



## Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.**

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

---

Reel  
162

Box  
58

Folder  
767

Russia and the United States - Is there no bridge between them?,  
1947.

693

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES -- IS THERE  
NO BRIDGE BETWEEN THEM?

By  
Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

At  
The Temple

On  
Sunday morning, October 19, 1947



It is clear that the U. S. and Soviet relations have deteriorated gravely. At the United Nations we have entered upon what you might call the vituperative stage.

Their spokesmen, ignoring all customary diplomatic usage are fighting with one another to discover the most biting, the most provocative phrases to hurl at one another. Unfortunately this is not the mere pastime of mud-slinging indulged in by a few private individuals. These hurlers of the barbs are the authorized spokesmen of two of the greatest powers on earth, erstwhile allies, who shed their blood in fighting a common enemy -- the two greatest powers on earth who hold within their hands the destiny of mankind.

Now, perhaps all this that is happening in the United Nations and outside is only a form of propaganda warfare that has come to be known as a cold war, a substitute for war. But it may well be a prologue to real war.

It is certainly not peace! And in such a miasmic and poisonous atmosphere the terribly difficult work of world reconstruction cannot go on. The rebuilding of a shattered society and the early restoration of mankind to the normal ways of life become well nigh impossible.

The role of our country at this moment generally is not an enviable one. For it is not the representatives of the Soviet Union alone who are hurling their vitter invectives and acrimonious charges against us. We seem to be disliked and distrusted almost everywhere in the world, wherever we have intervened politically or economically. It is not that we are not given credit for what we have done or are proposing to do to help the nations of the world. I believe that President Truman was correct when he stated the other day that " what we are doing we are not doing for credit, but because it is



right and necessary."

But far from receiving credit, praise, expressions of gratitude which we can well forego, we are being denounced and derided almost everywhere. We are being accused of dollar imperialism, of conspiring to use our role, our gifts of outright aid to the world as weapons to impose our will or domination on the nations of the world, or as some are saying -- all that we are doing by way of pouring out our monies and goods to the nations of the world is just a calculated device to save our own national economy which is dependent upon extensive and increased exports, and that therefore these nations do us a great favor by taking our monies and goods. They are saving us. Every recent surveyor of the situation abroad has testified to a growing Americaphobia as they call it -- a new term coined recently -- hatred of America. It is widespread on the continent of Europe and in Great Britain, and especially in Great Britain -- Great Britain which received 31 billions of dollars in Lend Lease from the United States during the war, and more recently a loan of 3-3/4 billions of dollars, and which is now hoping for additional huge gifts and loans by way of the Marshall Plan. Mr. Bevin has actually suggested that we turn over to him and to the other nations of the world all the gold which we have accumulated at Knoxville, and if that isn't possible, to revive on a large scale our lend lease program in order to maintain British economy in the British Empire indefinitely.

The bitterness on the part of the press of Great Britain has been commented on often in recent weeks and months. An extreme expression of it appeared recently in the "World Press News." This British newspaper is a trade magazine, from which I read:



"America is dollar greedy, and, under her Constitution and present setup, can't behave in another way than she does, which is to seek what she is today because she was protected for the hardest possible bargain. She is/a hundred years up to 1914 by the British navy. She profited in the first World war by being 'too proud to fight' -- but not too proud to sell munitions. She profited in the second -- as 'the arsenal of democracy,' after British money built her main factories and we took the risk of firm, long term contracts. It took Pearl Harbur to make her fight. She abruptly broke her bond over lend-lease, and sine has frankly aimed to shatter imperial preference and burst open empire markets for herself to exploit in hoped for one way traffic. Her film industry in 1942 rushed from this country L17,000,000 sterling -- we at any rate shed no tears, today for Hollywood. Her press today carries some responsibility for the present Indian situation, and their hands are not clean over Palestine." We are responsible for what happened in Palestine.

