

CONDITIONS OF USE FOR THIS PDF

The images contained within this PDF may be used for private study, scholarship, and research only. They may not be published in print, posted on the internet, or exhibited. They may not be donated, sold, or otherwise transferred to another individual or repository without the written permission of The Museum of Modern Art Archives.

When publication is intended, publication-quality images must be obtained from SCALA Group, the Museum's agent for licensing and distribution of images to outside publishers and researchers.

If you wish to quote any of this material in a publication, an application for permission to publish must be submitted to the MoMA Archives. This stipulation also applies to dissertations and theses. All references to materials should cite the archival collection and folder, and acknowledge "The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York."

Whether publishing an image or quoting text, you are responsible for obtaining any consents or permissions which may be necessary in connection with any use of the archival materials, including, without limitation, any necessary authorizations from the copyright holder thereof or from any individual depicted therein.

In requesting and accepting this reproduction, you are agreeing to indemnify and hold harmless The Museum of Modern Art, its agents and employees against all claims, demands, costs and expenses incurred by copyright infringement or any other legal or regulatory cause of action arising from the use of this material.

NOTICE: WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

GERMAN ART SHIFT STIRS STORM HERE

Continued From Page 1

Armed Forces of the United States at the Verwaltungsbau, the Third Army collecting point, in Munich. They reached the United States in the Army transport James Parker Dec. 6.

Army officials were inclined to be mysterious about the paintings when they were landed, and the general belief arose that they were art treasures the Germans had taken from invaded countries.

A week after their arrival, though, word came out of Washington that the trustees of the National Gallery, through Chief Justice Stone, had accepted custody of the paintings at the request of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, and that they included no German war loot.

How removal of the German art treasures came about has not been officially explained, but it is understood that President Truman and the heads of the other Allied Nations represented at the Potsdam Conference worked it out at that meeting.

The current Magazine of Art, published by the American Federation of Arts, has assembled the various protests made against transfer of the German art treasures.

32 Specialists Issue Protest

It has also printed a copy of a memorandum on the subject prepared on Nov. 7 in Germany, by thirty-two of the thirty-five specialists who assembled the paintings for shipment.

Copies of this protest document, unsigned because many of those protesting were still in the Army, reached the United States in mimeographed form. The memorandum says, in part:

"We are unanimously agreed that the transportation of these works of art, undertaken by the United States Army, upon direction from the highest national authority, establishes a precedent which is neither morally tenable nor trustworthy * * *

"The war is at an end, and no doctrine of 'military necessity' can now be invoked for the further protection of the objects to be moved, for the reason that depots and personnel, both fully competent for their protection, have been inaugurated and are functioning."

Pointing out that Nazi art looters, now on trial, were indicted on the reasoning that though the looters acted under military orders "the dictates of a higher ethical law made it incumbent upon them to refuse to take part in * * * fulfillment of these orders," the memorandum says:

"We, the undersigned, feel it our duty to point out that, though as members of the armed forces we will carry out the orders we receive, we are thus put before any candid eyes as no less culpable than those whose prosecution we affect to sanction."

On Dec. 10, only four days after the 200 paintings were landed in the United States, Andrew C. Ritchie, director-on-leave from the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo, wrote to The Magazine of Art from Germany protesting transfer of the art treasures.

Praises Munich Depository

"This decision has been made," Dr. Ritchie wrote, "despite the fact that there exists, as I can witness, an excellently equipped and physically secure depository in the Verwaltungsbau, Munich, now in use as the Third Army Central Collecting Point."

Dr. Ritchie contended that to divide Germany's museum collection among the Allied Powers with no definite assurance that the treasures would be returned would be to deprive Germany of one of the instruments of her cultural rebirth.

"Until * * * a neutral repository has been found," this letter continued, "I would strongly suggest that no further shipments of German-owned art be made to the United States. The Verwaltungsbau * * * while it is under United States Army guard, is presumably as safe a place as any for the present."

Herbert J. Spinden, curator of American Indian art and primitive culture at Brooklyn Museum, wrote:

"The news that a large shipment of German art had reached America on Dec. 6, 1945, was received with misgivings by many Americans.

