

AMERICAN OPINION

LOS ANGELES PUBLIC LIBRARY

NOV 27 1958

IN THIS NUMBER

HISTORY

Jean Louise Diehl

EUROPEAN SURVEY

William S. Schlamm

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

J. B. Matthews

HOW TO READ THE FEDERALIST

Holmes Alexander

NEGRO AMERICANS BACK TO AFRICA

Clennon King

Other Articles And Regular Features

AN INFORMAL REVIEW

Volume 1 Number 4

MAY 1958

50¢

Jean Louise Diehl

AMERICAN OPINION

Editor

ROBERT WELCH

Associate Editors

HUBERT KREGELOH

J. B. MATTHEWS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

HANS SENNHOLZ

Contributing Editors

COLM BROGAN

MEDFORD EVANS

RODNEY GILBERT

EDWIN McDOWELL

ELIZABETH WILSON

Editorial

Advisory Committee

The following group of distinguished Americans give the editor comments and advice which are helpful in determining the editorial policy, contents, and opinions of this magazine. But no responsibility can be attributed to any members of this Committee for any specific articles, items, or conclusions which appear in these pages.

GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG, JR.

JOHN U. BARR

K. G. BENTON

LAURENCE E. BUNKER

F. GANO CHANCE

JAMES L. COKER

KENNETH COLEGROVE

MARTIN J. CONDON, III

ROBERT B. DRESSER

CHARLES EDISON

WM. J. GREDE

FRANK E. HOLMAN

B. E. HUTCHINSON

ALFRED KOHLBERG

J. BRACKEN LEE

CLARENCE MANION

FRANK E. MASLAND, JR.

N. FLOYD MCGOWIN

W. L. MCGRATH

W. B. MCMILLAN

ADOLPHE MENJOU

LUDWIG VON MISES

COLA G. PARKER

J. HOWARD PEW

J. NELSON SHEPHERD

ROBERT W. STODDARD

ERNEST G. SWIGERT

A. C. WEDEMEYER

W. H. WILBUR

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON

CONTENTS — MAY, 1958

European Survey	William S. Schlam	1
The World Health Organization	J. B. Matthews	7
A Review Of The News	Hubert Kregeloh	13
How To Read The Federalist -	Holmes Alexander	15
Bullets		20
Negro Americans Back To Africa? -	Clennon King	21
We Pause To Remark		27
Washington Highlight	Lee Edwards	36
A Review Of Reviews	Edwin McDowell	39
Looking Both Ways	A Staff Report	44

April 3, 1958

Dear Readers:

This is just a word of thanks, to people we never see, for letters we can never answer.

For there must be few things in this feverish world more interesting than the mail of a small publisher. Subscriptions, renewals, cancellations, orders for extra copies, manuscripts, bills, changes of address; these routine components are only the beginning.

In one recent small batch there was a letter over a thousand words long, apologizing because the writer did not feel financially able to subscribe to our magazine. (We gave him a subscription.) There was a labored diatribe, telling us that our *Letter To Khrushchev* was "the most monumental piece of tripe" the author had ever read; and that he was sure nobody except the editor, the proofreader, and this critic himself, even waded through it. (He should have to acknowledge the response!) There was a check from one enthusiastic reader, who had already sent us subscriptions for many of his friends, covering five more similar subscriptions—and extending his own to sometime in 1963! (That one we really appreciate!) And there were forty-three more items, equally diverse.

Merely going through the mail every morning is an adventure—and an education. But the irreducible overhead with which this business operates makes individual replies, to most of the letters received, simply impossible. This is something for which we are extremely sorry. For we read them all. They are one of the greatest joys of our existence, and greatest helps to our straining efforts. Let'em come.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

AMERICAN OPINION—is published eleven months in the year by Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont 78, Massachusetts, U. S. A. Subscription rates are five dollars per year in the United States and Canada; seven dollars elsewhere. Copyright 1958 by Robert Welch, Inc. We use almost no articles except those written in order to fit our specific needs, and can assume no responsibility for the return of unsolicited manuscripts.

EUROPEAN SURVEY

by

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Mailed from Zurich, March 16, 1958

IT WON'T BE BELIEVED in the nicer sections of Boston, but Great Britain is at this moment the weakest link in the Western Alliance. This realm, this England, is currently going through the strangest eruption of political primitiveness—strange even if one takes into account that the British have always been given to a political eccentricity which superficial observers habitually misunderstand as plain stupidity. Whatever it is, this time England has got it bad.

The mysterious movement that is shaking all of England is a combination of the weirdest sort of political leadership and human conduct. Millions of Britons are banding together to cajole and blackmail their government into a policy of frantic capitulation. That is, into an immediate unilateral cessation of atomic armament; into a behavior that amounts to a forcible deportation of atom-armed United States air forces; into an immediate Summit Conference with the Soviets, whether or not the United States and some other British allies are ready to attend one. The manners and methods of the "movement" remind one of nothing so much as of the Holy Rollers. And the intellectual leadership of the crazy crusade is in the hands of Great Britain's aged buffoon, Lord Bertrand Russell,

whose top aides seem to have been pulled from all parties and all social strata. (Among them are, naturally enough, Mr. Arnold Toynbee, the over-sold "Christian" historian, and Mr. J. B. Priestley, the playwright who has never missed a chance to make fools of his audiences.)

The Lord Speaks For Labor . . .

Now the Labor Party, of course, didn't hesitate to adjust itself to the savage orgy of utopian thrills that has seemed to take hold of the British body politic. Labor has just passed a formal resolution that not only endorses Bertrand Russell's list of peculiar particulars, and adds to it the demand for Britain's acceptance of the Rapacki Plan; but that promises the organization of a country-wide shock campaign which is meant to make the government yield. Some observers claim that the Labor leadership acted under duress, does not really support Lord Bertrand's follies, and is actually trying to abort the "movement" by controlling its motions. And indeed, there have been lately a few Labor functionaries who produced very articulate arguments against the utopians. Mr. Shinwell, for instance, the Defense Minister in the last Labor cabinet, gave one of the most cogent speeches of recent

European Survey

times against the irresponsible kind of pacifism that is at the bottom of the current spasm. But Mr. Gaitskell, Labor's official leader, is himself hopelessly inveigled into the irresponsible political "planning" that started it all—the philosophizing à la Kennan that not only grants the possibility but demands the *realization* of a conclusive deal with Communism. The Russell "movement" is merely the plebeian response to the Deep Thinking of Ivy League Liberals and Socialists.

Nor is this response, by any means, confined to "men on the street". It penetrates some of England's most respectable clubs and newspapers, the organizations of the apparently reviving Liberal Party, and even the backbenches of the Conservative Government. The Conservatives, it seems, are badly frightened by the recent by-elections, which brought clear indications of a fatal Conservative shrinkage in the British electorate; and they are flirting with plain demagoguery. Some of them make noises that are indistinguishable from the sounds of traditionally banal radicalism. The London *Times*, which still enjoys the greatest intimacy with the British Foreign Office, often out-Kennans Kennan.

But, nonetheless, the main support of the Russell crusade comes from Labor—which is no consolation. British Labor is evidently riding a new tide that seems to be carrying it straight back to power. If Labor could enforce elections before the end of 1958 (which, in spite of Prime Minister Macmillan's ostentatious cheerfulness, is entirely possible) it would apparently win them. The reason for this is not so much a stiffening of socialist doctrine in the British people (although there is an interesting renaissance of utopian dog-

matism within the Labor Party). The reason is, first, a perfectly savage outbreak of the kind of British pacifism that, under Baldwin, demoralized England in the thirties and brought about World War II. It is, second, a demonstrable British apprehension that the days of prosperity are just about over. And the reason is, third, that British Conservatism hasn't shown one bit of gumption since it came to power. The electorate is simply becoming bored and tired with an unprincipled Conservatism that imitates Socialism without showing the emotional fervor that, fundamentally, accounts for the attractiveness of Socialism. In politics, he who sows boredom will reap defeats.

And Labors For Lunacy . . .

Meanwhile, the eighty-five years old Bertrand Russell has the time of his life. Until a short time ago, his constituency was mainly the New York *Times*—which, for years now, has been presenting him to the United States, practically every week in its Sunday *Magazine*, as The Voice of Western Wisdom. (And the TV networks, always animated by the political intelligence of Mr. Edward R. Murrow, have of course amplified the American importance of the clown who once was a great mathematician.) But in England, Lord Russell was practically forgotten, and certainly discounted. Now he is a political force of the first magnitude; and for those who know him, and England, this is the most eerie aspect of a fantastic situation. For this restless old fellow has always been a frivolous caricature of political man: Since the First World War, he has repeatedly advised his nation to commit suicide.

In 1914, he advocated a refusal to

bear at
goals
olution
lateral
("If ne
should
mies a
"Either
Soviets
bomb,
let the
now v
And in
Englan
them r
Bert
ball; a
us onl
the ch
fiesta
Times
as a v
intellig
unfort
day p
the in
than t
nally
iority,
ish pe
jump
to hin
tant s
But
Un
ists"
Britis
rotun
Dem
of a p
conse
If, he
expre
with

European Survey

bear arms. In 1918, he advocated the goals and claims of the Bolshevik Revolution. In 1938, he advocated a unilateral disarmament of Great Britain ("If necessary," he said then, "England should welcome Hitler's invading armies as tourists"). In 1948 he said: "Either we must make war on the Soviets while they lack the atomic bomb, or we must yield to them and let them rule over us. An atomic war now would be a war to end wars." And in 1958, he indeed advocated that England yield to the Soviets and let them rule over Europe.

Bertrand Russell is a tiresome screwball; and, personally, he should interest us only inasmuch as he remains one of the chief attractions of the intellectual fiesta with which the New York *Times*, and the Liberal Establishment as a whole, bamboozle the American intelligentsia into total confusion. But, unfortunately, Bertrand Russell is today perhaps a more powerful figure in the imagination of the British people than the Prime Minister. With his eternally mocking tone of cynical superiority, Lord Russell harangues the British people to do as the lemmings and jump in the sea. And they are listening to him. This, to me, is the most important story of the month.

* * *

But Russell Has Rivals . . .

Unavoidably, the German "neutralists" are itching to keep step with their British brethren. Herr Ollenhauer, the rotund head of the German Social Democracy, has just delivered himself of a pronouncement that may have dire consequences for Germany and Europe. If, he said, Poland and Czechoslovakia expressed their readiness to withdraw, within the Rapacki Plan, from the

Warsaw Pact, Germany would have to withdraw from NATO. Thus, for the first time in many a month, a responsible German politician has ventilated the possibility of a German break with NATO—and there is no one in Europe who doubts that, without Germany, NATO ceases to exist.

Herr Ollenhauer's tit-for-tat concession was a rather unbelievable performance, even for a Social Democratic leader. The Warsaw Pact, by itself, is a perfectly meaningless contraption. In the Soviet world, it never matters what formal treaties and pacts stipulate; it doesn't even matter whether they exist. What matters alone is the resolution, the firmness of the Communist Governments at the helm: Do they, or don't they, adhere to the basic Communist principle of "proletarian solidarity" vis-à-vis the non-Communist world? That is, do they, written pacts notwithstanding, basically believe in common interests of the Communist block in regard to the "capitalist" camp? And would they, in the event of a conflagration, fight on the Soviet side? Not even Herr Ollenhauer would dare deny that the Communist Governments of Czechoslovakia and Poland, in the case of a conflagration, would act as Communist Governments—i.e., fight "the final battle" in alliance with the Soviet Union.

In The Race To Surrender . . .

In the face of this unequivocal fact of life, a promise by Germany that she will leave NATO, if only Czechoslovakia and Poland will formally withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, would amount to actually leaving NATO; and for no consideration at all. The Warsaw Pact was never anything but a propagandistic reply to European notions of some

European Survey

kind of unity. Its signatories have never so much as contended that, by signing the Pact, they had created *new* facts. They merely expressed the undying readiness of Communist Governments to consider themselves forever linked in the interests of advancing World Communism. Czechoslovakia and Poland could "withdraw" today from the Warsaw Pact without the slightest reproach from, or damage to, the Soviet Union. In fact, the Soviet Government would *make* them "withdraw" immediately if, in exchange for such a meaningless gesture, the Soviets could realize their strategic immediate main goal in Europe—Germany's withdrawal from NATO.

For, contrary to the fictitious meaning of the Warsaw Pact, Germany's belonging to NATO is the paramount and perhaps the only reality in the entire NATO concept. Militarily, the German contribution in arms and men will constitute, in 1960, not just the skeleton but the entire effectiveness of NATO's continental establishment. The moment Germany leaves NATO, the defense of Europe has collapsed. Herr Ollenhauer has now committed his party (which may form the next German Government) to buying the phoniest goldbrick in the history of the con game: In exchange for Czechoslovakia's and Poland's tearing up a meaningless piece of paper, an Ollenhauer-led Germany will tear up the fabric of Western Europe.