To which a rather bitter editorial in a paper which is not and never has been too friendly to Great Britain, and which naturally seizes upon such outbursts wrote an editorial: "It would be difficult to state more and bigger lies in so small a compass. During the war the American people supported Britain with supplies for which we were never paid and probably never will be. We turned them over to a country that had welched on a debt growing out of the last war, and refused to discuss a renewal of payments after stopping them. Thus we undermined the economy of the United States and saddled ourselves with billions of debt in two British wars, which were none of our concern, and which we won only in the sense that we defeated Britain's enemy."



In the course of the last war we had constantly to be on the watch against British cheating, in going after our foreign trade in South America while we were giving single minded attention to fighting in Europe. They were not above selling to former customers of American firms goods obtained from the United States under lend-lease. We stopped that finally. After the war we gave a 3-3/4 billion dollar loan and made as a condition that we would negotiate for the ending of imperial preference, the name given to the conspiracy against American goods plotted by Britain in 1931." etc., etc.

"Whether Russian ingratitude is greater than Britain's is a question which might well be considered by some of those New York learned societies whose membership includes both commies and anglophiles. This we'll say at least for the Russians: That they don't expect gifts or loans. On the other hand, the British are convinced that that is the way to get the money. They know by experience that the worse things said about America, the easier it is to get dollars from those in power at Washington and New York who are unlimited in their admiration for the English ruling class and British imperialism."

And you can readily see how one form of bitterness provokes another. And unfortunately the United States finds itself in the position today of being misunderstood and maligned. And there is no reason for it. If you read the press on the continent of Europe and in Great Britain, you will find that leftists, rightists and on the continent press of Great Britain/all agree on one thing: that America must not attach any political or economic conditions to whatever assistance she may extend to Great Britain or ~~xxx~~ any other country. They do not want that which we give them to be tied up with any political interests which we may harbor. And unfortunately this is exactly what we have been drifting into. The whole purpose of our present and contemplated aid to Europe has been extended as saving Europe not from hunger so much as from communism. Those who are loudest in their advocacy of instant and boundless aid to Europe do so on the ground of saving this country or that country from communism not on the ground of humanity, of helping all hungry people everywhere, and of restoring the economy, especially of those countries which suffered



most from Naz aggression. American aid, unfortunately, is linked up with an anti-communist crusade. This, I am afraid, will defeat our relief program and will help spread communism. Europe, in my humble judgment, cannot be restored economically if it remains a house divided among itself, the agricultural East Europe failing to cooperate with the industrial West in Europe. Unfortunately, and perhaps unintentionally, the Marshall Plan coming in the wake of the disastrous Truman Doctrine, which openly challenged the Soviet Union as it did, on the heels of our intervention in Greece and Turkey, and our offers of loans and other forms of assistance to monarchicallist and reactionary governments, in order to strengthen them as a bulwark against Soviet expansionism, helped to divide Europe still further so that nearly one-half the countries of Europe have refused to cooperate in the Marshall Plan. The so-called Truman doctrine has poisoned the atmosphere of the world. A new emphasis was introduced in American foreign policy. There was a shift from American cooperation in world reconstruction to the use of American economic power against Russia and its dependencies. And if you avowedly and public set out to organize the world against certain states or complex of states, you cannot expect cooperation from that state or group of states when you ask that cooperation, and you cannot be outraged when they refuse to cooperate with you on almost anything, or when they set out to organize themselves effectively against you who have openly challenged them as the Russians seem to have done in the revival of the Comminterne. I don't believe there is enough money in the United States to restore Europe unless Europe is a unit, and unless all the peoples of Europe, not merely the states of Western Europe, cooperate in a strong mutual effort for sound economic re-habilitation. And I don't believe that it is our duty to keep the countries of Europe from going Communist if they choose to do so, and I am persuaded that it is not an enviable role to ask America <sup>ns</sup> indefinitely to pour out their money by way of food every time there is an election in France or in Italy in order to insure that a certain party wins the election, as we have been doing. This may develop into a form of ~~px~~ political blackmail whenever a reactionary government



