

AMERICAN OPINION

LOS ANGELES PUBLIC LIBRARY

NOV 27 1959

IN THIS NUMBER

EUROPEAN SURVEY

William S. Schlamm

Heat
HISTORY

THE FEAR OF FAILURE

As Motivation In Southern Asia

by

Rodney Gilbert

HOW TO READ THE FEDERALIST

Holmes Alexander

Other Articles And Regular Features

AN INFORMAL REVIEW

Volume 1 Number 5

JUNE 1958

50¢

AMERICAN OPINION

Editor

ROBERT WELCH

Associate Editors

HUBERT KREGLOH

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. BENTSON

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. WEDEMAYER

W. H. WILBUR

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON

CONTENTS — JUNE, 1958

European Survey William S. Schlam 1

The Fear of Failure,

As Motivation In Southern Asia - Rodney Gilbert 1

A Review Of The News Hubert Kregeloh 13

How To Read The Federalist - Holmes Alexander 13

We Pause To Remark 21

Bullets 33

A Review Of Reviews Edwin McDowell 34

Looking Both Ways A Staff Report 36

May 3, 1958

Dear Reader:

We are loaded with excellent articles, already bought, paid for, and "edited." Yet we are sending you this month a magazine of only forty pages. You can give credit for this "cut" to a Latin professor we had in college a century or two ago.

In those dim and distant days this unorthodox scholar had a habit of becoming so engrossed in whatever he was doing between classes—playing chess, usually—that he sometimes failed to show up at all for a late-morning period. And this made him the most popular professor on the campus.

Of course there was one member of our Latin class who objected to such windfalls. "When a professor cuts a class," he pointed out, virtuously, "each student is being deprived of some fraction of the education for which that student is paying." He was absolutely right, too. And for all we know he may be editing a magazine somewhere today.

Nevertheless, we decided that, with the "outdoor" weather now enticing all of the young in heart, a thin magazine would be more appealing at this moment than a thick one. This implies no slightest relaxation here, in our effort to recruit more knights to slay the Communist dragons. We are just trying to be more effective by being realistic. For what counts is not how much we publish, but how much you kind people read.

As for the fellow who feels cheated, if he will let us know, we'll make up the difference by writing him one of our shorter letters—let's say ten to fifteen pages.

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 to order to fit our specific needs, and can assume no responsibility for the return of unsolicited manuscripts.

EUROPE
and will
simplicity
suddenly
the forth
Only a
Continen
anger w
ness" in
by negot
was the
were so
America
Kennan
fighting
like Joh
Only a
Europea
that som
the Uni
peace w
ting aro
and oth
have ch
know"
might r
pretty s
if there
more th
Confere
without

A Sum
Perha
Mr. Du
victory

JUNE, 1

EUROPEAN SURVEY

by

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Mailed from Paris, April 16, 1958

EUROPEANS who love to be devious, and will never understand the basic simplicity of United States politics, are suddenly shivering when they think of the forthcoming Summit Conference. Only a few weeks ago, the emotional Continent was shaking with anger — anger with the American “stubbornness” in resisting the idea of redemption by negotiating with Khrushchev. That was the time when the Europeans were somehow made to believe that American angels (people like George F. Kennan and Walter Lippmann) were fighting with American devils (people like John Foster Dulles) and losing. Only a few weeks ago, in short, Europeans were under the impression that some sinister “warmongers” keep the United States from making eternal peace with the Soviets (simply by sitting around the table with Khrushchev and other nice chaps). Now things have changed. Now Europeans “in the know” are afraid the United States *might* negotiate with the Soviets, and pretty soon, but might do it *alone*. And if there is something Europeans fear more than the cancellation of a Summit Conference, it is a Summit Conference without Europeans.

A Summit Duet . . .

Perhaps he does not know it yet, but Mr. Dulles has won his first diplomatic victory in Europe in years. And he has

done so (unwittingly, I think) by carrying the Cold War, for a change, into Western Europe: For the first time in many years the British and French suspect that United States “psychological warfare” is aimed at them rather than the Soviets. Through some well-camouflaged channels (for there is no kind of official or non-official Washington statement to which it could be ascribed) the rumor has reached Europe, and has swept through its chancelleries like a tornado, that an Eisenhower-Khrushchev Conference is being prepared, a Summit Meeting of the only two real summits in the global landscape. The rationale (one keeps hearing in Europe) is the rather plausible suggestion that no one matters, anyway, but the two giant world powers; and that things could be mightily expedited if all those minor characters were sent off the stage, so that the decisive dialogue between the two protagonists could flow freely, directly and constructively. In addition to this (for Europeans) nightmarish notion of a conference *à deux*, European diplomats are horrified by another whisper; namely, that the United States is getting ready to create a propitious atmosphere for the Meeting of the Two by acceding, after the termination of the current Pacific test series, to the Soviet proposal that all atomic tests be suspended. And if there is something

European Survey

Europeans fear even more than the famed nuclear fall-out, it is the suspension of atomic tests *before* Europeans, too, have a nice atomic arsenal.

Europeans, in short, are afraid that Mr. Dulles is boiling them in their own juice. I have desperately tried, within my very limited possibilities—and to no avail—to disabuse some of them of the wild notion that a United States Secretary of State would ever use the tricks of diplomatic massage. For the time being, Europeans remain firmly convinced that the United States Government is turning the table on them, applying to Europe a bit of Europe's own medicine. All right, the United States Government is saying—in the opinion of French and British diplomats—all right, now you shall see what happens if we, the United States, *take* your advice and *really* get together with the Soviets! And if you don't like what's cooking, then you will kindly stop putting the pressure on us to light the oven (as you have so disgustingly done for a long time now).

Might Be Hard On Second Tenors. . .

What throws holy terror in French (and British) bones is especially the possibility that further atomic tests might be outlawed by an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States *before* the French (and the British) have succeeded in producing advanced atomic weapons. For to freeze atomic developments at their current state would mean that Western Europe, caught short, would be pronounced a helpless ward and be put entirely at the mercy of the two giants. If the "decisive" weapons are confined to only two powers, no one else counts. To egg the United States on, and

cheaply to prove themselves dedicated lovers of true peace, is one thing; to be deprived of the kind of armament that makes the British and French Governments members of the big league—that is quite another. The French and the British were delighted to set themselves up as "mature" and "responsible" gents who were trying to talk sense into the boyishly recalcitrant United States. But they are terrified by a prospect that the United States might beat them at that game and expose the sheer foolishness of Europe's pacifistic crusades by taking them seriously. Here, as I said, is the devious European mind at work: The United States, of course, has no such refined intention. But there is, for the time being, a lot of trembling in Paris and London.

* * *

Speaking of rumors, there is a particularly tall story making the rounds in Germany. Adenauer, or so they whisper, has told the Kremlin that he would be willing to renounce the reunification of Germany for several years, if the Soviets granted the East Germans certain basic liberties, such as free elections. If this were true, it would mean two rather contradictory things. One, it would prove that the Chancellor puts individual over national rights—the self-determination of people over the self-determination of nations. And I, for one, cannot recall a single German politician before Adenauer who did. Two, if the whole story were true, it would at the same time prove that he puts conveniently smooth relations with the Soviets, on the part of his administration, over the most elementary rights of his nation. For to renounce Germany's claims to Soviet-occupied German territory—

even to renounce would be a very integral general and must base reason, the

But Adenauer

And yet. Moreover, in the last game do seem, or some doubt the Chancellor have advanced world, and Russia, in the Soviet to be free. For the first in such a to German unification unnecessary the Soviet our position long secret days before the Soviet Smirnov. the kind sounded like was certain banalities machinery undeniable activity has any s then Adenauer indeed in forthcoming. This strengthening declaration

European Survey

even to renounce it for a limited time—would be tantamount to erasing the very integrity on which Germany in general and Adenauer in particular must base their case. If only for this reason, the rumor sounds improbable.

But Adenauer Seeks To Save . . .

And yet, it keeps tenaciously alive. Moreover, there were certain statements in Adenauer's declaration during the last great *Bundestag* debate that do seem, on second reading, to contain some *double-entendres*. For instance, the Chancellor said that "we would have advanced the pacification of the world, and our relations with Soviet Russia, immeasurably if the Germans in the Soviet zone were at last permitted to be free and to live as free men." For the first time Dr. Adenauer made, in such a solemn context, *no* reference to Germany's irreducible need for reunification. And he pointed out, rather unnecessarily, that "I saw to it that the Soviet Government is told of this, our position"—obviously referring to a long secret talk he had had only a few days before the *Bundestag* debate with the Soviet Ambassador to Bonn, Andrei Smirnov. If Adenauer's statement was the kind of commonplace oratory it sounded like, on first hearing it, there was certainly no reason to amplify such banalities through heavy diplomatic machinery. If, on the other hand, the undeniable increase of diplomatic activity between Bonn and Moscow has any specific reasons and meaning, then Adenauer's statement may have indeed indicated a rather momentous forthcoming change in German policies.

This suspicion was considerably strengthened by a far more precise declaration that came from Franz-Josef

Strauss, Bonn's Defense Minister, who is ever more the second-strongest man in Adenauer's party. "Is it really reunification," asked Strauss rhetorically, "that presses, tortures and subdues us in the first place? It is much less reunification in the sense of restored political unity of all Germany; it is far more the heart's desire to restore democratic and humane conditions in that territory (East Germany)." A curious statement indeed, and especially curious as it was produced by the one man in Adenauer's environment who usually makes no bones about the insoluble power conflict between Germany and the Soviet Union. Coming right after Adenauer's equivocal pronouncement, Franz-Josef Strauss's equivocation had a doubly discomfiting undertone.

All He Can Out Of The Betrayal . . .

Germany's neutralist press is of course capitalizing on these strange occurrences. For, in Germany, it has been always the neutralist wile to persuade the country that the only available path towards reunification with East Germany leads through the friendliest possible relations with the Soviets. And now that the Government (or so goes the rumor) has embarked upon bilateral talks with Moscow, in which it no longer makes any reference to Adenauer's traditional position (reunification as the *sine qua non* of any rapprochement with the Soviet Union), the neutralist press would like to cash in on its proprietary claims to the areas of appeasement.

Adenauer's advocates, on the other hand, argue that the Government, *if* there is to be a new approach to the problem, would be acting under duress. For the Western powers, above all the

European Survey

United States, have dropped the reunification of Germany as the No. 1 topic of any Summit negotiations; and, by doing so, have thrown back Germany's chances for many years. Under such circumstances (or so Adenauer's defender's claim), the German Government is simply compelled to make the most of a badly changed situation and must try to salvage the salvageable. If the United States no longer *insists* on German reunification, nothing remains for Bonn to renounce; you cannot convincingly renounce something that is clearly beyond your reach. Thus, the best Adenauer can do is to achieve at least some easements for the seventeen million Germans who must continue to live under Soviet control. This he is trying to do *before* the Soviets get a deal with the United States signed and sealed. For, by then, they would not even negotiate with Bonn. The time to obtain some kind of price is now — now, when the Soviets may find a "compromise" with Bonn improves their bargaining position vis-a-vis the United States. This, I submit, is true diplomatically. Historically, it must turn out to have been a bit of *Realpolitik* which was neither politic nor realistic.