This, verily, is an act unparalleled even by our inimitable British clown, Bertrand Russell. Europe's "neutralists" are in a mad race to outdo one another. At this time, the prize goes to Herr Ollenhauer. But the British "neutralists" follow neck-by-neck. The *Manchester Guardian*, for instance, has just

run an editorial that Khrushchev must have added to his most cherished trophies. Any Soviet attempt, mediated the venerable British paper, to occupy West Berlin must not, *and will not*, be fought by NATO with tactical atomic weapons. The *Manchester Guardian*, in other words, is not going to die for Danzig, even if Danzig, this time, is called Berlin. When this kind of slogan was used last time (by the French in 1939), Hitler went and took Danzig—and the rest. Maybe Khrushchev is more patient than Hitler, and postpones taking Berlin even after he has been assured by an outstanding British paper that he may, whenever convenient. In fact, it is quite likely that Khrushchev doesn't give a damn about West Berlin anyhow, as he has very good chances to get all of Europe simply by being nice and peaceful. Nevertheless, the growing British outspokenness is quite a temptation even for so patient a man as Khrushchev. A few weeks after Mr. Acheson made his historic remark about the unimportance of Korea, the rockets went off. If Khrushchev is not awfully phlegmatic, it may happen again.

* * *

While in France . . .

No one could be more surprised than French Prime Minister Gaillard that he is still in power. However, he isn't quite "in power". For the only reason he hasn't been formally thrown out is that the fixers of the French parliament have not yet agreed on his successor. And as there are some politically significant regional elections scheduled for April, the consensus seems to be that there's no profit in the usual free-for-all before May. So it seems that the Gaillard Government

will sta
weeks
French
underw
ry, the
ticular
conflict
come e
Algeria
Africa
and the
Murph
ing of
France
ica's
with th
a Fren
gust
"medd
The
bound
Mr. M
does
course
North
ness";
luck,
United

The
At
cians
the f
forme
Faure
Inter
sell h
ralize
out
Mitte
them
But
most
keep
men
supp

European Survey

will stay in power for a few more weeks—though there's not a single French political party that would fully underwrite its policies. On the contrary, the normal French *malaise* is particularly high-pitched right now: The conflict with Tunisia threatens to become even more dismal than that with Algeria; French casualty lists in North Africa are getting longer every day; and the United States "mediator", Mr. Murphy, gives the French an ugly feeling of national inferiority. No one in France would dare *not* to accept America's "good services" in negotiating with the Tunisians; but neither is there a Frenchman who can swallow his disgust with a world that constantly "meddles" in French "interior affairs". The United States, in any case, is bound to get it coming and going: If Mr. Murphy's intervention in Tunisia does *not* succeed, the French will of course blame any future trouble in North Africa on American "clumsiness"; but if Mr. Murphy *should* have luck, the French will forever resent United States officiousness.

The Situation Is Normal . . .

At the moment, three French politicians maneuver for the key position in the forthcoming cabinet reshuffle: two former Prime Ministers, Pleven and Faure, and the former Minister of the Interior, Mitterand. Pleven is trying to sell himself as the man who can "liberalize" French policies in Algeria without offending the right-wing parties. Mitterand would not mind offending them, if he can rally the left majority. But Edgar Faure, one of the ablest and most unprincipled French politicians, keeps talking of a "strong" Government of the left, *with more or less open support by the Communist Party*. In

short, Faure thinks of a revival of the Popular Front.

These diligent maneuvers do not mean that one of the three anxious men will be France's next Prime Minister. There's always the former Prime Minister, the terribly ambitious and driven Georges Bidault, who dreams of a come-back as the leader of a right-wing coalition. There is the former aide of General De Gaulle's, Soustelle, who used to be French High Commissioner in Algeria and is trying to sell himself as a true Algerian expert to a similar right-wing coalition. And there is, finally, General De Gaulle himself. For almost two years now the ground-floor wizards of French politics have been expecting his return to power at every critical turn of events; and they are today more hopeful than ever since the General withdrew into mystical privacy. Indeed, if a secret poll were taken among the French deputies, a clear majority would line up behind De Gaulle. But very few professional politicians want to go *openly* on a pro-De Gaulle record: The General has made abundantly clear that he won't accept an invitation without getting, at the same time, a constitutional reform from Parliament which reduces the powers of professional politicians and increases those of the Executive. To make De Gaulle take over the government, Parliament would therefore have to castrate itself. The problem is tough. And yet, talk of De Gaulle's comeback increases every day.

All Fouled Up, and Getting Worse . . .

Which is by no means unnatural. By now, everybody in France agrees that a final and radical solution in Algeria must be found, and quick, if France is to survive. Also, everybody agrees that

European Survey

no "normal" French Government would dare such a solution: If it is reached by strong-hand methods, the Government could not resist the onslaught of the French Left and of traditional United States "anti-colonialism"; but if it were reached by a radical withdrawal from Algeria, such a solution would result in a Rightist French upheaval. Thus, "normal" French governments are paralyzed, of necessity. And, therefore, all intelligent observers in France agree that only a government that would enjoy De Gaulle's "charismatic" authority in France and abroad could undertake a radical solution of the *one* kind or the *other*. And the consensus is that France is bleeding white, and will fast keep on, unless such a government is formed without much further delay. That's why De Gaulle's stock is at this moment high among "those in the know".

* * *

But Dulles Is (Somewhere) In His Heaven . . .

Europe's question of the month: How many more slaps in his face can Dr. Adenauer survive? Any government weaker than his would have tumbled under the impact of the latest folly of the Eisenhower Administration: The statement Dulles gave on March 12, in Manila, according to which the United States will no longer insist that a Summit Conference must put German reunification on its prepared agenda. This Dulles statement was followed by a joint declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, France, and England, gathered at Manila, who expressed their governments' willingness to attend a Summit Conference, even if only one subject were to be hopefully discussed there—

namely, "disarmament".

This was not merely an about-face of the Eisenhower Administration which, for the last several months, had insisted that no United States talks with the Soviet Union were admissible without an agreement on some kind of progress towards German reunification. And it wasn't merely a blunder either. This incredible Manila statement may have been a death blow to Adenauer's policies in Germany, to Germany's prolonged membership in NATO and, therefore, to the total defense establishment in Europe.

And All's Left With The World . . .

Two days after the fatal Manila declaration, Dr. Adenauer announced most pointedly that he must yield to the Anglo-Franco-American reconsideration of a previously self-understood attitude with regard to the German problem; and that he will make no difficulties. But Dr. Adenauer did not even try to hide that he, quite correctly, felt himself and the German government downright betrayed. And there are already symptoms that his firm NATO policy is falling apart and that Germany, rather than be left in the lurch, may start some fast negotiations with the Kremlin on its own.

Perhaps it all can be fixed again, at least for a while. But what will remain, no matter how subtly and successfully Mr. Dulles may mend the damage, is the chilling horror in European Chancelleries: That the United States can be so easily driven into abandoning firm policies just to satisfy its Allies' clamor for a Summit Conference. I am afraid the Manila statement, scarcely noticed in the United States press, will be long remembered abroad as one of Mr. Dulles' major blunders.

IF, A
to not
and w
in wo
in you
you co
being
curiosi
suspec
escape
might
that t
newly
zation
agency
popul
It re
invest
to the
to ma
garba
invest
and c
bage
at wh
teen-p
waits
leader
erally

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

by

J. B. MATTHEWS

In June, 1948, WHO's governing body, the World Health Assembly, met for the first time. WHO will, therefore, celebrate its tenth anniversary this year at a special session of the World Health Assembly, to be held in Minneapolis, beginning May 26.

It would seem unkind of us not to join in the celebration. In the following "anniversary article", therefore, Dr. Matthews takes a look at some of the personalities, purposes, and propaganda of this particular ring in the one-world circus. The show is well worth seeing, and we invite you to a ringside seat.

IF, A FEW YEARS AGO, you happened to notice some rather British-looking and well-dressed men—decidedly not in workmen's clothes—poking around in your city's sidewalk garbage pails, you could not have been blamed for being more than ordinarily curious. If curiosity had led you to make inquiries, suspecting perhaps that the men were escapers from a psychiatric ward, you might have been astonished to learn that they were representatives of the newly formed World Health Organization, a United Nations specialized agency which has now come to be popularly known by its initials WHO.

It really happened. A team of WHO investigators from Great Britain came to the United States in the fall of 1949 to make an investigation of American garbage pails and dump heaps. The investigators visited some twenty cities and counties on their tour of our garbage cans. They were frankly amazed at what they found and, in a seventeen-page report, told a world which waits breathlessly for United States leadership that our garbage cans generally were "dilapidated and nearly all

were uncovered, yet they were kept near to dwellings and placed on public streets to facilitate the work of the refuse collectors!"

As could have been easily predicted, the seventeen-page WHO report recommended government ownership and maintenance of garbage cans.

It is not of record that a single liberal voice was raised against this infringement of our democratic rights, by WHO. The WHO report on our system of garbage disposal made no mention of those unique American institutions: municipal graft and gangster unionism. Respecting our democratic right to deal with our grafters, microbes, and mobsters in our own way, the WHO report denied us the equally democratic right to be dirty. WHO would have been operating within its charter rights if it had turned our case over to UNEPTAUC (United Nations Expanded Program for Technical Assistance to Underdeveloped Countries).

Whence WHO? . . .

The World Health Organization had

The World Health Organization

its origin at the San Francisco Conference which set up the United Nations in April, 1945. The conference approved a joint proposal from Brazil and China that an international health organization should be established.

In June, 1946, the United Nations summoned a conference at which the Constitution of the World Health Organization was adopted and signed by representatives from sixty-one countries. The Interim Commission of WHO was established at this time.

When UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration) was terminated in 1946, it had an unexpended balance of three million dollars which was turned over to the Interim Commission of WHO.

On April 7, 1948, the last of the required twenty-six member states ratified its signature to WHO's Constitution and the document came into force.

A Magna Carta For Global Meddling . . .

WHO's Constitution opens with a statement that nine "principles are basic to the happiness, harmonious relations and security of all peoples." They are listed as follows:

Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition.

The health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security and is dependent upon the fullest co-operation of individuals and States.

The achievement of any State in the promotion and protection of health is of value to all.

Unequal development in different countries in the promotion of health and control of disease, especially communicable disease, is a common danger.

Healthy development of the child is of basic importance; the ability to live harmoniously in a changing total environment is essential to such development.

The extension to all peoples of the benefits of medical, psychological and related knowledge is essential to the fullest attainment of health.

Informed opinion and active co-operation on the part of the public are of the utmost importance in the improvement of the health of the people.

Governments have a responsibility for the health of their peoples which can be fulfilled only by the provision of adequate health and social measures.

Before commenting on the extraordinary nature of this set of basic principles, it will be pertinent to call attention to a booklet of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which praised the World Health Organization. Published on the eve of the formal launching of WHO, this booklet's preface, written by none other than Mr. Alger Hiss, contained the following statement: "The new specialized agency carries on one of the most successful parts of the work of the League of Nations. The Constitution of the World Health Organization, however, has a far wider basis than that established for the League organization, and embodies in its provisions the broadest principles in public health service to-

The World Health Organization

day. Defining health as 'a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity', it includes not only the more conventional fields of activity but also mental health, housing, nutrition, economic or working conditions, and administrative and social techniques affecting public health."

It would be difficult to imagine any area of human thought or activity—private or public, individual or collective—not covered by the definition of health set forth in WHO's Constitution. It could only have been dreamed up by a deranged mind bent on establishing a new and terrible tyranny over the lives of men. It is, indeed, a magna carta for unrestricted and global meddling; a limitless grant of power to investigate and legislate on everything from garbage cans to the effects of religion on the mental health of Moslems, Buddhists, Bahaists, Shintoists, Theosophists, and Christians, respectively.

Defining health as "complete physical, mental and social well-being", WHO could take upon itself the business of passing judgment upon the art of effective letter writing in social intercourse, the dangers of bob-sledding, how to pack picnic lunches, flower arrangements, pitching horse shoes, the relative merits of philately and numismatics as a hobby for presidents, and a hundred thousand other activities of the human animal.

Dramatis Personae . . .

Writing enthusiastically of the definition of health in WHO's Constitution, Professor Charles-Edward A. Winslow of Yale said, "It would be difficult to imagine a broader Charter." Professor Winslow might have said "impossible"

instead of "difficult". Among his many Communist connections, Professor Winslow was an honorary vice-chairman of the American Soviet Science Society, a national sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy, a speaker for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and a sponsor of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Brock Chisholm, about whom much will be said later, wrote as follows: "History is studded with critical dates—wars, invasions, revolutions, discoveries, peace treaties—that are firmly implanted in our minds . . . This document [WHO's Constitution] may well go down in history as one of the most far-reaching of all international agreements . . . The World Health Organization is a positive creative force with broad objectives, reaching forward to embrace nearly all levels of human activity."

Dr. Milton I. Roemer, chief of WHO's Social and Occupational Health Section, says that "to achieve their proper objective of contributing to positive health, sports must be engaged in by the average citizen." Contrary to this "must" of a high official of WHO, the dictates of civil liberty must leave the average citizen absolutely free to decide for himself whether to engage in sports or not to engage in sports. Dr. Roemer is currently a member of the advisory board of The Ernst P. Boas Memorial Fund, on which the late Communist, Bernhard J. Stern, was a fellow member, as are the veteran Communist fronters, Dr. Allan M. Butler, Dr. George D. Cannon, and Albert Deutsch.

