

AMERICAN OPINION

IN THIS NUMBER

POOL

Sixth in a series of (what have proved to be) the most penetrating and prophetic analyses of developments in Europe which have been published in America:

EUROPEAN SURVEY

by

William S. Schlamm

**Many Other Articles
And Regular Features**

AN INFORMAL REVIEW

Volume 1 Number 6

JULY-AUGUST 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. TIGERT

A. C. WEDEMEYER

W. H. WILBUR

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON

CONTENTS — JULY-AUGUST, 1958

European Survey	William Schlam
Another Letter From Paris	Hilaire du Berrier
A Review Of The News	Hubert Kreglo
Bullets	
We Pause To Remark	
The Scoreboard	
How To Read The Federalist	Holmes Alexander
Social Insecurity	Elizabeth Webb Wilson
A Review Of Reviews	Edwin McDowell

June 9, 1958

Dear Reader:

We are gambling on your desire for the truth instead of comfort. This, slightly reworded, is the way Hilaire du Berrier begins his article on Page 7. He has thus expressed for us the editorial precept of our magazine.

We do not know whether this contributor was himself consciously paraphrasing Emerson or not. But that most profound of all Americans said: "God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please — you can never have both." To which we can only add another paraphrase: Emerson, thou should'st be living at this hour.

If it is an uncomfortable business to hear the truth today, however, we can assure you it is a far more painful ordeal to speak it. As William Schlam implies (on the next page), all of us would like very much indeed to be calling to your attention that the forces of evil had been routed; and that a world once out of joint was now as right as a pippin. We'd sell more magazines by doing so. But we have doubts about being allowed to take the money with us to a concentration camp.

Eleven times a year, therefore, we publish some forty-eight pages of truth, much of which is intended to make any patriotic American better informed and more uncomfortable. But, as we announced when AMERICAN OPINION was born, no separate issue will be published for the month of August. Our next serving of plain truth will be dated September. And we share your hope that it will not have become still more discomfiting in the meantime.

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.

A visi
(housed
tainable
moving
sympathy
gether w
There is
friendlin
profound
tilingual
manners
still, aft
affects y
provisati
I found
NATO.
is in thi
undersiz
of honor
the kind
alas, wa
feats fo
Once
tional d
cation s
coming
being a
Army y
long be
attack
bleau
matters
your h
mind i
men, o
the lab

JULY-A

EUROPEAN SURVEY

by

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Mailed from Paris, May 16, 1958

A VISIT AT NATO headquarters (housed in the glorious castle of Fontainebleau near Paris) is one of those moving experiences that make your sympathy with the erring increase together with your certainty that he errs. There is an almost heroic spirit of friendliness, brotherly co-operation and profound confidence in the entire multilingual structure; an air of civilized manners within a military body that still, after several years of existence, affects you as if it were an amiable improvisation. I cannot truthfully say that I found much genuine cheer inside NATO. But from top to bottom there is in this overblown general staff of an undersized army the characteristic faith of honorable men in the job to be done; the kind of courteous good will that, alas, was the earmark of Western defeats for the last few decades.

Once you have conquered the traditional difficulties of Parisian communication systems (the "busy" signals keep coming in so thick that you can't help being apprehensive whether the Red Army wouldn't be crossing the Rhine long before the S.O.S. concerning their attack could get through the Fontainebleau operator), once you *do* discuss matters with learned NATO officers, your heart goes out to them—and your mind is more worried than ever. These men, one realizes after a while, outdo the labors of Sisyphus. The stones they

keep carrying up the hill not only keep rolling down again; these stones fall smack on their own heads.

Only a few NATO officers can indulge in the luxury of thinking. Just like soldiers anywhere else, they are expected to do, not to ask. But, this being a general staff, there are some men at NATO who coordinate action with thought, routine with anticipation, today with tomorrow. With some of these officers I have discussed the prospects of NATO. When in reporting the essence of these conversations I won't sound especially serene, it is a fault of neither the NATO officers (who toil in their jobs with impeccable loyalty) nor of this reporter (who would like nothing better than to suggest that everybody is going to live happily forever after). It is the fault of the unfriendliness of a world in which icy winds keep blowing from the East with ever-increasing velocity.

NATO's Reason For Existence . . .