or reactionary political party can call on the assistance of the American people for funds, or the American government to keep them in power or restore them to power, or to keep them from going Communist. And I am afraid that this new line which is being so actively propagandized among the people of the United States may lead us as a country deeper and deeper into an anti-Communist crusade in Europe, to finance their economy and before long the military rebirth of a strong Germany as a bulwark against Communism. And when we do that, we shall and take over that role of Hitler in Europe/just as unwittingly spread Hitler's propaganda. Already one hears more and more frequently and loudly that the key to the salvation of Europe is to quit the rehabilitation of Germany and that priority should be given to the restoration of Germany even of its victims -- a Germany which everybody acknowledges is as unregenerate and unrepenting as it ever was. This is the line of threat which has set in. Now no one complete answer as to how to normalize the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. "There is no easy formula," as someone stated, "to guide one in getting along with the Soviet." It is a difficult people, a difficult government. Concededly their background is different. They live in a more water-tight, isolated kind of a world. They have had experiences that have made them fearful and suspicious. No one denies that. On the other hand, there is a people which we must learn to get along with. There are those who hate the Soviet system and who hanker after war -- the quicker the better. They want us quickly to use our stock pile of atom bombs and destroy the Soviet Union. Everything will be lovely in the world. Communism will be done for. The democratic way of life will endure -- and the golden age of mankind.

Assuming that we can destroy the Soviet Union, assuming that we can -- we will not, in so doing, establish democracy in the world. Neither of the two last wars established democracy in the world. Quite the contrary. And we will plunge mankind into incalculable disorganization, chaos, disaster and ruin. Those who



advocate war with Russia -- they are killers, warmongers, who can't give mankind a breathing space, even to heal the wounds of the last war.

There are others who believe that the United States and the Soviet Union have irreconcilable ideologies and that <sup>a</sup>war, whether a cold war or a shooting war, is inevitable. Although they are prayerfully hoping against it, they compare the Communist regime of Russia with the Nazi regime of Germany as proof of irreconcilability and inevitability of war. In this regard I would like to quote a sentence of the former Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, whose book, "Speaking Frankly," has just appeared. Mr. Byrnes said the other day: "There is room in the world for the ideologies of Russia and the United States just as there is room for the people of the Soviet Union and the United States. The U.N. is our best -- if not our only -- hope for reconciling differences that exist between us."

Some of you may recall a book which has been forgotten by many, which was written during the war, by Joseph E. Davies, U. S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, which was at that time hailed by the American people, and fostered by official Washington. In this book, former Ambassador Davies wrote:

"Both Germany and Soviet Russia are totalitarian states. Both are realistic. Both are strong and ruthless in their methods. There is one distinction, however, and that is as clear as black and white. It can be simply illustrated. If Marx, Lenin, or Stalin had been firmly grounded in the Christian faith, either Catholic or Protestant, and if by reason of that fact this communistic experiment in Russia had been projected upon that basis, it would probably be declared to be one of the greatest efforts of Christian altruism in history to translate the ideals of brotherhood and charity as preached in the gospel of Christ into a government by men. The point is that the Christian religion could be imposed upon the communistic principles without doing violence to its economic and political purposes, the primary one of which is based upon 'the brotherhood of men.' Applying the same test to Nazism, the difference between the two is clear. The principles of the Christian religion cannot be imposed upon the Nazi philosophy, without destroying



the political base of the state. Nazi philosophy makes the state superior to the Christian religion and is in fact a religion in itself. For that end it has tried to destroy Christianity in Germany through persecutions. Nazi philosophy creates a government which is in fact based upon the denial of the altruistic principles of the Christian religion. The Nazi state is deified. To it, war is a virtue. Brotherly love, charity, justice, and Christian virtues are indications of weakness and decadence if they conflict with the utilitarian needs of the state. The state is the church and the confessional. Force, power, might, as the expression of a Nordic and racial religion, are the base of the Nazi ideology.