In his annual report last year, the Director-General of WHO came up with the remarkably interesting ob-

The World Health Organization

servation that "there is no clear demarcation between health and sickness." As will appear later, there is a solid basis in WHO's philosophy and practice for every human being to conclude that he is not only sick but also crazy.

Meddling Is A Must . . .

In at least one publicized case, WHO officially declared that eighty-five percent of the population of a certain country was suffering from yaws, a contagious disease of the skin known medically as frambesia. When the government of Haiti replied that yaws had been completely stamped out through an eight-year campaign, WHO acknowledged its error. Which leads one to wonder how many of WHO's facts are compiled from outdated reports or sheer imagination by desk bureaucrats in WHO's Geneva headquarters.

A study group composed of eleven "psychiatrists and scientific authorities", which convened in Geneva last November under the auspices of WHO, deplored the free and public discussion among scientists of questions which are controversial. "The publicizing of disagreements and contradictions among scientists, for example, about polio vaccine, or the cancer-producing effects of tobacco," said the WHO committee, has contributed to public mistrust of scientists and has caused science to lose "the infallibility with which it was credited in the nineteenth century." The WHO study group ignores the fact that the free discussion of differences has been a major factor in the progress of science through the centuries. But WHO apparently proposes to be a world authoritarian and totalitarian agency to hand down the scientific truth. A shining example of "liberal" aspirations for suppression of the free-

dom of the press!

Early in its existence, WHO found that its secretariat had picked up a hot potato in the form of advising Member States on the subject of birth control. At the 1952 World Health Assembly, delegates from strongly Roman Catholic countries expressed opposition to action by WHO in the field of birth control. Discussion ended without a vote, in the "interests of harmony"; but secretariat officials said they did not consider themselves bound by the views of the Catholic delegates.

And Power Insidiously Planned . . .

The pro-Communist Physicians Forum, founded by the veteran Communist fronter Ernst Boas, liked WHO's definition of health so much that it printed that section of WHO's Constitution on the cover of its monthly magazine for several years. Underneath the copy of WHO's definition of health, the Physicians Forum magazine says: "The Forum endorses these standards of the World Health Organization . . ."

The powers of the World Health Assembly, as set forth in Chapter IV of WHO's Constitution, were shrewdly defined. In Article 19, we read: "The Health Assembly shall have authority to adopt conventions or agreements with respect to any matter within the competence of the Organization." As we have seen, there is no matter which is *not* within the competence of WHO.

In Article 20, we read: "Each Member [State] undertakes that it will, within eighteen months after the adoption by the Health Assembly of a convention or agreement, take action relative to the acceptance of such convention or agreement. Each Member shall notify the Director-General of the action taken, and if it does not accept such convention

The World Health Organization

or agreement within the time limit, it will furnish a statement of the reasons for non-acceptance." The power of enforcement of the Health Assembly's decisions lies in the stigma of non-compliance on the part of a Member State.

Dr. Brock Chisholm, who had more than anyone else to do with the writing of WHO's Constitution, has explained that the aforementioned provisions of Chapter IV incorporated a "new principle of international law" by circumventing the usual procedures for the ratification of international conventions or agreements. The Member States, in ratifying WHO's Constitution at the beginning of their membership in the organization, signed a blank check to be bound by such regulations as should be adopted by the World Health Assembly in the future *unless* they formally notified the Director-General of non-compliance. "The long, slow, and usually never completed process of ratification by each government of an international convention is thus avoided," says Dr. Chisholm.

At the 1955 meeting of the World Health Assembly, the United States lost its bid for a reduced financial assessment in WHO, despite an energetic plea by the chief United States delegate. The vote was forty-three to two against the United States, which was thereupon required to contribute thirty-seven percent of the total WHO budget, although there are now eighty-eight Member States. American taxpayers should be interested to know that a world legislative body has the authority to levy taxes upon them as it sees fit.

II

Chisholm of WHO . . .

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION was placed in orbit in June, 1948. As

will be shown later, it is powered by the solid fuel of United States dollars.

At the formal launching of WHO, Brock Chisholm was elected Director-General of the organization. The new and revolutionary definition of health with which the WHO Constitution opens is the work of Dr. Chisholm, according to one of his assistants. "From its inception this agency has borne the impress of this man's personality and skills," writes Professor Charles S. Ascher, chairman of the department of political science at Brooklyn College and formerly a member of the staffs of UNESCO and WHO. Professor Ascher published an adulatory biographical sketch of Brock Chisholm in *The Survey* of February, 1952.

Parenthetically, and to indicate the type of ideologist which heaps praise upon Dr. Chisholm, a reference to the views of Professor Charles S. Ascher may be instructive. When the American Civil Liberties Union took action to remove known members of the Communist Party from its staff and governing committees, Professor Ascher joined with a group of Communists and pro-Communists in denouncing the ACLU as "a fellow traveler of the Dies Committee". Associated with Professor Ascher in this attack upon the ACLU were Communists John T. Bernard, Howard Costigan, and Theodore Dreiser.

Another well-known leftwinger, Mr. Abe Fortas, formerly Under Secretary of the Interior, also thinks highly of Brock Chisholm. Professor Ascher reported that Mr. Fortas, on hearing the future Director-General of WHO deliver a sweeping attack on morality, exclaimed: "He [Chisholm] not only pleads for mature men and women, but the nature of his plea discloses that he

The World Health Organization

himself is that extraordinary creature—a man of maturity.”

To know what Mr. Fortas meant by “a man of maturity”, a passage from Dr. Chisholm’s lecture to which Mr. Fortas had just listened is enlightening. (The indicated deletions in these remarks of Chisholm on morality were made by Professor Ascher.) “The basic psychological distortion . . . in every civilization of which we know anything . . . capable of producing these perversions,” said Dr. Chisholm, “is morality . . . the concept . . . of good and evil with which to keep children under control, with which to prevent free thinking, with which to impose . . . loyalties.”

Who Is This Hero Of WHO? . . .

Brock Chisholm is a sixty-two-year old Canadian M. D. He served with the Canadian Army in World War I. He advanced to the rank of major general in World War II and was deputy adjutant general of the Canadian forces. From 1946 to 1948, he was chairman of the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization.

To understand the nature and objectives of WHO completely, it is necessary to take an extended look at the views of the man who is alleged to have left the impress of his “personality and skills” upon this UN specialized agency from its inception—the man who charges that *morality* is a device and a psychological distortion with which “to keep children under control”, “to prevent free thinking”, and “to impose loyalties.”

It should be borne in mind that his extraordinary views on morality were publicly expressed by Brock Chisholm in his William Alanson White Memorial Lecture in October, 1945, three years

before he was elected Director-General of WHO.

Since his retirement as Director-General of WHO in 1953, Brock Chisholm has been elected president of the World Federation for Mental Health, a position which he still holds. Inasmuch as the World Federation for Mental Health is one of the “non-governmental organizations in official relations with WHO”, Dr. Chisholm still has an influential status in the UN agency.

Addressing the tenth annual meeting of the World Federation for Mental Health at Copenhagen in August, 1957, Dr. Chisholm gave expression to some remarkably iconoclastic views. In different words, he reiterated his thoughts on morality as expressed in his William Alanson White Memorial Lecture. He declared that “loyalty to the ideas or attitudes or beliefs into which we happen to be born” is antiquated.

The Oneworlder Par Excellence . . .

As the full context makes clear, Dr. Chisholm gave voice to the authentic oneworldism, as follows: “We need to grow up in order to be able to make the changes that are needed, or at least to start our children on the course of making them; and there is still a very long way to go. Legislation is not going to do it. Conformity to the rules of the past is not going to do it. Loyalty to the ideas or attitudes or beliefs into which we happen to be born, is not going to do it. None of the great problems of the world is going to be solved from inside any one culture, because from inside any one culture it is not possible to see world problems truly.”

The oneworlders are at war with cultural pluralism. With Dr. Chisholm,

(Continued on page 31)

A Review of the News

by

HUBERT KREGELON

In March, 1958 . . .

→ Pope Pius XII appointed Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Roman-Catholic Archbishop of Chicago, pro-prefect of the Church's Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Cardinal Stritch, whose duties will be at the Vatican, is the first American to become a member of the Curia of the Church of Rome.

→ The Kremlin continued to press for another "summit" meeting. Anti-Communists feared that the Administration, while "playing coy," had already decided to agree substantially on Soviet terms and that the forthcoming parley might prove to be the most disastrous yet for the free world. Furthermore, as the gradual surrender to Soviet demands continued, the Washington Administration hinted it might move closer to Moscow's position in the matter of disarmament "if certain conditions were met." Capitol observers saw the influence of the retired "disarmament adviser," Harold Stassen.

→ At Cape Canaveral, Florida, the U.S. Army launched a second three-pound earth satellite—identical to "Explorer I," fired on January 31 (See March issue of American Opinion). "Explorer II," however, failed to orbit and was lost. But on March 26, in another attempt and again using the JUPITER-C rocket, the Army succeeded in placing "Explorer III" into orbit, although it was announced that it had not got off perfectly and would not stay in outer space long. In the meantime the Navy, after failures since December, 1957, finally succeeded (on March 17) in firing its

VANGUARD rocket successfully and put a tiny (3 and 1/4 pound) baby satellite into orbit. Thus, at the end of March, there were four (known) satellites in outer space—three American, and the dog-carrying Soviet "Sputnik II," the first "Sputnik" having burned itself out on January 4.

→ After "hijacking" an American-piloted South Korean airliner in February, the North Korean Communists shot down an American jet fighter plane near their border. Some analysts speculated that the Reds might be testing United States determination to resist provocations.

→ Washington announced that in mid-February unemployment in the United States had reached a sixteen-year record with 5,703,000. Both the GOP "defendants" and the Democratic "prosecutors" engaged in much contradictory oratory about the business downturn. Many of the proposed recession "cures" would in effect cancel each other out, and sober minds questioned anyway that a depression can be "legislated" out of existence. Meanwhile, in the midst of the recession, it was announced that the cost of living rose another two-tenths of one per cent in February to an all-time high.

→ As the United States offered to share military science secrets with NATO allies, critical observers pointed out that some of these "allies" have so many Communists in key posts that we might just as well offer to share these secrets with Khrushchev & Company directly.

A Review of the News

→ At the conference of SEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organization) in Manila, Pakistan spearheaded a blunt demand for more United States economic aid as the implied price for resisting Soviet blandishments.

→ The House Committee on Un-American Activities conducted a week-long probe in Boston and, with the help of two F.B.I. undercover agents and many recalcitrant witnesses, established that Communists remain dangerously active in New England.

→ Although the situation was not quite clear at the end of March, it looked as if King Saud of Saudi Arabia, recipient of considerable United States economic and military aid, had been ousted from power by his anti-Western and pro-Egyptian brother, Crown Prince Feisal. American petroleum and other strategic investments in Saudi Arabia are formidable.

→ The five-weeks Senate investigation of the violent strike by the United Auto Workers against the Kohler Company of Kohler, Wisconsin, was terminated. It was characterized by new attacks on loyal Kohler workers in Wisconsin, and by angry exchanges in Washington between the U.A.W. chief, Walter Reuther, and Republican Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona; also by a brilliant display of histrionics on the part of Reuther. He denied all responsibility for violence at Kohler, which he blamed on the company, and denounced the entire investigation as a "Republican plot" to "destroy" him and his union.

→ In a major Kremlin shake-up Premier Bulganin was ousted by Party boss Nikita Khrushchev, who was "elected" to the premier post by the Supreme Soviet. General impression was that

Khrushchev now seeks Stalin-style dictatorial powers.

→ In connection with developments in the Kremlin, the following interesting sequence of events was noted: As the Kremlin stepped up its propaganda for the halting of H-bomb tests (after itself just having concluded a series of major tests) some of our most "controversial" scientists—including Dr. Linus Pauling of the California Institute of Technology and Dr. Edward Condon, former chief of the U.S. Bureau of Standards—unleashed a scare campaign in support of the Moscow objective. Condon predicted that many thousands will die of bone cancer and leukemia as a result of the nuclear tests. On the last day of the month, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko announced that Moscow will halt all further nuclear tests "unilaterally." While the propaganda value of this gesture was obviously great, informed Western experts could immediately point to the hidden "jokers" and traps. By a strange coincidence, CBS-TV carried a nuclear test scare program the day before Gromyko's announcement, and from New Haven, Conn. and Philadelphia, Penn., groups of "peace fighters" started to walk to New York City to petition the United Nations to halt nuclear tests through international agreement. By another coincidence, all this preceded the United States nuclear tests in the Pacific scheduled for April.

→ On the last day of the month, Prime Minister John Diefenbaker's Conservatives won the most decisive federal election victory in Canada's history. Incomplete returns showed that the Conservatives would have over 200 seats, in the 265-member House of Commons, and were assured of four years in office.

HOW TO READ THE FEDERALIST

by

HOLMES ALEXANDER

This is the second in a series of twelve essays by Mr. Alexander on the Federalist Papers. They will all appear serially in this magazine.

II

PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS is one of the "unalienable rights" listed in the Declaration of Independence—but what does it mean?