* * *

While Beyond The Alps . . .

Italy will elect, on May 25, more than its Parliament. It will also elect, from among very few alternatives, its course for the decisive next two or three years. And there aren't, at the moment, many optimists in this constitutionally gay and serene nation.

Expecting Shrimps To Whistle . . .

In the first place, because of a new

election law that favors the smaller parties and somehow punishes the big ones, the governing Christian Democrats would have to gain 900,000 votes over their holdings of 1953 just to *retain* their present (minority) position in Parliament; and it is not very likely that they will. Furthermore, the small "center-to-left" parties, who were much more catered to by the Christian Democrats in past years than was their due, have anything but promising election chances. Saragat's right-wing Social Democrats, in particular, who were staunchly anti-Communist until some absurd confusions after the Hungarian Revolt suddenly filled them with hopes for a "thawing" in the Communist camp — these bamboozled radicals will now have to pay for their apparently incorrigible tendency to illusions. Their heart's dream was to win Nenni's Leftist Socialists over. Little did they (or any of their American fellow-dues) know that Nenni, far from separating his party from the Popular Front after the slaughter in Budapest, would be swamped by resurgent Communist power within his own ranks. Right now he is being treated like a leper by his own people (though he has retained control over his party's most important paper, *Avanti*), simply because he has a few times expressed doubts about the holiness of Khrushchev. The crypto-Communists, who control the machinery of Nenni's party more ruthlessly than ever, have seen to it that most pro-Nenni Socialist candidates for the forthcoming elections are replaced in the constituencies by reliable Communist stooges. There can be not the slightest doubt that Nenni's party, after this effective purge, will be a mindless

European Survey

auxiliary of Communism in Italy's next Parliament.

Makes Supernumeraries Out Of Most Of The Cast

This has broken not only the heart but also the backbone of Saragat's party. Even in the unlikely case that Saragat's crew, having made such a preposterously wrong bet, will return to Parliament unscathed, even in that case it is improbable that the Christian Democrats can again center their coalition strategy on courting Saragat. Italians may be politically cynical, but they are not cynical enough to reward Mr. Saragat for one of the worst miscalculations of his time. And as he was responsible for the Government crisis that finally led to the new elections (he quit the coalition government in order to have an undisturbed flirtation with Nenni), their result cannot possibly be his return to governmental power. The Christian Democrats have been much too scared by Mr. Saragat's recent exuberance in defending the Rapacki Plan, Mr. Kennan's schemes, and every other neutralist foolishness that has been popping up lately all over Europe.

Consequently, the Christian Democrats (always assuming that they are not too badly beaten themselves on May 25) will have to form a Cabinet with either open or tacit support of the right-wing parties, the Monarchists and Neo-Fascists. And this is not a very friendly prospect for Italy either. An Italian Government that lives by the grace of extremists on the right is exactly what the Italian Communists desire. Such a Government must prove a terrific tonic for a Popular Front drive in Italy that will, more likely

than not, push the entire Italian left into the Communist camp. This may mean that more than one-third of the Italian electorate would be "united" under Communist leadership. And with far less than that have Communists, in other countries and in less favorable global circumstances, managed to penetrate into power! I could, of course, be proven wrong on May 26 when the election returns are in. But right now it looks to me as if Italy were moving fast into storm centers of immediate and gravest danger.

As A New Villain Moves Front

It seems ever more likely that the central figure of the Colonial Revolution (which Lenin considered the main act and climax of the World Revolution) will be neither Nehru nor Khrushchev but Nasser. This young man, whom one of Mr. Eisenhower's greatest blunders (the unwarranted and certainly premature United States intervention to bail Egypt out of sure defeat at Suez) has catapulted into the foreground of world politics, has snowballed his initial penny stake into an immense and probably decisive power investment. Today, this "dynamic" Socialist, who hates capitalism even more passionately than he hates "foreigners," is one of the five or six fatefully important people on earth. And even a Pollyanna would have to get drunk before she expressed any optimistic doubts as to where Nasser stands. Gamal Nasser is firmly resolved to be among the pallbearers of the West. And he has extremely good chances to realize his ambition.

The "United Arab Republic" (which is what Nasser calls his special kind of nationalist Cominform) has made in

European Survey

a few short weeks enormous advances into the royalist Arab realm. Washington may still try to minimize the event, but nobody who knows the area doubts that King Saud's abdication of power in favor of Faisal has dismantled the last, the *only* remaining bulwark against a total Arab "unification" under Gamal Nasser. Faisal's regime is, at best, the Arab counterpart to the Kerenski Government — that lasting symbol of helpless attempts to stop a ruthless revolution. The waves of Nasser's national-socialist Arabism are leaping ever more wildly against the crumbling fortifications of an ineane Arab royalty that has neither the nerve nor the power to resist an elementary outbreak. And because things are moving so astonishingly fast in an area that has remained dormant for millenia, Saudi Arabia may have been swallowed by the "United Arab Republic" before this report can be published. But if it hasn't yet disappeared, Faisal's regime will for a while endeavor to outshout the revolutionary competition; which means, it will, of necessity, kick the West where it hurts most—in the oil pipelines.

In Communist Mantle Clad . . .

So, while we are exchanging amenities with Khrushchev, his faithful ally, Gamal Nasser, is outflanking the West with giant steps. In two years he has grown from a pathetic joke into a personified focus of world power—and, whether he wants this or not, for the greater glory of Communism. But it is quite unlikely that he does not know what he is doing. The Soviet Union and Communist Poland have just supplied him with a formidable little navy, submarines and all; and

Communist Czechoslovakia keeps a tremendous flow of ammunition moving to his bins. Arab pilots are being trained by the hundreds in Moscow. And the Soviets have never allowed illusions as to what the price is of all that military aid.

Should Nasser still wonder, he could ask the Algerians, who worship him as the incomparable hero of the Colonial Revolution—and who, right now, have been compelled to pay the Soviet Union a most vital price for Soviet armament. A few weeks ago, three members of the Executive Committee of the Algerian Liberation Front were dispatched to Prague and Moscow. Their job: to get weapons. Moscow assured them they could get whatever they wanted—provided they would "co-opt" Ali Bou Hali, Algeria's exiled Communist leader who has established provisional headquarters in Communist Albania, into the Executive Committee. The Algerian delegation seems to have agreed. And they admitted themselves that this "may" mean the complete capture of the Algerian Liberation Front by the Communists. But, they insist, the sole responsibility for such "a deplorable turn of events" lies not with the Algerians but with the French, who were driving them to desperation; and with the Americans, who did not know how to talk sense into the French.

Come to think of it, Nasser will not have to ask the Algerians or anybody else. For even if he does not recall the conditions he agreed to when the Soviets began arming Egypt to the teeth, Mr. Soekarno of the Djakarta Government is making everything clear with a bang. He no longer tries to hide that, in suppressing the anti-

Communist
Sumatra,
planes,
Soekarno
is to sub
firm com
ment "u
And he,
as the
Revoluti
Nasser i
the form
"neutrali
Moscow
weaken
further
picked b
tion of t
tions tha
Asia, and
Together
Khrushch
come a
Trinity.
ment ma
old parlo
Nasser is
people d

And Du
The Sta
Secreta
rush in
just assu
seems to
crisis. F
Secretary
formula
will bary
under th
NATO.
seems to
Prime M
fate of
phy's for

European Survey

Communist Colonels' Government of Sumatra, he is using Czechoslovak planes, Chinese rifles, Soviet tanks. Soekarno's now openly proclaimed goal is to subdue all of Indonesia under the firm controls of a centralized government "with Communist participation." And he, too, glorified Gamal Nasser as the true leader of the Colonial Revolution. This global adoration of Nasser is no modish accident. Nehru, the former saint of pro-Communist "neutralism," has been discarded by Moscow: he is much too stale and weakened domestically to be of any further use abroad. Nasser has been picked by Khrushchev as the incarnation of the "non-Communist" machinations that will deliver, first Africa and Asia, and then Europe to Communism. Together with Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev himself, Nasser has become a member of the Communist Trinity. And while the State Department may go on killing time with the old parlor pastime of guessing whether Nasser is "really" a Communist, busier people don't play that game any more.

* * *

And Dulles Still Stumbles All Over The Stage

Secretary Dulles, who continues to rush in where angels fear to tread, has just assumed responsibility for what seems to grow into the latest French crisis. His special deputy, Assistant Secretary Murphy, has worked out a formula by which France and Tunisia will bargain over their disagreements under the "impartial" chairmanship of NATO. What's more, Mr. Murphy seems to have persuaded the French Prime Minister, Gaillard, to stake the fate of his government on Mr. Murphy's formula. Which, for all practical

purposes, means that the United States has directly intervened in the affairs of France. This reporter, to be sure, is not particularly afraid of the conventional "Liberal" accusations that the United States is interfering in other nations' business. But he would like to see United States power being used abroad (a) in the interest of the United States, and (b) successfully. He is not at all certain that the current Murphy mission in France will be remembered for either reason.

It has, for one, hardly a chance. The Gaillard Government, no matter how long cynical parliamentary convenience will allow it to play government, is on its way out [*This manuscript was mailed just before Gaillard's fall.* Editor]; and the proposed Tunisia settlement will only increase its death pangs. It was distinctly imprudent to have the good name of the United States so closely connected with a resounding political flop. Even more importantly, it was a very dangerous idea to have NATO drawn into national and political controversies of the Franco-Tunisian kind. The sole function of NATO, if any, is military. The United States has most certainly no reason to strain NATO's backbone by burdening it with impossible political tasks. And yet, at this very moment, Secretary Dulles' emissary has on his own initiative charged NATO with a highly political undertaking. The State Department, no doubt, acts on competent information. But, for the life of me, I cannot find out, or even guess, on what part of European reality the State Department's information is based.

THE FEAR OF FAILURE

As Motivation In Southern Asia

by

RODNEY GILBERT

THROUGHOUT the several centuries of trade, warfare, colonial establishment, and "development" (to use the comprehensive Japanese term) by Western powers, in East Asia, native hostility to the intruders was always described in English-language newspapers as "anti-foreignism". Now it is "nationalism". It has been, ever since the first professors of Bolshevik semantics arrived in Peking from Chita in 1919; and since others of their kind moved swiftly down through French, British, Dutch, and Portuguese colonies—and our own Philippines.

For in "nationalism" there is a suggestion of patriotism; which, as all the world concedes, is a noble sentiment. In "anti-foreignism", however, the suggestion is of narrow-minded, unjustified prejudice. So the Reds strove earnestly to drive the latter term out of fashion. Over the years they have succeeded so well that today any anti-Occidental movement, however unjustified or however savage in its manifestations, is described by all writers in our language as nationalistic.