"The subsequent explanation that this collection would be stored in

TRANSFERRED TO NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART IN WASHINGTON



"Assumption of the Virgin," by Castagno, a fifteenth-century panel from the Kaiser Friedrich Museum

the National Gallery at Washington for safekeeping and that ultimately it would be returned to Germany has not erased the first uneasy impression of the announcement. * * *

"It has been suggested that additional classes of cultural evidence, archaeological, ethnological, documentary, etc., may not be exempt from seizure, and relocation to further post-war nationalistic programs."

Anthropologists Assail Action

Dr. Spinden cited a resolution on the transfer of the German art treasures adopted Dec. 28 by the American Anthropological Association in Philadelphia, which said in part:

"Be it resolved that the appropriate United States authorities be apprised of the strong opinion of the American Anthropological Association that scientific documents and specimens and works of art, legitimately acquired * * * by public institutions in enemy countries be not made subject to seizure or alienation by the United States as reparations and that as soon as possible such materials be restored to institutions originally housing them."

On Jan. 15 Dr. Rensselaer W. Lee, president of the College Art Association of America and Professor of Art at Smith College, wrote to Secretary of State Byrnes: "The members of the College Art Association of America, a constituent member of the American Council of Learned Societies, have been disturbed by the removal to this country of works of art from Berlin museums.

"Information that we have received from abroad leads us to believe that the integrity of United States policy has been questioned as a result of this action. We have also been informed that adequate facilities and American personnel now exist in the American zone in Germany to assure the proper care of art treasures in that area.

"We would therefore urge that the Department of State clarify this action, and would strongly recommend that assurances be given that no further shipments are contemplated."

Army Says It Lacks Facilities

On Jan. 25 James W. Riddleberger, chief of the Division of Central European Affairs for the State Department, answered on Mr. Byrnes' behalf:

"The decision to remove these works of art to this country was made on the basis of a statement by [Lieut.] Gen. [Lucius D.] Clay that he did not have adequate facilities and personnel to safeguard German art treasures and that he could not undertake the responsibilities of their proper care.

"You indicated in your letter that you have been informed that adequate facilities and personnel now exist in the American zone for the protection of these art treasures.

Television Will Carry Lincoln Day Ceremonies

The first television broadcast between Washington and New York is scheduled for noon Tuesday, when the Lincoln Day ceremonies in the capital will be carried over the American Telephone and Telegraph Company's coaxial cable between the two cities. The 225-mile cable will be jointly used by the National Broadcasting Company, the Columbia Broadcasting System and the Allen B. DuMont Laboratories.

The telecast will be carried in New York through the NBC television station WNBC and the CBS outlet, WCBW, and in Washington through the DuMont station, W3XWT. The DuMont outlet in New York has not yet resumed operations.

Television cameras, which will be on the steps of the Capitol, and both inside and outside the Lincoln Memorial, will bring to the television audience interviews with Paul Porter, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; Senators Kenneth McKellar, Burton K. Wheeler, Wallace H. White and Representative Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House. The cameras will also record Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's arrival at the shrine and his placing of the wreath at the foot of the statue.

I must inform you that our information, based upon three separate investigations, is precisely the contrary. The redeployment program has, as you no doubt realize, reduced American personnel in Germany, and this reduction is applied to arts and monuments and

this personnel as well as to other branches.

"The coal situation in Germany is critical and has made it impossible to provide heat for the museums. General Clay cannot be expected to provide heat for the museums if that means taking it away from American forces, from hospitals, or from essential utility needs. We were furthermore advised that the security situation was not such as to ensure adequate protection in Germany. In short, the Department's information is such that it cannot agree with your premise.

"It was realized that the 'integrity of United States policy' might be questioned by some if these works of art were moved to this country. After a careful review of the facts, it was decided that the most important aspect was to safeguard these priceless treasures by bringing them to this country where they could be properly cared for. It was hoped that the President's pledge that they would be returned to Germany would satisfy those who might be critical of this Government's motives."

Taylor Defends Acceptance

Neither Chief Justice Stone, as chairman, nor David E. Finley, director of the National Gallery of Art, would comment yesterday on criticism over their accepting protective custody of the German art treasures, but Mr. Taylor, who was a member of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, defended the acceptance. He said:

"I have just returned from Washington, where I had an opportunity to review with the Secretary of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of

Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas the entire question of removal to safe keeping in the United States of some 200 German works of art placed by President Truman in the custody of the National Gallery of Art.

