THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE AND ITS VIEWS ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY FROM SEPTEMBER 3, 1945 (V-J DAY) TO JUNE 1, 1948

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

Winifred B. Brouwer

1948

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE AND
ITS VIEWS ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY
FROM SEPTEMBER 3, 1945 (V-J DAY)
TO JUNE 1, 1948

presented by

Winifred B. Brouwer

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in History and Political Science

John D. Harrison
Major professor

Date December 10, 1948

M-795

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE AND ITS VIEWS ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY FROM SEPTEMBER 3, 1945 (V-J DAY) TO JUNE 1, 1948

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE AND ITS VIEWS ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY FROM SEPTEMBER 3, 1945 (V-J DAY) TO JUNE 1, 1948

By

Winifred B. Brouwer

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan
State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of History and Political Science

1948

1/20/49
g

Acknowledgment

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Marshall Mason Knappen for his stimulating guidance in the writing of this essay and also to Dr. John B. Harrison and Dr. Walter Ray Fee for their kind and helpful suggestions.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Isolationist Tradition of the Chicago Tribune

B. Purpose and Divisions of Thesis

II. PREDOMINATING GENERAL ATTITUDES OF THE TRIBUNE

A. Antipathy to "Colonialism"

B. Opposition to "Imperialism"

C. Fear of an Entrenched Military Caste

D. Fanatical Opposition to the New Deal

E. Xenophobia

F. Opposition to the Eastern Seaboard and Glorification of the Middle West

G. Isolationism, National Self-Interest or America-First

III. THE TRIBUNE AND A BRIEF STATEMENT OF ITS RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS

A. Great Britain

B. Continental Europe

C. Russia

D. The Far East

IV. CONCLUSION: EVALUATION OF THE TRIBUNE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Colonel Robert R. McCormick as publisher of the Chicago Tribune, which celebrated its centennial in 1947, "carefully nurtures the thesis that 'the world's greatest newspaper' has been eternally right in all things from Grandfather Medill's day down to McCormick's."[1] A book entitled An American Dynasty by John Tebbel, published in 1947, gives the story of Joseph Medill and his journalistic followers--Robert R. McCormick, the late Captain J. M. Patterson and his New York Daily News and the late Eleanor Patterson of the Washington Times-Herald.[2] Shortly before publication of Tebbel's book, the Tribune canceled an advertisement that Doubleday thought it had scheduled for the day of publication. After reading the book, one can readily see why the Tribune did not like Tebbel's description and evaluation of its history. The first publisher who contracted to issue the book canceled publication in fear of reprisals.

The Chicago Tribune itself has published several books by its historian, Philip Kinsley. One is entitled Liberty and the Press. It came out in 1944 and cham-

---

1. Newsweek, 29 (February 17, 1947), pp. 67-8.
2. John Tebbel, An American Dynasty, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1947. (Reviewed by Newsweek above cited)

pions the Tribune as a protector of liberty of the press. The Tribune has spent about three million dollars in its court fights involving the free press issue.[3] It is apparent from a study of these cases that the Tribune regards freedom of the press as license to publish anything it chooses, attacking all those who dare to oppose it as enemies of a free press. More will be said on this attitude in the concluding chapter of this paper.

A two-volume work entitled The Chicago Tribune, Its First Hundred Years, also by Philip Kinsley, was concluded in 1945. Although sponsored by the Tribune, this history does give facts as to the editorial policy of the Tribune in its early years, some of which will be cited in this introduction.

An incident recorded on the last page of Philip Kinsley's second volume, covering the period 1865-1880, provides a fitting steppingstone to our subject. The London Spectator, commenting on American prosperity, remarked that America was doing nothing for the world involving self-sacrifice but was "practicing selfishness and isolationism." To this Joseph Medill replied: "In other words because the United States is rich and

---

3. Ibid, p. 324.

powerful the Spectator would have it pause in its great work of sheltering and educating the refugee oppressed of all nations, and start out, like another Don Quixote, upon a crusade for the settlement of political questions at issue between nations, to pull down this people and build up that, to get into all sorts of entangling alliances, and to reform everything that needs it....How would the Spectator like it if we undertook to reform Britain first in her persecution of weaker peoples?"[4]

The date of that editorial in the Tribune was December 28, 1880. Colonel Robert R. McCormick was then not quite five months old.

I have in this paper attempted to describe what the foreign policy of the Chicago Tribune has been since V-J Day, September 3, 1945, with special reference to the question--Has the editorial policy of the Chicago Tribune manifested a resurgence of isolationism, or has it, swayed by the fact of the United States as the dominating world power, struck out on a new path? The answer to this question I have sought to find chiefly through a study of the editorials, the main substance of which it is my purpose to present.

The similarity between the views presented in

---

4. Philip Kinsley, The Chicago Tribune, Its First Hundred Years, Vol. II, 1865-1880. Chicago: The Chicago Tribune, 1945, p. 349.

Joseph Medill's editorial of 1880 quoted above and the line of thought traditionally followed in McCormick's editorials is striking. In a letter sent to Colonel McCormick, I inquired whether the Colonel thought that the United States should follow the principle of "isolationism" or whether "national self-interest" would be a better description of his viewpoint on the role America should play in foreign affairs. A question was also asked regarding the Tribune's influence in the Middle West, whether, in Colonel McCormick's opinion, the Tribune gave expression to the opinion of the Middle West or was a molder of opinion of the Middle West.

Colonel McCormick replied: "The word isolationism was manufactured in England and fed to the Anglophiles in this country.

"I think 'national self-interest' or 'America First' are both better expressions.

"I think the Tribune is both expression of the opinion of the Middle West and a molder of opinion of the Middle West."

It is difficult to divide the editorial policy of the Tribune into specific compartments. However, it will become clear that the Tribune has certain predominating general attitudes which are repeatedly ap-

Joseph Medill's editorial of 1880 quoted above and the line of thought traditionally followed in McCormick's editorials is striking. In a letter sent to Colonel McCormick, I inquired whether the Colonel thought that the United States should follow the principle of "isolationism" or whether "national self-interest" would be a better description of his viewpoint on the role America should play in foreign affairs. A question was also asked regarding the Tribune's influence in the Middle West, whether, in Colonel McCormick's opinion, the Tribune gave expression to the opinion of the Middle West or was a molder of opinion of the Middle West.

Colonel McCormick replied: "The word isolationism was manufactured in England and fed to the Anglophiles in this country.

"I think 'national self-interest' or 'America First' are both better expressions.

"I think the Tribune is both expression of the opinion of the Middle West and a molder of opinion of the Middle West."

It is difficult to divide the editorial policy of the Tribune into specific compartments. However, it will become clear that the Tribune has certain predominating general attitudes which are repeatedly ap-

Joseph Medill's editorial of 1880 quoted above and the line of thought traditionally followed in McCormick's editorials is striking. In a letter sent to Colonel McCormick, I inquired whether the Colonel thought that the United States should follow the principle of "isolationism" or whether "national self-interest" would be a better description of his viewpoint on the role America should play in foreign affairs. A question was also asked regarding the Tribune's influence in the Middle West, whether, in Colonel McCormick's opinion, the Tribune gave expression to the opinion of the Middle West or was a molder of opinion of the Middle West.

Colonel McCormick replied: "The word isolationism was manufactured in England and fed to the Anglophiles in this country.

"I think 'national self-interest' or 'America First' are both better expressions.

"I think the Tribune is both expression of the opinion of the Middle West and a molder of opinion of the Middle West."