It is a poetic phrase, a little vague but rather beautiful and certainly unforgettable. It seems to have rolled off the Signers' pen without ado. They were supremely confident about their beliefs. They spoke of "self-evident" truths. They wrapped up "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in a single package. The first two of these three are readily understandable. Life is substantial, and liberty is easily defined and illustrated. But today, although we hear quite a bit of humbug about "human rights", we have to hesitate, meditate, even speculate, over the meaning of three little words that have been familiar to us all since childhood. "Pursuit of happiness — ?"

The Signers would have been better understood today if they had frankly called it—pursuit of money. The phrase is a gross over-simplification, and the evil-minded would misunderstand it, but that can hardly be helped. The same people who regard "pursuit of happiness" as meaning the unlicensed chase of sensual gratification would take "pursuit of money" to mean get-rich-quick and never mind how. We come closer to the true meaning of the phrase if we examine this fragment from *The Federalist No. 44*, in which Madison wrote:

"... laws impairing the obligation of contracts are contrary to the first principles of the social compact, and to every

How To Read The Federalist

principle of sound legislation . . . Very properly there have the (Constitutional) convention (members) added this constitutional bulwark in favor of personal security and private rights . . .”

Property, then, and the obligation of contracts, are things safe-guarded in the American Constitution on the same basis that life and liberty are safeguarded. Money, or property, is not a spiritual value; but the right to earn and keep it was so regarded by the Founding Fathers. The men who drew the Constitution were clearly thinking of private enterprise when they asserted the right to pursue happiness. It is the right to choose a profession, a career, or a business, and to make the most of it within the limits of decency.

It seems strange that in our day we find it difficult to understand what our forefathers were talking about. Why did they say “happiness” if they meant freedom-of-enterprise? Well, to Early Americans happiness and property were not at opposite ends of the spectrum. It is true that happiness, now and then, connotes spirituality. It is tranquility, harmony, a satisfaction that comes from honest accomplishment — and the physical aspect of accomplishment is the ownership of something to show for it. The bridge that connects the sense of hope with the realization of achievement is easily perceivable.

Still, it all requires some rather belated explanation. It would be much better if we had instant, instinctive understanding of these traditional phrases which Americans now have lived by for many generations. Somehow we Twentieth Century Americans have acquired a sense of guilt which makes us unwilling to admit that happiness and successful enterprise may be closely related. For fully a quarter-century, our businessman has been depicted as a Babbitt of dense stupidity and total lack of culture. Our American visitor to Europe, unless he happens to be bringing military or financial aid to foreigners, is still held up as a social barbarian. The interpretative writers who dominate our daily newspapers still commence

How To Read The Federalist

with the assumption that Americans, being relatively rich, are therefore lacking in sympathy and understanding concerning the rest of the world.

None of this should be regarded as entirely accidental. A confusion has been planted in our minds until our children grow up and come out of college with a conviction that to be American is slightly shameful. A conspiracy has been subtly operating. It is a plot of tear-down, level-out, share-the-wealth. It runs through our educational systems, our public information, and our political expressions. It seems to say that private wealth is spawned in wickedness and — since it cannot bring happiness to the person who earned and owns it — should be distributed by the Federal Government for public welfare, at home and abroad. And if the earner-owner happens to be a corporate person, representing thousands of stockholders, then the Congress is called upon to divest the corporation of its holdings and even of its occupation. By mid-Twentieth Century practically every phase of private enterprise in the nation has been forced to fight for its life against the bust-business socializers.

Such plots, conspiracies and misrepresentations could not survive if Americans still understood, and stood up for, the first principles of Constitutional Americanism. And the lack of understanding has befogged our outlook upon life with guilt and self-reproach. Gradually, we have permitted the good and true meaning of American folk-talk to be obscured and dirtied. Consider, for example, the lexicon of the Welfare State. Home has become housing. Health is now a legislative term denoting rump injections and free false teeth. Education is measured in classroom units. Labor no longer means either childbirth or honest toil, but a mass of faceless workers giving the fist salute to a leader on a balcony.

Let nobody think that America is not the poorer for all this. Our spiritual values have been carnalized. The yearnings of men to succeed have been re-characterized into political demands for the greed and gluttony of utopian materi-

How To Read The Federalist

alism. The dream of what the Founders called "happiness" is now supposed to mean a tossing nightmare of the greasy spoon and huddled collectiveness, called security.

In the face of all this, it might have been better if the Founders had been more flat-footed in relating happiness and private property. The men responsible for the Declaration and Constitution were nothing if not practical about their worldly affairs. It is characteristic of them that in their desperate rebellion, they pledged "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." The Founders knew that there is no reasonable way to separate such things. They knew that there is a moral unity in "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Perhaps it is not too late for America to recover this understanding of life. We need leaders to say often and publicly that money and happiness, like body and soul, have a natural affinity. When these ideas are violently separated, or maliciously alienated, the American people suffer. Even if the body would benefit in a Welfare State, which is debatable, the soul would certainly perish. Take away a man's right to earn and keep his property, and he soon loses much of his manhood.

The right-of-enterprise belongs high on any list of freedoms. It asserts a man's right to seek his chosen mate, to build a dwelling for his family, protect and improve his community by restrictive covenants if they serve the purpose, to gather an estate and pass it along to children and grandchildren — these being all that a man ever sees of Life Everlasting.

The quest, in this sense, for happiness is more precious to most men than life and even liberty, although in practice they are inseparable. Indeed, to say that a man works for "money" is really to say that he works to achieve a host of admirable and desirable things. Among them are home, family, permanence, tranquility, satisfaction, cleanliness, privacy, initiative and individualism. The propertied man can expect a measure of all these things, and the man without property cannot.

Property is one of those "unalienable rights" which no

Gover
seems
for h

tion
five p
repea
and i
contr

by tr
annu
port
tangl
the r
isters

indu
ship
and
thro
by f
and
acts

be ri
at t
by f
shou
tical
begi
like

How To Read The Federalist

Government can rightly take from the American people. It seems incredible, then, that Americans after two World Wars for human rights have come to consent to such things as:

1. Confiscation of private property by Federal competition in the field of business; Federal taxation above seventy-five percent upon income and inheritance; Federal control by repeated "emergency legislation" over wages, prices, rents and interest rates; Federal encroachments in the fields of Labor contracts and public education.

2. Dissipation of American wealth and military strength by transfer of many billions of dollars' worth of goods abroad; annual taxing of American citizens and corporations to support foreign nations; continuance and proliferation of entangling alliances; meddlesome policies which in effect transfer the right to declare war from the American Congress to ministers and politicians of foreign lands.

3. Destruction of the American character by political inducement of self-pity and unreliance; by perverted courtship of minority groups and hard-luck persons; by masochistic and slow-poison tear-down of the United States of America through unfavorable comparison with dependent countries; by fraudulent hysterics over alleged "persecutions" of spies and traitors which are in plain fact no more than national acts of self-preservation.

Against all these abuses, there is remedy. The wrongs can be righted by aroused, indignant and activated citizens' groups at the grass roots. These groups are not called upon to revolt by force of arms — merely to unite in political action. If it should happen that people in all States recaptured their political parties from the Share America cliques, that would be a beginning. The recovery of our lost freedoms would follow like the rise of the morning sun.

One businessman to another: "I wanted my son to share in the business, but the Government beat him to it."

BULLETS

The Moving Finger writes; and, hav-
ing writ,
Moves on; nor all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half
a Line
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word
of it.

Omar

Remember the good old days when
charity was a virtue instead of an in-
dustry?

Josh Jenkins

There must be an easier way to make
a living than by being Secretary of
Agriculture.

Ezra Taft Benson

The years teach much which the days
never know.

Ralph Waldo Emerson

The shortest distance between two
points is to run like hell.

Some Eager Beaver

Before marriage a man yearns for a
woman. After marriage the "y" is silent.

And So Is He

We go by the major vote, and if the
majority are insane, the sane must go
to the hospital.

Horace Mann

The true danger is, when liberty is
nibbled away, for expedients, and by
parts.

Edmund Burke

She means well, but she doesn't mean
much.

*By Whom — We Don't Know
About Whom — We Could Guess*

A good listener is not only popular
everywhere, but after a while he knows
something.

Wilson Mizner

What is mind? No matter. What is
matter? Never mind.

T. H. Key

I have no doubt that most of Russia's
recent triumphs have been produced on
American typewriters.

*Medford Evans,
In National Review*

It never troubles the wolf how many
the sheep may be.

Virgil

The chief justice was rich, quiet, and
infamous.

*Thomas Babington Macaulay
(On Warren Hastings)*

Saying Peace, peace; when there is
no peace.

Jeremiah VI, 14

Americans have come to believe that
it's easier to vote for something they
want than to work for it.

H. C. Diefenbach

A fool must now and then be right
by chance.

William Cowper

You don't have to be a cannibal to
get fed up with people.

*Especially With Scientists
Who Sign Petitions*

Even such is Time, that takes in trust
Our youth, our joys, our all we have,
And pays us but with earth and dust;
Who in the dark and silent grave,
When we have wander'd all our ways,
Shuts up the story of our days;
But from this earth, this grave,
this dust,
My God shall raise me up, I trust.

*Sir Walter Raleigh, In Prison,
The Night Before He Was Executed.*

NEGRO AMERICANS BACK TO AFRICA?

by

CLENNON KING

We have stated repeatedly in this magazine our belief that the trouble in the South over integration is Communist contrived; that Communist agents, working largely behind the scenes, are using every trick and skill in the Communist repertory to foment bitterness between black and white members of communities where no bitterness existed before; and that the Communists thoroughly intend to fan and coalesce small flames of "civil disorder" into the conflagration of civil war if possible.

Under the disturbing and difficult conditions which the Communists have brought about, one of the most heartening developments has been the good sense, good will, and sound patriotism of many of the responsible Negro leaders in the South. Outstanding among these leaders has been Clennon King, Professor of History at Alcorn (all-Negro) College, Alcorn, Mississippi, whose wise and courageous articles in various southern papers have been widely quoted.

But Professor King makes no bones about his feeling that the racial problem is very real. And he is an ardent advocate of the immigration of Negro Americans to Africa, for the good it can do on both sides of the Atlantic. We are glad to present his thoughts, in the following brief article which he prepared for us on his favorite subject.

A FACT: Christianity is losing in world influence.

Another fact: The race problem in America remains to be solved, and is now as sore as ever.

A further fact: Negro Americans are Americans first, but—no matter how reluctantly—Africans, too.

I have a theory that these three separate facts are not so separate.

The Harmful Publicity . . .

Suppose the United States would or could say to the world: "There is no American race problem!" It would be a

Negro Americans Back To Africa?

huge help to the beginning of a better era in international relations. But the United States cannot say this, *because Negroes would not go along.*

Why won't we go along? It is a good question, without any easy answer.

American Jewry certainly does *not* promote either public or foreign notions that America is a land of anti-Semitism. There actually is some anti-Semitism in America, of course. But Jewish Americans know that such lurid publicity would only make matters worse for America, and for themselves.

Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, and South-European Americans are discriminated against. But they do not promote loud-mouthed wailing on their behalf, either. These people know that their American advantages far exceed anything to the contrary.

But travel abroad, for me, has more than once been interrupted by the embarrassing "sympathies for the Negro" of some naive foreigner. Other Negro Americans traveling abroad have expressed similar feelings of discomfort. Only a dishonest or childish person likes to be pitied for false or exaggerated reasons. From an American standpoint, I commonly found the people visited much more to be pitied than my own.

A Negro ex-Communist who had been living in Russia for many years returned home a few months ago, and had this to say, in the March issue of *Ebony*: "In the search for (civil) rights I foolishly moved to Russia . . . I believed then that the black man's future lay in this Soviet 'promised land', that he would never achieve freedom and equal status in these United States no matter how long or how stubbornly he fought to do so. But I was wrong." Now, twenty-five years after leaving America, he has discovered that the moral and political values he sought were at home all along, and in superior degree. He apologizes, and promises that he has returned "a better and more convinced citizen."

We Negro Americans are one of the most fortunate races on earth. Our opportunities are definitely superior to those

Negro Americans Back To Africa?

of any other colored race in the world. Yet we too often express ourselves with strange cynicism. The prominent Negro American personality who, not long ago, petulantly exclaimed "the (United States) Government can go to hell," cannot help but be sorry. The damage is done, however, and other damage from other sources continues to be done.

NAACP, with all of its brain, has sought to go before the United Nations, to air globally the grievances of Negro Americans. The "dean of Negro thought," Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, renewed this request as recently as last fall. American racial incidents are purposely created, in order to give this country derogatory world-wide publicity—and to shame her into bowing to the aims and wills of private organizations.

It is no wonder that Christianity loses influence! The United States of America, the leading Christian nation, is indicted before the world by its own citizens as guilty of humanity's most unChristian offense: the lack of brotherhood.

Against the Objective Facts . . .

America has racial adjustments to make, of course, as *all* nations do—even the nations where all of the people are of the same color. Judged by pragmatic world standards, however, America actually looms as an outstanding example of superior inter-group relations.

No sincere spokesman expects America to be perfect. But we Negro Americans know that she is capable of advance in that direction. The problems that arise do not normally stagnate and putrify; they enter the process of favorable solution. The American way is the way of hope, and we know it.

