editorial continues, "that we are not today a thoroughly united nation. No doubt much of the division would disappear if we were plunged into a shooting war. But to use that event, or the present situation, as the occasion for 'enforcing unity' would be fraught with many dangers.

"We tried that test during the last war and, as Prof. Zachary Chaffee of Harvard Law School points out, it did not work . . . We won the war, *but we lost the peace* — the only thing that was worth fighting for. Our own temporary abnegation of true democracy actually became the seed-bed for Hitler's anti-democracy.

"We should not again make the mistake of believing the coercion is a substitute for conviction where national unity is concerned," counsels the *Post-Dispatch*.

"It only drives dissent underground, there to nurse its grievances, real or imagined, against the day when it can lash back with a terrible fury! . . .

"All this talk about our lack of unity, however, is tending to become over alarmistic. Perhaps we make too much of the public opinion polls and the grouching of draftees.

"Perhaps, as Prof. Avery Craven of the University of Chicago says, they 'indicate more a lack of uniformity than of unity.'

"Americans certainly are united on the necessity for preserving the free way of American life. They differ for the most part about the way in which this can and should be done. That being the case, we need not give way to the despairing thought that it is impossible to crystallize a truly united spirit in this country.

"But if we want a unity in support of democracy, we had better turn our backs on the idea of clamping down on the *Bill of Rights*. We had better listen to Prof. Chaffee's plea for more free discussion rather than less. Because, as he says, 'loyalty is a beautiful idea, but you cannot create it by force.'