"To impose the Christian religion upon Nazism would be impossible. They are utterly antithetical.

"That is the difference -- the communistic Soviet state could function with the Christian religion in its basic purpose to serve the brotherhood of man. It would be impossible for the Nazi state to do so. The communistic ideal is that the state may evaporate and be no longer necessary as man advances into a perfect brotherhood. The Nazi ideal is the exact opposite -- that the state is the supreme end of all."

Now, what Mr. Davies understood should be clear to everyone. There should not be this facile identification with the two systems. In my judgment, there should take place at once, a new rapprochement between our country and the Soviet Union through the heads of these two states -- direct contact again -- a fresh start made by the President of the United States and Stalin. The Truman Doctrine should be allowed to evaporate as rapidly as possible. The unrealistic crusade against Russia should be abandoned. The little fellows who have been doing their snapping and snarling at the United Nations should be by-passed. A fresh approach should be made even before the Congress of the United States is asked to approve the Marshall Plan, or even before the next meeting of the Big Four scheduled for London in November. Stalin made a declaration to eight British M.P.'s recently, and in my humble judgment that declaration should not only not be disregarded, but it should be seized upon as a basis of a new start



before we sink deeper and deeper .....

Mr. Stalin may be guilty of reversing himself from time to time, and inconsistent. So have we reversed ourselves from time to time. All you have to do is read about the Yalta conference and compare. We are unwilling at times to pick up our IOU's.

Mr. Stalin stated to Eight members of the British Parliament in a recent interview: "Just as the Soviet Union has always stood for improvement of political and economic relations with all countries, so it now stands for such improvement, beginning with the United States and Great Britain.

"If these countries wish to improve relations with the Soviet Union they will be welcomed. We shall be prepared to go forward to meet them irrespective of what the economic set-up may be in those countries.

"Cooperation between countries having different economic systems is possible. That already has been proved by experience.

"If, however, they do not want to improve their relations with the Soviet Union, we shall have to do without them. We shall nevertheless be able to carry on.

"We will wait until they regain their reason and understand cooperation between nations is necessary. We can wait. We are a patient people."

We are also a strong and powerful people, stronger by far, and richer. And because of our superior strength we ought to seize diplomatic initiative...to bring about better relations with this second most powerful group of people in the world to help bring about as quickly as possible world reconstruction.

I suggest that this meeting between the President of the United States and Stalin take place as early as possible.

Mr. Byrnes, in his book ~~many~~ favors making settlements with Stalin rather than with Molotov. He says: "I have found Stalin forthright. On several occasions I made agreements with him when I could not with Molotov. It is always best to talk to the man with the power to decide." And that is so.

Before President Roosevelt died, on April 12, he wrote a letter to Mr. Churchill who requested his advice about a speech which he was to deliver in the House of Commons.



And he sent him this message:

"I would minimize the general Soviet problem as much as possible because these problems in one form or another, seem to arise every day and most of them straighten out as in the case of the Ber meeting -- you may recall the incident when General Kesserling prepared to surrender the army in Italy -- a meeting arranged by the Allies. Russia asked to be included. That brought up a fuss which assumed great proportions and then as quickly liquidated.

Russia can and does cooperate when she is not made fearful. They cooperated with the 5 treaties since the termination of the World War with former enemies of allied nations. They cooperated in the U. S. trusteeship in. They helped build up the machinery for the UN, and though grudgingly they finally cooperated in Iran case.

They have faults -- many of them and they need not be ignored or rationalized out of existence. It is up to the Russians. They are over-suspicious, too unyielding. They have exploited the veto in the United Nations too often, although it should be remembered that originally the U.S. insisted on the veto power quite as strongly as did the Russians. Their propaganda at home and abroad is unrestricted, not calculated to bring peace to a troubled world -- all of which, however, is no reason why the United States should undertake a crusade against Communism.

America alone should not attempt to set the world right. There is a United Nations for that purpose. Our government should work through the United Nations. The Marshall Plan, in my humble judgment, should originally have been introduced through the United Nations.