What we too often do not know is that the minority peoples in other lands do not share as great a hope as our own. And far too little known is the truth that we, as a part of the world's colored races, have found something of great value here in Christian America; something which the world as a whole, and our African brothers in particular, can share through us. Dedicated Negro Americans must be encouraged

Negro Americans Back To Africa?

to see themselves in perspective, from afar; and also to see the great need for what they can offer in the world outside.

II

FOR ONE THING, Negro Americans who seriously say that they want to go to Africa to live should be helped to go. This should become a part of America's foreign policy. The prolonged meeting of the skeptical African and the adventurous Christian Negro American, in Africa, would heal a lot of wounds on two continents.

Because I believe this, and because United States Government help—despite the Langer African Migration Bill (S.759) currently before Congress—does not seem to be forthcoming, I am in the process of organizing an expedition to explore inexpensive means of launching a limited African migration project.

The fundamental difficulty in establishing cells of dedicated Negro American communities in Africa is not one of finding the Negro Americans desiring to participate. It is in finding sufficiently inexpensive means of travel. Seven hundred dollars or better per passenger is the average cost of a one-way trip from America to Africa. For a family this could easily run into several thousand dollars. This means hard cash money. It does not count the money one would need with which to "get started." If the trans-Atlantic passenger fares could be coped with more readily, the "get started" money would be far less a problem.

A Lesson From the Past . . .

Columbus himself could not have made it to America, even with Queen Isabella's help, if oceanic travel costs had then run into such big money. And the difference today is not due just to far greater labor costs. A critical part of the difference is caused by the basic change in the very *mode* of transportation; specifically, in the abandonment of sail for faster means. Before the last century the principal method of

Negro Americans Back To Africa?

inter-continental travel was by sailing ship. Expensive fuels, high vehicle maintenance costs, and travel luxuries were unknown for long voyages. An adventurous spirit was an absolute necessity for travelers of an earlier day. And there is no fundamental reason why, for a sufficiently earnest purpose, an adventurous spirit cannot substitute for a lot of travel luxuries today. A synthesis of the old and the new can bring about considerable savings on the trans-Atlantic passage—and offer reasonable comfort, safety, and speed at the same time.

There is no reason why Negro Americans, who *really* want to consecrate their lives to helping to develop a Negro Christian civilization in Africa, must have the luxuries and speed of modern ocean travel in order to get across. With a sailing yacht of moderate size, say fifty to one hundred feet (Columbus' favorite ship, the *Nina*, was only seventy feet long!), I hope to see the beginnings of low-cost African American migration take place. This service would be in the reach of all Negro Americans who sincerely want to make their own effective contribution to the great inter-group problems of our times.

III

IT IS NOW 339 years since August, 1619, when the *Jesus*, a Dutch "man of warre", landed twenty Negroes at Jamestown, Virginia. After the Revolutionary War ended in 1783, the number of Negro freemen in America multiplied by leaps and bounds. Some of these Africans, as they were then called, after having acquired some measure of wealth and a new faith in human dignity, sought to use this power for the benefit of their fellow men. Among the most interesting of the period were Paul Cuffe, a rich New England trader, and Lott Cary, the well-to-do pastor of the African Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia.

Pioneers Eastward . . .

Captain Paul Cuffe was owner of the 109-ton brig, *Traveller*. At his own expense he sailed from Philadelphia to

Negro Americans Back To Africa?

Africa in 1811 and again in 1815. On the second trip he carried thirty-eight freemen as settlers, and returned for a third voyage. But with so little government cooperation forthcoming, he turned his attention to helping to found the American Colonization Society (1816). He died in 1817, happy in the realization that his life had inspired a new era of freedom in Africa. In 1819 Congress passed an enabling act for the establishment of Liberia.

Reverend Lott Cary gave up his home and the leading Negro pastorate in America to see that the great Christian experiment in Liberia did not fail. In 1821 he sailed for Africa from Norfolk on the schooner *Nautilus*, with his wife, his two children, and twenty-eight other migrants. They reached Liberia, by way of Sierra Leone, in 1822. "The redemption of Africa" was begun.

Today a Welcome Is Waiting . . .

One hundred and thirty-four years later, President W. V. S. Tubman of Liberia, in his inaugural address, has this to say about his desire for Negro Americans to come to his country today:

"It is the policy of the Government to encourage such (desirable) immigrants. The National Legislature has enacted the following arrangements . . . Three months' free lodging at the Government's expense will be arranged for immigrants . . . A single immigrant will be allocated ten acres of land free of cost and each family will receive twenty-five acres . . ."

President Tubman is one of the surest friends that America has in Africa. He is of American descent, and a Christian. May his tribe increase. Independent Negro Americans like Captain Cuffe and the Reverend Cary stimulated private citizens of this nation into a realization of their obligations and opportunities in Africa, over a century ago. I believe it is time once more to be following their example.

We agree
in the re
Potomac
of Sherm
ident in
out, the
term.

Senato
na, in a p
as having
the leade
be trustee
son why
leaders'
reason v
Ellender
rience.

Woul
You can
of block
to the f
see is a
on the
cipants
Mesta a

"A S
now u
news it
of an
twenty
Access
last ach
lonians
that, b
we ha
rians i
decade
sound
Lydia

Life

MAY,

We Pause To Remark...

We agree with Mr. Fletcher Knebel, in the relief expressed in his column, Potomac Fever, that there is no danger of Sherman Adams running for President in 1960. As Mr. Knebel points out, the Constitution forbids a third term.

* * *

Senator Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana, in a plea for "coexistence", is quoted as having said that he "did not see why the leaders of Soviet Russia could not be trusted." That one is easy. The reason why we do not trust the Soviet leaders' good faith is exactly the same reason why we do not trust Senator Ellender's good judgment: past experience.

* * *

Would you like to walk on water? You can now buy "water shoes", made of blocks of styrofoam, to be attached to the feet like skis. What we want to see is a hundred-yard dash—preferably on the Potomac River—between participants wearing those things. Perle Mesta and Elsa Maxwell, for instance.

* * *

"A South American business center now under construction," so a recent news item tells us, "will be in the form of an ascending spiral. It will cover twenty-five acres and be 365 feet high. Access will be by ramp." So we have at last achieved the *ziggurats* of the Babylonians. Also, there is hardly any doubt that, behind the Iron Curtain, at least, we have now caught up to the Assyrians in cruelty. Maybe in another few decades or centuries we can have a sound hard currency, such as the Lydians had.

* * *

Life is so complicated. One thing

leads to another. This is a most inconsiderate arrangement, on the part of Providence, that we think the "planners" should do something about. We are indebted to Mr. Louis Ruthenburg for the story of the state legislator who introduced a bill to change the relationship between the diameter and the circumference of a circle, from the "usually accepted" ratio of 3.1416 to the more convenient ratio of exactly 3. Perhaps the socialists can persuade that same legislator to bring in a bill providing that henceforth one thing shall not lead to another, but vice versa. If it is passed, and the Supreme Court doesn't rule that this legislative field has been preempted by our federal government, we promise to move to his state.

In the meantime, however, we must suffer all the baleful results of the outmoded order of things. For instance, we subscribe to *The Worker*, *The National Guardian*, *the New World Review* and a few other out-and-out Communist publications—and read them, too. Otherwise we would not know—as Anna Louise Strong informed us in a recent issue of the *New World Review*—that it was Russia which came to freedom's aid "when the armies of France collapsed before Hitler, and all Europe feared a Dark Ages of a thousand years". Somehow we had got the preposterous idea that Stalin had been an ally of Hitler when Hitler overran France. But these publications rapidly clear up any such misconceptions in the minds of their readers. We wouldn't miss them, even for a weekend with Milovan Djilas.

But—this love for great literature means that your editor's name is on all

We Pause To Remark . . .

kinds of subscription lists, some of which are available to all kinds of liberals for all kinds of purposes. So some one thing we have done (we have no idea what) led to this other thing, of our getting a letter from Eleanor Roosevelt, which in turn led to our flirting on the edge of great danger. As will become clear from our reply.

* * *

March 8, 1958

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt
345 East 46th Street
New York 17, New York
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

On my return from Washington tonight I found on my desk your letter dated March 7. In this letter you plead with me, on behalf of yourself and your friend Lester Pearson, to join with your other friends in sending at least one hundred dollars each, to help pay for a conference the American Association for the United Nations is holding in Washington later this month.

My secretary, knowing how favorably I would regard such a request, especially from such a source, had already made out my personal check for one thousand dollars, to the A. A. for the U. N. (of which I note you are Chairman of the Board of Governors), and had placed it on top of your letter, ready for my signature.

I was just about to sign this check, and send it on its way, when I picked up a book which was gradually being pushed off my desk by the accumulated brochures of the American Civil Liberties Union. It happened to be the English edition of Corliss Lamont's *FREEDOM IS AS FREEDOM DOES*, and my thumb caught in the middle of Bertrand Russell's introduction (which Mr. Lamont had apparently been too modest to publish in the American edi-

tion). There I learned, before I could get my thumb out and close the book, of the nightmare of persecution now rampant in America against anybody who does what I was about to do. In fact, Mr. Russell solemnly assured me that anybody in this country "who goes so far as to . . . say a good word for the United Nations is liable" to be visited and threatened by the F.B.I. And of course not only you, I am sure, but another authority with almost as much prestige and knowledge as yourself, namely the *New York Times*, will vouch for the fact that Bertrand Russell utters only words of truth and profound wisdom.

So I was saved by so timely a warning. But I cringe to think what would have happened to me if I had mailed that check. Even now I can hear the F.B.I. bloodhounds yapping at my heels. So you will simply have to hold that conference without any of my dollars to help to buy the vodka.

Regretfully,

Robert Welch

* * *

Despite all the persiflage above, we make no commitment not to be serious in these particular pages. And since, at every turn, Bertrand Russell seems to be moving in and out of the copy for this number of our magazine, let's pull him all the way in and take a sober look at this notorious egghead. He is a specimen well worth careful study.

In 1932, Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg, whose reputation as a military hero carried all the way back in German memories to the Seven Weeks War in 1866, was re-elected as President of the Weimar Republic. And some wit remarked that the Germans had elected a *legend* to head their government. With the shadow of Adolph Hitler al-

We Pause To Remark . . .

ready forecasting future events, this had been a foolish and disastrous thing to do. But even more foolish, and likely to be equally disastrous, is the course being taken today by quite a large segment of the British public. For they have chosen, as their spiritual leader and political mentor, a doddering old refugee from the fourth dimension.

Bertrand Russell was born, with a silver spoon in his mouth, as the second son of an English peer. As Will Durant said in a brilliant double pun, some thirty-five years ago, he thus missed inheriting an earldom by an "heir's breath". As Will Durant did not say, he also missed inheriting any common sense, by an immeasurable gap. Eventually nature corrected the first omission, and our subject became Lord Russell. But the second margin was too large to overcome, so it has gradually grown wider.

If his prowess as a mathematician were important to this discussion, we'd venture a few pinpricks to test even that huge bubble of prestige. We'd begin by pointing out that a small but highly dramatic part of his early reputation rested on his proposal, around 1900, of a brilliant definition of a cardinal number (as the class of all classes similar to a given class); and that while Bertrand Russell has always been given credit by his admirers for having arrived *independently* at this concept, the fact remains that it had already been proposed some twenty years before by the German mathematician, Gottlob Frege, with whose work Russell was familiar. We'd mention next that Russell's one and only important book, *Principia Mathematica*, was written in collaboration with Alfred North Whitehead. Several volumes of "learned moonshine" (as they have been de-

scribed by a friendly critic) he wrote all by himself.

But further innuendoes of this kind would sound entirely too much like something out of the Book Review Section of the *New York Times*, when dealing with an anti-Communist book, to be at all honest. So let's take the curse off even the remarks above, by readily conceding that we are not qualified to appraise Bertrand Russell as a mathematician; and that his glorification in that field by the Liberal Establishment may be entirely justified by the facts. Nor do we think that his "moral turpitude" (or whatever the term was which, in a more righteous age, our immigration officials held up to shield us family-loving Americans from contamination by the Bertrand Russells of Europe) deserves more than a passing sentence. What we are coming to, that *is* important, are his merits as a philosopher-statesman. And we wish they were merely negligible, for that would be a huge improvement.

Lord Russell has himself written many chapters to prove that the distinctive feature of the unintelligent man is the hastiness and absoluteness of his opinions. And few men have ever described themselves so accurately—albeit unconsciously—in their own pronouncements. The core of this unintelligence does not consist of the flip-flops and reversals and glaring inconsistencies to which Russell is addicted, but of his refusal to admit any inconsistency between the position he is pontifically supporting today and the categorically opposite position which he was supporting yesterday or may be supporting tomorrow. Always, in all ways, the world is wrong and Bertrand Russell is right. And since the Soviet Union is the only part of the political world which, to

We Pause To Remark . . .

Bertrand Russell, is even worthy of a second thought, his arrogant omniscience invariably winds up guaranteeing the eternal wisdom of the current Communist line—as fast as he can catch up with its turns.

