Shapito

The copy of your letter to Dr. Lehmam which you sent me shows a lack of understanding.
NATHAN D. SHAPIRO
COUNSELOR AT LAW

MORTIMER A. SHAPIRO
JACOB JACOBSON

50 COURT STREET
BROOKLYN 2, N. Y.

October 19, 1946.

Hon. Herbert H. Lehman
E 20 Park Avenue
New York City

My dear Governor Lehman: gaining many votes by your explanations, you have alienated the votes of a great many people who believe that it is our concern when the Americans are in danger. After all, the anti-American statements made by the Anti-Fascist Liberators are not only in the air; they are the only ones who know how to make a Nazi Kabaret. Do they think that they can win over the sympathy of the American people by their lies? They are not capable of it. They are not capable of taking over the situs of the Daily Worker, and they cannot make the American people believe that they are in the center of the fight for world war II. We cannot be isolated in the world.

The statement could be expected from a "Stalin Democrat," a Communist or a "totalitarian liberal," but not from a man of your background and understanding. The Daily Worker could not have said it any better. Do you forget that it is the democratic national administration that is trying to get a little more freedom for the oppressed people of Europe and Asia? Do you want us to vote against you because of what your party is doing in Washington?

The average American to whom you spoke knows that we are not perfect. He also knows that progress in democracies is slow. The last word in economic, social and political matters will never be written. But just as Secretary Byrnes said last night, we did make quite some progress. Would you call his enunciation of democratic principles "sheer hypocrisy" simply because we have not as yet attained perfection?

We surely could and should answer the "false and misleading propaganda" of the Stalin government and be alarmed about its aggression in Europe and Asia, even if we have not as yet reached a state of perfection, especially if this is the "One World." Furthermore, since you never hesitated to attack the Fascists, why do you hesitate to attack the Communists? Why do you reject the Communists votes? Your rejection was undoubtedly based upon your belief that they are agents of a foreign power whose interests are repugnant and dangerous to our democracy.

On February 10, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt did not hesitate to say in most unmistakable language that the Soviet Union "is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world." Joseph E. Davies, in his "Mission to Moscow," revised edition 1943, page 352, said that Russia is a dictatorship not "of the proletariat" as professed, but "over the proletariat. It is completely dominated by one man."
Hon. Herbert H. Lehman

Your statement reminds me of a well-known gag concerning an American Military Aide in Moscow who was taken during the war for an inspection of Soviet plane production. He was shown a huge field covered with planes as far as the eye could see. After examining the planes, the American turned in some astonishment to his Russian guide and asked, "But where are the motors?" To which the Russian drew himself up stiffly and snapped back, "And what about the Negro problem in the South?"

Instead of gaining many votes by your explanations, you have alienated the votes of a great many people who believe that it is our concern what Stalin is doing, especially in Eastern Europe and China. To most of us Hitler and Stalin are like two peas in a pod. After our lessons from Hitler and his infamous pact with Stalin to divide Poland and control Eastern Europe (which was the green light for World War II) we cannot be isolationists, notwithstanding the wishes of Henry A. Wallace, the American Labor Party and other friends of the "Stalin democracy".

Stalin, like Hitler, is a one-man dictator. He decides who shall live and who shall die; who shall eat and who shall starve; who shall work, where, when, at what wages and during what hours; and who shall be educated or schooled and for what period. He likewise passes upon and controls everything his subjects taste, smell, eat, wear, speak, write, print and read, see, sit on, sleep in, listen to and touch. All international policies, pacts, treaties and declarations of war are made, controlled and broken by Stalin, whose power is greater than the Czars, and whose term of office is unlimited as his power.

An excellent analysis of your attitude is contained in an article by Hans Kohn entitled, "The Century of Betrayal", which appeared in the September issue of the "Commentary", a magazine sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, in which the following very significant and true statement is contained:-

"The most dangerous symptom for the future of civilization is the admiration which even liberal intellectuals hold for liberty's most determined enemies, for their seeming efficiency and their success. The astonishing ability of the mind to deceive itself and escape its responsibilities is revealed in the brilliant array of excuses and subterfuges. To compete with totalitarian claims, immense demands are put upon free society, which no society can meet. Its survival, and our right to its survival, are made dependent upon the solution of many problems that by their nature are insoluble except in a Utopia, or allow only a slow and gradual amelioration by patient and sustained effort. The boasts of totalitarian regimes are accepted uncritically at face value. So it is with the most popular slogan: 'unemployment'. As if the totalitarian regimes had solved that problem otherwise than by gigantic prepar-
actions for war or defense, 'guns instead of butter',
and with a standard of living that the 'unemployed' in
a capitalistic society would reject."