The pioneer Red propagandists in East Asia also introduced, along with "nationalism" and antithetical to it, the words "imperialism" and "colonialism"—connoting criminally despotic purposes and practices on the part of the Western nations. They succeeded in

having these words, with the implications the Reds desired, introduced into all Asiatic languages, and eventually into the regular usage of English-language journalism. Always, the suggestion that went with the appearance of these terms was that the peoples under colonial rule, no matter how ill-prepared for self-government, were entitled to their independence. Always, there was the further suggestion that, no matter how benevolent the administration of a colony might be, the people in that colony were the wretched victims of cruel repression and exploitation.

The Drive Began In China

The first Soviet agents to reach China found an anti-Japanese student movement in full swing. It had already promoted a nation-wide revulsion of feeling against a government in Peking (Anfu), which was charged with selling rights to Japan that impinged upon China's sovereignty. The Soviet agents soon saw this agitation bring on attempted military suppression, which ended with the defeat of the Anfu government's armies and the flight of its personnel. Here was just the medium of expression that the Reds needed; and they seized upon it at once. In almost no time at all they had great processions of Chinese young

people
street
peculi
closed
ence
slogan
means
these
any
Comm
mind
ating,
was s
hatefu
next
Furth
were
line,
subve
to the
throu
Amer
learn
to ov
explo
the v
they
is a
antag
[In
this
amon
forei
port
prop
ialism
that
State
any
"imp
man
ialist
of fo
in th
coun

The Fear Of Failure

people moving slowly through the streets of China's major cities, with a peculiar waddling gait and with half closed eyes as though under the influence of hypnotism, shouting just one slogan: "Ta tao ti-kuo chu-i". This means: "Strike down imperialism". In these demonstrations there was seldom any specific mention of Japan; the Communists had many other uses in mind for the feeling they were generating, that this newly invented "ism" was something peculiarly sinister and hateful. In China, the British came next as targets of the treatment. Further south the French and Dutch were soon subjected to it. And this line, of what might be called moral subversion, has of course been sustained to the present. It has been carried along through India to the Mediterranean. American travelers in Asia today are learning that one does not even have to own a colony, which might be exploited, to be an "imperialist". For the virulent anti-Americanism which they encounter at one time or another is a cleverly cultivated "nationalistic" antagonism to "American imperialism".

[In an article in an earlier issue of this magazine, we pointed out that among the most harmful effects of our foreign-aid program has been the support thus given to this Communist propaganda against "American imperialism." The Communists well knew that they could never make the United States either become, or even appear to any people for very long to be, "imperialists" by the sword. So they maneuvered us into becoming "imperialists" by the dollar. With our horde of foreign-aid administrators interfering in the domestic affairs of "undeveloped" countries, and lording it over the

natives, we have not only made ourselves look and act like "imperialists"; we have actually become imperialists. Which is exactly what the Communists intended when they sowed the seed of our foreign-aid program and nourished the poisonous vine all the way to its present monstrous size and reach.
Editor]

And Now Another Factor Is Important

But there is something more than Soviet invention and agitation, which enables a great army of Kremlin agents to sustain this anti-imperialist outcry. There is something more to account for demonstrations of hysterical "nationalism" in countries like India, Ceylon, Indonesia and Burma. For, having been granted full, untrammelled independence, such countries might have been expected by now to have become less vociferously "anti-imperialist" than they were as colonial peoples. In Red China, which so many writers in this country now hail as an impregnable Communist fortress, as a great military power, as on the point of becoming a great industrial nation; in a country making such claims to mighty independence, there is something more than Soviet inspiration behind the incessant clamor against rapacious imperialists and their evil designs on Asia. Behind all of this raucous "nationalistic" clamor against the West, behind such feverish efforts to liquidate the last remnants of Occidental establishments—as in Ceylon — there is something more than Soviet Russian influence. It is the fear of failure. Gnawing at the fierce pride of the newly great is this unceasing fear: that they will not make good as independent custodians of the wealth,

The Fear Of Failure

security, and welfare of the rich and populous territories they have taken over from the colonial powers.

Anxious Boys At Men's Jobs

The world is small. All parts of it are interdependent. The new governments of the former colonies are sitting on valuable properties whose good management in the past made them important to the economy of many other peoples. They know they are being watched, and weighed in the balance. This engenders panic. So, in panic, and in near despair, these governments are sticking their heads in the Red bear's mouth. For if they make an unholy mess of their stewardship of the assets turned over to them; if the world at large should finally conclude that the ruin of such valuable properties had gone far enough; then who would growl defiance of world opinion for them but the great Red bear?

This is a state of mind that can be outgrown—if the people afflicted with it have the stuff in them to profit by trial and error, and to show signs of making good from that experience. Those who know China's story, and have known the Chinese of various classes over the past four or five decades, will, I am sure, agree. To understand what is going on in other Asiatic minds, the ups and downs of Chinese thinking about China's place in the world are worth a brief review.

II

WHEN THE FIRST Portuguese navigators came feeling their way up the China coast, early in the sixteenth century, Chinese civilization, with its achievements in governments, the arts, agriculture, commerce, the highly

skilled crafts, and the engineering of public works, was at least three thousand years old. Throughout this long period the Chinese had never had more than hearsay knowledge of any other peoples who were their equals in any of these fields. In war they had held their own against the constant pressure of barbarians on their frontiers. Sometimes, it is true, they had been defeated and invaded. But always the Chinese had either raised new forces and thrown the invaders out, or had civilized them and absorbed them into the population. Periods of contracting boundaries under decadent rulers had invariably been followed by periods of returning expansion as more aggressive families came to power. Under the Han and Tang dynasties the writ of the Son of Heaven had run deep into central Asia. And the earliest traders on the China coast saw this happen again under the Manchus.

Against An Ages-old Background

An important part of Chinese thought, therefore, when friction first developed between the Occidental intruders and the imperial authorities in the ports, was that fortunes of war had no serious bearing on China's survival. For no people in a position to threaten them militarily had ever pretended to be the cultural equals of the Chinese people. Even after Kublai Khan, Grand Khan of the Mongols, had whipped all China into submission in the thirteenth century, and established his own capital in Peking, his dynasty had petered out in a few generations; and the Mongols who were not back in their ancestral grasslands, tending their flocks and herds, had become indistinguishably Chinese.

Also
this br
ever p
Son of
China
custod
civiliza
consta
peared
came
and a
kindg
hadn't
were.
tribut
feet o
wise a
what
Chine

The
The
to tr
they
belief
perio
nor t
iority
rulers
Chin
ill-ma
Chin
tions
comm
called
estab
as di
scene
to th
treat
But
that
emp
to b
mon

JUN

The Fear Of Failure

Also, no potentate, before or *after* this brief period of Mongol occupation, ever pretended to be the equal of the Son of Heaven, the emperor who ruled China by Heaven's mandate, the serene custodian of China's vastly superior civilization. Throughout the ages a constant succession of embassies appeared at the imperial courts. They came from neighboring dependencies, and also from barbarian tribes and kingdoms so remote that the Chinese hadn't the slightest idea where they were. But all such emissaries brought tribute, prostrated themselves at the feet of the Son of Heaven, and otherwise acknowledged his suzerainty over what was all creation so far as the Chinese knew.

The Pattern Begins . . .

Then the Occidentals came to China to trade. And in no respect did they subscribe to the age-old Chinese belief in the ineffable Chinese superiority over all other human kind, nor to the parallel belief in the superiority of China's emperor to all other rulers, including their own. The Chinese found them rough, disorderly, ill-mannered, and inclined to accept no Chinese conventions. Irksome restrictions were soon imposed on the foreign community at Canton. The traders called upon their governments to establish diplomatic relations. As soon as diplomatic missions appeared on the scene, their first demand was for access to the emperor, and the next was for treaty relations on the basis of equality. But these alien envoys made it clear that they would not kowtow to the emperor, or thereby acknowledge him to be of higher rank than their own monarchs. So access was forbidden. And

all talk of relations on a basis of equality was regarded by the Chinese as impertinent nonsense. Everything that ensued—opium or no opium—was the inevitable result of this Occidental challenge to the Chinese belief in the superiority of their own institutions, whether political or cultural, over all others; plus the further challenge to the divinely appointed authority of the Son of Heaven over all mankind.

III

THE SERIES OF WARS, from the so-called Opium War of 1842 down to the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, was a succession of mortifying Chinese defeats. China's humiliation at the hands of Japan in 1894 was so swift and total that, in the eyes of the onlooking world, it was a travesty on warfare. This was particularly galling to the Chinese because the Japanese—"the dwarf slaves"—had for at least twelve centuries been looked upon as humble students and borrowers of Chinese culture. They had been regarded by all Chinese as an inferior breed, brought up from savagery to a degree of culture through imitation under Chinese tutelage. More alarming, however, was the freely expressed belief throughout the world that uppish, conceited, recalcitrant China was no longer fit to survive as a nation; that it was on the point of being carved up, properly disciplined, and developed in the interest at large — and to the great advantage of the Chinese people.

There were several Chinese reactions to this. By this time some Chinese had been educated abroad. Some had learned a great deal about foreign methods and devices from close relations with Europeans and Americans

The Fear Of Failure

in the ports and, to a lesser degree, in the mission stations. Those affected by these Western influences did not concede the inferiority of Chinese to any other people; nor did they concede the inferiority of Chinese culture to any other civilization. But they did concede that the Occidentals were superior in many things—beginning with military and administrative affairs, and ending with the use of mechanical gadgets and technical skills—which China had to learn in a hurry, as Japan had learned. This couldn't be done under the decadent Manchu dynasty without a complete change of attitude. The imperial government had to be awakened to an understanding of China's backwardness. Two of these enlightened reformers got access to the young Emperor, Kuang Hsu, and converted him to their way of thinking. But the Dowager Empress learned of this, imprisoned the Emperor, and sent the reformers scurrying into the foreign concessions.

A second form of reaction was revolutionary. China had to catch up in a hurry, or perish. It couldn't be done at all under the Manchu regime, so the Manchus had to go. Dr. Sun Yat-sen eventually emerged as the leader of those so disposed.

The third solution was that supported by the Dowager Empress. The old lady's idea was that China had only one way out of a desperate situation: Exterminate as many of the aliens as possible, drive the rest into the sea, slam China's gates shut, and keep them shut. This program culminated in the Boxer movement, and another humiliating defeat. It was one which left China prostrate, discredited, and — for the moment — hopeless.

Reaction Fails

The imperial armies were routed between Tientsin and Peking. The Empress fled into western China. The capital was occupied, and a heavy indemnity imposed, by the Western powers. High Chinese officials who had favored the Boxers were executed. For some years China was benumbed and docile. The only native leaders who had any hope of winning for her a position of equality in the world were revolutionaries. They still insisted that, if the Manchus were out of the way, government could be modernized, reforms would follow swiftly, and China would have a chance.