It would take volumes to write a short introduction to the idiocy of Bertrand Russell's fulminations with regard to the practical details of the world's economics and politics. So we'll confine ourselves to an illustration on a higher level; in that realm of generalization and logic where he professes to be such a master. Some years ago he wrote, practically as his credo, and with all the solemnity of which he was capable: "Better the world should perish than that I, or any other human being, should believe a lie." We are sure he would claim that to be the essence of his philosophy today. Yet within the past three weeks he has written, in a personal letter to a friend of mine, that if no alternatives remain except Communist domination or extinction of the human race, he prefers Communist domination. And this, of course, is the line of "blackmail" he is currently using on the British public to condition their thinking in favor of surrender to the Kremlin.

Now so great a logician would certainly welcome our putting his reasoning in the form of a syllogism. When we do, we have this sequence: (1) it is better for the world to perish than for anybody to believe a lie; (2) it is better for the Communists to rule the world than for the world to perish; (3) therefore, it is better for the Communists to rule the world than for anybody to believe a lie.

Since, as Bertrand Russell well knows, Communist power has been acquired by lies, and its continuance and growth

depend vitally on lies, the conclusion he supports is childish in its absurdity. But this is mature and rigorous argument compared to most of what he is spouting in his writings and speeches today. The truth, of course, is that this conceited old crackpot—who has always regarded the labyrinthine processes of his own mind as the most important phenomenon in nature—has now degenerated into merely a puppet of the Communists, happy in the conspicuousness he achieves through being dangled by them at the front end of their propaganda line. Russell himself has proclaimed that he loves "perfection more than life". He has good grounds, therefore, for a feeling of happiness and accomplishment. For we believe he can easily claim the honor of being the most consummate egghead of our times.

* * *

In the *New York Times* on January 26, 1958, Dore Schary is quoted — we presume in connection with his recent opus, *Sunrise at Campobello* — as saying: "I had read everything that had been written about Franklin D. Roosevelt since his death." Alfred Knopf describes that as the neatest trick of the year. But we disagree. We think the neatest trick of the year was performed by Bill Buckley of *National Review* when, on proposing a non-governmental committee to study what is wrong with Radio Free Europe, he suggested Henry A. Kissinger as a member of that committee. We expect any day now to hear that General Douglas MacArthur has suggested to President Eisenhower that Adlai Stevenson be made chairman of a committee to study what is wrong with Foreign Aid. It's a topsy-turvy world, my masters. Here's hoping you are not the same.

(C
they see
distorti
which th
which is
is; and,
perches
it is the
agencies
tion, en
health,
to mind
Our r
like our
view of
his pres
consign
United
the wor
obvious
was eve
way it i
support
think
signed
always
was the
of war
of all
Because
I think
the wor
change
changin
tutions
ruthless
of doin
same
design
world
It Is A
Unite
Dr.
it is
small

The World Health Organization

(Continued from page 12)

they see that "every culture provides distorting or colouring glasses" through which the world appears as something which is different from what it really is; and, therefore, from their lofty perches as oneworlders, they decree that it is the mission of WHO and kindred agencies to globalize standards of nutrition, environmental sanitation, mental health, and anything else that comes to mind.

Our respective national constitutions, like our moral standards, are obsolete, in view of Dr. Chisholm and his kind. In his presidential address last August, he consigned the Constitution of the United States, along with all others of the world, to limbo. He said: "It is obvious that none of our constitutions was ever designed for the world the way it is now. It was never designed to support and use the United Nations. I think all our constitutions were designed for competition to the death, always with the certainty that warfare was the final recourse; and the concept of warfare lies behind the legislation of all past generations. That is gone. Because that is true, our constitutions, I think without exception anywhere in the world, are obsolete and need to be changed extensively in order to fit this changing world. All our national institutions were designed for competition, ruthless competition. All our methods of doing business were designed for the same purpose. None of them was designed for mutual co-operation on a world basis for the welfare of mankind."

It Is A Crime For The United States To Be Rich . . .

Dr. Chisholm went on to say that it is "manifestly absurd" for a "very small proportion of the human race",

meaning the people of the United States, to enjoy a "tremendous proportion of the world's natural resources". He predicted, with the obvious envy which oneworlders feel toward the United States, that this situation cannot last, because Nature's gifts to the American people are "not a sensible arrangement". Apparently, Dr. Chisholm feels that we are heading toward a socialist redistribution of wealth on a global scale—and heartily approves.

Or Even To Exist . . .

Finally, in this presidential address before the World Federation for Mental Health, Dr. Chisholm went all-out for world government and the obliteration of all national boundaries. He asked rhetorically, "National boundaries. Why? What for?" After explaining that wise and intelligent visitors from some other planet would be at a total loss to understand the national loyalties found on the Earth, Dr. Chisholm declared that "if we really looked at it, we might come to the conclusion that all our international boundaries are ridiculous."

Dr. Chisholm then envisioned the day of complete integration of the nations of the world in a global society ruled over by a global government. Movement in this direction has been undertaken by the World Federation for Mental Health, which is an official part of the total WHO apparatus. Said the founder of WHO: "One of the early steps toward integration is being taken in this organization, the World Federation for Mental Health, and it has gone a little way."

In 1957, Dr. Chisholm delivered the "Bampton Lectures in America" at Columbia University. In his third lecture, he returned to what is ap-

The World Health Organization

parently a favorite subject; namely, that the very idea of morality has no validity in man's nature and his universe, that the very concept of sin is the equivalent of superstition, that there are no eternal values and verities the violation of which entails unhappy consequences.

And To Believe In Sin Is A Sin . . .

"I think," said Dr. Chisholm in his Bampton lecture, "there is no doubt that this idea of sin creates much havoc in our relationships with other cultures . . . We must remember that it is only in some cultures that sin exists. For instance, the Eskimos didn't have this concept until quite recently. Now they have; they caught it from us." Dr. Chisholm then quoted an anonymous and "very eminent cleric" who was alleged to have said: "You know, for years we couldn't do anything with those Eskimos at all; they didn't have any sin. We had to teach them sin for years before we could do anything with them." On his own, Dr. Chisholm added contemptuously: "The Eskimos were in a state of innocence, but they had to be made to feel sinful so they could be controlled."

Dr. Chisholm's "very eminent cleric" was a palpable fiction calculated to titillate his Columbia University audience. The mental-health program, which WHO was chartered to foster as one of its basic aims, holds that the concept of sin is the excrescence of diseased minds, as well as a tool of other diseased minds scheming to control masses of innocent and immature human beings.

Also in his third Bampton lecture, Dr. Chisholm reported that many members of the secretariats of the United Nations and its specialized agencies came to him during his tenure

as Director-General of WHO to say that they were "unhappy and embarrassed by . . . instructions from their governments, from their state departments, from their foreign offices . . ." This is easy to believe with respect to some of the Americans who were in the employ of the UN and its agencies, and who were eventually exposed as Communists. One thing, however, is certain: none of these delegates and secretariat personnel who complained about the necessity of obeying the instructions of their respective governments were from the Soviet Union.

While Loyalty Louses Up The Deal . . .

Expanding on this subject, Dr. Chisholm told his Columbia University audience: "I have also seen many members of secretariats come back to work from home leaves very unhappy indeed. I remember one man telling me that he didn't know how he was ever going to be able to go home to live, because he found it very painful living among his own relatives . . . *He had become a functioning world citizen.*" (Italics supplied).

Inadvertantly, perhaps, Dr. Chisholm thus revealed that the prevailing attitude among the personnel of the United Nations and its agencies, excepting always the Communists, is that working in the UN, WHO, FAO, UNESCO, and UNICEF is working for a burgeoning world government. Exposed to the seductive sentimentality of doing good for the human race, these members of the secretariats betray their trust, privately repudiate their national loyalties, and ride off as globaliers to the final crusade.

Brock Chisholm is on record as declaring that the term "Iron Curtain" . . .

creates in
"the com
damagin
imaginari
world it
To sur
wave of
reached
blems of
from H
national
Constitu
United
institutio
dying p

WHO A

IN SE
declarat
of the v
the que
hazards
public's
they we
ment o
House
Medical
amount
in favor
New Y
the pro
findings
that ne
about t
water o
York C
The p
even al
prevent
seventy
which i
propos
six mil
compul
useless.
water s

The World Health Organization

creates imaginary boundaries" and that "the concept of the 'Iron Curtain' is damaging to world peace." It may be imaginary to Dr. Chisholm; to the world it is real.

To sum up, Dr. Chisholm sees in the wave of the future, when men have reached maturity, "the lugubrious emblems of mortality" (to borrow a phrase from Hawthorne) for sin, morality, national loyalties, the United States Constitution, the natural wealth of the United States, and other concepts and institutions which belong to a dead and dying past.

III

WHO And Fluoridation . . .

IN SEPTEMBER, 1957, WHO made a declaration in favor of the flouridation of the water supply. This dictum left the questions of the precise benefits or hazards of putting fluorides in the public's drinking water exactly where they were before. WHO's pronouncement on the subject, like that of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, in December, 1957, amounted to a propaganda statement in favor of socialized medicine. The *New York Times* was quick to exploit the propaganda value of the so-called findings of both WHO and AMA in that newspapers's campaign to bring about the fluoridation of the drinking water of eight million residents of New York City.

The proponents of fluoridation do not even allege that it is beneficial in the prevention of dental decay for the seventy-eight percent of the population which is above nine years of age. They propose, nevertheless, to subject some six million New York residents to a compulsory medication which is at best useless. The cost of fluoridation of the water supply is borne by the taxpayers.

It is socialized medicine in an area of health where the allegedly preventive fluorides are readily available in tablet form to individuals who desire to purchase them for their children.

Regardless of all questions of toxicity, mottling, and caries, the compulsory and socialized medication involved in the fluoridation of the tax-supported water supply is the main issue. Shall we turn to Big Brother to cut down dental bills? WHO and AMA say yes. If so, why not a daily glass of compulsory carrot juice to cope with the problem of defective eyesight? Why not get to the root of the matter and pass a law, making it illegal to sell candy to children and decreeing punishment for parents who permit excessive carbohydrates in their offspring's diet? Or, since health is bound up with correct nutrition, shall we put WHO on the job to watch us at every meal?

IV

National Citizens Committee For The World Health Organization . . .

THE LEFT-WING CHARACTER of WHO is evident in the political orientation of its most ardent supporters as well as that of its officials.

On May 15, 1953, the National Citizens Committee for WHO was incorporated in the State of New York "for non-profit, charitable and educational purposes". "For propaganda purposes", would have been a more accurate way to put it. Naturally, the Citizens Committee enjoys federal income tax exemption.

At the present time, the Citizens Committee for WHO has a policy committee and board of directors numbering sixty-three members. Nine out of ten politically informed Americans could guess that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is one of them. Probably, a large num-

The World Health Organization

ber could guess that one of the Reuther boys is another. In this case, it is Victor, the author of the slogan, "Carry forward to a Soviet America." (Walter is vice-president of the United World Federalists.)

Seventeen of the members of the National Citizens Committee for WHO have records of affiliation with Communist enterprises.

According to the latest annual WHO report, Dr. E. M. Bluestone, Montefiore Hospital, New York City, is a member of WHO's Expert Committee on Organization of Medical Care. Dr. Bluestone sponsored the notorious Waldorf-Astoria conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions which the State Department described as an "instrument of Soviet propaganda". He was also affiliated with the following Communist organizations: American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, and the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Dr. Leo Eloesser, professor emeritus of Stanford University, was a member of the WHO staff from 1947 to 1949. Prior to that, from 1945 to 1947, he was employed with the China Mission of UNRRA, and subsequently, from 1949 to 1953, he was with UNICEF. During the Spanish Civil War, Dr. Eloesser served as a surgeon with the Communist forces in Spain. After the outbreak of the Korean War, he was honorary chairman of the China Welfare Appeal, a Communist organization which raised funds in the United States for Red China. Dr. Eloesser's other Communist connections have been too numerous to mention. It has been reported that he unnecessarily held up a WHO project for the treatment of trachoma for the children of Taiwan.

WHO, Mental Health, And World Government . . .

Attention has already been called to the official connection between WHO and the World Federation for Mental Health, and that Dr. Brock Chisholm was the first Director-General of the former and the incumbent president of the latter. Dr. Chisholm's world-government ideas pervade the thinking of these interlocked organizations. In an article written for *Survey Graphic* magazine more than ten years ago, Dr. Chisholm said: "In order to obtain peace for the world it is certain that we will have to sacrifice much of our own national sovereignty; we must ourselves grow to the stature of world citizenship and develop larger loyalties. . . . Surely it is becoming increasingly clear that nothing short of world government can ensure survival of the human race."

At the final session of the International Congress on Mental Health, held in London in August, 1948, the discussions of the gathering were summed up by Professor J. C. Flugel, as follows: "Under present-day conditions full mental health is only possible with reference to 'one world'. Hence, the emphasis on 'world citizenship', which has however been interpreted not so much politically but rather as a spiritual acceptance of world community. . . . We need new concepts and new symbols around which world loyalties can crystallize."

At the same International Congress on Mental Health, the following official declaration was made: "Principles of mental health cannot be successfully furthered in any society unless there is progressive acceptance of the concept of world citizenship. World citizenship can be widely extended among all

The World Health Organization

peoples through the applications of the principles of mental health."

The New Abracadabra . . .