It is difficult to divide the editorial policy of the Tribune into specific compartments. However, it will become clear that the Tribune has certain predominating general attitudes which are repeatedly ap-

parent on the editorial page, reflected in the cartoons and in the news coverage. These attitudes or "pet peeves" will be described in Chapter II. They may be designated as follows: anti-colonialism; anti-imperialism; anti-militarism; anti-New Dealism; anti-foreigners; anti-easterners and anti-internationalism. A brief treatment of the Tribune's policy toward four main geographical areas will follow. The main substance of this paper, however, is to be founnd in the chapter dealing with the Tribune's general attitudes because they inevitably color the Tribune's opinions on what American foreign policy should be in the four main geographical areas to be considered, namely, Great Britain, Continental Europe, Russia and the Far East. The above groupings are bound to overlap to a certain extent, and a discussion of all of them will be limited by the actual ground covered by the Tribune editorials themselves in the period from V-J Day to June, 1948. In presenting this material, it would seem most expedient to give criticism at the time when a point is discussed which calls for criticism, rather than reserving all evaluation for the final chapter.

CHAPTER II

PREDOMINATING GENERAL ATTITUDES OF THE TRIBUNE

A discussion of the predominating general attitudes manifested by the Chicago Tribune may be begun by reference to the Tribune's pronounced antipathy to "colonialism." On September 2, 1945, in an editorial entitled "Infamy Revived" the Tribune quotes Colonel Conrad H. Lanza whose military criticisms are printed from time to time in the Tribune. Colonel Lanza claimed that pending military arrangements in the Pacific presaged the revival and continuation of the colonial system. "As far as now known, the intention of the Big Three is to restore in the Pacific the old colonial system. The British are going back to Burma, Singapore and Hongkong; the Dutch to the Netherlands Indies; the French to Indo-China. The major change is that Russia is replacing Japan in Manchuria." The Tribune laments this revival of colonialism and goes so far as to declare: "It would be too terrible a tragedy if all these American lives should have been lost to perpetuate such infamy....The colonial system was the worst thing in the world for hundreds of years. It must be stopped for the welfare of the whole world. It bred wars. It retarded the economic progress of the

world....If the colonial powers are to have their sovereignty restored, as it seems they will be in the interest of world order, it must be with the understanding that they are to return as trustees and teachers, not landlords and slave drivers....It is the duty of the United States to insist that such policies be adopted. Without them permanent world peace is a chimera."[1]

Again on Friday, October 5, 1945, the Tribune declares, "Colonialism has gone wild. The Dutch, the English, French, Australian and New Zealand exploiters want us to help them recover what they owned."[2]

The Tribune, characteristically, does not inquire into the readiness of the natives for freedom, but it repeatedly states that "the right is on the side of the natives who want their freedom. If after their own bitter experience of subjection the French and Dutch haven't the decency to give their conquered subjects unqualified freedom, perhaps the natives can win freedom for themselves. Americans will wish them well."[3] No attempt is made to explain how the natives can achieve "unqualified freedom" and no investigation is made of internal conditions in the colonies. The final

---

1. The Tribune, "Infamy Revived", Sunday, Sept. 2, 1945, Part I, p. 4.
2. "Hirohito--Man, Mouse or Myth?", p. 14.
3. "Freedom for Colonies", Sunday, Oct. 7, 1945, Part I, p. 6.

sentence of the above quotation is a typical example of how the Tribune identifies itself with the American people. It goes without saying that the attitude of the Tribune is the attitude of "Americans" and if there are Americans who hold different views, they are not true Americans but most often "Anglophiles" or lackies of some other country or of some special interest such as "Wall Street".

As will be evident, the Tribune uses catchwords and phrases which call up certain established reactions (at least on the part of the Tribune editors). In its repetition of these catchwords, and "colonialism" is an example, the Tribune, consciously or unconsciously, assumes a propaganda technique which is not unlike that used by the showmen, past and present, of the totalitarian states.

Another typical example of a catchword which assumes a condition to exist without proof and which carries with it an established emotional pattern is the use of the word "tyranny" in an editorial entitled "Voices Against Tyranny". The view expressed by the Tribune in this editorial is commendable in that freedom-loving people everywhere should seek and find at least moral support in America. "This country should take astand not with the British, Dutch, or French, but with the Burmese, Annamites, Indonesians, Koreans, Malayans,

and the Indians asking independence."[4] The Tribune oversimplifies the problem, however, when it assumes that independence assures freedom and civil rights to the natives.

A second predominating general attitude of the Tribune is its opposition to "Imperialism", at least when it is practiced by other countries, particularly Great Britain. "We are fast losing our good name in the Pacific by giving support to the imperial nations in their efforts to reinslave the colonists."[5]

Chapter XI of the San Francisco Charter requires that in reference to territories whose peoples have not yet acquired a full measure of sovereignty, the administering states must report to the United Nations organization regularly on economic, social and educational conditions. Under this requirement our government must report on Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, despite the substantial measure of self-government which these territories enjoy. This the Tribune bitterly opposes. "Americans of international bent are willing that their fellow-citizens in Alaska and Hawaii be placed in this situation in order that the United States be committed to the global schemes which serve Britain and Russia.

---

4. Saturday, Dec. 1, 1945, p. 8.
5. "Toward a Republican Foreign Policy", Saturday, October 27, 1945, p. 6.

The United Nations organization thus begins life in an atmosphere of complete hypocrisy in which the enslaved millions are called free, and men and women who enjoy all of the liberties of the American constitution and Bill of Rights are regarded as wards who must be protected from the iniquities of the American government. The anomaly will be appreciated by those who have a certain regard for the truth."[6]

At the same time, however, that the Tribune denounces imperialism, it writes an editorial entitled "The Bases We Need".[7] The Tribune praises acquisition of nine major fleet bases in the Pacific and states we should also have Guadalcanal because of the price Americans paid there.[8] These nine include a point in the Ryukus, in the Philippines, and seven others from Kodiak in Alaska to the Admiralty Islands on the equator. The six we have in the Atlantic are inadequate, and the Tribune believes we should retain bases in Newfoundland and the Bermudas and four major bases which guard the Caribbean approaches to the Panama Canal. We should also be strongly based in Greenland and the Azores if only to make certain that these regions will not be used against us.

---

6. "Backward Peoples", Friday, Sept. 14, 1945, p. 10.
7. Friday, Sept. 14, 1945, p. 10.
8. No attempt is being made in this paper to take a stand on all aspects of American foreign policy nor even unequivocally to evaluate that desired by the Tribune, but it would seem proper to point out inconsistencies in Tribune policy where they occur.

The United Nations organization thus begins life in an atmosphere of complete hypocrisy in which the enslaved millions are called free, and men and women who enjoy all of the liberties of the American Constitution and Bill of Rights are regarded as wards who must be protected from the iniquities of the American government. The anomaly will be appreciated by those who have a certain regard for the truth."[6]

At the same time, however, that the Tribune denounces imperialism, it writes an editorial entitled "The Bases We Need".[7] The Tribune praises acquisition of nine major fleet bases in the Pacific and states we should also have Guadalcanal because of the price Americans paid there.[8] These nine include a point in the Ryukus, in the Philippines, and seven others from Kodiak in Alaska to the Admiralty Islands on the equator. The six we have in the Atlantic are inadequate, and the Tribune believes we should retain bases in Newfoundland and the Bermudas and four major bases which guard the Caribbean approaches to the Panama Canal. We should also be strongly based in Greenland and the Azores if only to make certain that these regions will not be used against us.

---

6. "Backward Peoples", Friday, Sept. 14, 1945, p. 10.
7. Friday, Sept. 14, 1945, p. 10.
8. No attempt is being made in this paper to take a stand on all aspects of American foreign policy nor even unequivocally to evaluate that desired by the Tribune, but it would seem proper to point out inconsistencies in Tribune policy where they occur.