"As a member of the commission, I have been acquainted with various steps by which the President and the Secretary of State arrived at this decision. In a statement made by the White House, issued Sept. 27, the pledge of this Government was expressed in the following unequivocal terms:

"The United States Government is removing from Germany to the continental United States certain perishable German art objects not readily identifiable as looted property, with the sole intention of keeping such treasure safe and in trust for the people of Germany or the other rightful owners.

"The United States Government will retain these objects of art in its possession only as long as it might be possible to return them to their rightful owners. The return of readily identifiable looted art objects to the liberated countries from the American Zone in Germany already is under way.

"When objects of art are definitely established as being bona-fide German origin they will be returned to Germany when conditions there warrant.

"The reason for bringing these perishable art objects to the United States is that expert personnel is not available within the American Zone to insure their safety."

Points to President's Data

"Certain misunderstandings have arisen based upon the personal opinion of individuals in Germany and in the art world who have questioned 'the integrity of the United States policy.' While I have the highest opinion of the work of the Monuments Fine Arts and Archives officers who have been alarmed at the action taken by the United States Government, and share with them their apprehension lest misrepresentations and misconstructions be placed by European scholars upon such action, it must be pointed out that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State had access to information regarding conditions and policy in occupied territory which was reserved for discussion at the highest level.

"Shortage of coal, necessarily reserved for hospitals and other human wants, together with the absence of adequate facilities for housing and guarding, made critical by the acceleration of redeployment, were obvious factors in the decision.

"The responsibility for this action was taken by the highest authority in the United States and the American Commission were informed. The National Gallery of Art, which is governed by a board

Excellent Selection
of
Violins • Violas
Cellos • Basses
and Accessories
NEW YORK BAND INST. CO.
Stores Open Evenings
1166 Sixth Av., near 45th St., N. Y. 19
25 Flatbush Av., nr. Fulton St., B'klyn 17

STORE OPEN TO

The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY	Collection:	Series.Folder:
	AHB	I.A.170*

8 X

+

ART

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, MAY 23, 1948

REICH ART TREASURES

Metropolitan Exhibition
—Other Events

By HOWARD DEVREE

THE spacious installation and clear lighting which the Metropolitan Museum has accorded its exhibition of masterpieces from the Berlin museums have resulted in a more impressive showing than the earlier rather crowded display at the National Gallery in Washington. The superior visibility and adequate labeling of the works, individually and by schools, add to the effect, more than offsetting for the average visitor the absence of the group of paintings selected for early return to the American zone in Germany.

While the general public will be interested in the exhibition as a whole, and especially in the work of artists with whom it is already more or less familiar, students and others with more specific interests will welcome the opportunity to examine paintings by early Italian and German artists and by others slenderly represented in American collections. The little Massaccio panels which leave one with the impression of their being so much larger than they really are; the brilliant and architecturally powerful Castagno "Assumption of the Virgin"; the Correggio "Leda and the Swan"; the Rubens "Landscape With the Shipwreck of Aeneas" (the great Rubens landscapes are unknown in this country); the massive Rubens figure "Andromeda"; the very moving Konrat Witz "Crucifixion" (reproduced); paintings by Altdorfer, Baldung and Elsheimer; pictures by the Sienese painters Sassetta and Giovanni di Paolo; and such examples as the Gossart (Mabuse) "Portrait of a Man" are more likely to be magnets for the student and the art sophisticate than the gallery of Rembrandts or the group of Botticellis.

Comparisons

It is well worth while, moreover, devoting one visit to portraits alone—the Titians of a young man, of the artist's daughter and the unfinished self-portrait; the Giorgione of a young man (would the artist have done more with the hair, one wonders?); the Tintoretto of the doge and the man with a beard; the Rembrandt self-portrait (compare it with the one in the Altman group in the museum's collection); the three Bronzinos, especially the one with the architectural interior for background; the Mantegna "Cardinal" and the Mabuse (reproduced).

Or compare the Rubens landscape mentioned above with the

AMONG BERLIN MUSEUM PICTURES AT THE METROPOLITAN



"Crucifixion," by Konrat Witz, fifteenth century German, and "Portrait of a Man," by Jan Gossart (Mabuse), sixteenth century Flemish.