That is the bridge between the United States and the Soviet Union. As Byrnes indicated -- the United Nations. The United Nations was created to weld together one world -- not that one world exists today. But nations pledged themselves to make an effort to cement the world, this shattered world of ours through patience, care -- to weld the world ultimately into one world.

What is happening today is a definite effort to perpetuate the rift between the two worlds. I believe that the U. S. ought to give all that it can ~~spend and~~ spare



to help the people of Europe on the basis of humanity -- to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and to help the nations to economic self-sufficiency as far as possible. I believe that aid should be given without any political maneuvering to all people as far as we can, and I believe that aid should be given only after we have made a careful survey of what we can spare without undermining our own national economy. We ought not to be placed for the world Santa Clause indefinitely, and our people ought not to be fooled about baning money to other nations which they have no intention of paying back. The American people is a generous people, as demonstrated time and again. And I believe that it will respond generously to every legitimate appeal to aid a suffering people. I don't think it will respond indefinitely to the campaign against so-called Communism in the world.....Money sent to China for that purpose -- money down the drain...

May I close with this sentence from Ambassador' Davies' book -- just this sentence:

"I found among the leading Soviets a real friendliness to the United States possibly based on the fact that there was nothing that they had that we wanted, and that we had nothing that they could take; so there was a natural basis for a policy of 'live and let live' between our two peoples. They bitterly resented the attitude of Britain and France to look down their noses at the Soviets, and this intensified their distrust and ultimately drove them into the Hitler camp."

And that, my friends, has been true for 150 years. There is nothing that Russia has that we want. There is nothing that we have that they can take. We are not naturally rivals or competitors. Naturally, we are, or should be, friends. And if these two great people, both born in revolution, in spite of their differing outlooks and ideologies can once learn to work together in their everyday, day by day problems, mankind will be launched upon the ways of peace and long living. May they come about soon, we pray!



4

Unfortunately this is not ~~the~~ <sup>a mere</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> common pastime of und-  
slightly changed in by a few private individuals.  
There are <sup>hundreds of the world's</sup> the authorized spokesmen of the two greatest powers  
on earth, Soviet Union, who hold both in their hands the  
destiny & welfare.

Perhaps all that is happening at VN - and outside - ~~the~~ is only  
a propaganda war, a cold war, a substitute for war. But  
it may be a prologue to real war.

It is certainly not peace! - And in such a disastrous  
and poisonous atmosphere the terribly difficult work  
of post-war reconstruction, the rebuilding of a shattered  
society, and the early restoration of mankind to normal  
life is well nigh impossible.

2/ The role of the U.S. at the moment is not an enviable one.  
It is not the Soviet Union alone which is threatening back-  
lash at U.S.

We are disliked and ~~disusted~~ almost everywhere, where  
we have interviews / politically or economically.

It is not that we are not given credit for what we have done and are attempting to do to help the nations of Europe and Asia. But, it never is correct



when he states that "we are not doing this for credit, but because it's right and necessary"

But far from receiving credit we are denounced and derided, accused of dollar imperialism, of conspiring to employ our loans and out-right aid to Europe as weapons in an economic and diplomatic war to impose our will upon the peoples of Europe or as a means to save our own economy which is dependent upon increased exports. ~~to~~ They are doing us a great harm by taking our dollars and our goods.

- Every surveyor of the situation knows that "Americanophobia" is wide spread on the Continent of Europe and in S.B.

- Especially in S.B. which received 31 billions in lend-lease from U.S. during the war, a loan of 33 1/4 billions 18 mos ago, and is now asking for additional huge gifts thru the Marshall Plan.

- Mrs. Beveridge - the old Knoxville - a revised of lend-lease - to maintain the B. economy and the B. Empire indefinitely.

