

## CLINICAL NOTES

USA, BRITAIN, USSR

Few political writers and speakers are so naïve that they do not know of the fateful political duel under way between Russia and the English-speaking allies. If Americans have heard little about it, the reason is that most commentators still look on the whole subject as untouchable. How these hush-hush boys expect our country to meet and solve the great problems growing out of the relations between democracies on one side and a dictatorship on the other without benefit of an enlightened and sympathetic public opinion is not clear.

William Philip Simms of the *Scripps-Howard Newspapers* and Forrest Davis of the *Saturday Evening Post* are important exceptions to the general rule of a reticence that amounts almost to a conspiracy of silence. When the whole story is told, the American people will have cause to thank them and a very few others for having had the wisdom to take the public into confidence on a struggle in the political sphere as vital, in its way, as the struggle in the military sphere.

Mr. Simms has had the courage, in the face of ardent delusions on all things Russian, to put the question of Moscow's claims to the Baltic States and Eastern Poland in the right perspective, as a test of the United Nations ability to protect its smaller members against the appetites of its larger members.

Mr. Davis has dared to cut through the deceptions (that deceive nobody but the American people) in connection with Winston Churchill's proposals for a permanent Anglo-American alliance, even unto a common citizenship, labeling it plainly for what it is: an answer to Soviet Russia's unilateral decisions on the fate of its small neighbors and all Europe.

In his Guildhall speech on June 30 and even more so in his subsequent Harvard address, the Prime Minister in effect proposed an "intimate alliance" of his country and ours as a counterpoise to the Greater Russia being projected by Stalin. The Guildhall pronouncement came after Russia had broken relations with Poland and set up its

own communist-led Union of Polish Patriots and its own Polish Army. The stronger and more explicit Harvard speech came after Moscow's thinly disguised offer of a negotiated peace to a Germany — almost any kind of Germany — without Hitler. It also followed closely on the Moscow announcement, timed demonstratively during the Quebec conference, of Maxim Litvinoff's recall as Ambassador to Washington.

In effect Mr. Churchill was saying: British and American air and naval power, backed by the world's most advanced technological civilizations, are more than a match for Russia, and Stalin should recognize this "hard, cold, vindictive truth" (Churchill's words). As soon as this is understood we can get together as equals to work out joint instead of unilateral solutions for the problems of postwar Europe.

It is not altogether accidental that negotiations for a Russian-American-British conference thereupon took a long leap forward. Support of the Churchill thesis by both Democratic and Republican leaders and newspapers in the United States has undoubtedly meant more to the hard-boiled master of the Kremlin than the passionate serenades of Wallace and Willkie under his windows. Stalin

despises sentimentalism. It has meant to him, we may be quite sure, that he will have to deal with his major allies together and not, as he had thought possible, with each of them separately.

Whatever doubts he might have retained after Mr. Churchill's straight talk were wiped out by the President's message to Congress on September 17. Mr. Roosevelt flatly denied the Moscow claim that our African and Italian campaigns and our aerial attack on Germany were not helping Russia. More significantly, he declared:

But there is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be rooted out of Germany — and out of Japan — if we are to have any real assurance of future peace.

Though few American commentators and editorial writers seem to have had the sense to grasp it, the Kremlin knows well enough that this was the American answer to the Moscow-sponsored Free Germany Committee offer to deal with the German military leaders if they got rid of Hitler.

The logic of Mr. Churchill's general proposal for an Anglo-American alliance is too compelling to be dismissed, even if the crisis in our relations with Russia which brought

it into the open is happily resolved. It takes no profound knowledge of history to recognize that two World Wars might have been headed off had the aggressor nations known definitely and well in advance that a quarrel with England meant also a quarrel with the United States. Even if the wars were inevitable, it is obvious that our victory could have come sooner and been more decisive if there had been no uncertainty about America's rôle and no costly delays. Surely Russia, which has an agreement with Britain, which has proposed one to Czechoslovakia, and which, in fact, pioneered in the technique of dual agreements within larger groupings, cannot reasonably object to an Anglo-American alliance.

—E. L.

#### WHERE IS THE CLERGY?

ONE of the minor phenomena of World War II, in this country, is the comparative quiet of the clergy. In the last war they split the heavens with their denunciations of the Hun. The verbal onslaughts of such divines as the Rev. Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis and the Rev. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman will be recalled by Americans in their late thirties or over, but there were other mighty wielders of the theological sword: the Rev. Dr. Charles

Aubrey Eaton, the Rev. Dr. Howard Ganster, the Rev. Dr. Henry van Dyke, the Rev. Dr. Charles Parkhurst, and, of course, the Rev. Billy Sunday. Most of them are now in the heaven they yearned for, and almost none have appeared to take their places. Bishop William T. Manning, to be sure, was one of the first to see the full meaning of Hitlerism, as were a number of other ministers — but they have been very few in number and strangely reserved in their public utterances.

One wonders why. Certainly the spiritual issues involved in the present world struggle are far more obvious and numerous than in the last one, and from all reports the soldiers and sailors are now more anxious for the guidance and counsel of chaplains, who seem to be slow in joining the services.

—C. A.

#### NEGROES WITHOUT SELF-PITY

I MAY be wrong, but it seems to me that what happened at a Negro meeting in Florida the other day is important — important not only for Negroes and not only for Florida. I think that it strikes a new, wholesome note in the black man's relation to his native America.

It was a meeting of the State-