More and more people, at all levels, began to share this hope—because it seemed the only hope. And so there came the successful revolution of 1911-12. Elation ran wild. Far from there being any trace of anti-foreignism in this excitement, it fed on just the opposite. The nation-wide urge was to introduce *all* foreign institutions into China, lock, stock, and barrel. An American or European traveler in the interior—a sewing machine or patent medicine agent, perhaps—was received by provincial authorities as a distinguished guest. He was begged for advice on any and all matters, from the development of a possible oil field down to the appropriate use of a frock coat and silk hat.

And Revolution Is Worse

But the chaos and disillusionment that followed during the next dozen years, toppling both this elation and its mental pillars, produced a thoroughly reckless national mood. First Yuan Shih-kai tried to make himself emperor, (Continued on Page 28)

In Apr

→ In C
against
Batista

→ Pres
drastic
fication
United
gate
sweepi
commu
of Sta
determ
there v
segme
Congr

→ WI
the c
States
were
age "I
article
ing r
tion.
Secon
ate
Assoc
the tr
public
cotte
aban
educ
→ A
Cong
Daug
passe

A Review Of The News

..by

HUBERT KREGELOH

In April, 1958

→ In Cuba the uprising of Fidel Castro against the government of Fulgencio Batista seemed to be fizzling out.

→ President Eisenhower, in the most drastic military reorganization and unification program yet proposed for the United States, asked Congress to delegate to the Secretary of Defense sweeping power over all armed forces commands, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As the President voiced his determination to get his plan adopted, there was considerable resistance among segments of the Services as well as in Congress.

→ While pundits continued to debate the education crisis in the United States, more teachers in public schools were physically assaulted by their teenage "students" in big cities. A critical article in *Life* magazine reflected growing rejection of "progressive" education. But the National Association of Secondary School Principals, an affiliate of NEA (National Education Association), suggested angrily and in the true "liberal" spirit that the Luce publications *Life* and *Time* be boycotted by public schools until they had abandoned an attitude "inimical to education."

→ At their sixty-seventh Continental Congress in Washington, D. C., the Daughters of the American Revolution passed resolutions, among others, calling

for the abolition of the Federal Income Tax; curbs on the U. S. Supreme Court; rejection of federal aid to education; withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations, and the evacuation of the UN from the United States.

→ Former President Harry Truman enjoyed himself. At Yale University, before the Senate Banking Committee, at press conferences, and to just about anybody willing to listen, Truman belabored the Republicans, whom he held responsible for all the ills of the nation and the world. Although he always favored higher taxes while in office, he now called for an immediate five-billion-dollar tax cut to "fight the recession." He denied statements attributed to him in an interview with New York *Times* reporter Arthur Krock in 1950, but was later forced to admit the accuracy of the quoted statements.

→ The French Government of Felix Gaillard fell (the nineteenth to fall since World War II) over the Algerian-Tunisian crisis, amid bitter anti-American speeches and demonstrations. Of the tired old men associated with previous fallen governments none had succeeded in forming a new Cabinet at the end of the month.

→ Former Massachusetts Governor Paul A. Dever, keynote speaker at the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1952, died of a heart attack in his sleep

A Review Of The News

at his Cambridge, Massachusetts, home at the age of fifty-five.

→ Playing Russian compositions at the Tchaikovsky International Music Festival in Moscow, twenty-three-year-old Texas pianist Van Cliburn won top honors, including the dubious one of being hugged by Nikita Khrushchev.

→ Developments before the Senate Committee investigating labor union practices, and in Congress, where Senator Knowland was trying to introduce effective labor legislation, showed again that in 1958 United Auto Workers chief Walter Reuther is the real chairman of the Democratic Party.

→ The first World's Fair since 1939 (when it was held in New York) opened in Brussels, Belgium, with the USA and the USSR engaged in what European reporters quickly dubbed the "Exposition Cold War."

→ In its latest propaganda move to brand the United States a reckless warmonger, Moscow charged that flights in the direction of Russia, by our Strategic Air Command bombers with nuclear weapons, threatened to plunge the world into an atomic war. The Soviets introduced a resolution in the UN Security Council condemning the United States, but withdrew it when it appeared the resolution would be defeated.

→ Former President Herbert Hoover, eighty-three, underwent an emergency gall bladder operation in New York. His recovery seemed good.

→ Princess Margaret of Great Britain arrived in Trinidad to open the first Parliament of the new West Indies Federation, an island dominion volun-

tarily proposed and organized by London.

→ The Federal Bureau of Investigation released its crime report for 1957. It showed a sharp advance in major crime (9.1 percent over 1956) and an especially sharp increase in juvenile crime (9.6 percent over 1956). The FBI said that crime among persons under eighteen had increased fifty-five percent since 1952 and that in 1957 youths accounted for 47.2 percent of major crime arrests.

→ In Bonn, West German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano and Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan signed a \$375 million trade pact. They also agreed on consular representation in Bonn and Moscow.

→ General Maurice G. Gamelin died in Paris at the age of eighty-five.

→ In Brookline, Massachusetts, the FBI arrested Russian-born Mark Zborowski, a Harvard University research assistant, and charged him with having functioned as a top Soviet spy for twenty-five years.

→ Because of the recession and large inventories, Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers bargained from a position of relative weakness for the first time in many years; and for the first time in many years the industry's "Big Three" joined in a united front to resist the demands. Reuther offered to extend the present contract for another three months, provided the manufacturers cut prices and met other conditions. But the "Big Three" rejected this suggestion and served notice on the union that they would consider the present contract as expired at midnight on May 29th.

HOW TO READ THE FEDERALIST

by

HOLMES ALEXANDER

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

III

NATIONAL SELF-INTEREST is the true meaning of loyalty. To call a man loyal because he never betrayed his country is to restate the story of the Honest Brakeman—he never stole a boxcar.

Relatively few persons in a normal lifetime are presented with the opportunity or temptation to give aid or comfort to the enemy in time of war. All Federal officers swear to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States." So long as they don't pass atomic secrets or commit some form of malfeasance, they are true to their oaths, negatively. And if they keep duty hours and get a modicum of work done, they have complied with their vows, though feebly.

But very little praise is due this negative aspect of loyalty. Ill fares the country whose patriotism is a matter of virginity instead of virility. Our success as a nation is told in positive, masculine terms of self-assertion. In times gone by this aggressive declaration of national self-interest has ordered and even expelled Old World powers from the Western Hemisphere, pushed our continental borders to their limit, and given us a few daft notions of manifest destiny.

The expulsion and expansion movements have had their day, but there's still some hair left on the chest of our loyalty concepts. The promise to adhere to the Constitution means to adhere to that—and to nothing else besides! Divided and diluted patriotism is not what the Founders had in mind when they

How To Read The Federalist

prescribed the basic oath of office. And yet in the mid-Twentieth Century there are exponents of lesser-Americanism who achieve not only social acceptance, which is bad enough, but social approbation, which is incredible. It is a policy of this interpreter of the Federalist Papers to speak ill only of the dead, and then not very often. For that reason these examples of partial patriots may only be generalized. But you have known their names and seen their faces.

1. The World Statesman: He can be sufficiently described as an American politician with a roving eye for exotic interests. Although usually elected and always paid by the American tax-payers, this fellow is a philanderer with foreign nations. In earlier days he was apt to be the "misunderstood" patriot, who protests, when caught, that his intrigues to overthrow our Government were really — though we didn't "understand" — for America's greater glory and advancement.

Such a man, for instance, was Aaron Burr. His modern prototype has none of that dash and romance. He affects instead a pious concern for countries not his own, and he meddles with them to the prejudice and neglect of his own. Any wife will recognize these symptoms in an erring husband, but a nation is more naive and often fails to see that a President, Senator, or Ambassador is being unfaithful when he acts in the interest of somebody else's government.

This very thing has happened a number of times since Sarajevo. Our "world statesmen" have a habit of rising above their oaths of office to serve, or to save, some charming little nation or noble old empire which is not, however, their lawful charge.

This is not treason, but it is disloyalty. Sometimes the infatuation of the "world statesman" is an Oedipus complex for his fancied Mother Country. Sometimes the sentiment arises from boyhood travels abroad, from stamp collections, from pictures of old sailing ships. There is an ultra-modern form of world-statesmanship wherein the practitioner plays the role of a global polygamist. His own country is merely one of the

How To Read The Federalist

household wives in a Super State.

There is a patriarchal delusion in this role. It often overtakes elderly politicians. They easily succumb to suggestions that they resemble Old Testament prophets and that as "world figures" their names will live in history. But young or old, cynical or silly, an American public servant who trespasses outside the bounds of his oath is being adulterous toward his country. Loyalty is restrictive and jealous by its very nature. No man can serve two masters or be true to more than one wife. Plural patriotism to other States or to a Super State is infidelity to America.

2. The Free Trader: He is more apt to be a fool than a knave, but there are both. In either case the idea which obsesses the free trader is the exact opposite of national self-interest. There are industrialized island-nations, like Great Britain and Japan, which prosper by export of manufactured goods and are advantaged when their purchaser-nations have no tariff walls. There are raw-material regions, like India, Australia, and the Malay Peninsula, which are commercially benefitted by free-from-tariff markets. The free trader, whether he's a dupe or a cunning schemer, is promoting an idea which is admittedly advantageous and beneficial to many foreign nations. But this idea of no-tariff or low-tariff is not in the American interest. It's impossible for a true man to promote free trade and yet hold to the basic Federal oath which should now be read in full and in context:

"I solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter; so help me God."

So thick is the smoke-screen around this subject of world trade that the American layman often sees nothing but the

How To Read The Federalist

congenial adjective "free" looming through the man-made curtain of mystery. The adjective seems attractive because it carries connotations of "liberty" and of "something for nothing," both dear to the American heart. But the expression free trade is only a product of the sloganeers. Its connotations could more accurately be those of no-pay or low-pay labor in foreign lands and of built-in bankruptcy for American small business.

Tariff walls, like the armed forces, are part of the American defense system. They are rightly and unapologetically called "protective" tariffs. Since the First Congress they have guarded our hard-won, home-made independence, which must have economic integrity or it cannot have political and military integrity. The economic-political-military relationship is too obvious to need any laboring. The need for tariff protection against cheap foreign labor is almost equally clear. What is perhaps harder to see, because of the propaganda barrage, is that:

All major nations have protective tariffs;

The United States has the lowest tariffs among the major nations;

And ninety-some percent of raw materials can enter our ports with no tariff-charge whatever.

These facts are obscure to laymen only because of the smoke-screen. The figures are available in Government documents and have been presented again and again in public places. But the tall tales against terrible tariffs still persist. The free traders know that the global work-wage is far below that paid in America. They know that America has a peculiar need for tariff-protection in that we produce for our own consumer-market. They know that our natural resources of the Western Hemisphere and our native inventiveness make us literally self-sufficient in the things we need, to fight a war or to live in peace. Why then, do the free traders urge and promote the abolition of tariffs?