The incantations of mental health are as far removed from the political and economic realities of the world as the animism of an African tribe is distant from the theology of Aquinas. And yet, the doctors of mental health prescribe it as the cure-all for what ails the world. Dr. Frank Boudreau is a good example of the mental healthists in this respect. Addressing the Seventy-ninth Annual Meeting of the American Public Health Association in San Francisco, Dr. Boudreau declared: "Our present aggressiveness and competitive spirit must give way to compassion, sympathy, and cooperation. Advances in our knowledge of human psychology, sociology, and psychiatry, built into programs of mental health, give the most promise of success. WHO's present limited programs for mental health need to be developed and expanded until they cover the earth." Then and only then will we have "vigorous cooperative action toward building a world society in which opportunities for health, long life, rising standards of living, and freedom will be open to men, women, and children of every race, creed, or country." Dr. Boudreau is a member of the board of directors of the National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization.

Apparently WHO considers the United Kingdom the most sacred shrine of the mental health sect. Thither WHO sends native sons of other countries to study the principles and methods of the cult, in order that they may return to their homelands as more zealous evangelists of world citizenship. In its latest annual report, WHO listed fel-

lowships for the study of mental health in the United Kingdom to trainees from Nigeria, Germany, Ireland, Egypt, Israel, and Japan—to take a few examples. We shall see what success these returning evangelists have in curing the natives of these countries of the competitive spirit and national loyalties.

But The Same Uncle Sap . . .

The 1957 assessments for the operating costs of WHO totalled \$12,911,710, of which the United States share is \$3,867,610 or thirty-three per cent. The United Kingdom's share is a little less than ten percent and that of the U.S.S.R. is also just below ten percent. Of the internationally recruited WHO employees, twenty-one percent are from the United Kingdom and twelve percent are from the United States.

It has come to be axiomatic in these global endeavors that they depend for their existence upon financial support from the United States. The United States contribution of \$3,800,000 will not bankrupt the taxpayers of the United States or dislocate our national economy. But the main question is "Why?" Why should American taxpayers be called upon to finance a global soterialogy which runs counter to both reason and our foreign policy?

Obviously, the world is full of crazy people who need to be restored to some kind of mental health. The craziest of all are those who would have us throw away our weapons and stockpile maudlin sentimentality in their place. And a lot of them will be meeting in Minneapolis in May.

There will be another article by Dr. Matthews in the June issue of this magazine.

HIGHLIGHT OF THE MONTH IN WASHINGTON

by

LEE EDWARDS

March — The Kohler Company In The Star Chamber

After a particularly smooth morning session, midway through March, Robert Kennedy, counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, strolled over to the United Auto Workers' legal table and, with an infectious grin spreading over his cherubic face, inquired of Joseph Rauh, chief union counsel: "How are we doing?"

Such camaraderie between investigator and investigated suggests that the UAW had more than a passing advantage in the recently completed Senate investigation of union violence and vandalism during a strike against the Kohler Company of Wisconsin. Frankly, "we" did not do very well, but it was through no fault of assorted senators, staff members and witnesses who made it abundantly clear that they knew the Kohler Company was guilty on all counts submitted by the UAW. This included several charges unrelated to the issues, that occurred twenty years before the four-year-old strike began. A roll call of presumably unbiased participants makes this painfully apparent:

Robert Kennedy, chief (and Democratic) counsel. Reporters argued that he tried to be dispassionate, but his personal feelings were as evident as indicated by his remark quoted above.

Democratic chairman John McClellan of Arkansas. He was described by members of both parties as impartial yet, when the efficacy of his committee

was challenged on the Senate floor, he did *not defend it*. Instead, he stated that the committee's 1957 report would "fully justify to any impartial mind . . . that the work of his committee in *its first year* was effective and was worthwhile." (Italics added.) McClellan made no defense of the Kohler inquiry other than to promise that "when ever I reach the conclusion that the usefulness of the committee has come to an end . . . I shall walk out on the floor of the Senate and so report." This was not a statement calculated to rally opinion to the committee's cause.

Democratic Senator Patrick McNamara of Michigan. A former union leader, on whose election in 1954 the UAW (which he was supposed to be investigating) had spent \$725,000.00, McNamara did his best to place the Kohler people in the worst possible light. One day, he entered the room at 2:55, listened to the testimony of Lyman Conger, company counsel, for a half hour, described the use of private detectives by the company as "gestapo methods", and left at 3:35—five minutes after the television cameras stopped.

Democratic Senators John Kennedy of Massachusetts and Sam Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina. Both men made infrequent appearances; Kennedy undoubtedly through a desire not to embarrass the UAW's president, Walter Reuther, a useful man to have as a friend in the 1960 presidential primaries; Ervin for less obvious reasons.

Highlight Of The Month In Washington

Republican Senator Irving Ives of New York. Senator Ives is a Republican sometimes, but a liberal always. He also elected to travel the easiest road by never (well hardly ever) dropping in on the party.

Fortunately for the Kohler Company and the record, Republican Senators Barry Goldwater of Arizona, Karl Mundt of South Dakota and Carl Curtis of Nebraska were in constant attendance, determined to show that violence, coercion, and boycott constituted the *modus operandi* of the UAW.

Certain facts did emerge from the maelstrom of emotion and hyperbole. (1) The UAW has spent over ten million dollars in the strike (which celebrated its fourth birthday on April 5), on strikers' benefits and in support of a nation-wide boycott against the Kohler Company. (2) Over eight hundred complaints, of violence and vandalism against—mainly—workers who refused to strike, have been filed with the Sheboygan police. (3) William Bersch, Jr., testified that a beating by strike sympathizers had, according to physicians, contributed to his father's death. (4) John Gunaca, named and identified before the committee as one of Bersch, Jr.'s assailants, has avoided Wisconsin prosecution by residing in Michigan, where he will probably remain forever—while Governor G. Mennen Williams has refused, for three and one-half years, to grant extradition. (5) Robert Burkart, who took an active part in strike preparations in 1954 as a UAW representative, belonged, from 1944-1947, to a Trotskyite group known as the Socialist Workers Party. Burkart denied under oath that he was still a member, to which Lyman Conger later retorted: "He may have left the party, but the party hasn't left him."

There is no denying the complexity of issues of the Kohler strike, which cannot be explained solely in terms of the Senate investigation. The NLRB conducted hearings for a period of over two years, filling 19,700 pages of transcript. Once, in October of 1956, the trial examiner held that the case should be dismissed because union trustees (who had originated the demand for investigation) had not filed non-Communist affidavits, in accordance with the Taft-Hartley Act. On February 8, 1957, the five-member NLRB board reversed the ruling, holding that the trustees were not "officers" of the union; and that therefore they were not required to file affidavits.

Much of what the Rackets Committee heard was a rerun of testimony given before the NLRB. This repetition disturbed several pundits, who argued that nothing new was uncovered and that the investigation was a waste of time. Such critics mistake, or ignore, the purpose of the committee; which is not to serve as a board of arbitration, but to recommend legislation on the basis of its probing of labor and management activities.

Both Senators Goldwater and McClellan declared that there is need of new labor laws to curb the indiscriminate use of power by labor unions. McClellan said that Congress should do something about a situation in which a union can employ "so many pickets" (approximately two to three thousand in April, 1954 and presently 250 outside the Kohler gates) and "keep people away from their work by sheer force."

Equally important was that the record of the strike and the brutalities committed by the UAW were presented to the public. The Dumont Television Network carried the hearings locally

Highlight Of The Month In Washington

for five hours a day from March 10-21. The UAW frequently attempted to capitalize upon this telecasting. On March 20, before the morning session began, Joseph Rauh, the union counsel and a founder and present vice-chairman of the ADA, was interviewed. Smiling Joe ended an argumentative diatribe for boycotts by saying: "Certainly we believe in them, and if anybody's listening, we want to urge them not to use Kohler products made by scabs."

[Mr. Rauh, it should be recalled, is a man of parts. Among his other honors he has the distinction of having been one of three men—Alfred Friendly and Clayton Fritchey being the other two—who paid a fake named Paul Hughes \$10,800.00 to try to get something on Senator McCarthy. Their agent Hughes aptly described himself, in a memorandum to Fritchey early in this association, by writing "...relaxing somewhat on ethics . . . perhaps is probably what I'm best suited for . . ." Editor]

No clearer contrast of the principles and principals involved could have been offered than that of Herbert Kohler and Walter Reuther, who testified late in March. The company president, a tall, squarely-built man with a deep resonant voice, outlined his position calmly and firmly. He said that the union had lost the strike, and that his

company would not reward violence and illegal conduct by suing for peace. The UAW president, who fluctuates between the emotional levels of a labor missionary and a self-educated professor, was finally persuaded to admit that some mistakes had been made by union members at Kohler, Wisconsin! But he disclaimed any personal responsibility. Senatorial questions were used, by the tiresome but untiring labor leader, as launching pads for philosophical, economic and political flights of oratory. Reuther resembled nothing else so much as a very agile squid that disappears into inky darkness whenever it is attacked.

The original demands of the strike are not now of prime importance. The major obstruction to settlement is the union demand that strikers be reinstated, which would require the company to dismiss those men who have loyally served the Kohler Company for four years, and which would thus condone the union tactics of vandalism and terror. To this reporter, to accede to such a demand would be as logical as to admit Communist China, conceived in massacre and sustained by purge, to the United Nations. It is significant that the Open Persuaders for the cause of the one are as vociferous in their support of the other.

PSALM OF THE WELFARE STATE

The government is my shepherd, I need not work. It alloweth me to lie down on good jobs: it leadeth me beside the still factories. It destroyeth my initiative: it leadeth me in the paths of the parasite for politics' sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of laziness and deficit spending, I shall fear no evil; for its doles and its vote-getters, they comfort me. It prepareth an economic utopia for me by appropriating the earnings of my grandchildren. It filleth my head with bologna: my inefficiency runneth over. Surely the government shall care for me all the days of my life and I shall dwell in a fool's paradise forever.

To avo
it is onl
month, t
VIEW v
not talk
This d
we have
by oste
from eve
munism,
ror no l
last part
we still
every b
and with
who wi
them to
there. T
under t
that the

Contr
commo
Comm
cosmic
minism
Nor w
science
force a
abolish
the dic
ble cal
parativ
—in th
of fou
years
becom
world,
it is a

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

by

EDWIN McDOWELL

To avoid undue shock to our readers, it is only fair to warn you that, this month, the middle part of this REVIEW will talk about books that do not talk about Communism.

This does not mean, however, that we have joined the liberal herd which, by ostentatiously stampeding away from even a sidewise glance at Communism, is trying to prove that the terror no longer exists. As the first and last parts of this parley will indicate, we still see Communists under almost every bed—more than ever before—and with good reason. For anybody else who will take an honest look can see them too. The Communists are right there. They are very real. And those under the beds are now so numerous that their feet stick out on all sides.

* * *

Contrary to carefully promoted and commonly accepted beliefs, the rise of Communism did not come about as a cosmic accident, or by historical determinism, or through divine inspiration. Nor was Communism conceived as a science. It began as a militant call to force and violence—for the purpose of abolishing capitalism and establishing the dictatorship of an amorphous rabble called the proletariat. How a comparatively few men following this call—in the infinitesimally minute period of four decades which began seventy years after the call was issued—have become able to threaten the entire world, is a story without parallel. And it is a story which, true to its original

plan, has been written in blood and terror.

The call to arms, by Karl Marx and his partner-in-crime, Friedrich Engels, might never have got beyond the shouting and scheming stage had it not been for Vladimir I. Ulyanov, alias Nikolai Lenin. In 1917 this merciless fanatic, with a handful of bedraggled followers, was able to overthrow the moderate Kerenski regime which had started the Russian Revolution, and to put the beginning of modern Communism into practice. J. Edgar Hoover, in *MASTERS OF DECEIT* (Holt, N.Y.; 374 pages, \$5.00), traces the progress of Communism, from its genesis in the fiery writings of Marx and Engels, to its present claims in the "drunken" boasting of Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev. The author then goes on to a careful analysis of Communism in America.

The story of the growth of the Communist Party in the United States opens with bickering, fighting, and bitter rivalry among the many factions striving for control. But by 1921 sufficient solidity had been achieved for the Party to split itself consciously and deliberately into two parts: the above-ground Communist Party and the *nameless* underground Party. (There was a time when the Communists themselves boasted that their organization in America was like an iceberg, with the nine-tenths under the surface, which could not be seen, constituting their real strength. Today, when the percentage of that strength which is underground is im-

A Review of Reviews

mensely larger, they would like to have the iceberg analogy forgotten.)

After the security of disciplined unity had been achieved, the Communists began their infiltration into the everyday activities of American life. The contamination of schools, labor unions, patriotic organizations, and all other groups and segments, got under way. Soon, wherever there was an opportunity to foment trouble the Communists were sure to be on hand—working incessantly to confuse and to divide, until the day should come when they could impose their dictatorship on a helplessly disunited United States.

Mr. Hoover convincingly dispels the popular myth that the *numerical* strength of Communist Party membership indicates the *real* strength of Communist influence. This myth is, of course, deceptive nonsense. For neither Alger Hiss nor Harry Dexter White was ever a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. Yet, in their hidden roles, they did irreparable damage to our country. And the real measure of Communist strength is the total influence of the strategically placed dupes, sympathizers, and fellow travelers, whom the secret Communists are able to keep mobilized in service to the conspiracy.