The United Nations organization thus begins life in an atmosphere of complete hypocrisy in which the enslaved millions are called free, and men and women who enjoy all of the liberties of the American constitution and Bill of Rights are regarded as wards who must be protected from the iniquities of the American government. The anomaly will be appreciated by those who have a certain regard for the truth."[6]

At the same time, however, that the Tribune denounces imperialism, it writes an editorial entitled "The Bases We Need".[7] The Tribune praises acquisition of nine major fleet bases in the Pacific and states we should also have Guadalcanal because of the price Americans paid there.[8] These nine include a point in the Ryukus, in the Philippines, and seven others from Kodiak in Alaska to the Admiralty Islands on the equator. The six we have in the Atlantic are inadequate, and the Tribune believes we should retain bases in Newfoundland and the Bermudas and four major bases which guard the Caribbean approaches to the Panama Canal. We should also be strongly based in Greenland and the Azores if only to make certain that these regions will not be used against us.

---

6. "Backward Peoples", Friday, Sept. 14, 1945, p. 10.
7. Friday, Sept. 14, 1945, p. 10.
8. No attempt is being made in this paper to take a stand on all aspects of American foreign policy nor even unequivocally to evaluate that desired by the Tribune, but it would seem proper to point out inconsistencies in Tribune policy where they occur.

It is thus apparent, and the Tribune admits this, that the defense of America should not be limited to the geographical boundaries of the United States and its possessions. Any inconsistency in its program, however, the Tribune does not recognize. Yet in a later editorial it accuses President Truman of an inconsistency similar to its own unrecognized one:

> The whole program seems hopeless. Mr. Truman's speech on foreign policy made it no better. He said we have no imperial ambitions but here comes Rhys Davies of the British Labor Party telling us the United States is today building up an empire faster than the British ever did. "Your armed forces," he says, "are in many, many parts of the world, which is indicative of the imperial idea." The American people don't want this empire, says Mr. Davies, but are getting it almost against their will.
>
> Mr. Davies is right when he says the American people don't want an empire and right again when he says that they are well started on the imperial way. The remedy is to get our soldiers out of the places where there is no more excuse for their presence. We should make peace with Italy and get out. It is almost as unfortunate that we cannot get our soldiers our of France and England. In the Pacific we aren't yet in as big a mess as the British are in Java, but only luck or weather, doubtless, will keep us out of a bigger one in China and Manchuria. We had better rely on withdrawal and not on luck.[9]

A third "pet peeve" of the Tribune is fear of an entrenched military caste. The President's suggestion after V-J Day to conscript men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five was criticized:

---

9. "This Is A Strange America," Friday, Nov. 9, 1945, p. 16.

> He says we have commitments which require the United States to maintain millions of men in arms for some time to come and he doubts that the need can be met by volunteers. He does not say what these commitments are. Common sense says they do not exist. The Germans and Japanese are patently helpless and can be kept that way, if so will it (sic), for the next few years with no more than a dozen divisions of occupation troops.
>
> In truth, the demand for huge armies of occupation can be explained but not excused. Part of the explanation is found in the desire of some people here and abroad to impose a bad peace on Europe and another bad peace on Asia....
>
> To hear Mr. Truman tell it, there is no such thing in our arsenal as the atom bomb and no such thing in the defeated countries as a revulsion against war to assure the maintenance of our victory in the next few years. He has taken a position in this matter which is as unsound as it will be unpopular with everybody except the generals who want an excuse to keep them in their present ranks. The Republicans in Congress should lose no time in driving the truth home.[10]

Nevertheless, the Tribune frequently makes the point that the country which can produce the best weapons and use them with the greatest skill has the best chance of survival. "We must make very sure that we have the most atom bombs and the best airplanes in which to deliver them. If we are so armed, we can face the new era without threat."[11]

---

10. "Mr. Truman's Gift to the Republicans," Saturday, Sept. 8, 1945, p. 6.
11. "Old Adam; New Atom," Thursday, Sept. 20, 1945, p. 12.

The Tribune opposed vigorously the idea espoused by Mr. Clark Eichelberger, "the one-worlder", who told "the delegates that the United States should give the atom bomb to the San Francisco League."[12] The Tribune supports its contention by stating that if the goal is international agreement not to use the bomb, it would be easier to get that by keeping the secret in the United States.

The Tribune attacked President Truman's 1945 Navy Day speech which called for the maintenance of a much larger peacetime military establishment than we have ever had before. Of the four reasons which President Truman gave for such an establishment, only one was acceptable to the Tribune. One reason--to enforce the peace--the Tribune derided as enforcing "the peace on our defeated enemies that are already helpless." A second--to fulfill our obligations under the San Francisco Charter--the Tribune regarded as foolish. "Because of the veto, the League's power can be used only against the little fellow." In response to a third--to protect Latin America--the Tribune asked--from whom? Only from the naval power of England. The only sensible reason according to the Tribune lay in provision for the common defense

---

12. "Giving the Bomb Away," Thursday, Oct. 4, 1945, p. 16.

of the United States, and even in reply to this the editorial contended that Russia could not attack us for several years to come.[13]

Before asking Congress to authorize peacetime conscription Mr. Truman, according to the Tribune, should have asked the other nations to abandon the institution. "If they had consented there would have been little reason for the draft here. If they had refused Mr. Truman's case for conscription would have been strengthened greatly."[14] The Tribune stated an alternative here which assumes a far more simple state of world affairs than actually exists.

Over three years since V-J Day the problem of defense still had not been settled. The Tribune still denounced conscription as "involuntary servitude" and argued that when conscription exists the ways are "greased for a lot of things equally outrageous to the country. The project seems to be to break down...the constitution through departures assertedly justified not by war but by the 'absence of peace'." We are being led toward dictatorship "by some men who are deliberately conspiring to establish a military state...."[15]

---

13. "Mr. Truman's Foreign Policy," Tuesday, Oct. 30, 1945, p. 10.
14. "An Alternative to the Draft."
15. "The Totalitarians Plan a Field Day," Thursday, May 6, 1948, p. 22.

A final quotation clearly indicates the Tribune's fear of an entrenched military. "Representative Twyman's remarks in the house the other day on the enormous influence of the military in the federal administration deserve wide attention. Anyone who will take the trouble as he did to assemble a list of high-ranking office-holders who are also high-ranking military men cannot fail to be impressed with the danger to the Republic in this militarization of its federal government."[16]

A fourth major attitude of the Chicago Tribune which colors all of its editorials is its fanatical oppo sition to the New Deal, its domestic policy and its foreign policy, as carried on by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his democratic predecessors and his followers. We are particularly interested in this foreign policy as it affects aid to Europe measures--lend-lease and the Marshall Plan.

Roosevelt, according to the Tribune, originally claimed we should be repaid for lend-lease within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities. Later he "decried the petty bookkeeping minds which sought to interject the silly old dollar sign into

---

16. "Militarism in Washington," Monday, May 17, 1948, p. 18.

our relations with other nations. Still later he said that lend-lease was of great importance to post-war trade and foreign reconstruction....This was a far cry from the original package sold the American people, represented as a bundle that Britain needed to withstand Hitler."

Now "President Truman has informed Congress that the United States should not attempt to exact payment for more than 42 billion dollars in lend-lease extended to forty-seven foreign countries during the war." But the Tribune claims that victory over Germany and Japan is not enough when we consider that we "beat the Japs alone and contributed the biggest share to the downfall of Hitler." We should collect those things which have been "lent" or "leased" and which we now think we might use; and in lieu of that, we should be pressing for payment in kind. We can use a great deal of British tin, rubber, and oil. We can use Russian minerals, oil and raw materials. These nations may not have dollars, but they have commodities and we can use them.[17]

The Tribune had nothing good to say for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association.