The answer needs to be known. The answer is that Free Trade is a doctrine for the economic uplift of have-not na-

How To Read The Federalist

tions. It is one of those supposed cure-alls for world poverty. It is an international share-the-wealth proposition whereby America's riches would be pooled and distributed out among the poor-house nations, and among those who "talk poor." Whatever can be said for its philanthropic value—and that's another story for a future paper in this series—the Free Trade doctrine is plainly in the self-interest of other nations, but not of the United States of America.

Well, what business has an oath-taking Federal officer to be working in any self-interest except our own?

3. The Welfare Statesman: All men, as the Declaration of Independence puts it, are "created equal," and the Founders never presumed to improve upon their Creator's handiwork. The rich and poor, the intelligent and stupid, are held equal before God and in their "unalienable rights."

There is nothing in the American tradition that justifies the effort to handicap talent and to level out wealth. The American Constitution is known to history as a sanctifier of contracts, a protector of property and an encourager of private initiative. All men have equal rights to succeed—and to succeed in unequal degrees according to their worth.

"I agree with you that there is," wrote Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, "a natural aristocracy among men. The grounds of this are virtue and talents . . . (This) natural aristocracy I consider the most precious gift of nature, for the instruction, the trusts, the government of society."

Charity—in its original meaning, love—is a benignity that is extended from man to man. It is a social obligation by nature, not a political activity. And even when good will to mankind is the only motive, and even when a desirable purpose can be demonstrated, to twist the Constitution to fit an "emergency" or a "social gain" is to play the Constitution false.

This was done many times in the New Deal days. It was done, and a subservient Supreme Court was appointed to make it legal. Another time will do for detailing the damage done by

How To Read The Federalist

torturing the clauses of the Constitution to make "general welfare" and "interstate commerce" mean what the New Deal managers wanted them to mean. But for present purposes it's fitting to show what was in the Framers' minds on the equality of the right to succeed. James Madison, writing in *The Federalist Number 10*, gave the matter this thumb-nail treatment:

"The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to the uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of Government."

How far the Welfare Statesmen have fared from that "first object of Government!" And how false they have been in their oaths to "support and defend the Constitution!" Again, this is not treason; it is mere disloyalty, if you will. But it's doubtful if all the traitors from Benedict Arnold through the Rosenbergs did more to destroy the Country than those oath-breakers who have subverted the equal rights of men to gain and retain what their talents deserve.

These three samples—the world statesman, the free trader, the welfare statesmen—are grabbed from the bag to illustrate what is happening to our eroded sense of loyalty. Such things, and worse, will keep on happening unless Americans junk the idea that their self-interest is something of which to be ashamed.

National self-interest began when the Declaration of Independence laid claim to "unalienable rights" and charged King George III with a long, specific list of "repeated injuries and usurpations" to the American people and their property. The Constitution's famous preamble is a clear statement of self-interest "for ourselves and our posterity." One after another of the early documents — *The Federalist*, Washington's *Farewell Address*, Jefferson's *First Inaugural*, the *Monroe Doctrine* —spoke without a quaver for American advantage.

Our leaders should be speaking and acting for the same thing today. Indeed, it's disloyal for a Federal officer to be speaking and acting for anything else.

We Pause To Remark . . .

SUKARNO's pretense of having only a last name has been carried so far that no first name nor initials are given even in *Asia Who's Who*. If this attention-seeking affectation has annoyed you, as it has us (and the pusillanimity of the American press in letting him get away with it has annoyed us even more), we are glad to turn on the light. The real name of Moscow's No. 1 boy in Java is Achmed S. Sukarno.

* * *

The bootstraps we had sewed onto our shoes, by which to lift ourselves up to great heights, are now being neglected. We have discovered a better way. We have borrowed fifty thousand dollars. Each month we give that fifty thousand dollars to various people, with the understanding that they will use it to purchase from us copies of our magazine. When they do so, we take the same fifty thousand dollars and give it again to the same people next month for the same purpose. The sale of a hundred thousand copies of the magazine each month makes us prosperous and happy.

Just how we pay the printer for all of these magazines, or what happens when our friends take *our* money some month and buy copies of the Communist *Worker* with it, or how we ever pay back the fifty thousand dollars to the people from whom we borrowed the money—those are minor details we haven't figured out yet. But there must be some good answer, for we took the whole scheme—lock, stock, and barrel—from the explanation now being given of the glories of our Foreign Aid program.

Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, for instance, who neither loses his Mona Lisa smile, nor even chokes, over his own title of "Deputy Undersecretary Of State For Economic Affairs," points out that seventy-five cents of every dollar we give away under this program will be used to buy American goods. Moreover, he says, "practically all the rest of the money will sooner or later return to bolster our economy." And we are quoting this "sales pitch" for Foreign Aid almost verbatim from the *Boston Traveler*, one of dozens of great newspapers throughout our land which are blowing the bugle for their readers to heed such words of wisdom.

The real tragedy here is not in the annual waste, or worse, of four billion dollars. The American economy can stand that, for a while anyway. It is in the fact that the American people have already been brainwashed to the point where they accept such idiocy as making sense.

* * *

A people who are willing to believe, however, that giving their money to Gomulka and Tito is a way of fighting Communism, would swear on a stack of revised bibles that the naked emperor had on the most beautiful suit of store clothes they had ever seen.

As Dan Smoot has pointed out, with documentary proof, the original concept of what is now American Foreign Aid came from Stalin. As we ourselves have been emphasizing for a long time, in speeches as well as in the pages of this magazine, the seed of Foreign Aid was planted in America during the war years, and the embryonic plant nourished through its earliest growth, by

We Pause To Remark . . .

Earl Browder and his fellow Communists. From the beginning our program has been carried out, and constantly expanded, primarily for the various purposes the Communists had in mind. As far back as 1951 this writer reported, in a small book, how so much of the money we contributed to UNRRA—which was the first modest flowering of the Foreign Aid Plant—had gone directly to help the Communists, as in Poland and China.

We are recalling this past history at this moment, however, not for its own sake, but because of a strange sample of today's madness which yesterday's did prepare. As an incidental result of this treasonous absurdity of twelve years ago, there now struts in our midst a beneficiary of our handouts. The Kremlin agent who was given our first UNRRA money in Poland made it a weapon in the brutal Communist subjugation of the Poles. He did so by limiting the distribution of food, into which this aid was converted, to those who were active supporters of Stalin's Lublin Gang. (The facts are all in a 1946 report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.)

This Communist was Mikhail Menshikov. He thereby served the Kremlin so well, with our money, that his rise in rank was inevitable. So that today this same Menshikov is Soviet Ambassador to the United States, and is being constantly gushed over by delegations of Republican ladies. Today the bones of our anti-Communist friends, whom Menshikov starved because they would not join our Communist enemies, lie rotting in the mass graves of Poland. And we can only say, with Thomas Jefferson: "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."

Late one afternoon some eighteen months ago your editor was walking, along a beautiful stream in one of the college towns of England, with a friend of ours who is quite a successful manufacturer in that country. His son had attended that university. We were having some very happy hours, visiting halls and scenes where great tradition was so palpable that it made you think in terms of decades instead of days.

"You shouldn't worry so much about the Communists," our friend picked up an earlier discussion. "Things go on. If they take us over, we'll be able to adjust to it. We can find some way to live under Communism, and to get along with the Communists."

There were plenty of people in Czechoslovakia who felt the same way, only ten years ago. We have Chinese friends who felt that way twenty years ago. There are millions of Americans who feel that way now. We do not expect to convince them otherwise. But we'd like to tell them about the current fashions for encouraging such "adjustment" to Communism, on the mainland of China. Another friend of ours has just been talking to Chinese, in Hong Kong, who have had recent experience behind the Bamboo Curtain. The favorite form of persuasion by the Communist authorities at present is to tie one's thumbs together with wire, and then hang him up by the thumbs for a day or two. Another way of arguing the matter is to stand a man in the sun all day, bound hand and foot, and at intervals snip a bit of naked flesh off his body with shears. And after killing some forty million non-adjusters outright, the Communists are carrying on these "persuasions" with more millions all of the time. The

We Pause To Remark . . .

adjustment to living under Communism is something to look forward to—in your spare moments, of course.

* * *

We recently took a mild crack in this column at Bill Buckley of *National Review*, for a tentative appointment he had made to an imaginary committee. We are glad that we did. For that now gives us a chance to toss a barrage of bouquets in his direction, without seeming to go overboard in praise of our favorite weekly.

The reason for this burst of enthusiasm is *National Review's* part in the affair of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. It may be too much to expect that the magazine will have brought Powell to justice, but it certainly has brought Justice towards Powell. In fact, *National Review* did not just play a part in "souping up" the mills of the gods and of the Justice Department in this case, when they were grinding so slowly that no motion at all could be detected. *National Review* was the whole show—to the definite disgrace of the "Great American Press," which is always patting itself on the back as a faithful public servant. (Evidently "the press" did not want to annoy some of the Powell-ful connections.)

We do not know what, if anything, may have happened to Junior by the time these lines hit the mail pouches. But we do know that about 160 million Americans, including especially the Negro Americans, owe Bill Buckley a huge vote of thanks. He kept the *National Review* spotlight persistently on some very unworshipful clay feet of this self-haloed idol.

* * *

At long last we have come across a news item which should incline us

more favorably towards a Summit Conference. Dean Acheson is opposed to one. Or so he says.

In this connection Marquis Childs takes occasion to gloat that "the close parallel between Dulles and the Acheson outlook on American policy toward Russia is a striking phenomenon of the postwar era." The only fitting comment we can think of was made for us years ago by a great American ambassador, Arthur Bliss Lane, when he was informed that Acheson had become Secretary of State. Lane summed up his feelings, based on his own experience and knowledge, in one brief sentence: "God save the United States." To which we can only add, humbly: "And please, Lord, you better hurry!"

* * *

We have no idea what kind of a bunt Acheson is trying to lay down in this ball game. We haven't been watching his swings lately. But it certainly was to have been expected that Dulles would verbally oppose a Summit Conference, in his statements for home consumption. For his role—apparently chosen by himself, for reasons which we do not pretend to understand—has at least been consistent: (1) to say all of the right things inside America; (2) to say all of the wrong things outside America; and (3) to *do* all of the wrong things in both settings.

For illustration of (1), consider his magnificent speech in San Francisco a few months ago, against recognition of Red China. As an example of (2), reflect on his speech at Jakarta, in March, 1956, making a George Washington out of Sukarno. As to (3), his treatment of our NATO allies, England and France, during the events leading up to the Suez crisis, was so disastrous

We Pause To Remark . . .

as to be considered by them a deliberate double-cross; it made Dullesism the most hated word in the British press for many months. And almost every single thing Dulles has said or done for years will, on careful analysis, fall neatly into one of those three categories.