NATO policy (to begin my story at the middle) is being set not in Fontainebleau but in Washington (or, as the matter may be, at the golf course of Augusta). The NATO officers may add a few trimmings to the whats and whys of NATO planning. The decisive factor remains what Mr. Eisenhower intends to do about the Soviets. And right now, no truly thoughtful NATO

European Survey

officer doubts that Mr. Eisenhower *seriously* proposes atomic disarmament, provided the Soviets and the United States can agree on methods of a mutually satisfying inspection system. This one fact prejudices every single step of NATO. It makes its existence altogether problematic.

The central prerequisite, the intellectual foundation of the whole NATO concept, was from the beginning, as it is now, the axiomatic assumption that we shall stay atomically armed. Because we *do* possess atomic weapons, we decided to construct a mere skeleton of any army to secure, not Europe as such, but merely the atomic bases of Europe against a Soviet onslaught. No sane military mind can ascribe to NATO a more ambitious job. Under United States leadership, the contributing NATO powers have programmed for 1961 a total force of thirty NATO divisions — to confront the eighty-two Soviet divisions that are currently poised against the West, plus the four hundred Soviet divisions that can be set going within a month after the outbreak of hostilities. At the moment (and most likely throughout 1959) about eighteen NATO divisions are actually employed against such overwhelming Soviet superiority in troops—superiority at a ratio of about five to one in ready manpower, of twenty-seven to one a month after a conflagration started.

This, under normal conditions, would be rightly considered the survival chances of a maniac suicide. And yet, sound NATO strategists were perfectly willing to take these chances for one, and only one, forceful reason: as NATO would remain equipped with atomic weapons, and would merely serve as a protective shield for the atomic bases,

the manpower proportions on both sides do not really matter. The military establishment of the West could be considered adequate once it was big enough to hold those bases against any surprise attack. The rest would be up to the Strategic Air Command.

May Cease To Exist

Now think what would happen if the Soviets suddenly accepted Mr. Eisenhower's honest offer to disarm atomically, under mutual disarmament controls! Well, responsible NATO officials *have* begun to think about this nightmare; and here is what they come up with.

In the first place, they think it *entirely feasible* that the Soviets will grasp the ultimate advantage which an atomic disarmament, under *serious* mutual inspection, would offer them. In the past, the Soviets showed a primitive, ritualistic horror in regard to foreign controls on their territory; and Western diplomats got used to reckoning with that Soviet repugnance as an unchangeable fact of international life. But it isn't. The post-Stalin Communist leaders have given abundant evidence that they are perfectly capable of taking another look at practically anything. One day they will most certainly ponder, with characteristic freshness, the promises of atomic disarmament, in counterbalance to traditional Soviet revulsions against foreign observers on Soviet soil. And if they do, they are bound to discover that the presence of a few United States control commissions in the Soviet Union (even if they were not impeded in motion and observation) is as nothing compared to the gigantic change in the international balance of power a serious atomic disarmament must unfailingly produce. To overlook this, the Soviet

European Survey

leadership would have to be blind. And we have not the slightest reason to presume that it is.

And So May NATO . . .

NATO strategists, in short, reckon with a sudden Soviet acceptance of Mr. Eisenhower's atomic disarmament proposal as a distinct possibility and even a realistic probability. If it happens—what then happens to NATO, to Europe, to the West? On this, there is a difference of opinion within NATO. Some strategists think it would mean NATO's immediate demise, Europe's immediate surrender to the Soviets, the immediate end of the West. The other school of thought assumes the demise, the surrender, the end would not be immediate but piecemeal. And there is no third school of thought.

The argument anticipating a dramatically fast decline of NATO, Europe, and the West goes something like this. As long as both sides possess atomic weapons, the likelihood of atomic consequences precludes a frontal Soviet attack. For, even if the immensely superior Soviet army could crush the eighteen to thirty NATO divisions in a few weeks, the continuous atomic counterattack would have in the meantime rendered the occupied territory uninhabitable; would have destroyed the supply lines between the Red Army and the Soviet Union; and would have, above all, turned decisive Soviet regions into radioactive ashes. Therefore, because it cannot pay, a Soviet attack has not yet materialized. But if there are no dangers of an atomic reprisal, once both sides have effectively dismantled their atomic establishments under working mutual controls, then Europe sinks unavoidably under the gigantic weight of a "conventional" Soviet army

that outnumbers the West, first, five to one and, a month later, twenty-seven to one. Even more: A responsible European government, *any* responsible European government (i.e., not at all a "neutralist" or Quisling type of government), would *have* to come to fast terms with the Soviet Union *before* the inescapable avalanche came down on their country. For while an individual can heroically decide to die for a hopeless cause, a nation must not. A nation, once resistance has become intellectually inconceivable and theoretically hopeless, must surrender. A serious and mutually guaranteed atomic disarmament of both sides makes West-European resistance against a Soviet attack intellectually inconceivable and theoretically hopeless. Thus, immediate surrender.