---

17. "Recapturing Lend-Lease," Sunday, Sept. 2, 1945, Part I, p. 4.

It claimed, on the contrary, that U.N.R.R.A. was a good thing only for its administrators. It claimed U.N.R.R.A. was W.P.A. all over again.[18] Bretton Woods with its creation of an international bank and currency stabilization system also received no praise from the Tribune.

Tribune viciously attacked "New Dealers (Who) Want the Marshall Plan." It pushed its hate campaign to ridiculous extremes when it declared, "Their real purpose is not to aid Europe, but to enslave Americans by imposing again the government controls that have hampered and weakened the nation in the past."[19]

The Tribune lays the blame for almost all that it dislikes about American foreign policy at the door of the democratic party, particularly the New Deal, although Wilson comes in for his share of vituperative condemnation. American foreign affairs under the constitution are supposed to be conducted with the advice and consent of the Senate. The course followed by Roosevelt, Truman, and their proteges makes a mockery of the Constitution. The frontiers of eastern Europe were fixed at Tehran and Yalta and confirmed at Potsdam. Congress had nothing to

---

18. "U.N.R.R.A," Sunday, Oct. 7, 1945, Part I, P. 6.
19. "Why New Dealers Want the Marshall Plan," Thursday, Nov. 6, 1947, p. 16.

do with these matters.[20]

The Tribune denounced Benjamin V. Cohen's suggestion that a bipartisan foreign policy "be saddled on the country permanently." In order to ensure continuity, he has "borrowed a leaf from the British" by recommending establishment of a permanent under-secretary of state who would remain through changing administrations....The primary task now before the country is to achieve the renunciation of the New Deal as an instrument of national policy. That can only be done by the Republicans with the support of the people. It can never be done if the Republicans permit themselves to be trapped into adoption of all of the New Deal lies and codification into a permanent policy to which the nation would be held."[21]

"The Truman administration and the bipartisan boys in Congress are now talking about a military guarantee for the five-nation western European coalition alignment against the Soviet Union. A revival of lend-lease to rearm these countries and such other allies as can be mustered is also recommended."[22]

The Tribune accused the administration of get-

---

20. "Secret Diplomacy," Thursday, Oct. 18, 1945, p. 14.
21. "Renounce the Liers," Monday, May 3, 1948, p. 20.
22. "The Next Step," Tuesday, May 4, 1948, p. 14.

ting the Marshall Plan passed under false pretenses. "Now that the Marshall Plan is passed, we learn that it will not, after all, save us the necessity of spending billions on a huge air force, adopting peace-time conscription and a stop-gap draft to fill up the ranks, and resigning ourselves to wartime controls over production, materials, manpower, pricing, etc....Not only will the Marshall Plan fail to save us from these things at home, but it is now admitted that the Marshall Plan is not going to save Europe from communism."[23]

A final sweeping indictment of Roosevelt by the Tribune may be quoted to conclude this point: "Mr. Truman's diplomacy serves one useful purpose. It discloses more clearly than ever before the fact that 300,000 young Americans died at Mr. Roosevelt's behest to achieve a victory for Russia and barbarism."[24] There is no need to waste space describing the Tribune's lengthy discourses attributing the entire responsibility for Pearl Harbor directly to F.D.R.

A fifth major general attitude of the Chicago

---

23. Ibid.
24. "Mr. Truman's Self-Made Dilemmas," Sunday, May 16, 1948, Part I, p. 10.

Tribune is its antagonism toward all things "foreign." Perhaps this attitude can be summarized by the term Xenophobia. The Tribune not only suspects all foreign countries but it also attacks European snobbery and European laziness. In a speech before the Advertising Club in Washington on October 2, 1945, Mr. McCormick stated that American victory meant "that there will never again be a class of groveling snobs who will seek to be better than other Americans by admitting inferiority to foreigners." The Colonel went on to say that the only serious defeats suffered by Americans occurred because they were directed by foreign commanders. "All the distinguished admirals and generals of this war are Americans," he said.[25]

The Tribune, therefore, frowns upon aid to Europe measures. "The time is coming, if it is not here already, when the American people must ask themselves whether they will not do more good abroad by withholding aid than by giving it. Cutting off the flow of relief might pound some sense into stubborn minds."[26]

---

25. John Tebbel, op. cit., p. 247.
26. "Denmark's Surplus of Meat," Wednesday, Oct. 10, 1945, p. 14.

In the same editorial, the editor states that instead of arguing about whether China and France shall have anything to say about the Balkans, the diplomats should work on repairing the war's damage. How the damage is to be repaired is not explained. The Tribune then goes on to say, "The American people are not in a mood to deprive themselves indefinitely for the relief of a continent which won't take advantage of its own resources."[27]

The Tribune through the years of its editorial policy under question continues to ask: "What are England, Russia and the other countries going to give us in exchange for the loans they are demanding?" It justifies this claim by arguing that nearly every congressional committee that has gone abroad has returned in a state of mingled alarm and indignation over what the members saw. For example, "The Congressional Committee of seven members of the post-war economic policy committee of the House returned from their travels filled with zeal to save America and overwhelmed with evidence of the betrayal of American interests by our efforts in foreign affairs."[28]

---

27. Ibid.

28. "Congress Gets Another Report on Europe," Friday, Oct. 12, 1945, p. 18.

Something happens to these men and women once back in Washington, however. According to the Tribune, they are found voting as they are told in plain disregard of their own convictions and the convictions of their constituents. The Tribune then offers its oft-repeated explanation--the importance of social life in Washington and the social dominance of the foreign ambassadors. "They call the tune; American officialdom dances to it."[29]

The Tribune, however, wavers in its viewpoint on loans to Europe. It goes so far as to say Europe would be better off if forced to recuperate on its own power. Then it comes out with an editorial stating that "America can't force freedom on the world, but it can promote freedom here and there by appropriate use of its economic strength." Those who desire the benefits of gifts and lo ans can have them on our terms one of which would be the guarantee of a free press.[30]

In a more recent editorial, the Tribune denounces the nations which expected to receive aid under the Marshall Plan for issuing a memorandum telling our government that it must not use the plan as a lever

---

29. Ibid.
30. "Promoting Freedom," Wednesday, Oct. 17, 1945, p. 14.

and interfere in their domestic affairs. The lender has the right, responds the Tribune, to attach reasonable conditions to his loan.

> We ought to insist that the recipients of loans agree in advance to balance their budgets and to end all restrictions on the transfer of money across their frontiers. If the borrowers feel that this kind of thing is too serious an affront to their sovereign dignity to be borne, they can always decline to accept the money....The reason for the European arrogance can be found in the background of the Marshall Plan. Europe did not come to the United States petitioning for a loan. Instead, it has tried to blackmail this country into granting it. The threat has been that if the American people did not burden themselves and deny themselves in order to support the people of Europe, that continent would go communist....Now the European statesmen threaten that any conditions we attach will result in "political repercussions." This is another way of threatening that in spite of the loan, they may go communist unless this country lets them spend and waste the money as they like.... The European statesmen who are trying to dictate the terms of the loan are less interested in their own people than in perpetuating the bureaucracy of which they are members.[31] They want the United States to finance socialism in Europe, despite the apparent evidence that socialism is a failure.[32]

Although Colonel McCormick threw his support to Governor Dewey when his choice --Robert A. Taft-- lost out at the Republican nominating convention in 1948, he had not spared Dewey in 1947. "Governor

---

31. Here again the Tribune makes a sweeping indictment unsupported by evidence.
32. "Borrower's Terms," Wednesday, Nov. 5, 1947.

and interfere in their domestic affairs. The lender has the right, responds the Tribune, to attach reasonable conditions to his loan.