Somebody has explained that it is Dulles' consuming ambition to go down in history as America's greatest Secretary of State; that you can't be "the greatest" Secretary of State without a reasonable tenure in that office; and that, with the forces in control of our government today, nobody can become or remain Secretary of State unless he makes "appeasement" his watchword. This elucidation will have to do until a better one comes along.

* * *

At any rate, Dulles' loudly publicized opposition to a Summit Conference, and all of his firm insistence on satisfactory terms as a prerequisite for any such conference, is just talk. That he will let himself be overruled and batted down, until he winds up as the most enthusiastic guest at the shindig, should cause nobody any surprise. It is the exact formula he observed with regard to how often the foreign ministers would meet in the Soviet sector of Berlin in 1954; in connection with the participation of the Chinese Communists in the Geneva Conference which sold out Vietnam; in connection with German reunification within the last few months. And we venture the prediction that, if and when the other forces opposing our recognition of Red China are sufficiently worn down by the unceasing pressures of the Kremlin's world-wide drive, you will find Mr. Dulles forgetting his San Francisco speech just as surely and easily as he

forgot what he had promised the British and French with regard to Suez.

Even if we grant, however, that Dulles is merely congenitally unsuited for the role of Horatius at the bridge; and even when we grant further that he certainly has extensive knowledge and skills which *should* be useful for the head of our State Department; then the real question still remains as to why an administration, elected largely to get rid of the foreign policies of Dean Acheson, should have foisted an assignee of Acheson on the American people as Secretary of State, and have kept him there for five years. And if your memory is so short, gentle reader—as the Left Wing hopes and expects to be the case for all patriotic Americans—that you do not clearly recognize John Foster Dulles as a protege, understudy, admirer, and companionate spirit of Dean Gooderham Acheson, maybe we should spare a couple of paragraphs to refresh it.

* * *

On January 12, 1950, Dean Acheson publicly defined the United States "defense perimeter" in the Far East, and conspicuously omitted Korea and Formosa. This statement, coming shortly after his own insistence that we provide 150 million dollars in economic aid for South Korea, was quite in line with the earlier advice of his good friend and advisor, Owen Lattimore—that we give Korea a parting grant of \$150,000,000 and then let South Korea fall without appearing to have pushed it. The statement was also a visible invitation to the Soviet and its North Korean agents to walk in and take over the rest of that country. And on February 9, 1950 occurred the famous White House conference at which Acheson

We Pause To Remark . . .

tried to engineer an immediate, decisive, and highly dramatic final sell-out of Nationalist China—and was prevented by Senator Vandenberg.

But obviously none of these Achesonian wiles or purposes disturbed Dulles. For after a period of informal "cooperation" between the two friends, during the very time that these maneuvers were taking place, Dulles was officially appointed consultant to Secretary of State Acheson, on April 5, 1950. Then, from June 17 to June 20, Acheson's new assistant was in South Korea, visiting military units near the 38th Parallel. What he saw and was told there can be easily surmised. For our own intelligence units had sent back more than one thousand reports, during the preceding twelve months, that the North Korean Communists were preparing for an early invasion. And the South Koreans were emphatic as to what was about to happen. Yet, when the Communist forces did cross the border on June 25—only five days after Dulles was there—he and Acheson were just as surprised as everybody else.

At that time Chiang Kai-shek had several hundred thousand troops, veterans in fighting the Communists (even when, thanks largely to George Marshall and Dean Acheson, they had no guns or ammunition), who were straining at the leash to fight them in Korea (with guns and ammunition). Acheson, and the little man from Missouri neatly under his thumb, turned down this offer. They established a blockade by our Seventh Fleet to keep Chiang from getting in the war against Red China in any way, even after the Chinese Communists were openly fighting our men. They sanctioned and perpetrated

an incredible diplomatic hocus pocus to keep MacArthur from having any chance to win a conclusive victory; and then fired him. Dulles was obviously willing to go along with all of these Acheson-fathered measures; and they all have important bearing on the relationship between the two men. But we'll have to skip them here, after such brief mention, as merely background to a far more important undertaking of collaboration.

For soon after the Korean War was started, John Foster Dulles was assigned by Acheson to prepare a Japanese Peace Treaty. Despite a few transparent protests by Communist diplomats, for the record, and their usual quota of screaming lies, it was plain to any observer with an ounce of realism in his mental equipment that there were few things the Soviets wanted more at this juncture than the consummation of such a treaty. It would withdraw American protection of Japan from the internal agitation and advance of the Communists, who had never been able to get to first base so long as MacArthur was running the country. It would leave a still weak and disrupted, and now-more-than-ever overpopulated, Japan on its own—with many of the traditional forces of its internal strength swept away—as an easy prey to exactly the infiltration and increasing domination by Communist influences which has in fact taken place. A Japanese Peace Treaty, worked out while we were in the midst of the Korean War, was the answer to a Communist prayer. So Acheson and Dulles gladly obliged.

The treaty was signed, in San Francisco, on September 8, 1951, at a meeting for which Dulles was most directly

We Pause To Remark . . .

responsible. But of course both treaty and meeting—the substance and the decorations—had godfather Acheson's happy approval and support. At this fiesta, for the confirmation of the Dulles brainchild, fifty-two nations were represented. Even though the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, still going through their phony motions of objection, refused to sign the treaty, their representatives came to the party. Egypt was there, and Ecuador, and Saudi Arabia and Vietnam; and Laos and Liberia and Norway and Luxembourg. But no representative of Nationalist China was present—because none was invited!

May we remind you that Japan had begun this war, in 1937, by attacking the Nationalist Chinese, under Chiang Kai-shek. That Chiang and his Nationalist Chinese had been fighting this full-scale war against brutal invaders for four years before Japan attacked us and we even got into it. That after we were in, and Japan had swept us out of the Philippines, the British out of Singapore, and the Dutch out of Indonesia, Chiang Kai-shek kept approximately *three million Japanese*, half of them well-equipped soldiers in uniform, bogged down in China for four more years, when they might otherwise have been fighting us. That Chiang had done this despite increasing attacks on his own forces, during the latter years of the war, by the Chinese Communists; despite so much of his country being occupied by the Japanese that they set up a puppet government, supposedly for all of China, under Wang Ching-wei; and despite the fact—vouched for by General Wedemeyer, among others, on his personal knowledge—that Chiang was offered many

favorable opportunities by the Japanese to make a separate peace. In the whole Pacific side of World War II—in other words, in the war *with Japan*—Chiang and *his government* were the only allies we had whose participation was of real importance.

And yet, at the signing of the treaty drawn by Dulles, ending this war with Japan—the *Japanese Peace Treaty*—Chiang Kai-shek was not even invited to send a representative. But Cuba and Honduras and Syria and Ethiopia—they were parties to the negotiations and signatories of the document. Mr. Dulles has had the gall, somewhere, to explain the lack of an invitation to the Nationalist Chinese Government as an *oversight* on his part. If anybody who believes that will come around to see us, this editor personally will sell him the Brooklyn Bridge. But the matter is not important; for the official reason given for this incredible affront and betrayal was even worse. It was that the Chinese were excluded from having anything to do with the Japanese Peace Treaty because Britain and the United States could not agree on *which* Chinese government to invite.

Let's toss that criminal absurdity around for a minute in its proper space-and-time setting. On October 26, 1950 the Chinese Communists intervened *directly* in the Korean War. It happened to be on that very day that Dulles sent the first draft of his treaty to various nations that he thought should see it. His discussions of this draft, and of changes in it, extended over the next several months. During all of these months the Chinese Communists were killing our men in Korea. On February 1, 1951, even the weak-kneed United Nations General Assem-

We Pause To Remark . . .

bly condemned Communist China for being "engaged in aggression" in Korea. On April 23, 1951 the Chinese Communists began their third major offensive against us. And on September 8, 1951, at the time of the signing in San Francisco, we were still very much at war with these same Chinese Communists.

During all of this time the Nationalist Chinese Government had been doing its utmost to get us to use their half million soldiers, or to let them fight the Chinese Communists directly as our allies, or both. During all of this time the Chinese Nationalist Government had a full-scale embassy in Washington, headed by one of the world's most respected diplomats, Dr. Wellington Koo. It was still fully and officially recognized by us as *the* Chinese Government; because even Acheson and Dulles had never dared to fly in the face of the known mood of the American people, so far as to talk *publicly* about withdrawing that recognition. And during all of this time not even George Catlett Marshall would have dared to suggest to the American people that the murderous aggressors who were killing their sons in Korea should be recognized as a legitimate government.

And remember one more thing. Although we, the United States, had been officially in charge of all the UN

forces in Korea (including our own) solely because—in theory, anyway—the UN Security Council had asked us to assume that responsibility, the boys doing the fighting against these Chinese Communists had been fifty percent Americans and forty percent Koreans. The British had been a part of that ten percent which included *all others*.

Yet, under all of these circumstances, we couldn't decide *which* Chinese Government to invite to San Francisco. We, which really meant Acheson and Dulles (God save the United States!) couldn't have Chiang's representatives sign the treaty to a war in which they had fought, and in which their country had been horribly devastated, for eight years—on the excuse that the British wouldn't agree.

All of this and a great deal more happened under the Acheson-Dulles partnership before a half-awakened citizenry voted one of them out of office—only to get the other one in. And we believe that the American people have just been fooling themselves ever since, or have been horribly deceived, in thinking that there are five degrees of difference between these two ardent patrons of Alger Hiss, even in the whole range of 360 degrees which a foreign policy can take. As Robert Morris has so aptly put it, "no wonder we are losing."

AN AFTERTHOUGHT

It is certainly no pleasure for your editor to write so disparagingly, as he has done above, of a man holding so high an office in our government. But what we have said about John Foster Dulles is mild indeed, compared to characterizations of him in other countries on which we are depending as allies. Near the end of a long and bitter article last year, for instance, London PUNCH decided that Mr. Dulles was a schizophrenic. "There exists within him," it said, "a vigorous majority in favour of guaranteeing to tell the approximate truth between 11 A.M. and 3 P.M. on Sundays, Washington time. By other bits of him it is still felt that . . . such a concession would undermine the entire basis of Mr. Dulles' position."

We think this is an exaggeration.

The Fear Of Failure

(Continued from Page 12)

and failed. There was a second revolution. Then there were the ceaseless interprovincial wars, from which evolved the notorious "war lords" with their great private armies. There was no peace, nor chance of peace, anywhere. In the end the Communists were invited—or invited themselves—into southern China, as an *antidote* to "imperialism"! These agents of the Kremlin were permitted to infiltrate Dr. Sun's Kuomintang (National People's Party), and were given so much voice in the determination of policy that they all but took over China. In Canton, in 1924, Dr. Sun was warning the nation that unless his organization—already dominated by the Communists — could conquer the northern war lords and restore unity, the "imperialists" would take over China; and that the Chinese people would then be reduced permanently to the status of second class human beings, hewers of wood and drawers of water—while the "imperialist" great powers were draining off the wealth of the land.