Mr. Hoover also offers excellent examples of the misleading double-talk which abounds in Communist writings and speeches. He does not name names, until his not doing so becomes annoying. But his restraint in this respect is understandable. He has to consider the continuing effectiveness of his Federal Bureau of Investigation, one of the few remaining strong bulwarks against the Communist advance in this country. So there was nothing to be gained by drawing any unnecessary fire from the

irrational liberals. Of course such "liberal" voices as the *New York Times Book Review* and the *Saturday Review Of Literature* made it clear to their readers once again that Communism were now almost as extinct in this country as dinosaurs; and that it was a pity the long out-dated Mr. Hoover should tilt his lance at the few remaining dinosaurs, before they could "silently steal away" into oblivion. But even some of the liberal press found a few good words to say about *Masters Of Deceit*. And with them, or despite them, the book is likely to remain near the top of the best seller lists for quite a while.

* * *

If this were played upon a stage now, I could condemn it as an improbable fiction.

Twelfth Night, Act III, Scene 4

THE PENTAGON CASE (Freedom Press, 520 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N.Y., 247 pages, \$3.95), by Col. Victor J. Fox is supposedly a work of fiction. In reality it is one of the truest and best records yet written of contemporary Communist activities. The academic words are full today of dishonest hacks and careless pundits who label their blatant distortions as history. (See bottom of Page 139 in *The Crisis Of The Old Order*, where Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., makes three important misstatements of fact in one sentence.) Col. Fox—the name is a pseudonym—has reversed the procedure. He has written some amazing history, of what has happened to America through these blatant distortions in press, television, magazines, movies, and radio—and has labeled it fiction. And the result is a "thriller and chiller" to equal the best.

As exciting as is the tale of Bret Cable, Special Assistant for Public Re-

lations in
however
a second
tious" eve
eyes. Gra
fall into
puzzle—c
novel. Sc
identifying
velopmen
can't hap
shocking
ing here,
well conc
most of t
lieve the
eyes.

But th
angle to
as Bret
the gove
mentally
tim of a
front, se
that it
governm
of tricks
committe
where, h
he will
ever sile
the tale
rious, h
with th
For Ful
and Co
of the
omew
his boo
two cas
"fictiti
the "m
life Fl
roaded
compla
sexuals

A Review of Reviews

lations in the Department of Defense, however, even the story-interest assumes a secondary importance as the "fictitious" events unfold before the reader's eyes. Gradually these events begin to fall into place, like a well constructed puzzle—or as in a truly great mystery novel. Soon the reader finds himself identifying real persons and factual developments. The initial reaction that "it can't happen here" gives way to the shocking realization that it *is* happening here, on a scale so large, and so well concealed by sheer brazenness, that most of us refuse either to see or to believe the true situation right before our eyes.

But there is an even more striking angle to this work of "fiction". As soon as Bret Cable uncovers subversion in the government, he is accused of being mentally unsound, and becomes the victim of a calculated campaign on that front, so insidious and so vindictive that it *should be* unbelievable. High government officials try, by every form of trickery and coercion, to have Cable committed to a *government* hospital where, bereft of medical examination, he will be pronounced insane and forever silenced. What makes this part of the tale so strange and so deadly serious, however, is the fantastic parallel with the Fletcher Bartholomew case. For Fulton Lewis, Jr., had not revealed, and Col. Fox did not know, anything of the true story of Fletcher Bartholomew until *after* Col. Fox had written his book. And the big difference in the two cases is that Brett Cable, being a "fictitious" character, managed to elude the "mental health" trap; while in real life Fletcher Bartholomew was railroaded to a mental hospital when he complained about the number of homosexuals in the Free Europe program.

You can be sure that the "liberal" reviewers have ignored, and will continue completely to ignore, this book. But partly because of its superlative quality as fiction, partly because of the urgent importance of its message, it is already achieving a phenomenal sale and distribution. This is largely through the chain reaction of one astounded reader buying copies to give his friends, each of whom does the same for friends of his own. (These copies are being purchased, in most instances, either from *The Bookmailer*, or directly from the publisher. For, due to the loud silence of the liberal reviewers about it, many bookstores have not yet even heard of *The Pentagon Case*.) Here is a book, in fact, which may easily become an outstanding best seller in reality, without ever getting anywhere near the "official" best seller lists at all.

Former counterspy Herbert A. Philbrick has said of *The Pentagon Case*, "In terms of sheer terror it has no equal". The *Daily News* called it "an exciting and informative novel". And the excellent magazine, *U.S.A.*, promised to give a year's free subscription "to any reader who can start reading *The Pentagon Case* and not finish it".

* * *

Now for that recess we promised, from preoccupation with the battle of the twentieth century, Kremlin *versus* Humanity.

Since the days of Marco Polo, the Orient has held a special fascination and charm for the western world. The mysteries and mysticism of this strange "never-never land" have had an appeal like that of fairy tales. So completely different did this realm seem that Kipling added to his fame by proclaiming the irreconcilability of East and West. And his dictum might have gone un-

A Review of Reviews

challenged longer, had it not been for a vagabond traveler named Lafcadio Hearn. This wandering nomad, half Greek and part Irish, had journeyed the world over, searching for Shangri-la. Finally he came to Japan. Here, with his Japanese wife, Lafcadio Hearn spent the rest of his life interpreting the Orient and the Occident to each other.

RE-ECHO (Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho; 161 pages, \$10.00), by Kazuo Hearn Koizumi, edited by Nancy Jane Fellers, is the inspiring story of "life with father", told by Hearn's first-born son. Through kindly patience, understanding, and—when necessary—firmness, Lafcadio Hearn awakened the boy to the wonders of exciting worlds beyond the seas. Geography and history, literature and arithmetic, were taught with the embellishments of a master story teller. Each lesson brought the breathless thrill of a new discovery, and learning became something to regard as an unending joy.

This is a beautiful book, containing original Hearn sketches and paintings which are the last Lafcadio Hearn source materials previously unpublished. Each page is a wonderland of stories, lessons, and information. Reading it is like reliving some of childhood's wonderful years. The book's underlying theme, the companionship of a father and son, is timeless; and its appeal, to young and old alike, will be exceptionally strong.

* * *

H. L. Mencken hated government, lampooned hypocrisy, and laughed at *homo americanus*. But this "pied piper of Baltimore" (as John Abbot Clark called him), who was the idol of the intelligentsia during the twenties, be-

came the "reactionary misanthrope" of the fifties. It was not that Mencken had changed; for he never lost his enjoyment of life, and his wit and its barb remained as sharp as ever. It was just that truth, once so dear to the hearts of the intellectuals, had now fallen into disgrace with fortune and men's eyes.

H. L. MENCKEN, PREJUDICES (Vintage N.Y.; 258 pages, \$1.25), selected by James T. Farrell, is an excellent sampling from his wide range of interests. Whether writing about reason, religion, or Roosevelt, Mencken deflates both the boobs and the buncombe artists with sure strokes of his acid-coated pen. Of course, to admire Mencken, for his individuality and his swellegant language, is not to embrace every Mencken "prejudice" as one's own. Willi Schlamm once said of him: "Within his limits, Mencken is magnificent and incomparable. Inflated beyond them, he bursts." In these selections he is magnificent and incomparable.

* * *

Recess is over. Short, wasn't it?

In the November, 1953 *American Mercury*, Dr. J. B. Matthews published an article, so powerful in its revelations that it proved to be explosive, on Communism in our churches. Myers Lowman and his *Circuit Riders*, in Cincinnati, have been steadily and effectively turning their searchlight on the same subject for years. Nevertheless, the increasing appearance of pro-Communist spokesmen and of collectivist doctrines in our pulpits has been explored less than similar infiltration into any comparable field. Or it had been, that is, until the recent publication of Edgar C. Bundy's consummate study, *COLLECTIVISM IN THE CHURCHES* (Church League of America, Wheaton, Illinois;

354 pages, names a encyclopedia tions tarred. Also, it is ticularly

Mr. Bu gian, is ch of America he explain been able Christ un able from If you ha church g time after opposition Bill or th bomb tes port of f creased p you will

If the on their outdistan the "liber tion of be for deliv of the Churches have alre

Some c room to tioned. T Chicago; Louis D patrick, i tifully southern (Yale P \$6.00), l scholarly and econ LOVE (\$350), a

A Review of Reviews

354 pages, \$5.00). This book names names all right; it is a comprehensive encyclopaedia of persons and organizations tarred with the Communist brush. Also, it is fully documented and meticulously indexed.

Mr. Bundy, a Protestant lay theologian, is chairman of the Church League of America. With detailed illustrations, he explains how the Communists have been able to distort the teachings of Christ until they become indistinguishable from the rantings of Karl Marx. If you have ever wondered why some church groups (usually the same ones, time after time), were so vociferous in opposition to the McCarran-Walter Bill or the Bricker Amendment or H-bomb tests, while equally noisy in support of federal aid to education or increased power for the United Nations, you will find the answers in this book.

If the "liberal" theologians continue on their present track, they will soon outdistance the "liberal" professors and the "liberal" scientists, for the distinction of being the group most responsible for delivering America into the hands of the enemy. *Collectivism In The Churches* will show you how far they have already gone.

* * *

Some excellent books we do not have room to review must at least be mentioned. *THE LASTING SOUTH* (Regnery, Chicago; 208 pages, \$5.50), edited by Louis D. Rudin, Jr., and James J. Kilpatrick, is a collection of fourteen beautifully written essays dealing with southern life. *THEORY AND HISTORY* (Yale Press, New Haven; 384 pages, \$6.00), by Ludwig von Mises, is a scholarly interpretation of the social and economic problems of history. *ON LOVE* (Meridian, N.Y.; 204 pages, \$3.50), a posthumous volume by Jose

Ortega y Gasset, is — surprisingly enough, when you note either the title or the author — primarily a stout defense of common man. *YEAR OF CRISIS* (Macmillan, N.Y.; 414 pages, \$5.50), edited by Evron M. Kirkpatrick, is a thorough analysis of the various propaganda techniques used by the Communists during 1956. *ADENAUER AND THE NEW GERMANY* (Farrar, N.Y.; 300 pages, \$5.25), by Edgar Alexander, presents a definitive biography of Germany's chancellor and Europe's greatest statesman. *7 YEARS' SOLITARY* (Harcourt, Brace, N.Y.; 256 pages, \$4.50), by ex-Communist Edith Bone, is the story of one who, returned from the dead, can tell you what Communism really is.

But it wouldn't do for a conservative to be making positive sounds too long. We must start knocking something or somebody again, if just for the sake of balance — and to keep some liberal from fainting. We'll wind up, therefore, with equally brief mention of the two most "godawful" books we can think of at the minute, out of the current crop. They are: *A TESTAMENT OF FAITH* (Little, Brown, Boston; 176 pages, \$3.00), by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam; and *PIOUS AND SECULAR AMERICA* (Scribner's, N.Y.; 150 pages, \$3.00), by Reinhold Niebuhr. Oxnam issues a not so subtle call for a new social order, while Niebuhr concerns himself with simply swimming in the contemporary sociological seas. Each has a favorite *bête noire*. For Oxnam it is the "former conspirator", Whittaker Chambers; for Niebuhr, it is the symbol of "the period of hysteria", Senator McCarthy. If you'd like to know something more about the authors themselves, we refer you to *Collectivism In The Churches*, reviewed above.

LOOKING BOTH WAYS

Our print order always includes, besides enough copies for our subscription list and our current prospect list, a sizable overrun to take care of orders for individual copies. For the first time since we began publication of AMERICAN OPINION's predecessor, ONE MAN'S OPINION, in January, 1956, our most recent issue is sold out before we are well into the month of its publication date. At present, the April issue of AMERICAN OPINION is out of print, and we have a number of unfilled orders on hand.

We shall probably run more. For the interest in all of the contents of this number has been most encouraging. Dr. Hans Sennholz's article on *The Federal Reserve System*, in particular, has attracted what is—for us—wide attention. But the heaviest part of the unusual demand, nevertheless, has been for the longer essay, *A Letter To Khrushchev*. We have received more mail, and more favorable mail, on that article, than on all others put together since we started the magazine. So the one certain effect already achieved by this small flood of orders has been to push us, finally but firmly, into the reprint business.

Reprints of a earlier article, *A Letter To The South, On Segregation*, have been available since the December following its first publication in September, 1956. (It is, in fact, in a third printing, and still going well.) And reprints of *A Letter To Khrushchev*, in the same large type and book style, occupying forty pages, as when it appeared in the April AMERICAN OPINION, are now ready. Prices for both are listed below, and reprints of additional articles will be offered soon. We hope and believe that this is one more step in the direction of greater effectiveness.

A LETTER TO THE SOUTH

In Quantities of	10 - 99	10¢ Each
In Quantities of	100 - 999	8¢ Each
In Quantities of	1,000 or more	7¢ Each

A LETTER TO KHRUSHCHEV

In Quantities of	3 - 99	3 for \$1.00
In Quantities of	100 - 999	25¢ Each
In Quantities of	1,000 or more	20¢ Each

These prices include delivery charges.

Order from: AMERICAN OPINION, Belmont 78, Mass.