Not so, says the other school of thought at NATO. Or, rather, not so fast. If the Western nations are indeed so anxious to be freed of atomic apprehensions, they surely must be willing to pay the price. Now the price can be exactly stated: it would have to be the willingness of the Western nations, in exchange for atomic disarmament, to expand their "conventional" armament several times over. To be precise (say the coolly calculating NATO officers), the Western nations would have to keep a minimum of eighty to one hundred divisions in fighting posture, plus a minimum of another two hundred divisions ready for action one month after the fight began. In other words, the Red Army can be checked in Europe even after an effective atomic disarmament—if the NATO nations are willing to increase their current "conventional" military establishments from five to fifteen times their present size. And not in some

European Survey

distant future, but immediately.

And The Nations Which Comprise It . . .

At this point, the adherents of the other NATO school of thought cut in caustically: "Do you really think democracies can shoulder that kind of permanent mobilization in peacetime, perhaps for a whole generation or two, and yet remain democracies?" This objection, I must report, scores heavily. The only rational answer I've heard to this one is, I'm sorry to say, irrational; namely the academic proposal that, under such circumstances, democracies may prefer becoming something else rather than going under completely. And as NATO officers are much too polite to suggest the introduction of authoritarian regimes, the advocates of the more serene perspective soon lose their cause in debate. For both sides can agree on these four conclusions: (1) after atomic disarmament the Western nations can survive only if they increase their "conventional" military establishments fivefold to fifteenfold; (2) no democratic society can survive such a total submission to military needs in peacetime; (3) it is therefore unlikely that the NATO nations, immediately following an atomic disarmament, will supply the required minimum of eighty to one hundred poised and two hundred reserve divisions; (4) therefore, an atomic disarmament means the end of the West.

This, against the incredibly beautiful background of Fontainebleau's blooming gardens, was the essence of my talks with wise NATO officers. Perhaps I should have told you more about the magic light that was playing on the lilacs and kept caressing the yellow walls of the chateau. But, to me, these hours

were forever soaked with the ash gray of decline.

* * *

On The Italian Scene . . .

I know better than to predict the results of the Italian elections in a report that will be published a long time after the event (May 25). But the last several weeks have disclosed deep fissures in Italy's socio-political structure that will remain open, and will fester, no matter where the voters happen to go. Two trends seem momentous above all: (1) the Nenni-Togliatti Left has shown an unrelenting hold on about one-third of the Italian people; (2) the Christian Democratic Party has shown its own deep division that is bound to grow into an explosive incompatibility between the two wings.

The Christian-Democrats have never recovered from De Gasperi's death (a fact that should send shivers down the spine of German Christian-Democrats who, some day, are going to bury Dr. Adenauer). But even while he was still alive, the party's left wing was battling the right wing far more lustily than it ever fought the Anti-Catholic Left. And with Signor Gronchi's surprising promotion to the Presidency (with the votes of Italy's Communists) the left wing of the Christian-Democrats attained a commanding position in Italian politics. Hardly a day went by that anti-Communist Italian statesmen didn't run into some effective presidential interference. But slowly Italy awoke to the fact that the real center of anti-anti-Communism wasn't President Gronchi (much as he tried to qualify for that role). The true manager and operator of the leftist Maffia within Italy's Christian-Democracy turned out to be Signor Enrico Mattei, the shrewd, able and ruthless boss of Italy's

European Survey

immense (state-owned) oil and gas concern, ENI, and the related nationalized industries.

Advances Mr. M. . . .

Signor Mattei, today very probably the most powerful man in Italy, is the author of all the dangerous schemes that have disturbed Italy's policies for the last two years. He is the man who has pushed Italy's foreign policy onto the perilous course of fraternizing with Nasser. He is the man, too, who has maneuvered President Gronchi into his (to put it mildly) ambiguous pronouncements on "neutralism." He has promoted all the confusions and uncertainties that have plagued Italy's Christian-Democratic governments in regard to the Rapacki Plan and Mr. Kennan's seductions.

