

position that the actual selection of ministers was his sole prerogative. Moreover, he was unwilling, as he said bluntly in a broadcast to the French people, "to confide to them [the Communists] any of the levers that command foreign policy: the diplomacy that expresses it, the army that sustains it, and the police that protect it." To do so, he suggested, would be to orient French policy toward Russia and defeat his aim of maintaining a position of equilibrium between the East and the West. Outraged as the French Communists are at what they regard as a reflection on their patriotism, they can hardly deny that, on foreign policy at least, their line is determined in Moscow. Thus the French crisis illustrates once again the difficulty of political combinations involving a party with external allegiances.

✕

AS WE WRITE NO WAY OF BREAKING THE deadlock appears in sight. With the balance of political forces as they are in France, it would be difficult to organize a government which excluded the Communists. The Socialists and the Mouvement Republicain Populaire together command a bare majority in the Assembly, and the former, moreover, are anxious not to drive the Communists into opposition, where, free of administrative responsibility, they would be able to devote all their energies to tightening their grip on the French working classes. But a Socialist-Communist coalition would also function uneasily. On domestic issues the two parties are in broad agreement, but they differ on foreign policies, and as rivals for the leadership of the left they are intensely suspicious of each other. Moreover, such a combination would automatically exclude De Gaulle, and a government without the General, certainly the most popular figure in France, is unthinkable. As we went to press the Assembly, against Communist opposition, asked De Gaulle to renew his efforts to form a government giving "equal representation to the three parties." This move might be considered either as support for the General's position or as a hint to meet Communist demands. It seems hardly likely to end the crisis.

✕

THE HYPOCRISY OF AMERICA'S CHINA POLICY has never been more clearly revealed than in the recent series of official statements designed to defend our intervention in that country's internal struggle. Secretary Patterson, for example, asserted that there was "no danger of our troops becoming involved in civil war in China," but added that the areas seized by American troops would be turned over to Chungking forces and that if the Chinese Communists resisted, the Americans would "react with vigor and success." He defended the dispatch of American marines to key points in North China on the ground that they were needed to disarm the Japanese, but Ambassador Hurley contradicted this a day later by admitting that the Americans were sent to prevent the Japanese from surrendering to the Communists. Similarly, although the American embassy in Chungking denied reports that the United States was planning to equip seventy Chungking divisions or that a \$64,000,000 loan had been granted for the purchase of American arms and ammunition, General Wedemeyer, also in Chungking, admitted that this country was prepared to arm thirty-nine divisions. An independent dispatch from Kunming states

that 35,000 tons of American ammunition, guns, and equipment had been handed over to the Kuomintang authorities under Lend-Lease, while another report told of the presentation of a large number of American planes to Chiang Kai-shek, including enough transport planes to meet all of Chungking's needs for the next five years. And as if this evidence of intervention were not sufficient, General Wedemeyer declared that the possibility of increased military aid for the Kuomintang was being discussed at a higher level, presumably in Washington.

✕

MEANWHILE, THE FUTILITY OF OUR COURSE in China is daily becoming more apparent. The Chungking forces are not going to be able to take North China and Manchuria from the guerrilla armies unless American troops help do the fighting. Such action would not only be indefensible; it would be dangerously provocative. One can imagine the sort of reaction it would provoke in Moscow. Although Russia has maintained strict neutrality toward the Kuomintang-Communist struggle, it would be wrong to confuse neutrality with indifference, particularly where Manchuria is concerned. The Sino-Soviet pact showed that Stalin was ready to meet the United States halfway in an effort to bring about stability in China. But Ambassador Hurley's policies have destroyed the basis of that understanding, imposing upon this country the necessity of finding a new way out. Withdrawal of foreign troops, both American and Russian, and the termination of arms shipments to China are essential first steps toward establishing a new internal balance in China and preventing the civil war from becoming an international test of power.

✕

THE RISE OF NEW NATIONALIST LEADERS IN Indonesia has had the good effect of bringing into sharper focus the issue of independence versus imperialism. Leadership has passed to those who either refused to work with the Japanese or worked actively against them, eliminating the false issue of collaborationism. That issue was false, because, unlike collaborators in Europe or the Philippines, Soekarno and many of his followers who worked with the Japanese did so as part of the struggle for national independence. During the war, the Dutch themselves recognized this, refusing to denounce Soekarno as a Quisling even when it was suggested by American political-warfare specialists. Perhaps Soekarno's main fault has been his failure to recognize fully the need of disciplined popular forces as the foundation for a successful independence movement. The new leadership is made up of level-headed, young Socialist militants. Premier Sutan Sjahrir is a Holland-educated lawyer who became a labor leader at the age of twenty-three and was exiled soon afterward to the notorious Tanah Merah concentration camp in New Guinea. During the war he refused to take any office under the Japanese and since the war's end has led the fight against the opportunistic wing of the Indonesian Socialist group. The Minister of Internal Security, Amir Sjarifuddin, who has the difficult but essential task of imposing discipline upon the Japanese-incited racialist nationalists, was a leader in the wartime anti-Japanese

underground. Imprisoned, tortured, and condemned to death for his activities, he was saved only by the ending of the war. These new leaders are clearly anxious to negotiate an agreement ending the present bloodshed. But they are not prepared to abandon their demand for independence in exchange for the Dutch offer of "home rule," which they suspect, with reason, to be merely the old imperialism in a new package.