My dear Governor, is our democracy so vulnerable
that we must be speechless while another Hitler is emerging
somewhere in Europe? I don't think so; and I am afraid that the man
who wrote or advised you concerning your speech did you a great
disservice.

Very truly yours,

NATHAN D. SHAPIRO

ccs: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
    29 Washington Square
    New York City
The Gallup Poll:

Voters Favor Byrnes Policy Against Wallace on Reds

By GEORGE GALLUP,
Director, American Institute of Public Opinion.

Voters who say they have followed the arguments over the Byrnes vs. Wallace ideas for dealing with Russia, vote 5-to-1 in favor of sticking to the Byrnes policy.

Fewer than half the nation's voters have been paying attention to the discussion over the two men's ideas. That is shown in replies to the following:

- Have you followed the arguments about Byrnes' ideas and Wallace's ideas for dealing with Russia?
  - Yes ____________ 42%
  - No _____________ 58%

- Whose policy do you think we should follow—Byrnes' or Wallace's?
  - Byrnes' __________ 78%
  - Wallace's __________ 16%
  - No opinion __________ 6%

The vote of all who have followed the discussion and had definite conceptions of the ideas of both men:

- Byrnes' __________ 78%
- Wallace's __________ 16%
- No opinion __________ 6%

Public has interpreted what they have said.

This is shown in the following two questions, asked of those who say they have followed the discussions:

- In general, what do you understand Byrnes' ideas to be regarding Russia?
  - Byrnes wants to be firm with Russia; fair but firm; tell them just where we stand ______ 76%
  - Wants to co-operate with Russia ______ 7
  - Miscellaneous and don't know ______ 17

- In general, what do you understand Wallace's ideas to be regarding Russia?
  - Wallace wants to be easy with Russia; lenient; wants to appease her ______ 50%
  - Try to see Russia's viewpoint, side with her a little more ______ 16
  - Pro-Russian, a Communist ______ 17
  - Miscellaneous and don't know ______ 17

Both Mr. Wallace and Mr. Byrnes will be interested to observe what the voters in the poll think the two men's ideas are for dealing with Russia, and how accurately or inaccurately the
As Elliot and Stalin See It

Review by STANLEY NALEPA

Elliott Roosevelt's wartime life with Father was not a bed of roses. His "biological qualifications" forced him to be at his father's side at most of the historic wartime meetings. He was a message-runner, errand boy and official drink-filler. For the benefit of future historians, he took mental notes of all that was said and done at all the secret sessions. He studied Churchill's un-American drinking habits and made careful estimates of his liquor-holding capacity. He was a human filing cabinet of top-secret plans, bargains, and commitments.

Today Elliot is an angry man. He feels that his father has been betrayed. He denounces British and American Tories and reactionaries who are subverting the structure of world peace for which his father laid the foundation. Only Russia escapes his righteous wrath, for there are no Tories in that freedom-loving land. And only Stalin is still plodding up the tortuous path Elliot's father charted.

The secret battle of the Atlantic Charter, was a diplomatic blitzkrieg for Roosevelt and a Dunkirk for Churchill—just as Elliot had expected. Churchill put up a magnificent struggle, but he never had a chance. While Winston pledged for American help, his opponent listened, unmoved. Occasionally Roosevelt interrupted with a sly question—"just drawing him out, drawing him out." At times he kept "prodding and needling" his victim. Churchill fought on. "He braced his shoulders like a bull, his hands slashed the air...."

"Churchill's neck reddened, he rushed forward." He "growled" and "began to look apoplectic." At last the Prime Minister collapsed—he'd never had a chance.

He left the meeting, probably muttering something about England losing all the battles and winning the war.