Mr. M.'s power comes, simply enough, from his boldness in corrupting the governmental party with the sweet fruits of economic control. His trust is without a doubt the wealthiest economic combine in Italy—very likely richer than all of Italy's private enterprises put together. The gentleman determines the distribution of tens of thousands of lucrative jobs—and this in a country whose citizens, with a disarmingly naive cynicism, frankly admit that no political or even religious dedication could possibly compete with a person's "need for a good job." Mr. M. has many more well-paying jobs to fill than the entire Italian government. And so his power exceeds theirs.

Steadily To The Left . . .

But, as it happens, Mr. M.'s allegiance tends towards the East. Not that he is, himself, a verifiable fellow-traveler. No, he goes to Church, watches his steps, keeps his trap prudently shut in public.

But he is an intimate friend of Mr. Mikoyan, the No. 2 man in the Soviet establishment; and he has, above all, some very strong convictions on such subjects as State Capitalism, a "genuine" New Deal for Italy, Keynesian manipulation of fiscal powers, and all the rest that constitutes incorrigible Leftism. Unlike some Anglo-Saxon brethren-in-spirit, whose convictions are moderated by pale academicism, Mr. M. is a powerhouse of Machiavellian wiles. In him, an Italian Harold Ickes seems to have been stimulated by the deviousness of an Italian Harry Hopkins. He is the Italian version of F.D.R.'s Brain Trust, all wrapped in one, with all the city machines thrown in.

This dynamo of a leftist operator has now hurled his total weight into the battle over the re-orientation of Italy's governmental policies. As I said, I won't dare predict the election results a mere ten days before the votes are counted. But I do not hesitate to predict what has already happened—namely, a profound weakening of Italy's Christian-Democracy, which is damned if it forms a coalition with the Monarchists and Neo-Fascists on the right, and damned if it accepts "an opening on the left." The point is that the Christian Democratic Party simply must do one of these two things. There is no third alternative. Desperately trying to remain the country's *relatively* strongest party, it has not the slightest chance to recover the status it enjoyed under De Gasperi, as Italy's *sovereign* political power.

When the votes are in, a Cabinet will *have* to be formed. If it includes, to secure a majority, the Monarchists and Neo-Fascists, the Christian Democratic Party's left wing will not recoil from

European Survey

splitting Christian-Democracy; and *any* right-wing government (unless it were willing and able to suspend the constitution) would topple. Will Mr. M. succeed in driving his party into a deal with Nenni? If so, the Communists would have practically re-entered the Italian Government. And the Soviets could mark their greatest European triumph since the Czechoslovak putsch of 1947.

And In France . . .

I left a discussion of the shattering French events to the end, not because they aren't crucial (they could be the most important European story of 1958), but because I have analyzed their roots and consequences two months ago (in *AMERICAN OPINION* of May 1958). What was said there a long time before the events still holds at the time of their passing. And I beg my readers to believe me that this assertion is not meant to blow my own horn. I say it, on the contrary, with a feeling of desperate frustration. Our world, it seems to me more than ever, is going to pieces because our overlords of government and press are the "serene," the "optimistic," the "confident" type—men, in short, who stare at the silver lining while the clouds are bursting and the flood engulfs the world. Anybody, anybody at all could have seen for years now that France was moving toward a major spasm. Nobody, nobody at all reported it in the United States press; and the managers of our governmental establishment kept acting, always smiling blandly, as if the bliss of Normalcy and Prosperity would never disappear from Western Europe again.

The Flimflam Sets Off . . .

While I am writing this, it is still not

known what kind of regime will emerge from the French army upheaval in Algeria. De Gaulle has at last pronounced his readiness to assume power. This might suffice. And then again, the "center-left" parties are so deadly frightened (and, indeed, the Parisian street is in an ugly mood of lynching) that they might stiffen, at least for a while, into some kind of firmness. But if the Pflimlin crowd hangs on and rejects de Gaulle's invitation to hand the power over to him, they must end in the choking embrace of the Communist Party. The Pflimlin Government survived the very first vote in the *Chambre* only because the Communists abstained from voting; and so, actually, the Communists allowed the Government to exist. They will not remain modestly tactful very long. France has reached one of those stupidly simple crossroads of history: it will have to be either de Gaulle, based on an openly rebellious Army, or some kind of Pflimlin, based on the Communist Party of France.

A Crisis For The West . . .