(a) Bitterness <sup>many transposed editions</sup> "World Press News" the B. newspaper  
Trade magazine - Sept. 18  
~~a letter~~



(b) An equally bitter reply - "Chicago Daily Tribune" (Just)<sup>13</sup>

(c) <sup>It is however clear that</sup> Both the left and right paper press <sup>& a centrist</sup> seem to agree on one thing: that America must not attach any pol. or econ. conditions to what-  
ever assistance she may extend to S. B. or any other country.

3/ Unfortunately this is <sup>exactly</sup> what we have been drifting into - ~~and~~ the whole ~~purpose~~ purpose of our present and contemplated aid to Europe has been advertised as directed towards saving Europe from Communism. Those who are loudest in their advocacy of instant and broader aid to Europe do so on the ground of saving this country & that country from Communism not on the ground of humanity, of helping all hungry people everywhere, and of restoring the economy, esp. those countries which suffered most from Nazi oppression.

(a) Am. relief has been linked up with an Anti-Communist Crusade! - This will do - put the Relief program, and will help <sup>the spread of</sup> Communism.

(b) Europe cannot be restored econ. if it



as a house divided against itself - Agricultural (4)

East Europe failing to cooperate with industry. W. Europ.

- Unfortunately, and unintentionally the Marshall Plan,  
coming in the W. 16 - disastrous Truman doctrine

challenge to Soviet - on heel of an intervention

Greece, Turkey - loans to Monarchist Reactionary

helped to divide Europe still further -  $\frac{1}{2}$  parts

Truman Doctrine preserved agri <sup>attempts</sup> emphasizing Amer. foreign  
policy shifted from cooperation  
to dependence <sup>in which reconstruction to</sup>  
world ag. <sup>econ. warfare against Russia and</sup> Communism

- you cannot expect cooperation -

- or endowed - if refuse to cooperate on anything

- or organize Eas - Revolution Communist

(a) had enough money in U.S. - to restore - values  
Europe is a unit - Econ. interdependent

(b) spent enough money in U.S. to keep countries -  
Communist -

& 1 And it is no enervable role - to pull out

France or Italy - may develop into Int. Relations



on the plan of saving their country from Communism.  
(a) This way had <sup>us</sup> is ~~it~~ we get deeper + deeper, with  
an Anti-Communist crusade in Europe, to save  
the econ. + ~~help long with~~ the military, which ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~Germany~~  
as a bulwark against Communism - thus taking  
over the role of Hitler in Europe - as we are even  
now <sup>unwillingly</sup> ~~preaching~~ his propaganda -

4/ (A) Already we have the propaganda that  
the key to the salvation of Europe is the econ.  
rehabilitation of Germany - and that priority must  
be given to the restoration of Germany over the victims.

(B) Unrepresentative Nazis - <sup>has been true</sup> - no change  
4/ No one has the complete answer - How to improve  
the relations bet. U.S. + Soviet Union? <sup>There is no easy  
example to guide one  
in getting along with the  
Soviet Union.</sup>

(C) There are those who hate Soviet Union - <sup>with</sup>  
in war - Stock-piles of atomic bombs.  
There are criminals and ~~war criminals~~ <sup>war-changers</sup>

(D) Inevitable ideologies - war, cold or hot  
war is inevitable - death hdp against  
- Compare it with Nazism - vision with Jews

(a) James F. Byrnes - former Secy, State -



when book "Shaking hands" has just appeared - stated<sup>16</sup>  
the other day - (Josh) -

(b) "Mission to Moscow" - Joseph E. Davies  
U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union 1931-8.

Quote p. 486

(c) A new rapprochement - direct but over  
Gant. & Stalin.

The Truman doctrine should be allowed to  
evaporate.

The unilateral Embargo should be abandoned.

The little fellows who have done their snaffery  
and monkey <sup>stuff</sup> should be by-passed.