> We ought to insist that the recipients of loans agree in advance to balance their budgets and to end all restrictions on the transfer of money across their frontiers. If the borrowers feel that this kind of thing is too serious an affront to their sovereign dignity to be borne, they can always decline to accept the money....The reason for the European arrogance can be found in the background of the Marshall Plan. Europe did not come to the United States petitioning for a loan. Instead, it has tried to blackmail this country into granting it. The threat has been that if the American people did not burden themselves and deny themselves in order to support the people of Europe, that continent would go communist....Now the European statesmen threaten that any conditions we attach will result in "political repercussions." This is another way of threatening that in spite of the loan, they may go communist unless this country lets them spend and waste the money as they like.... The European statesmen who are trying to dictate the terms of the loan are less interested in their own people than in perpetuating the bureaucracy of which they are members.[31] They want the United States to finance socialism in Europe, despite the apparent evidence that socialism is a failure.[32]

Although Colonel McCormick threw his support to Governor Dewey when his choice --Robert A. Taft-- lost out at the Republican nominating convention in 1948, he had not spared Dewey in 1947. "Governor

---

31. Here again the Tribune makes a sweeping indictment unsupported by evidence.
32. "Borrower's Terms," Wednesday, Nov. 5, 1947.

Dewey is heart and soul for the Marshall Plan.... Mr. Dewey, thereby, endorsed the central plank in the Truman foreign policy. The 'me too' candidate of 1944 hopes to be the 'me too' candidate of 1948." Dewey differed only in that he favored paying on the installment plan. The Marshall Plan, says the Tribune, will not make Russia any less our enemy. "If the Marshall Plan is the answer to the Russian enmity today, what will be the answer when Europe has used up its funds and clamors for more?"[33]

A sixth general attitude of the Tribune is its opposition to all things eastern which is closely allied to the above point on xenophobia. As quoted from Colonel McCormick's letter in the Introduction, the Tribune claims to be an expression and a molder of middle-western opinion. In the Middle West, the great heart of the nation, "people are more firmly dedicated to the liberties of the Republic than they ever have been or will be on the European-minded east coast, with its slavish regard for the condescending and niggardly favors which are to be had from foreign aristocracy."[34] It is doubtful that

---

33. "Dewey Says 'Me Too'," Friday, Nov. 7, 1947, p. 18.
34. "The Middle West Gets a White House Nod," Friday, Sept. 7, 1945, p. 12.

Mr. McCormick could find much support for his claims regarding the Tribune and the Middle West in the voting record of Chicago. In the 1944 election Chicago voted overwhelmingly for Franklin D. Roosevelt and also voted out the isolationist congressmen, Stephen Day and Charles S. Dewey.[35] His description of the "European-minded east-coast" is also meaningless conjecture.

Regarding American activity in the United Nations, he writes, "It would be hard to find a collection of Americans less representative of America than the men and women who have served as our spokesmen at the various sessions of the United Nations....For all practical purposes, the whole lot of them think and act as if they had been born, brought up, and lived all their lives east of the Alleghanies, as most of them in fact have done."[36]

A final predominating general attitude, which, in a sense, summarizes all the preceding and all that follows in this paper, is the Tribune's isolationist attitude, its pleas for national self-interest or America -first. It sets this up against the alternative of internationalism, thus making it a

---

35. John Tebbel, op. cit., P. 249.
36. "An Eastern Monopoly," Thursday, Dec. 4, 1947, p. 24.

foregone conclusion that what is best for America does not lie in the direction of international organization.

The descriptive term, isolationist, if strictly applied, however, does not correctly describe the Tribune. The Tribune, as mentioned under the heading of imperialism, feels "we should have commercial rights to airfields we have built" on the possessions of other countries. "We should have islands in the Atlantic, Caribbean, and Pacific which are vital to our defense."[37] The Tribune voices no objection to anything it feels will make America strong, but objects to any interference in world affairs which will jeopardize its sovereignty. A typical statement which expresses the Tribune's grievance is this: "We have paid the bill all around, and now we are invited to sit at the foot of the table."[38]

Commenting on a Labor Day speech made by Admiral of the Fleet William D. Leahy, the Tribune declared that the Admiral "paid a remarkable tribute to the Middle West" which he could not have made while serving as Chief-of-Staff to the Commander-in-Chief during Roosevelt's term." " He said that

---

37. "Recapturing Lend-Lease," op. cit.
38. Ibid.

despite the successful completion of a global war in one particular we remain isolationists--in our primary devotion to the interests and welfare of America."[39] Isolationism, says the Tribune, was a smear word in the days of the New Deal. It was distorted into a term intended to rebuke millions of patriotic people in the Middle West. "The Middle West was a continual target for the smears of the eastern seaboard, abetted by the entire New Deal."[40] One wonders if the Tribune is not attempting to draw adherents to itself and to its policies by emphasizing a regional difference which does not really exist at all, and by trying to instill into the people of the Middle West an indignation against the critics of isolationism, which to the writer would seem ridiculous since there is nothing to prove that the Middle West is particularly isolationist in contrast to the rest of the country.

If the term "isolationist", in the opinion of the Tribune, was distorted, the term "internationalist" is no less distorted by the Tribune. Quotations from an editorial--"The Meaning of Quisling"--will prove this contention. "Internationalists no less

---

39. "The Middle WestGets a White House Nod," Friday, Sept. 7, 1945, p. 12.
40. Ibid.

despite the successful completion of a global war in one particular we remain isolationists--in our primary devotion to the interests and welfare of America."[39] Isolationism, says the Tribune, was a smear word in the days of the New Deal. It was distorted into a term intended to rebuke millions of patriotic people in the Middle West. "The Middle West was a continual target for the smears of the eastern seaboard, abetted by the entire New Deal."[40] One wonders if the Tribune is not attempting to draw adherents to itself and to its policies by emphasizing a regional difference which does not really exist at all, and by trying to instill into the people of the Middle West an indignation against the critics of isolationism, which to the writer would seem ridiculous since there is nothing to prove that the Middle West is particularly isolationist in contrast to the rest of the country.

If the term "isolationist", in the opinion of the Tribune, was distorted, the term "internationalist" is no less distorted by the Tribune. Quotations from an editorial--"The Meaning of Quisling"--will prove this contention. "Internationalists no less

---

39. "The Middle WestGets a White House Nod," Friday, Sept. 7, 1945, p. 12.
40. Ibid.

than nationalists revile Quisling. Here may be another evidence of confusion in the internationalist mind, for Quisling's offense in essence was against nationalism. He was guilty of depriving his countrymen of their national independence, of leading their country into an internationalist system organized under alien auspices."[41] The Tribune makes the mistake of describing the Hitler regime and also Russian communism as ventures in internationalism--efforts to overcome nationalist sentiment--whereas, actually, they are both nationalism pushed to extremes, at the expense of other nations, to be sure, but still fundamentally nationalistic, not internationalistic.

An attempt will be made to trace briefly the attitude of the Tribune from September, 1945, to June, 1948 toward American efforts to foster international cooperation and toward the United Nations Organization. It is not difficult to detect inconsistencies in the Tribune's position. The Tribune, always vigorously anti-British and opposed to British domination, bans the use of the term Big-Five, stating there are really only two--the United States and Russia. Talk of the Big-Five is an attempt to persuade the people of

---

41. Tuesday, Sept. 11, 1945, p. 12.

this country that they should transfer to and even support nations of inferior power.[42]

At the same time that the Tribune criticizes American participation in world organizations, it argues that British and Russian imperial policy are in conflict all over the world, that our only policy has been appeasement, and that the only way to achieve a stable world is to "assert our strength and quit letting both the British and the Russians use us as a cat's paw in their quarrels."[43] How the United States is to assert its strength is not explained.