✱

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS HAS AT last ruled upon the hysterical act of Congress which banned three individuals, by name, from employment in the federal government. President Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, Attorney General Biddle, and others, *The Nation* among them, called this act unconstitutional and odious when it was adopted two years ago; their judgment has now been vindicated by the court. The valuable services of the three individuals—Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin B. Watson, and William E. Dodd—have, of course, long since been lost to the government; and the men themselves were forced to endure, in war time, an unwarranted reflection upon their loyalty. They deserve amends from the legislative body which inflicted so grave an injustice. They were proscribed by Congress for nothing more than the exercise of a constitutional right, the expression of opinion. Accused by the Dies committee, they were convicted without trial. Thus the action of Congress partook of all the essential characteristics of a bill of attainder. And worst of all, perhaps, it entailed a gross usurpation of executive authority. We hope that Congress will appeal the decision to the Supreme Court—so that it can receive a definitive confirmation of the rebuke administered by the Court of Claims.

✱

OUT IN LOS ANGELES, WHERE NEW COMMITTEES to support good causes spring into existence every day, the National Committee for Radio Freedom has been formed, with former Congressman Thomas Ford as chairman. Support for the legislation introduced by Congressman Celler will be the committee's major project. Sorely needed at the present time, this legislation would stiffen FCC requirements for license renewals, insure sustaining public-service programs at good listening hours, place broadcasting companies on a public-service basis, and guarantee the right of any legitimate sponsor to buy time on the air. It is high time that opinion was organized in support of radio freedom. Not only is the proposed legislation needed immediately, but such a committee can perform an invaluable function by keeping public attention focused on the work of the FCC, some of whose recent decisions have been extremely disturbing. The new committee was not born in Los Angeles by mere chance or as a by-product of the evangelical climate of Southern California. It first developed as the Emergency Committee on KFI, to protest the decision of Earl C. Anthony, owner of Station KFI, to take local commentators off the air. Certain of these commentators, such as John B. Hughes, had large radio audiences on the Coast and were universally respected for their integrity and candor. Southern California wants them back on the air; and it wants them on Station KFI. The need for organized public action was further emphasized in Los Angeles recently when Messrs. Jack and

Harry Warner, smarting from their recent defeat by the Conference of Studio Unions, began to interfere with the broadcasts of Sam Balter, still another popular commentator.

✱

WASHINGTON CROSSED THE DELAWARE NEAR Trenton, New Jersey, as every D. A. R. knows. Last week in the same locality United States District Judge Philip Forman crossed the D. A. R. He calmly informed the chairman of the Americanization committee of the local chapter that "the action of the national body of the D. A. R. in restricting the use of its hall in the capital at Washington against Negroes was the kind of policy that could not be reconciled with the doctrines of American citizenship" and suggested that "unless the chapters desiring to participate in [naturalization] proceedings would repudiate the action of their national body their introduction would be embarrassing to the new citizens, the court, and the D. A. R. itself." The logic of Judge Forman's remarks seems to us irresistible. As for his statement that new citizens may be embarrassed by the D. A. R.—instead of vice versa—it deserves to be illustrated by Helen Hokinson.

✱

BERNARDO SAENZ, A SPANISH REPUBLICAN soldier, can no longer patch together the rags he has been wearing since he escaped into France after the civil war. Pablo Martinez, who lost his left arm in the fight against fascism in Spain, has recently returned to France from the Nazi death camp at Mathausen and faces the coming winter without an overcoat. These men are typical of the 150,000 Spanish Republican refugees in France who have known little but privation and war since 1936. Their physical condition is far below normal. And the winter of 1945-46 will be harder on them than on most other people in Europe: for the official relief agencies, set up to help the citizens of ravaged countries, can do nothing for these nationless men, women, and children. The Spanish Refugee Appeal, in an effort to save as many of them as possible, is conducting a clothing campaign to extend through December. The Unitarian Service Committee will handle the distribution in France. Clothing should be sent to the Spanish Refugee Appeal Warehouse, 715 Second Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

A United Defense Policy

THE chief reaction of ordinary citizens to the current brawling over unification of the armed services is likely to be one of sorrow that outstanding generals and admirals should descend to such fishwifely levels in debate. We may well feel that a prime argument for unification can be discerned in this very squabbling over unification. When our military leaders differ so publicly and so virulently over a major issue of military policy, shouldn't they be unified in order to prevent their differences from hamstringing the national defense?

Manners apart, the weight of common sense and good citizenship still falls on the army's side of the dispute: that