Elliot is very bitter about the violation of the Atlantic Charter, and he goes over it point by point—almost. He leaves the first two points aside because Russia is the only nation that violated them, and Russia is trying very hard to prove something else. He pauses on the third because it gives him a chance to reflect on the peoples of Indonesia. There is no much sense in reflecting on the peoples of Viet-Nam, Poland, Rumania, etc. because they are Stalin's concern. He passes over the fourth point because "its mysteries are too deep," and besides only Stalin is violating it. The fifth is just a "pious echo," he says. The sixth "still waits." The seventh "seems safe at the moment." (Stalin's fleet is too small to violate that one.) The last point is "especially cogent today," Elliot thinks. It seems that only General Groves is violating it.

Elliot's book is a mixture of father-worship, historical distortion and ignominious vilification of those who oppose Stalin. It will probably be popular with readers of gossip columns.

Democratization of Health Policy
I am sorry, if I really see what I think I see. I hope I am wrong. I hope I am suffering from aberrations, double vision, myopia, and all the other things some of my readers accuse me of. I hope it's a nightmare and I shall wake up. I don't want to be proved right. And I am not absolutely sure I am right.

But some nine years ago I had similar aberrations, myopia, and nightmares, and they turned out to be real. "Similar" doesn't describe it. They were exactly the same.

There was a totalitarian state, east to center of Europe. It began by liquidating all internal opposition and reawakening while preaching peace. It had only a few concerns, all concerning neighboring states and what it called "Lebensraum," or Security Spheres. It claimed to be threatened by surrounding small countries—Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc.—which might be "outposts of hostile forces," and must have "friendly governments." It consciously fostered external hostility—by the ruthless persecution of racial and political minorities—in order to convince its people that they were threatened from without. Anyone who called attention to such peculiarities in its behavior was called a "warmonger." It planted, in all countries, a fifth column, instructed to work for "peace." It absorbed a neighboring state (Austria) by diplomatic means forcing the existing government to give way to another and staged a great celebration of welcome to the liberator. It absorbed a second neighboring state by demanding rectification of frontiers, and, having accomplished that peacefully, it took the entire country and installed its own government (Czechoslovakia). It then demanded concessions from a third neighboring state (Poland) and when they were refused, marched in its armies against "reactionary warmongers." All that it was doing was for the rectification of past injustices, and peace.

No one wanted war. All that Hitler wanted was to put himself, step by step, in a position where no nation could make war against him, whereas he could, at any time, blackmail or attack the rest of the world.

His strictest understanding geography. They had read Mackinder and improved him by Hausser. The strategy was the domination, not immediately of the world, but of the "Great Island," the Eastern Hemisphere, where dwell eight-tenths of humanity and the bulk of resources. To do this one must knock out France, weaken and sow dissension in China. Disintegrate the British Empire and drive it out of the Near East and Asia, isolate the United States, control a solid bloc of territory from the Channel to Siberia, be able to close the Suez Canal and control the Danube, and mass troops on the northern border of India.

To do this successfully, it was necessary to make the original moves without opposition, and, in fact, with the consent of the future victims, originally aimed at on "spheres of influence" only to absorb them all when the moment came.

To do this successfully, it was also necessary to have ideological allies within all the countries which were to be kept quiet until it was too late, peace and friendship parties, as it were. And accompanying all was a virulent press and radio war of propaganda.

To keep it all, the organizer of it all wrote it down and told the world as advance.

There were all the steps to World War I. And for the life of me I cannot but see it is being repeated step by step today.

There is the same technique of the fifth column crying "warmonger" to every one who even tries to call attention to what is apparently going on—but it is a far more effective and fanatic fifth column than Hitler could make out of racialism plus peace. There are the same strategic devices, by the same means, and in the identical places.

There are all the devices of open or veiled aggression, and there is the same war of nerves, going on insidiously in all languages over the air and in "friendly" newspapers.

And as far back as Lenin, it was all predicted—the "inevitable" series of clashes until all "capitalist states"—whether fascist, or "bourgeois" democratic, or democratic socialist—should be subjected under one masterplan.

If all this is not going on, I want to be corrected as to fact. To be convincingly corrected would certainly cheer me up.
Stalin-Hitler Agreements
Divided Central Europe Between Themselves

By Julius Epstein

Author of “The Nonsense of Autarchy,” “Japan on the Threshold” and “Sources of Anarchism”