By this time there were thousands of Chinese, many of them educated in Europe and America, who knew precisely what the foreigners in the treaty ports were thinking and saying. It added up to the following terrible indictment. Not only was the country in a chaotic state, but the chance was almost negligible that any Chinese leader would emerge who could do anything about it. A Chinese could be taught to run a machine, but nobody could teach him to keep it in order. Chinese soldiery could be taught to drill beautifully, and could be rigidly

disciplined; but they couldn't and wouldn't fight. The Chinese just could not administer justice fairly. In Shanghai courts had been turned over to highly qualified jurists, trained abroad; and had still proved as venal, or as subject to official intervention on behalf of guilty persons, as any old fashioned up-country magistrate. Chinese underlings in foreign firms and banks were shrewd, capable, and hard-working; but they couldn't establish a bank or a corporation of their own, because their fellow countrymen had no faith in their integrity.

Under pressure from the Legations, the Chinese governments had employed a great number of highly paid foreign advisers, in many fields; but they didn't advise, and couldn't. For the native bureaucrats made sure that these advisers got their fancy pay, but made equally sure that they acquired no real knowledge of the work in the several departments in which they were supposed to be helpful. The bureaucrats wanted no witnesses to their own ineptitude, or to what became of their funds. Finally, it was impossible for the foreigners to have close social relations with most Chinese officials, even of high degree, or to admit these officials to the foreigners' clubs, because of uncouth and sometimes filthy habits. As for the acquisition of technical and scientific knowledge: If there were any Chinese who had gained such knowledge abroad, they were either denied a chance to use it, or had no interest in using it, at home.

Till The Bottom Is Reached

As the state of the nation drove the better informed Chinese into despond-

The Fear Of Failure

ency they had to admit, on looking over the scene, that evidence to disprove these damning generalizations of their foreign critics was increasingly hard to produce. So the fear steadily increased that the fate for China, which Dr. Sun had prophesied during the year before his death in 1925, was actually impending. This fear drove large numbers of China's intelligentsia into the Communist camp. And there they were promptly saturated with a virulent anti-imperialist "nationalism." [Not enough Americans are aware that, among the two or three most important agents of the Kremlin in China at this time, promoting this hatred of the "imperialist" nations in an effort to have Moscow gain control of China, was Earl Browder. Editor]

IV

ONE MAN who escaped this virus was Chiang Kai-shek. But for a while after Dr. Sun's death he was not in a position to do anything about the Communists. Even when he organized and led the Kuomintang army north to the Yangtze, as the beginning of the long awaited campaign for the unification of China, he was surrounded by Soviet advisers and their Chinese stooges. There was nothing the Communists wanted less, however, than to have China unified under Chiang Kai-shek. So they and their sympathizers tried to set up a "central government" in Hankow. And a Communist controlled unit of the army for which Chiang was responsible, after Chiang himself had advanced beyond Nanking, perpetrated a number of overt outrages against the foreigners in that city. This was the first attack on foreigners by Chinese revolutionary forces since the revolution

had begun in 1911. It was fomented and carried through entirely by the Communists. But it was also the turning point, in that cycle, of their attempt to take over China.

Chiang felt bitterly his own responsibility for what the Communists had done. With troops he could thoroughly trust, he turned back to Hankow, restored order, and punished the malefactors. (This included execution of the ringleaders.) Within a few months he was cleaning the Communists out of the army, out of official life, and out of the student and labor groups. He sent Moscow's agents scurrying homeward, and broke off relations with Russia.

And The Chinese Come Back

The next year Chiang moved on northwards, defeated all of the warlords, and actually united China. Then, though the unification was still tenuous, and though Moscow's fresh start with guerrilla forces under Mao became increasingly a source of heavy harassment in the early 1930's—nevertheless there now came an era of nearly ten years of reform; of discipline, of military and official re-education, and even of widespread popular education in such matters as public health, sanitation, and personal hygiene. Budgets were balanced, troops were paid, industry flourished, flies were swatted and nails were cleaned. And the great restoration of Chinese confidence in themselves began.

This writer left China in 1929, and did not go back until he turned up in Chungking, the wartime capital, in the early summer of 1944. By then the change was emphatic, and important.

The Fear Of Failure

The kind of "nationalism" which is synonymous with anti-foreignism, bred of fear of failure to make good, was all but dead. One evidence of it was the free and easy social relations between Chinese and Occidentals. Another was the Chinese readiness to take foreign advisers into close collaboration with officialdom, ask advice, and use it, without fear of exposing either inefficiency or peculation. This was because the Chinese were proving that they could learn to do anything with the foreigner's tools, institutions, or methods—anything that the foreigner could do. The fear that the Chinese would, due to inherent weaknesses, sink into a permanent second-rate status among the races of men, was dying fast. Since then this writer, during some years on Formosa, has seen that fear fade out almost completely. And with it has gone the memory in most minds of that embittered "nationalism", which was bred by that fear.

What brought the change? Well, for one thing, China's war record helped a lot—despite the feverish efforts of the Communists and their friends, towards the end, to discredit Chiang Kai-shek and his regime. By trading space for time, and occasionally striking back with spectacular success, China held out alone against Japan for four years. She then continued to hold out while British, French, and Dutch resistance to Japan was crumbling in Southeast Asia; and while the United States was recovering from Pearl Harbor and the debacle in the Philippines. China rejected flatly all the increasingly attractive Japanese offers of a separate peace, and remained rigidly loyal to her allies when the prospects were darkest.

Earning Their Way In Blood And Sweat

But also, then and since then the Chinese have gone on demonstrating further that they could learn to use Occidental tools and institutions as expertly as the gadget masters of the West. As competent American observers attest with enthusiasm, the Chinese can not only use fighting planes and ships, tanks and all modern weapons, with highly professional skill, but can take care of them too. In Formosa they are developing responsible representative government which works. So does their system of elections. And so does their local self-government. Without coercion, they have smoothly put over land reforms which disposed of initial Taiwanese suspicion and hostility; and which has markedly improved the standard of living of the rural population. They run the railways like clockwork. With some technical guidance and help, which they gladly accept, they carry through difficult engineering projects. Thanks to a scientific approach to agriculture—as well as the incentives of a non-collectivized free society—they have a surplus for export of almost everything the island grows. In medicine they are well up to scratch. The educational system that they took over from the fifty-years Japanese occupation of the island was far below par; now it attracts thousands of Chinese students from all over Southeast Asia. Those whom aliens are likely to meet have adapted themselves so perfectly to universal conventions that there is no inequality in social relations whatever, and no thought of any. And they run banks and corporations which enjoy the confidence, not only of their own people, but also of the Occidentals who

The Fear Of Failure

live among them and do business with them.

What is more, haven't two young Chinese physicists in this country, dabbling in pure science, become Nobel prize winners for proving wrong a thesis in physics which the world's scientists had thought was axiomatic? Fifty years ago only a tiny minority of Chinese students had the use of Arabic numerals. Such calculations as they could not achieve in their heads they worked out on the abacus. Now China's high school (*alias* middle school) students have gone through more mathematics, with conspicuous ease, than the average American college graduate.

To The World's Respect, And Their Own

In short, the Chinese have demonstrated to themselves—which is more important than demonstrating it to others—that given a chance they can compete with any Occidental in any field. So what have they to fear? They don't just hope that, when Communism in the homeland has run its course and has been consumed in the inevitable holocaust, they can take over the unholy mess and regenerate it. They *know* they can. And they know that in that day they will have not only the help but the respect of the "imperialists." This assurance is founded solidly on confidence in themselves; while such muddling "nationalists" as Sukarno, quite justifiably fearful of failure both ludicrous and ghastly, depict these same "imperialists" to their people as great vultures roosting on nearby points of vantage, restrained by nothing but the benevolent and protective interest of Sukarno's good friends in the Kremlin.

V

THIS ACCOUNT of the inception and decline of Chinese "nationalism" has taken more space than the writer intended. But he hopes thereby to have provided one explanation of the anti-foreignism, *alias* "nationalism," of the most vociferous elements among the Indonesians, the Burmese, the Singha- lese and the Indians. The Chinese, when desperately afraid that they were bungling their way into chaos and possible loss of nationhood, rashly accepted the moral and material support of the Soviet Union. So today do well informed politicians and intellectuals elsewhere—who would scream in terror if they thought the Red tyranny was about to engulf them — support their leaders in acceptance of Soviet interest in their affairs, and themselves take lessons from the Kremlin's agents in the business of cursing the "imperial- ists". They know well enough that Moscow's good will is non-existent. They know that one of Moscow's important purposes is to turn their mismanagement into total ruination, for the damaging effect it will have — among others—upon the economy of the Western nations. But such subver- sion these supporters of Soviet inter- vention hope against hope to handle domestically. At the same time they fervently pray that the Kremlin's thor- oughly vicious interest in them will make the free world leery about the step of which they live in dread. This would be for the free world one day to come along and say: "See here, you fellows, you have now come close enough to botching irreparably the job with which you were entrusted. Sup- pose you let us take a hand in restoring order, sanity, and solvency here."

The Fear Of Failure

It need scarcely be added that what has been written above does not explain the lengths to which gentry like Nehru and Sukarno have gone, to abet Soviet policy in all international relations, and in general to forward the Kremlin's program of world conquest. No such services to the Kremlin have been necessary, or are now necessary, to elicit a Khrushchev's "fatherly" interest in the independence and sovereignty of formerly colonial nations. Stacks of evidence have been accumulated to show that, if such worthies are not actually crypto-Communists, operating under the Kremlin's instructions, it is because they are more valuable to the Red cause as phony neutralists.

Yet no such inclination to support the Kremlin at every turn can be charged against great numbers of men, in these southern Asiatic countries, who know Communism and its devices and aims as well as we do, but who nevertheless play the Communist game. They do so by promoting a bitter "nationalism", by reminding the masses of the people of the supposed horrors of long defunct "colonialism", and by fostering hatred of the "imperialist" bugaboo.

Their motivation is the knowledge that the civilized world is watching them—yesterday sympathetically, today critically and doubtfully, and very likely with growing irritation tomorrow.

But Will The Pattern Hold For Others?

The Chinese got over all of that because they had the stuff in them to make good. They had the intelligence, the vitality, and the courage to take count of their disabilities and shed them. Thirty-odd years ago, during a period of flamboyant "nationalism" in China, this writer ground out a book showing how and why the Chinese were sunk, beyond salvage, under a weight of conceit and ineptitude. He was wrong, and he is now happy to admit it. But how about these southern Asiatics? Do they have the same stuff? Do they have in them what it takes, to work out of their present state of fear and folly, before first slithering down the road into the Red Avernus—a road that is being greased for them by some of their own leaders? I wish I knew the answer to that one, but I don't.