The Tribune, not without reason, is pessimistic about all efforts at international cooperation, on the ground that all the participating nations are as selfish as ever.

> The so-called peace-loving nations, having a meeting of ministers in London, have decided that, as much as they love peace, they love other things including booty more. The United States loves peace to the extent of never being at all prepared to get into another fellow's war and then getting in as soon as it possibly can, particularly if the other fellow is a Britisher....The Ministers' Conference in London came to a failure because, first, it was composed of incompatible elements and second, because the incompatible elements had conflicting aims of gain and self-interest.[44]

---

42. "What Big Five?", Tuesday, Sept. 25, 1945, p. 8.
43. "A Million Casualties—For What?" Friday, Sept. 28, 1945, p. 12.
44. "The London Flop," Thursday, Oct. 4, 1945, p. 16.

Tribune seems to take delight in any events which seem to follow its gloomy predictions regardless of whether they are unfortunate for the United States and the world.

> The failure of the London Conference has served at least one useful purpose. It has disposed for good of the myth that the nations of the world are eager to follow American leadership....The one-worlders have exploited the myth from the days of the Senate debate over the original League of Nations until this moment. It was said that things would have been different if we had signed up. We knew that was baloney and said so. The members of the League had ample power to check the Italians in Ethiopia, the Japs in Manchuria, or the Germans in Austria and the Rhineland. What was lacking was the will....Today, the United States is a full participant in international affairs.... But did Mr. Bevin and Mr. Molotov yield to Mr. Byrnes when differences of opinion arose? They didn't.[45]

The Tribune looks upon the participation of the United States in the U.N., not as a means toward peace,but claims that "San Francisco has made American participation in all wars as nearly certain as a document can."[46] The Tribune, of course, pours contempt upon the U.N. as a failure because of Russian military, political, and economic aggression in Middle Europe. It fears, moreover, that since the United States is the strongest of all nations, the next war

---

45. "Bang Goes Another Myth," Saturday, Oct. 6, 1945, p. 10.
46. "A Year in the Army," Thursday, Oct. 25, 1945, p. 16.

will be directed against us as the nation which has to be knocked out first if the aggressor is to have any chance of success. The administration, then, must first of all clean out the State Department. It must adopt and execute a foreign policy for once which will make the security and welfare of the United States the paramount one, indeed, the sole guide of American diplomacy." "We should compel our government and the State Department to cease making America the instrument of either British imperialism or communistic imperialism, or both of them, and to dedicate themselves anew to the United States alone--first, last and always."[47]

After reading a statement like that last one, I can readily see why the Tribune arouses the support of as many readers as it does.

Little by little, says the Tribune, "the Senate has voted to sacrifice American sovereignty to a bad cause." Especially did the Tribune deplore the action by which the Senate gave the President the power to place American forces at the disposal of the U.N.O.[48]

Our membership in the U.N.O., according to the Tribune, puts us in the embarrassing and deplorable position of condoning the wrongs perpetrated by the

---

47. "America Between Two Imperialisms," Thursday, November 29, 1945, p. 18.
48. "Senators Who Lied," Thursday, Dec. 6, 1945, p. 16.

Russian and British imperialists. Our habit of mind is not that of an empire nation. Our government is ill-adapted to the task of carrying out the Marshall Plan. "The purpose of the Marshall Plan is to thrust the United States into the role of boss of the universe....One thing that is wrong with the scheme is that it promises war after war, and in the end the same kind of ruin that has overtaken every nation that attempted to boss the world....Our government will no longer be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, but a government of militarists, for other nations, not our own people."[49]

The Tribune welcomed the admission of the United States Atomic Energy Commission that after two years it failed to work out a plan for international control of nuclear energy. The majority of the Commission blamed the failure of their efforts upon Russia which refused to qualify its prerogatives of national sovereignty. Thus the "United Nations has provided another demonstration of its futility and the United States of its naivete."[50]

It is thus apparent that the Chicago Tribune has not changed its isolationist attitude. It regards

---

49. "Dewey Says Me. Too," Friday, November 7, 1947, p. 18.
50. "Atomic Control Fails," Thursday, May 13, 1948, p. 18.

the U.N. as an obvious failure, and any talk of world government as an alternative solution is, of course, anathema to the Tribune.

> Some of the most frank now contend that since the U.N., as an organization of limited powers, failed to achieve an atomic settlement, the only thing to do is to supplant all existing sovereignties with a world government possessing unlimited power. The mere existence of world government is no guarantee of the good faith of the component parts. Nations or combinations might acquiesce in order to possess themselves of the atomic weapons and turn them against the other disarmed and helpless members....Russia has more men and larger unimpaired natural resources than we. We would be committed to going to war at a self-imposed disadvantage. As it is, we retain all of our sovereignty and we can look forward to the prospect of building up such an enormous advantage in atomic weapons as to impress any potential enemy with the fact that the hazards of extinction are so great that peace is the only sane policy.[51]

---

51. Ibid.

CHAPTER III

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE AND A BRIEF STATEMENT OF ITS RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS: GREAT BRITAIN, CONTINENTAL EUROPE, RUSSIA AND THE FAR EAST

As will have become apparent, the Chicago Tribune can find no epithet strong enough to denounce the British. "The truth is that the ruling caste in Britain retains all its imperial ambitions, but lacks the money or power to maintain them. Hence America is to be charmed into putting up the money to keep Britain mistress of the seas. Next thing we know they will ask for Halsey's fleet."[1] The British tell us that we must strengthen them because in so doing we strengthen ourselves. We actually stand to lose, argues the Tribune, because the money they are asking would be tied up in their obsolete industrial system.[2] It is difficult to square the Tribune's criticism of the British system as obsolete with other criticisms of her venture into socialism.

The Tribune not only objects to the British

---

1. "The Sponging Empire," Monday, Sept. 24, 1945, p. 12.
2. "More Than the Senator Could Stomach," Monday, Oct. 15, 1945, p. 10.

pleas for financial aid on the ground that it objects to British imperialism and decadence, but also on the ground that Britain was responsible for the war. "Who but Britain permitted the expansion of the German navy in violation of the Versailles Treaty? Who but France and Britain failed to prevent the invasion of Austria and the remilitarization of the Rhineland when they could easily have done so? And who today is engaging in aggressive warfare in Java and Indo China deliberately calculated to deprive peoples of their national independence? The answer is France and Britain whose representatives are about to sit in judgment on Germans....And how will the German occupation of Czechoslovakia be distinguished from the bolshevik occupation of Czechoslovakia?"[3]

When Congress approved a loan to Britain of $4,400,000,000 in December, 1945, calling for repayment in fifty-five years with interest at 2%, the Tribune cried, "Once again our State Department has shown itself to be merely a subsidiary branch of the British foreign office. What are called

---

3. "The Indictment," Saturday, October 20, 1945, p. 6.

negotiations are, in reality, merely one-sided discussions, with the British certain to have their own way after a decent interval spent in 'examining the problem'. In the end what is always achieved is a betrayal of American interests to the British."[4]

The Tribune's deep personal hatred for the British and its exaggerated estimate of British influence have been apparent throughout this paper. Therefore, no more space need be devoted to this point.