A fresh approach should be made - even  
before the Congress is asked to approve  
the Marshall plan, which under present  
circumstances will not accomplish what  
it hope to - help Big 4 Council <sup>Foreign Ministers meeting London Nov. 25</sup> to 8 by the M. Ps  
Stalin - recent declaration, should not



be disregarded <sup>(Just)</sup> - States may have been justly, <sup>(b)</sup>  
 reversing himself <sup>- consistent</sup> in the past. So have we -  
 Read abt. our arguments at Jalta. - = 200 =

But, Mr. Brown point out — "There is greater

Opportunity to settle disagreements with States than with  
Mexico. I have found States farth w/ it. On several  
occasions I made agreements with him when I could  
not with Mexico - & it is always best to talk to the  
man with the power to decide.

(d) Pres. Roosevelt, on April 12, an hour before he died,  
replying to the Prison Minister's request for advice about  
his speech to Congress, sent this message:

"I would warning the general Soviet further as much  
as possible because these problems, in one form or another,  
seem to arise every day and must therefore heighten  
out as in the case of the Bern meeting" - referring  
to the incident of the proposed trade by  
~~to meet with Allied forces in Germany~~  
German Army in Italy. Russians felt that it  
would be invited to take part in discussion -

5) Russian can & do cooperate - when not made perfect

① 5 Treaties ② Iran ③ U.S. Trusteeship ④ VN.



6/ They have faults - on - misperis - Too vulgar -  
Veto - Propaganda - at home unrestrained, misleading

7/ Amer should work thru UN - That's the bridge -  
Marshall plan should have been channeled thru UN

8/ Whatever assistance to Europe should be given  
① without disturbance as to govts - human need -  
- contribution to recovery of Europe -  
② After survey of our capacity - our  
resources are not inexhaustible -  
- And one nation should not carry the load  
③ - Played for ~~Santa Claus~~ ~~St. Nick~~ ③ Fool people at home  
land - lease

9/ UN - on world may take a long time  
for welding

But split into 2 hostile spheres - disorderly  
~~There is a bad superstition in the air~~

10/ U.S. & Russia ( into human & material "49%")  
America is strong



# Stalin Tells Britons He Shuns War, Bids Us 'Regain Reason' for Peace

By The Associated Press.

WARSAW, Oct. 17—Eight Labor members of the British Parliament declared tonight that Premier Stalin had told them in Russia that he had no thought of making war and wished to settle political and economic issues with the United States.

The Britons, headed by Konni Zilliacus, said that the Soviet leader had added that if the United States and Britain did not wish to settle differences, "we shall wait until they regain their reason."

Mr. Zilliacus said that he and the other Britons, who were visiting Moscow to study Russian trade unions and factories, had been flown in a special plane to Premier Stalin's villa at Sochi, on the Black Sea. The Premier voiced a desire to reach an understanding between the East and West and to dissipate fears of a new conflict, Mr. Zilliacus declared.

The group quoted their host as

having said in a two-hour interview:

"We want as close trade relations with Great Britain as possible. We are interested in the development of trade relations between our two countries.

"The sooner the two states agree, the better for good partners in common work.

"Just as the Soviet Union has always stood for improvement of political and economic relations with all countries, so it now stands for such improvement, beginning with the United States and Great Britain.

"If these countries wish to improve relations with the Soviet Union they will be welcomed. We shall be prepared to go forward to meet them irrespective of what the economic set-up may be in those countries.

"Cooperation between countries

Continued on Page 4, Column 2



# Chicago Daily Tribune

THE WORLD'S GREATEST NEWSPAPER

FOUNDED JUNE 10, 1847

10

SATURDAY, OCT. 18, 1947

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER MAY 14, 1903.  
AT THE POSTOFFICE AT CHICAGO, ILL., UNDER  
ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

All unsolicited articles, manuscripts, letters, and pictures sent to The Tribune are sent at the owner's risk, and The Tribune company expressly repudiates any liability or responsibility for their safe custody or return.

## THE BRITISH WAY OF WOOLING DOLLARS

The attitude of Russia toward the United States since the end of the war is often said to entitle the soviet union to be designated as the worst ingrate of all times. But before Russia's record as the most outrageous ingratitude of all time can be conceded, Britain's treatment of the United States merits careful consideration.