REICH ART SHOW

The exhibition of pictures from the Berlin museums, current at the Metropolitan Museum, will continue through June 12. The museum opens weekdays at 10 A. M. and closes at 5 P. M. On Sundays the museum opens at 1 P. M. On Wednesday and Sunday evenings the museum will remain open until 9 P. M. to permit visitors to attend this special exhibition. On Decoration Day the museum will be open from 1 to 5 P. M. Admission is 50 cents.

Stephen Csoka; paintings by Louis Bosa; and oils and drawings by Philip Guston and John W. Taylor.

Amid the distractions of some 250 such diverse items, certain points may be noted. Donal Hord seems to be developing away from the tendencies displayed in his work shown several years ago at the Museum of Modern Art into a more decorative manner, although still making use of themes suggestive of the American Indian. Jack Taylor's painting is broadening and freeing itself of tightness, with deeper and richer use of color, especially in such canvases as

The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY	Collection:	Series/Folder:
	AHB	I.A.170*

The Washington Post

Registered in U. S. Patent Office.

An Independent Newspaper
(Published every day in the year.)

Eugene Meyer, Editor and Publisher

The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to use the publication of all news dispatches credited to it or otherwise credited in this paper and local news of national or international interest published herein. Rights of reproduction of all other matter herein are also reserved.

New York Office: 270 Madison Avenue
Chicago Office: 360 North Michigan Avenue

CARRIER DELIVERY
District of Columbia and Suburbs
Daily and Sunday Sunday Only Daily Only
One week . . . \$ 25 One week . . . \$ 10 One week . . . \$ 15
One month . . . \$ 1.10 One month . . . \$.45 One month . . . \$.65

BY MAIL—PAYABLE IN ADVANCE
Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia and North Carolina
Daily and Sunday Sunday Only Daily Only
One year . . . \$12.00 One year . . . \$ 3.25 One year . . . \$ 4.50
Six months . . . \$ 6.30 Six months . . . \$ 1.75 Six months . . . \$ 2.40
One month . . . \$ 1.30 One month . . . \$.35 One month . . . \$.45

Other States, Mexico and Canada
Daily and Sunday Sunday Only Daily Only
One year . . . \$12.75 One year . . . \$ 4.00 One year . . . \$ 5.50
Six months . . . \$ 7.00 Six months . . . \$ 2.00 Six months . . . \$ 2.75
One month . . . \$ 1.30 One month . . . \$.35 One month . . . \$.45

Rates to Foreign Countries not listed will be furnished upon request.

Entered at the Postoffice, Washington, D. C., as second-class mail matter.

TELEPHONE NATIONAL 4200.

**** Saturday, May 18, 1946

Last Resort

Precisely 24 hours in advance of the scheduled strike of locomotive engineers and trainmen, Government seizure of the railroads was ordered by the President. Refusal of the two brotherhoods to accept the findings of the emergency board created under the Railway Labor Act left the Government no alternative means of trying to prevent a transportation tie-up that would paralyze the country's industry, imperil the health, and threaten the lives of millions of Americans through the resultant breakdown of essential community services.

Over the heads of the union leaders, who have insisted that the strike will go on as scheduled, the President has appealed to the members of the brotherhoods to keep the trains running. There is no law to force compliance, and even if there were, there would be no way of compelling free Americans to work against their will. All that Government seizure does in the way of bringing pressure to bear is to penalize persons who actively interfere with the operation of seized plants and encourage strikes and interruption of services.

It is sobering to reflect that only voluntary abstention by the engineers and trainmen from exercise of the right to remain away from work will save the country from a major disaster, the effect of which would be felt for many months after the end of the crisis. We do not venture to predict what their decision will be. We only hope that they will realize that as good citizens they are under obligation to put the national welfare ahead of their personal concerns. For the freedom of initiative that we now enjoy under our democratic system of Government cannot long endure if organized groups insist on pursuing policies that make a mockery of the rights of other citizens.

Two Blocs

Secretary Vinson has made it clear that our foreign policy is to keep the door open to Russia to join with us and the British in a trading community. He was testifying in House committee in behalf of the loan to Britain. The World Bank and the Stabilization Fund, both of which Russia helped to set up, are still available to Russian membership. That would give Russia a voice in these organizations appropriate to her standing. In these bodies she would participate in making the rules governing world finance. Commerce, if it is to remain peaceful, has its rules, also, and these are due to be formulated at the forthcoming world trade conference, provision for which was made in the loan agreement with Britain. But membership in the trade system has a price of admission, viz, a readiness to submit to common rules. There can be no doubt that financial aid would be available to the Russians if they would join with us in the creation of such a trade system.