THIS IS LIKE SPELLING BANANANA

A story recently going the rounds in Czechoslovakia deals with the pretense the Communists recurrently make of allowing free discussion.

At a meeting where this claim was emphasized, a man named Novak sought permission to ask two questions, and was told to go ahead. "Comrade President," he said, "my first question is: Why is meat so high? And my second: What happened to Archbishop Beran?"

"Comrade Novak," the chairman replied, "it is getting late, and I had rather not drag out the meeting. I'll answer your question next time."

At the next meeting another member of the discussion group begged permission to put three questions. With permission granted, he asked: "First, Comrade President, why is meat so high? Second, what happened to Archbishop Beran? Third, what has happened to Comrade Novak?"

BULLETS

Absence of occupation is not rest.
A mind quite vacant is a mind
distressed.

Cowper

Doctor, to patient: "Let me know if
this prescription works. I am having
the same trouble myself."

Saturday Evening Post

Blessed are the young, for they shall
inherit the national debt.

Plus Accrued Interest

Walter Reuther controls more mil-
lions of dollars for political campaigns
than do the Democratic and Republi-
can parties combined.

Tom Anderson

A little fire is quickly trodden out,
Which, being suffered, rivers cannot
quench.

Shakespeare

He proposed to her in the automo-
bile. She accepted him in the hospital.
And They Lived Happily Ever After

Businessman to secretary: "I've got
to call up my wife. Send my daughter
a telegram to get off the phone."

Kirk Stiles

He was the sort of man who could
bring chaos out of confusion.

Paul Crume

In national affairs, a million is only
a drop in the budget.

Burton Roscoe

PLEASE, MR. PRESIDENT, DON'T
GO.

Alfred Kohlberg

Sweet young thing: "I don't know
how the Russians do it. When I drink
vodka, I say 'yes' to everything."

Kroehler News

The purse of an American lady must
be large enough to carry both the
money and the soul of its owner.

(Surprise!) *Edgar Allan Poe*

If you haven't any ideas

Don't worry.

You can get along without them.

Many of the nicest people do.

Christopher Morley

Bride, responding to compliment:
"He's nothing. You should have seen
the one that got away."

Leonard Dove

One something sees beyond his reach
From childhood to his journey's end.

Gustave Nadaud

He didn't know what to think — his
psychiatrist was out of town.

Youth In Action

June means weddings in everyone's
lexicon,
Weddings in Swedish, weddings in
Mexican.

Breezes play Mendelssohn, treeses play
Youmans,

Birds wed birds and humans wed
humans.

Ladies grow loony and gentlemen
loonier.

This year's June is next year's Junior.

Ogden Nash

There is nothing government can
give like that it takes away.

With Apologies to Byron

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

by

EDWIN McDOWELL

In October, 1939, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov gleefully announced that nothing remained of Poland, "that ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty." His statement was optimistically premature. For it was not until the Yalta Conference, in February, 1945, that Poland was *officially* handed to the Kremlin, as one of the bribes for Russian participation in the war against Japan. Even then it took nearly three years of full-fledged and merciless Communist terror to *persuade* the brave and patriotic Poles to even a passive acceptance of their enslavement.

ALLIED WARTIME DIPLOMACY (Wiley, N.Y.; 481 pages, \$6.95), by Edward J. Rozek, is a fully documented history of the Soviet seizure and subjugation of Poland. Its author, formerly an officer in the Polish Armored Division of the Allied armies, was wounded four times and holds several decorations for bravery. He is today an assistant professor of political science at the University of Colorado. The facts in his book are taken from the official documents of the Polish government, and from the private files of former Prime Minister Mikolajczyk of Poland. The background to this tragic story of treason and terror has already been given in such excellent books as *I Saw Poland Betrayed* by Arthur Bliss Lane, *America's Second Crusade* by William Henry Chamberlin, and many others. What is most important about this new volume is the understanding it provides of *how* the Soviets were able to

threaten and cajole the Allies into sycophantic obedience to their every demand. In the process of the cruel and cowardly yielding to Stalin's wishes, on the part of Roosevelt and Churchill, their *Atlantic Charter*, with its sonorous pronouncements, became just another "scrap of paper" in the archives of hypocrisy.

Professor Rozek's book is no polemic, however, but a scholarly and objective study of a shameful epoch. The Katyn Massacre, the Lublin Gang, and the wanton Russian betrayal of Bor-Komorowski's home army, are presented without emotional rancor. Only rarely, as when he mentions that the Teheran Conference constituted a new partition of Poland, with Churchill as the chief engineer of the partition, does the author digress from the official record. And in such instances his comments are thoroughly justified, as the facts fully show.

Allied Wartime Diplomacy is a most valuable addition to the scanty stock of dependable histories in a very important field. It is, as even the *New York Times* proclaimed with surprising enthusiasm, "...the voice of the victims . . . heard . . . through documentary evidence." More than this, it is the voice of our national conscience, crying in an academic wilderness.

* * *

The short-lived Cox Committee, created by the Eighty-Second Congress to investigate tax exempt foundations,

made
its dem
there h
directe
founda
Comm
THEIR
Adair,
A. We
deliber
cessful
basic A
As o
(which
in the
ser lea
mainly
have b
lions t
—liter
that r
haps t
leftist
dation
Of Pa
a chos
fluenc
Comm
Its ac
subsid
feller
\$2,600
cases,
to ser
were
ganize
found
free-e
and i
Mr.
job o
mater
by th
book

A Review of Reviews

made one startling revelation before its demise by frustration. It found that there had been a *Communist, Moscow-directed plot to infiltrate American foundations and to use their funds for Communist purposes*. FOUNDATIONS: THEIR POWER AND INFLUENCE (Devin-Adair, N.Y.; 412 pages, \$7.50), by René A. Wormser, makes it clear that this deliberate plot has been amazingly successful, to the disastrous cost of our basic American freedoms.

As counsel to the Reece Committee (which succeeded the Cox Committee, in the following Congress), Mr. Wormser learned how foundations, supported mainly by large American businesses, have been using their tax exempt billions to subvert the capitalistic system—literally striving to devour the hand that raised them and feeds them. Perhaps the most publicized example of a leftist organization supported by foundation funds is the infamous Institute Of Pacific Relations. Its huge part, as a chosen instrument of Communist influence, in delivering China to the Communists, has been told many times. Its activities were made possible by subsidies from the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations to the extent of \$2,600,000. But there have been other cases, of the use of foundation money to serve Communist purposes, which were even more flagrant. And the organized interlocking effort of many foundations, to destroy or discredit the free-enterprise system, is continuous — and incredibly powerful.

Mr. Wormser has done an excellent job of collecting and presenting this material. His success is best indicated by the palpable silence with which his book has been greeted by the liberal

press. For to acknowledge its existence, and its irrefutable conclusions, would be an admission that there is, indeed, something nauseatingly rotten in the state of America. If you have enough patriotism to want to know how rotten, by all means read the whole book yourself — and read between the lines to see how high the rottenness reaches.

* * *

Another book which the liberal press chose to ignore, when it appeared about a year ago, is *THE VISION AND THE CONSTANT STAR* (The Long House, New Canaan, Conn.; 192 pages, \$3.50), by A. H. Hobbs. This two-hundred-page essay could properly be called a handbook for conservatives. For in it Professor Hobbs covers the collectivist waterfront, chopping the ground out from under the Fabian schemers, and reinforcing the supports of belief in the dignity of the individual.

Sociologist Hobbs, like Felix Wittmer, has been pilloried on the campus because of his non-conformity to the liberal line. For he is one of those increasingly rare anachronisms, a professor who still believes in the American way of life and—what is far worse in gulliberal eyes—who is not afraid to speak out in its defense. He does this speaking out in a beautiful, exoteric prose style, which makes his book a valuable addition to every americanist library.

* * *

We're not stopping here because of the New York *Times'* recent solemn assurance that Communism in America has "no longer any strength or influence"; that because our editor cut us short of space. You—and *he*—will hear more from us next month.

LOOKING BOTH WAYS

In the *European Survey* in our March issue, William Schlamm discussed the Kennan-Rapacki Plan. And we have not yet seen in print, anywhere else, nearly so concise and penetrating an analysis of this blueprint for the proposed betrayal of central Europe. Then, in the *European Survey* for our May number—which was mailed from Paris on March 16—Mr. Schlamm called the turn on what was going to happen in France, and when, and why. He could not have been more accurate if he had been operating by means of a certified thousand-tube crystal ball. One subscriber wrote us that Willi Schlamm's articles alone were well worth the price of our magazine. We agree. In fact, we think that in this game we have a grand Schlamm.

In the current issue we call your especial attention to *The Fear Of Failure, As Motivation In Southern Asia*, by Rodney Gilbert. Mr. Gilbert, a newspaper man for fifty years, writes with expert first-hand knowledge of his subject. After a thorough apprenticeship with newspapers in this coun-

try, he spent from 1912 to 1929 in China, with side trips into Chinese Turkestan, Tibet, Malaya and Indonesia. He next spent fourteen years on the editorial staff of the New York *Herald Tribune*. He was back in China again at the end of World War II, and once more in 1950. His article contributes some important original thinking, soundly based on long experience, to an understanding of what makes the current crop of Who's Who in Asia think and act as they do.

The next article by Dr. J. B. Matthews will be in the July issue (instead of this one, as we mistakenly indicated in a footnote last time). We're being coy about the subject matter, but we believe the article will create a lot of interest. Also in the July number will be an excellent essay, *Social Insecurity*, by Elizabeth Webb Wilson. And of course William Schlamm will be back, with Holmes Alexander, Hubert Kregeloh, Edwin McDowell, and others. In fact our bid, in the combined July-August issue, is a *grand slam*, doubled and redoubled.

AMERICAN OPINION REPRINTS

Since the last issue we have added two new reprints to our series. The following now available, with their respective prices, are given below:

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION	J. B. Matthews
Prices: 10-99, 10¢ each; 100-999, 8¢ each; 1,000 or more, 7¢ each.	
THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM	Hans Sennholz
Prices: 10-99, 5¢ each; 100-999, 4½¢ each; 1,000 or more, 4¢ each.	
A LETTER TO THE SOUTH	The Editors
Prices: 10-99, 10¢ each; 100-999, 8¢ each; 1,000 or more, 7¢ each.	
A LETTER TO KHRUSHCHEV	The Editors
Prices: 3-99, 3 for \$1.00; 100-999, 25¢ each; 1,000 or more, 20¢ each.	

1929 in
Chinese
d Indo
years on
w York
n China
r II, and
contrib
hinking
ence, to
akes the
in Asia

B. Mat
(instead
ndicated
e being
but we
a lot of
ber will
security,
And of
be back,
rt Kreg
hers. In
d July
doubled

the four

Matthews

ennholz

Editor

Editor

OPINION