The unfriendly position reflected in the editorials in London newspapers is sufficiently summarized in an editorial in the Sept. 18 issue of the World Press News, the British newspaper trade magazine. The following is a paragraph from that editorial:

"America is dollar greedy, and, under her Constitution and present political setup, can't behave in any other way than she does, which is to seek the hardest possible bargain. She is what she is today because she was protected for a hundred years up to 1914 by the British navy. She profited in the first World war by being 'too proud to fight'—but not too proud to sell munitions. She profited in the second—as 'the arsenal of democracy,' after British money built her main factories and we took the risk of firm, long term contracts. It took Pearl Harbor to make her fight. She abruptly broke her bond over lend-lease, and since has frankly aimed to shatter imperial preference and burst open empire markets for herself to exploit in hoped for one way traffic. Her film industry in 1942 rushed from this country £17,000,000 sterling—we at any rate shed no tears today for Hollywood. Her press today carries some responsibility for the present Indian situation, and their hands are not clean over Palestine."

It would be difficult to state more and bigger lies in so small a compass. During the war the American people supported Britain with supplies for which we were never paid and probably never will be. We turned them over to a country that had welched on a debt growing out of the last war, and refused to discuss a renewal of payments after stopping them. Thus we undermined the economy of the United States and saddled ourselves with billions of debt in two British wars, which were none of our concern, and which we won only in the sense that we defeated Britain's enemy.

In the course of the last war we had constantly to be on the watch against British cheating, in going after our foreign trade in South America while we were giving single minded attention to fighting in Europe. They were not above selling to former customers of American firms goods obtained from the United States under lend-lease. We stopped that finally. After the war we gave a 3¼ billion dollar loan and made as a condition that we would negotiate for the ending of imperial preference, the name given to the conspiracy against American goods plotted by Britain in 1931.

Every school boy who sees something besides the National Education association propaganda knows that the British navy did not protect our coast line. The only time we were in a tight place was in the Civil war, and then the British built ships to prey upon our commerce, for which they later were obliged to pay millions of dollars. Britain was the power most persistent in making enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine difficult.

Whether Russian ingratitude is greater than Britain's is a question which might well be considered by some of those New York learned societies whose membership includes both commies and anglophiles. This we'll say at least for the Russians: That they don't expect their insults and lies to get them any more gifts or loans. On the other hand, the British are convinced that that is the way to get the money. They know by experience that the worse things said about America, the easier it is to get dollars from those in power at Washington and New York who are unlimited in their admiration for the English ruling class and British imperialism.



...forthright. On several occasions I made agreements with him when I could not with Molotov. Furthermore, Stalin has the power to make decisions. It is always best to talk to the man with the power to decide.

### **Sees Room for Both**

“There is room in the world for the ideologies of Russia and the United States just as there is room for the people of the Soviet and the United States. The U. N. is our best—if not our only—hope for reconciling differences that exist between us.

✓ “The story that I tell (in his book) of the agreement on the five treaties at the meeting in New York last December is a good example

# **N**



# STALIN PROFESSES PEACEFUL INTENT

Continued From Page 1

having different economic systems is possible. That already has been proved by experience.

"If, however, they do not want to improve their relations with the Soviet Union, we shall have to do without them. We shall nevertheless be able to carry on.

"We will wait until they regain their reason and understand cooperation between nations is necessary. We can wait. We are a patient people."

Mr. Zilliacus declined to say

B  
C

Li

T  
gau  
Sov  
crea  
mur  
com  
the  
Min  
In  
of  
post



□

---

# Byrnes Peace Plan: 'Firmness With Patience'

of firmness and patience bringing about agreement. No matter how positive the Soviets were on many of these questions, they did not find it difficult to change and agree on Iran, the commission of Greece and our trusteeship situation in the Pacific."

"Do we have any evidence that Russia considers present relations with us any more than

Along

B  
I  
C