When Britain agreed to pay this price in the loan agreement, it seemed a heavy one to many Britons. But to the government in London the overriding consideration was that peace requires rules to bind the nations in their economic no less than in their political dealings. A multilateral code, in other words, is a necessary underpinning of the peace. Without it there would be a perpetuation of the dog-eat-dog trading which heralded the Second World War. Evidences of this kind of trading are still available all over the world. Britain's Sterling area, which will be wound up when the financial agreement comes into effect, is an outstanding example. In this group of nations the members trade on exclusive terms. Looked at from the inside, it is a defensive arrangement; looked at from the outside, it is offensive. Russia also has her exclusive arrangements. In the Balkans, for instance, Russia has a stranglehold on trade, and in Argentina she is reported to be bidding for the entire linseed oil crop against, of all people, UNRRA. No economic peace is possible in a world divided into such mutually exclusive, or warring, blocs.

It remains true that, as long as Russia remains outside our system, the world, assuming the financial agreement with Britain is passed, will be divided into two blocs. Russia and her satellites will make one system; Britain and the United States the other. That, however, is not so horrendous presently as it sounds. For Russia is as yet only a minor consideration in world trade. Her bulk purchases, underbidding, and bilateral deals do not constitute much of a threat to the other trading nations, as Germany's did between wars. And what should be remembered is that the British-American bloc would not be exclusive. It would be based upon equality of treatment for all,

Russia included; while the two seats on the World Bank and the Stabilization Fund would still be left for Russia to fill. In short, it would be only Russia's exclusionism or isolationism that would make a bloc out of the rest of the world. The system of which the financial agreement with Britain is the foundation stone is the nucleus of the one-world concept in economic relations. This is what Secretary Vinson ought to have stressed when the question about blocs came up.

Mr. Hoover's Speech

The impression created by Mr. Hoover's report to the Nation last night must have been profound. His engineering mind kept his humanitarian zeal in check, but it made the appeal vivid and salient. No American with any compassion in his heart could have heard the former President without determining, if he had not already determined, to seat an invisible guest at his table. The former President traveled 35,000 miles. "I have seen with my own eyes," he said, "the grimmest specter of famine in all the history of the world." Hunger hangs over the homes of over a third of the people of this earth.

Mr. Hoover is careful with his terms. The use of the phrase "mass starvation" is eschewed, because, as Mr. Hoover explains, such a level has not yet been reached. He says the mass starvation level is a 900-calorie diet. But mass starvation has been prevented only by the shipments which have been made to the have-not nations since the danger became apparent. Moreover, mass starvation will infallibly arrive if the have nations fail to fill the gap, estimated at 3,600,000 tons before next harvest, which separates needs from available supplies. This is the irreducible figure necessary to prevent mass starvation. It equals, Mr. Hoover says, the whole amount necessary to save 40 million people and it would enable the deficit nations to pull through the summer, and maintain order and economic life.

For his calculation Mr. Hoover's bedrock figure is 1500-1800 calories. Just before Mr. Hoover went to the microphone, a one-third slash in bread rations was ordered in the American zone in Germany for 18 million Germans, bringing the ration down to 1180 calories, which is way below the lower limit of Mr. Hoover's bedrock figure. It looks, therefore, as if mass starvation is just around the corner.

Mr. Hoover has confronted the civilized world with the measure of the famine problem. The haves must bridge the 3,600,000-ton gap. The task is a mighty one, but it is within our powers, for, as Mr. Hoover shows, the haves are living much above the standard necessary for health. The average intake to meet the standard is 2200 calories. Mr. Hoover says that "We Americans, the British, the Canadians, the Australians, the Swedes, the Argentinians, and most of the Western Hemisphere are consuming over 2900 calories per day right now." The only flaw in Mr. Hoover's presentation is this manner of lumping together the haves. Granted that we could all do more, Mr. Hoover's way of bracketing the British with ourselves is unfair to the British. The facts are that we are now eating an average of 3360 calories, or more by about 10 per cent than we did before the war, and that the British are certainly much worse off. The British say they are down below 2900 calories. The contrasting picture is one of conspicuous consumption and belt-tightening. But, no matter how the haves differ, they can all do more, and they must do more, either for conscience sake or in their own self-interest, to meet "this terrible world crisis."

