

WSM, MARCH 10, 1946

Good Morning, Friends:

The principal topic of conversation during the week has been the speech of the Honorable Winston Churchill which he delivered at Westminster College in Missouri after having been introduced by President Truman. The reaction in Washington was divided. Some called it an unfortunate saber rattling speech, while others described it as not only a realistic speech but one of the greatest of all times.

In between these two extremes there were varying opinions but the middle ground opinion seemed to be that it was a good speech, as all Churchill's speeches are, but one which <sup>might</sup> ~~would~~ have perhaps been better ~~and~~ delivered.

Mr. Churchill's proposal of an alliance between the British Empire and the United States did not meet with majority favor. Of course, we have ties with England which, in my opinion, are stronger than any commitment we might make on paper. I speak of ties of kinship, kindred language, kindred heritage, similar institutions, kinship by blood. England is our Mother Country and, though we grew very rapidly and large and became so unruly that we renounced her rule, the fundamentals of friendship and mutual concern are still there. Whenever England has been threatened in the past, <sup>It is so far the future.</sup> The United States could be depended upon to give her aid. This is the tie of which I speak, a tie of blood and language and mutual interests. It does not have to be put on paper. Perhaps if we tried to write it down and seal it in stated obligations, we would but weaken it.



Mr. Churchill suggested that the mutual defense agreement existing between Canada and the United States be extended to include Great Britain. If Mr. Churchill had advocated a mutual defense pact with England <sup>alone</sup> ~~and the United States~~ or even with the British Dominions ~~and the United States~~, it would have met with more favor than <sup>it did with</sup> the inclusion of the British Empire. <sup>It</sup> ~~There~~ is not within the Dominions, <sup>such as</sup> ~~such as~~ — Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa — that controversies <sup>exist.</sup> ~~arise.~~ It is rather in the British areas not having dominion status such as India, the Near East and the Mediterranean that the most troublesome questions arise. Indeed, it is in these non-dominion spheres of interest where the British Empire comes into <sup>contact</sup> ~~conflict~~ with what Mr. Churchill describes as the indefinite expansion of the Russian Empire. <sup>in these areas,</sup> ~~Also,~~ it would be the British, not the United States, who would take the initiative in not only <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>solving</sup> ~~solution~~ but in the creation of problems. ~~in these~~ <sup>areas.</sup> In this way, the power of the United States would operate, not as a prime force in its own right, but as a reserve strength of the British Empire. > I say these things not because of any bias against Great Britain. Quite to the contrary, I feel very friendly toward the British Empire.

I recognize <sup>+ acknowledge</sup> that over the last several centuries she has done more to bring civilization and light to the world than any other power. But she has not been perfect and I do not think we should <sup>be</sup> ~~cast~~ in the light of buttressing with our own very great power Great Britain's own brand of imperialism and domination of subjected peoples.

Now, as to Mr. Churchill's strong words about Russia, there are at least two and perhaps more ways of looking at it. One, is that we may as well be realistic and state the blunt truth as we see it, calling a spade, a spade. Another viewpoint is that it is well and good to recognize the situation for what it is



but that it is not always wise to say everything one thinks.

I do not believe there is any man in public life in Washington <sup>Today</sup> who does not deplore the turn of world events since V-J Day. Perhaps there is not one, no, not one, who does not feel apprehensive over the drift, over the differing interests and developing points of controversy between the United States and Russia. As for me, I feel <sup>just that way,</sup> ~~all those things~~ but I deplore, also, public prattling of another war. Talk of war between nations is an insidious thing. It gives rise to suspicion, distrust and hate. This leads to actions of retaliation, revenge and finally to an armament race. It is upon these elements that the hysterical germs of war breed.

America <sup>the</sup> has taken the leadership in creation of the United Nations Organization. I believed then and I believe now that <sup>this</sup> ~~it~~ was a great stride toward establishment of peace. ~~by it~~ But the United Nations Organization will not work and can not work unless we, the preeminent power of the world, place some faith in it and some dependence upon it, <sup>by casting our ~~own~~ great weight into this great coop. effort.</sup> If a nation has erred, as I believe Russia has erred, in the expansion of her power and sphere of political domination, <sup>then</sup> let that nation be called to task in the councils of the United Nations <sup>thereby giving</sup> ~~and give~~ the democratic processes of that Organization a chance to operate. We might be surprised at the results.

I sometimes think that if we would talk about the vast areas of agreement between nations now and then instead of talking all the time and reading headlines only about the points of controversy, the interest of peace would be better served.

Well, Here in Washington housing, for the second week, was the leading political controversy. There was a sharpe division of thought. On one side were those who said that the best solution to the problem was to raise prices of building materials. They said that this would bring out more production and <sup>more</sup>



side  
people could build houses. On the other ~~sides~~ were those who said that to continue  
to raise prices wouldn't help the people who needed help most, particularly the  
veterans who have had no chance to earn big money during the war, because the ~~price~~ <sup>cost</sup>  
of building <sup>a house is</sup> ~~was~~ already beyond the reach of many of them and to raise prices  
still farther would put it even farther beyond their reach.