As for Continental Europe, the Tribune has given much editorial space to Germany, upon whose reconstruction, it declares, depends the welfare and future of Europe. Already in September 4, 1945, the Tribune was clamoring for our occupation troops to be withdrawn. "The Russians, the British, and the French, are in Germany for a purpose. The purpose is to exploit Germans. We have no ambitions as a nation along those lines, although some of our Wall Streeters and international minded businessmen may have."[5]

The Tribune repeatedly bewails ill-treatment

---

4. "The Loan to Britain," Saturday, Dec. 8, 1945.
5. "Trouble in Berlin," Tuesday, p. 10.

of Germany and is especially critical of the Nuernberg trials, stating that international military tribunals of the sort which Jackson invented had absolutely no standing either in American or international law. The proper tribunal before which the Germans should have been arraigned on any offences against American military personnel is an American military court. The articles of war recognized by Congress authorize such courts. There is no authority anywhere for an international military court.[6] How those who were responsible for the rise of Nazism and the atrocities perpetrated under it, though not against American troops, were to be punished was not made clear by the Tribune.

In 1948, the Tribune favored the stand of the United States not to guarantee to defend the Rhine River for the French which was France's price for a unified government of western Germany.[7]

In October, 1945, the Tribune lamented the "appalling prospect for the peoples of Europe and Japan this winter," placing the blame on the foreign ministers in London for failing to prepare a stable political order. The reason, says the Tribune, is

---

6. "Lawless Army Justice," Friday, May 21, 1948, p. 18.
7. "Distortion of History," Sunday, May 9, 1948, Part I, p. 10.

that they tried to make a hard peace, which is madness from the viewpoint of self-interest as well as from the viewpoint of moral principle. The remedy lies in restoring Europe to self-support as rapidly as possible.[8] The Tribune does not describe how Europe should be restored, saying only that we should distribute food and clear out as quickly as possible. Neither does it reckon with the influence of Russia in Germany, at the same time claiming Russia should be checked. The Tribune does state, however, that political organization of western Europe would not be objectionable to Americans. The only risk (in line with the Tribune's xenophobia)--the formation of a military alliance with Russia against us.[9]

At the time that the Council of Foreign Ministers decided to create an internationally controlled free port at Trieste, it was gratifying to find the Tribune regarded this "as sensible a disposition as could have been found for that problem." These arrangements would last only as long as the balance of power lasts, however. The New League of Nations founded at San Francisco is supposed to prevent such situations from causing war but says the

---

8. "The So-Called Peace," Tuesday, Oct. 2, 1945, p. 12.
9. "New Allies for Old," Sunday, Dec. 2, 1945, Part I, p. 6.

Tribune, because of the veto, Russia and Britain, whose interests are opposing, could vote against action against Yugoslavia or against Italy, whichever might be the aggressor, since both seek to control the Mediterranean.[10]

A concluding quotation summarizes the Tribune's position as far as Europe is concerned: "Europe has never been very far from the law of the jungle, and it is closer today than at any other time in modern history."[11]

The Chicago Tribune's policy toward Russia since V-J Day emphasizes the alledged mistakes made under the leadership of the Democrats in appeasing Russia--Stalin "made suckers out of Churchill and F.D.R." Franklin Roosevelt vetoed Churchill's proposal to go into the Balkans and counter Russian influence there. The claims of President Truman that he obtained Stalin's consent at Potsdam to American occupation of the Kurile Islands are now shown to be erroneous. Mr. Truman couldn't make such a bargain because F.D.R. gave the Kuriles, most of which were never occupied by the Russians, to Stalin. "President Wilson made Japan a threat

---

10. "Trieste," Sunday, Sept. 23, 1945, Part I, p. 18.
11. Ibid.

to us by giving her the Marshalls and the Carolines in order that nothing might impede his mania for a league of nations. President Roosevelt has made Russia, a far bigger and more powerful nation, a threat by his deal on the Kuriles. That is the price we had to pay, twice, for having presidents who put their personal interest and their egotism above the true interests of their country."[12]

"Russia as a peace-loving land of freedom is a picture to make a hyena laugh....Russia entered the war in September, 1939, as an ally of Hitler, not in June, 1941, as is now assumed."[13] The peace is falling apart because it had no good faith to keep it together. The Russians, quite properly, have been held responsible for all of the post-war troubles. Stalin is a dictator who has been accepted as an altruistic and freedom-loving head of state. When reason can so abase itself, continues the Tribune, anything can happen. Russia is not the only predatory nation, but it is the most aggressive one. The Russians have never known freedom and they now know less of it than ever before. An understanding born of a mutual sense of responsibility between

---

12. "The Kurile Deal," Thursday, Sept. 6, 1945, p. 14. I leave it to the reader to decide whether or not this is fanatical misjudgment on the part of Tribune.
13. "Delusions in War and Peace," Sunday, Sept. 16, 1945, Part I, p. 6.

Russia and the United States is unbelievable. Attempts to create one are deceitful. The incongruities in any assemblage of the peace-loving nations are so great that only the highest regard for the pledged word and unqualified consideration for the general good could bring fair decisions.[14]

"Very likely we are in the dark ages again and don't know it."[15] This pessimistic outlook the Tribune blames on fear of Russia which prevails over the continent. "Although the American government undertakes to oppose the Stalinite dictatorship, it does, apparently, feel a twinge of conscience on the score of its good faith. It promised many countries certain elementary rights and privileges which gradually are being canceled by power settlements disregarding these rights and privileges.[16]

The Tribune takes the position that it is impossible to do business with Stalin. It feels that a pro-Russian policy has prevailed in this country until recently "except when it came into conflict with British foreign policy which is championed in this country by an even larger and more ardent group of sycophants than the American adherents of

---

14. "The London Flop," Thursday, Oct. 4, 1945, p. 16.
15. "This Howling Planet," Thursday, Oct. 11, 1945, p. 18.
16. Ibid.

Communism."[17]

Passing to a brief discussion of the Tribune's attitude toward our conduct of foreign affairs in the Far East, one immediately notes the contrast between the barrage of criticism the Tribune raises at our handling of Germany and the praise it gives to Mac Arthur's work in Japan. "To stimulate Japan to establish their (sic) own democratic government will be a long and difficult task but the steps already taken toward it by General MacArthur and General Eichelberger are more promising of success than are the efforts on the other side of the world to turn all of central Europe into a chaotic playground for Communist missionaries."[18] The Tribune was especially lavish in its adulation when General Mac Arthur announced in September, 1945, that he believed 200,000 American volunteers would be sufficient to police Japan six months from that time. The Tribune spared no vehemence in criticizing Dean Acheson, acting Secretary of State, for being angry with Mac Arthur for issuing this statement.[19] The Tribune attributed the State Department's alarm over MacArthur's

---

17. "Outcasts in Our Own Country," Sunday, Oct. 21, 1945, Part I, p. 7.
18. "Wise Steps in Japan," Thursday, Sept. 6, 1945, p. 14.
19. "Whose Chestnuts," Saturday, Sept. 22, 1945, p. 8.

statement to the idea that it would hinder the State Department's aim to keep a "huge army in Germany".[20] Tribune feels that "The task of statesmanship today is to seek terms of peace which will permit occupation to be terminated as quickly as possible."[21]

The Tribune's views regarding British, French and Dutch activity in Asia have already been presented.

