

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.'"

Tin Conspiracy Unmasked

Plenty of Ore in U.S., Trust Prevents Its Use

ONE of these days some New Deal-ocrat will try to persuade us that the United States must go to war against Japan to secure our supply of tin from the Malayan Peninsula.

Will the New Deal-ocrat be right or wrong?

Is sufficient tin ore available right here in America, and has this fact been kept from the American people by a great international conspiracy, to which our own Government has been a party?

We quote herewith an article in the *Technocrat* news magazine for August, 1941:

"A prime example of the organized opposition American citizens have faced in their efforts to develop U. S. tin deposits is found in the case of the Juniper Ridge deposit, near Burns, Oregon. Here alone 10,000 acres have been drilled and tested and tin ore has been found to a depth of 190 feet, and the bottom has not yet been reached. In that part of the U. S. alone can be found enough tin to supply all the needs of America; but a conspiracy has prevented its recovery; imports from half way around the world have continued.

"This is the disgraceful story.

"In 1938, Technocrat Arch Malin and others were endeavoring to get it recognized that Juniper Ridge contained high-grade tin ore. They took samples for assay and submitted them to the 'government umpires' on both the West and East coasts and asked for official assay reports. The answers came back: 'No tin.'

"This puzzled Mr. Malin. He knew from his own test smelting in his own laboratory that there was plenty of tin in the ore. He and his friends decided they would try again. This time when they submitted samples they asked for a 100 per cent analysis. They estimated beforehand that the ore contained about 7 per cent tin — a very high content.

"Pretty soon the answer came back. The assay report showed 'no tin': 93 per cent various elements and 7 per cent *undetermined*! A high school chemistry student should be able to do better than that, they knew. What was this, the run around?

"Undaunted, Arch Malin and friends tried again. They themselves smelted some tin shot from the ore; they submitted that. Still the assay reports came back: 'no tin.'

"So the untiring (?) miners decided to try an experiment. They bought one dollar's worth of chemically pure tin sponge from Braun Chemical Co. and also some pure silica. They smelted the sponge in a new clay crucible, ground the clinker and panned out the tin shot. This time there would *have* to be a report of tin because all they were going to submit was this pure tin and silica.

"But the Government umpire 'saw them coming.' The assay report again read 'no tin.'

"Who was lying?

"Then samples were sent to several leading universities. Their science departments also reported no tin.

WHEN is tin not tin?

The answer, according to the United States Government is when it is found in the United States.

America, says the *Technocrat* magazine, has domestic tin ore deposits more than sufficient to supply its needs — and yet this country imports 99 per cent of what it uses.

The United States buys nearly half of the world's output of tin but has no voice in its production or price.

Added to this indictment of national policy is the charge that our Government has been a party to a great international tin conspiracy which has prevented America from establishing — in the interests of our own national security — tin mines and smelters of our own.

Here is the story.

"The backers of the Juniper Ridge were stymied. The ore lay dormant.

"Of course, one might conclude, there just couldn't be tin there because the United States Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines says in its *Yearbook* (1939) that the hope of obtaining national security by developing domestic tin is remote and that the U. S. lacks commercial deposits. And specifically, 'Federal and state engineers (have) held that the deposit, known as Juniper Ridge and located 37 miles west of Burns, did not contain tin and due to its being on Government range reserve could not be mined.' (*California Mining Journal*, April, 1941.)

"But early this year the cat was let out of the bag. After a running fight of years the Government has decided to change its mind and give in. Said the *California Mining Journal*: 'Burns, Ore., Mar. 16—The Federal Government has canceled its tin claim contest hearing which was to have been held here on the 18th and has indefinitely set aside its formal action pending further development of the property, which is now believed to be the first large-scale tin mine in the United States . . . The fight has raged for months, the Government doggedly holding to the *decision* that it could not possibly be a tin deposit.'

"And so the conniving politicians decided to switch their decision, just like that. Of course it had finally become quite embarrassing; the latest Department of Interior assay report showed that after 273 assays, the tin content runs in excess of 50 pounds of tin to the ton!

"Those other assays, made in 1938, must have been 'a mistake.' Or maybe the Government had just now learned how to tell what tin is.

"To know the full significance of the foregoing story of 'yes we have no tin' is to show the history and structure of the present world monopoly," the *Technocrat* article continues.

"Why the average American citizen knows little or nothing about the subject—and still believes, as he is told, that the United States is forever dependent upon foreign tin—is easy to understand: the facts are hard for him to find.

"Fortunately for the record, however, in the archives of Government reports are the proceedings of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives, published in 1935, which reveals the facts.

"Long unnoticed by the public, these revelations indicate that our Government has not been ignorant of the situation but, instead, has been the big obliging *sucker* for the great tin conspiracy."

Although tin ore occurs widely scattered on the earth's surface, only a handful of countries mine 90 per cent of the world's production. These countries are, in the order of quantity: Malay States, Bolivia, Netherlands, East Indies, Nigeria (Africa), Siam, China, Australia, United Kingdom, Burma.

Twenty other countries mine tin in smaller and varying amounts. In the past 20 years the world's total of ore mined yearly has run between 120,000 and 200,000 long tons. Of this the United States has averaged about 30 tons since 1924, and this speck has been recovered only as a by-product of mining for other minerals.

Smelters, says the *Technocrat*, are the bottleneck in tin production. "Whoever controls the smelters controls the flow of metallic tin. This fact is the key to the international control of tin. Thus, the picture begins to shape.

"The principal tin smelting centers of the world are in the British Isles and in British Malaya. Some half dozen large smelters are located in Singapore, Penang and Liverpool, smelting the bulk of the world's tin.

"Until recently, all of Bolivia's ore, for example, was transported across the Atlantic to England to be smelted and then the tin shipped out from there. The bulk of Japan's metallic tin has been smelted in British smelteries in the Far East. Great fleets of freighters have been kept busy carrying tin ore from over the world to British smelters and then carrying the tin away again!

"The big question arises: 'Why don't other countries cut in on this monopoly for their own benefit, and smelt their own tin?' The answer is easy. They now do—all, that is, except the biggest consumer of tin, the United States!

"The Dutch, the Germans, the Russians, the Chinese, the Japanese and even Argentina have built—and are now building more than ever—their own smelters. But not the Americans.

"As the Congressional report referred to above points out, 'the world market for tin is centered in London in the London Metal Exchange. By and large, tin ore, wherever produced, and metallic tin wherever smelted, may be said to enter the market at prices governed by the quotations on the London Metal Exchange. The tin market in the U. S. and elsewhere is merely a reflection of the tin market in London.'

"Despite England's present desperate war, tin quotations remain active; trading in all other metals is suspended.

"And in spite of the fact that 'tin is essential in the manufacture of certain munitions and certain ordnance necessary to the maintenance of the military and naval establishment of the government and to the conduct of military and naval operations,' the U. S.

(Continued on Page 11)