As for ourselves, the problem is administrative as well as personal. Though Mr. Hoover spoke only of breadstuffs, there are many other makers of calories in our diet that we can spare, or that the Administration could make available to the deficit nations. We have hitherto mentioned some of the necessary measures that could retrieve food, especially fats, from the national wastage. These measures should be taken now, for hunger cannot wait, and the solution of this "most dangerous crisis" is necessary to ourselves. Famine breeds pestilence, and pestilence has wings, while revolution might unsettle the world so drastically as to involve the entire world in its toils. Mr. Hoover puts the appeal not only in these terms but also on the nobler level that our aid now is "part of the moral and spiritual reconstruction of the world." The pilgrim has now reported. Let us all be guided by his counsel.

Small's Blunder

One of the minor mysteries of this confused Capital is why John D. Small, Civilian Production administrator, took it upon himself to make an obviously foolish recommendation to Congress that it outlaw strikes for six months. Certainly Mr. Small contributed nothing to the debate on labor legislation. Spokesmen both for and against additional controls over labor relations threw down his suggestion and pumpeled on it. "You might as well try to outlaw war," said Senator Byrd, "as to try to outlaw strikes." It is difficult to understand how a man holding a responsible administrative position in the Government could have failed to see this point.

The second element in the mystery is how Mr. Small ever got the idea that he is a proper spokesman for the Administration on labor matters. As Civilian Production administrator he has a direct interest, of course, in keeping our economic machinery in operation. His anxiety over the paralysis with which John L. Lewis and other labor leaders are threatening the country reflects a commendable sense of duty. But concern over a problem and authority to make an official statement as to remedies are two utterly different things.

The confusion that afflicts large segments of our economy would be transferred to the

Administration itself if officials outside of the Department of Labor and every other labor agency were allowed to shoot off their faces on how to curb strikes. The fact that Mr. Small took such an obligation upon himself without consulting the Labor Department or the President left Mr. Truman no alternative to repudiation of his blunder. There is enough tension over the present labor crisis and the efforts of Congress to pass constructive legislation to facilitate the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes without having high Government officials contribute to unrest and confusion in this manner.

Welfare Department

President Truman's announcement that he will seek departmental status and a permanent place in the Cabinet for the Federal Security Agency is a logical outgrowth of the merger of health education and welfare activities he has just effected under his reorganization powers. The size, scope and significance of this agency, as it is now constituted, clearly as Mr. Truman noted, "demand for it the highest level of administrative leadership and a voice in the central councils of the executive branch." The Post having long urged this development, rejoices, of course, in the President's advocacy of it.

It is a simple, common-sense association of functions that the President has now ordered. The Children's Bureau, so long something of an anomaly in the Department of Labor, belongs in close relationship with the Office of Education. The Employees Compensation Commission should obviously be aligned with Social Security. This drawing together of related activities was accompanied by a sensible elimination of duplication, so that the Federal Security Agency is now not merely enlarged but streamlined as well. It should be able to operate more effectively than in the past by integrating health, education and welfare undertakings which inevitably impinge upon one another.

It is in this agency and particularly when it is granted departmental status, that there should be established welfare funds of the type now sought by John L. Lewis in the coal mining industry. Such welfare funds are manifestly needed for the protection of workers living under the feudal conditions which Agnes E. Meyer has described in the coal country. But the management of them should be in governmental, not union hands. Congress can constructively move to meet the issue raised by John L. Lewis by acting speedily to create the welfare department for which the President has asked and by giving it authority for the broadest surveillance over social security and working conditions throughout the Nation.

Art Custody

It is sometimes rather wonderful to see the alacrity with which Americans accuse fellow Americans of the worst Nazi practices and motives. A case in point is the letter of protest recently addressed to the President by a group of art authorities referring to the shipments of German art treasures to this country for safe-keeping as "brazen looting" reminiscent of the "protective custody" used by the Nazis as a camouflage for the sequestration of the artistic treasures of other countries. The best answer to this absurd accusation was provided by Representative Frances P. Bolton, who simply read into the Congressional Record the successive official statements announcing that the German paintings would be brought here and explaining why.