Regarding the United States and China the Tribune criticized the "striped pants boys" in Washington on the grounds that they worked against the interests of America. "The followers of Moscow were solicitous to keep the Chinese Communists going because that would serve Russia's interest. The pro-British wing of the State Department felt the same way about it. If Chiang is obliged to spend most of his strength in the North against the Communists, he will have little left with which to resist the British Empire's grabbing in the South."[22]

The Tribune attacks what it terms as delusions: China a Republic, Russia a Democracy. It maintains that Britain under any government is an American liability in all parts of the world. Mr. Atlee got

---

20. "MacArthur's Orders," Tuesday, Sept. 25, 1945, p. 8.
21. "A Long Occupation For A Bad Peace," Friday, Oct. 12, 1945, p. 18.
22. "The Loan to Britain," Saturday, Dec. 8, 1945, p. 6.

into Hongkong just as quickly as Churchill, the Imperialist, could have done.[23]

---

23. "Delusions in War and Peace," Sunday, Sept. 16, 1945, Part I, p. 6.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION: EVALUATION OF THE TRIBUNE

As John Tebbel points out in his book, An American Dynasty, there is a possibility of two errors in making an evaluation of Colonel McCormick and the Tribune. On the one hand, over-emphasis of its influence "would cite McCormick as the dangerous leader of Chicago and Midwestern isolationism whose hatreds and prejudices coupled with the immense resources of his empire make him a menace to our national life." In refutation of this over-emphasis Tebbel points out that the Chicago area has a population of 5,000,000 people. The Tribune has a daily circulation of scarcely a million and a large percentage of that are out-of-town subscribers.[1]

But neither should the influence of the Tribune be underemphasized. John Tebbel writes:

> When the country was at war, McCormick insisted on the right to do as he pleased, a right which he seemed to think was conferred upon him because of his wealth and property ownership. The McCormicks and the Pattersons were the worst offenders in this lack of responsibility. In terms of practical politics, it appears the influence of McCormick-Patterson thinking is negligible, but no one can estimate the extent of its influence on

---

1. John Tebbel, op. cit., p. 249.

> American minds, where it may be expressed in more subtle ways than the direct method of the ballot box. For example, that thinking must be to blame, at least in part, for the continued political existence of such men as Gerald L. K. Smith, Senator Theodore Bilbo, Representatives Clare Hoffman and John Rankin; and such institutions as the Christian Front, publisher Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government, and all the numerous festering movements whose catchwords "American" and "Christian" attract the forces of bigoty, chauvinism and intolerance.[2]

My chief criticism of the Tribune is that it fails to recognize that freedom of the press is a responsibility in a democracy, not license to publish anything it pleases in an effort to foster its own prejudices. The Tribune makes repeated attacks on hate objects, and its editorials, far from being scholarly, are expressions of fixed prejudices supported by rationalization. They do not attempt to investigate all of the facts in a given situation in order to arrive at just conclusions.

The Tribune considers itself the champion of freedom of the press in this country, vigorously opposing all infringements by government, arguing that restrictions must emanate from the people, not from the government. How the people are to wield this restraining influence is not clear.

---

2. Ibid., p. 347.

Far from being open-minded, the Tribune never admits the possibility of error, seemingly convinced of its own infallibility. Actually, as has been illustrated at various points in this thesis, the Tribune is guilty of many inconsistencies. On the one hand, for example, it declares that America must insist upon breaking down the colonial system; on the other hand, it argues that America must not attempt to boss the world. The Tribune does not feel obliged to take upon itself the task of discovering how the colonial system is to be broken down. It rails upon British and Russian imperialism but demands the acquisition of numerous bases by the United States. It states that we must get out of Germany and also that we must not yield to Russia. It argued that we should not insist on a hard peace for the defeated countries, that we should help Europe to help itself, but opposed vigorously the Marshall Plan, not explaining how Europe was to be aided in her task of reconstruction. The Tribune looks to the atom bomb for security for the United States, but it does not reckon with Russia's eventual acquisition of the atom bomb.

As has been suggested earlier in this thesis,

the Tribune's methods are not unlike those employed by the master propagandists of fascism. It professes to be a guardian of democracy, but it is itself an instrument of power in the hands of one man, setting himself up as the authority from which the people may learn what is good for them. I have found no source to contradict my contention that the Chicago Tribune is the personal organ of Colonel McCormick.[3] There seems to be general agreement and complete recognition that the Tribune is the voice of one man and, therefore, reflects all of his personal convictions and prejudices. This does not imply that there are not those who share his viewpoints, but it does indicate that McCormick's claim that his paper is America's greatest and that it expresses and molds opinion of the Middle West is the height of conceit. When such power is wielded in the sphere of foreign policy it is especially obnoxious. The events of the past few years, however, have indicated that the forces of isolationism are on the losing side. McCormick's gloomy predictions about the Marshall Plan have not materialized. It seems to be generally acknowledged that the Marshall Plan is working, and that European reconstruction is well on its way.

---

3. See Harold L. Ickes, America's House of Lords, An Inquiry Into Freedom of the Press. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1939.

As long as the nations abroad are aware, and as long as the people of this country are aware that the Tribune is the mouthpiece of one man, its statements on foreign policy may not have too harmful an effect on the delicate framework of international relations.

It has not been my purpose in this paper to pass judgment on the Tribune with reference to domestic matters, to its business policies, nor to its circulation tactics. Much could be written about each of these points. However, a general estimate of the Tribune and of the respect which it commands or rather which it does not command on the score of truthfulness and reliability is indicated by a poll taken by Leo C. Rosten of ninety-three Washington correspondents representing leading newspapers throughout the country. They considered the Chicago Tribune the "least fair and reliable" individual newspaper in the United States.[4]

The question of whether or not the Tribune continues unchanged in its isolationist attitudes has already been answered. It ridicules efforts toward international cooperation and stands firmly

---

4. The Washington Correspondents. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.

As long as the nations abroad are aware, and as long as the people of this country are aware that the Tribune is the mouthpiece of one man, its statements on foreign policy may not have too harmful an effect on the delicate framework of international relations.

It has not been my purpose in this paper to pass judgment on the Tribune with reference to domestic matters, to its business policies, nor to its circulation tactics. Much could be written about each of these points. However, a general estimate of the Tribune and of the respect which it commands or rather which it does not command on the score of truthfulness and reliability is indicated by a poll taken by Leo C. Rosten of ninety-three Washington correspondents representing leading newspapers throughout the country. They considered the Chicago Tribune the "least fair and reliable" individual newspaper in the United States.[4]

The question of whether or not the Tribune continues unchanged in its isolationist attitudes has already been answered. It ridicules efforts toward international cooperation and stands firmly

---

4. The Washington Correspondents. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.

As long as the nations abroad are aware, and as long as the people of this country are aware that the Tribune is the mouthpiece of one man, its statements on foreign policy may not have too harmful an effect on the delicate framework of international relations.

It has not been my purpose in this paper to pass judgment on the Tribune with reference to domestic matters, to its business policies, nor to its circulation tactics. Much could be written about each of these points. However, a general estimate of the Tribune and of the respect which it commands or rather which it does not command on the score of truthfulness and reliability is indicated by a poll taken by Leo C. Rosten of ninety-three Washington correspondents representing leading newspapers throughout the country. They considered the Chicago Tribune the "least fair and reliable" individual newspaper in the United States.[4]

The question of whether or not the Tribune continues unchanged in its isolationist attitudes has already been answered. It ridicules efforts toward international cooperation and stands firmly

---

4. The Washington Correspondents. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.

for America first, unaware that the welfare of America depends upon the welfare of the world and upon the success of international cooperation.

The fact that Mc Cormick bitterly opposed a bipartisan foreign policy and fought cooperation between the two parties is a good indication of his lack of true patriotism.

How the Tribune will adjust itself to the inevitable march of the United States in the direction of internationalism remains to be seen. Colonel McCormick is already an old man, and a large share of his ideas may pass with him from the American scene.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Chicago Tribune, September 1, 1945 to June 1, 1948.

Ickes, Harold L., America's House of Lords, An Inquiry Into Freedom of the Press. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1939.

Kinsley, Philip, The Chicago Tribune, Its First Hundred Years, 2 Vols., Chicago: The Chicago Tribune, 1945.

Kinsley, Philip, Liberty and the Press, Chicago: The Chicago Tribune, 1944.

Rosten, Leo C., The Washington Correspondents. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1937.

Tebbel, John, An American Dynasty. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1947.