This latter group advocated production incentive payments to the small building  
material operators in order to bring them into production and also to bring into the  
building field some of the newer elements like aluminum, plastics and other war  
time developments. Well, after eight days of fighting, the longest debate on any  
bill in the House of Representatives in the eight years I have been here, the  
first group won out. This group was composed of practically all the Republicans  
and some of the Democrats from the South. This coalition which has been in  
the majority on many other questions again bore the flag of triumph.

Well, the ~~question~~ government's food sharing program is getting underway.

The President, the Secretary of Agriculture and Former President Hoover have  
given it their moral support and a convention of the Protestant churches of

America endorsed the program and called upon the people to cooperate.

quote Letter to Dr. Johnson  
L. Will March 7, 1946 - Filed  
Miss



# STATE OF THE NATION

By ROSCOE DRUMMOND

Chief of the Washington Bureau of The Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON

What, this country needs, ~~but~~ <sup>often have thought</sup> is less public speaking and more private thinking. This is doubly evident about Russo-American relations.

At the present time Russo-American relations are in one of their periods of conflict and controversy, and the outlook here is for a spate of rough words, mutual name calling, and despondent suspicion until both sides decide to stop talking uselessly and start doing something usefully.

There are plenty of matters outstanding between Washington and Moscow over which official opinion and private opinion understandingly can become aroused and agitated. ~~These dissents and doubts and sore points include:~~

The part which Soviet espionage—a vice in which nearly every country has indulged at one time or another—has played recently in seeking to acquire atomic and other military secrets in the United States and Canada is a sore

<sup>spot</sup> ~~Here~~ The repeated delays by which Russia has postponed and postponed again the withdrawal of its troops from Manchuria and the restoration of Manchuria to Chinese sovereignty despite the Yalta undertaking to this end ~~are~~ <sup>are still</sup> the last unfulfilled deadline.

<sup>Russia's</sup> ~~Here~~ The unresolved dispute between Russia and Iran and the imminent test of Soviet intentions, which comes March 2—the date when Generalissimo Joseph Stalin agreed to withdraw his troops from that country ~~on March 2.~~

There is also Stalin's election speech, which read to many Americans like a warning of a Russo-American armaments race, and there are other issues concerning the extension of Soviet influence in the Near East and in the Mediterranean which complicate

collaboration between Moscow and London.

The central fact is that the United States and the Soviet Union are each profoundly uneasy about the intentions of the other. And if anyone wonders why Russia is uneasy, it shouldn't be difficult to put oneself in Russia's position and wonder how we would feel if Soviet natural scientists had discovered and developed the atomic bomb, if Soviet management had put three years and the equivalent of \$1,000,000,000 into atomic industrial equipment and know-how, if Soviet industry were continuing to turn out bigger and better atomic bombs described as many times more powerful than those which administered the finishing blows to Japan.

This reversed comparison is not offered to justify at all the things which fear and suspicion drive Russia to do. It is offered to suggest some understanding of what moves and motivates a great nation which nearly saw defeat in World War II.

A few weeks ago when Stalin and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower stood together atop Lenin's tomb in Moscow, reviewing units of the victorious Soviet Army as it marched across spacious Red Square,



Associated Press from United States Army 12th Air Force; By a Staff Photographer  
Stalin Said to Eisenhower—

Stalin is reported to have said in substance to the American Chief of Staff: I know you Americans are a peaceful people; you are too peace loving; that is, you let yourselves become weak when war has passed. America should keep strong.

A war-minded Stalin could hardly look with favor upon a strong America, and whereas Russia could hardly welcome America's becoming an atomic colossus, there may, in Stalin's frank statement to General Eisenhower, be reason to believe that the Soviet Union is by no means looking for an armaments race with the United States.

If an armaments race is to be avoided, though, less talk and more useful action will be needed to avert it.

There is immediate action which can be taken—immediate action which will provide both a test and a proof that the United States and Russia each is ready to bridge the differences and dissolve the suspicions between them.

Obviously, the atomic bomb is the major irritant, the procuring cause of Russo-American tension. Then why not begin the work of the United Nations Atomic Control Commission now; not tomorrow or next week or next month? Last Jan. 24 the United Nations Assembly proclaimed that such a commission—to exchange scientific information, to control atomic energy, to prevent an atomic armaments race, and to safeguard atomic regulations—"is hereby established."

It is not established, however. Its members haven't been appointed. A first meeting hasn't been called. Its work hasn't begun.

Why not less talk on both sides—and more action on both sides? Russo-American differences can be met only when they are faced.

JAN 29 45 TW R -46-47  
HON ALBERT GORE  
USE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
REP WASHINGTON  
D C