On September 26, the White House issued a press release saying that "The United States Government is removing from Germany to the continental United States certain perishable German art objects . . . with the sole intention of keeping such treasures safe and in trust for the people of Germany or the other rightful owners." And it was explained that "the reason for bringing these perishable art objects to the United States is that expert personnel is not available within the American zone to assure their safety. At present these perishable objects are being stored under conditions which would bring about their deterioration. For many of these art objects, there are not adequate housing facilities in Germany."

Anyone who reflects for a moment upon the present state of German museums must recognize the accuracy of this explanation. Salt mines are not ideal places for the preservation of masterpieces of art. It was expressly said, moreover, in a War Department press release of December 6 announcing the arrival of the masterpieces—and more's the pity, in our opinion—that "it is not contemplated that any of these works of art will be exhibited to the public until, perhaps, before the time arrives for their return to Germany." Evidently the "looting" was not undertaken for profit or even for our pleasure.

For our own part, we share the opinion of the late Chief Justice Stone, who declared that the United States Army deserved the highest praise for the care exercised in salvaging these great works of art and in making provision for their safety until they can be returned to Germany. Art is the possession of the world and all men are its custodians. We should think there would be no vandalism in permitting Americans to see and draw inspiration from these great heritages of the past.

THE STALLION
Night comes swiftly,
a stallion
pacing the wind.
Night is a wild stallion
cantering through tall prairie-grass,
unsaddled,
riderless . . .
mane flowing like clear water,
eyes holding two stars—
a dark stallion
racing the wind
toward
dawn!
MAE WINKLER GOODMAN



©1946 THE WASHINGTON POST

Letter

"U. S. In Germany"

In *The Post* of May 13, Mr. E. Baldwin takes issue with Mr. L. Mann's article on "United States in Germany," of May 9. It does seem to me that Mr. Baldwin understands the purpose of the directive of our State Department providing for a decentralized Germany. It is not as Mr. Baldwin asserts, to satisfy "the Hebrew tenet of a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye" (which, by the way, he most inappropriately applies), or to satisfy any feeling of revenge on the part of Mr. Morgenthau or the American people.

The purpose of this directive is to prevent the reoccurrence of fascism through a centralized government and a strong Germany. The American Government realistically recognizes that the majority of the German people deeply believes in the fascist way of life. It is for this obvious reason that a strong Germany in the near future, or as Mr. Byrnes states, in the next 25 years, is inadvisable.

Mr. Baldwin is much concerned that the "economic prosperity of these United States cannot be durably reconstituted and maintained without a reasonably prosperous economic Europe." However, a reasonably prosperous economic Europe is not to be confused with a strong Germany. To the contrary, a strong Germany in the past has not promoted general European prosperity, but has exploited the rest of Europe for purely German ends, the consequences of which are evident in two world wars.

Let us not be unduly concerned with German economy. Rather, let us be more concerned with the economic prosperity of those desolated areas which UNRRA is attempting to serve so admirably. If the people of the rest of Europe can be made physically strong enough to serve democracy, perhaps the ideological basis of fascism remaining in Germany can be gradually stamped out. Only then will a strong and prosperous Germany be of value to its own people and the other peoples of Europe.

HELEN WEIN,
Falls Church, Va.

House-Hunt Story

My wife and I are both veterans with a total of 10 years service, 5 1/2 of which was spent in Europe. We met in 1942 in Iceland and were married in England. We enjoyed married life for one day since my wife was scheduled for return to the United States. We didn't complain because we understood perfectly that our duty came before personal happiness.

Early in 1945, I was returned to the United States on limited duty and after several months obtained an assignment where my wife and I could be stationed at the same post. We both had sufficient points for discharge and last November I came to Washington so I could enter a commercial radio school and brush up on my wage-earning abilities.

We had decided to begin a family even though we realized that we would immediately be blacklisted for violating the holy law of real estate interests. During the past winter the tourist cabin we enjoyed became untenable because of lack of heat and frozen water pipes. We accepted her aunt's invitation to have her stay in New York with her until something else was found. Transferring to a school there was impossible because of the current school shortage.

Net result: We've enjoyed five months of married life since 1943. I do commute and after checking studies permit and after checking with the various housing agencies to find if my application is forthcoming of results before 1947. Studies from 8 to 12 hours a day don't leave much time for house-