This much is certain: the "quiet," the "calm," the playful years of Western prosperity are over in Europe. The metropolitan press of America may try for a few more months to suppress the fact, but it is a fact nonetheless, and it will determine the next phase of history. The Western world is in an upheaval again. France hangs on the horns of its fundamental dilemma. Italy is being "opened on the left." The only real winner of the elections in Greece were the Communists. The Labor Party is pushing into power in England. Germany is being neutralized. May everybody enjoy his vacation. It could be one of the last.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM PARIS

by

HILAIRE DU BERRIER

Elsewhere in this number (and earlier numbers) we have commented on the subtle campaign to make the United States hated everywhere in the world. It is a long-standing campaign which we believe to be spearheaded by Communists and Communist sympathizers right in Washington. And nowhere have the shadows of this conspiracy shown more clearly than behind the policies we have nourished with regard to the French troubles in North Africa.

The following article is reprinted, by permission, from the H. du B. Reports. Its author, a patriotic American from North Dakota, has lived in Paris and been a close observer of the French political scene for many years. In this report, dated May 20, 1958, he provides our readers with some true facts from the Algerian front, and an insight into both their cause and their significance, which certainly could not be obtained from our metropolitan press.

Specters and Nightmares: Your correspondent is gambling on his reader's desire for the truth instead of comfort. Most American editors do not question an out-and-out anti-French report but will neutralize or hurriedly discount any solid information about France and her Algerian problem as being pro-French or even propaganda.

On past American insistence France granted independence to Lebanon, Syria, Morocco and Tunisia. Belatedly it is recognized that those initiating the hasty procedures did not understand the perplexities of that region. Now the Algerian rebels are demanding independence, and again American officials are encouraging them.

Some Americans seem bemused by the problems that underdeveloped peoples do present to today's socially conscious world. When official, their hasty meddling and risky intrigue

interfere with the development of a practical understanding, by these inexperienced peoples, of what independence entails—that thirst for independence is just the beginning of getting it and hanging on to it!

Officially America has panicked before the word "colonialism." And our resulting policy has pushed us into forcing a production of infant states in strategic spots around the world which Communism swallows by subversion or outright aggression. With little economic and political experience to support their independence, these peoples come to hate us as they sink into anarchy or dictatorship—as *specters* they should haunt us.

But the *nightmare* of thinking Americans is an America, stripped of allies, and forced to go it alone. NATO is already sicker than the doctors have told the family. Britain's next government

Another Letter From Paris

will be Laborite and Neutralist. Our repudiation of our allies at the time of Suez doomed Britain's government that was with us. And in France, events since Suez have increased the prestige of the army that had the situation in hand. Each succeeding month takes its toll in French respect for their government that acceded to America's ultimatum over Suez.

II

Jacques Soustelle: Monsieur Jacques Soustelle, archeologist, lives in a ground floor apartment at 85 Avenue Henri-Martin. Since the rebel Algerians placed a price on his head, two armed guards and a plain-clothes man are outside the door. Books and objects from Aztec and Inca excavations line the walls of the drawing room where the visitor waits. Monsieur Soustelle emerges from a small study off the hall. His desk there is littered with arriving letters, each one of which he reads personally. From these letters, which have inundated him since the Paris NATO Conference last December, comes a picture that is frighteningly serious. Frenchmen think they have answered President Eisenhower's plea for free world solidarity affirmatively, but that their loyalty has not been returned.

The extent to which solidarity has decreased, since that plea was made, can be judged by the circumstances of the fall of the Gaillard government on Tuesday, April 15th. Upon receipt of a note from President Eisenhower, Premier Gaillard weakened his former stiff position before the Anglo-American mediation mission in North Africa. Deputy Jacques Soustelle, long regarded as France's coming man, charged in the French Assembly that French policy

was being made in Washington. The Gaillard government fell before this attack by a vote of 321 to 255. President Eisenhower's reaction was to term the Soustelle speech "a political gimmick."

In the new mood of France, the most important piece of real estate to the West's defense in the free world, President Eisenhower's next plea for solidarity may find instead the realization of all the things strategists fear. If the collapse of western defenses starts, it will be here, in France.

Only by knowing how our allies feel and then allowing a certain amount of give as well as take are we going to keep NATO's props from caving completely. And the commodity in this give and take must be mutual consideration, not dollars. Finding out to what extent Deputy Soustelle was speaking for his country would seem to be a more responsible approach than President Eisenhower's attempt to play down that speech.

France's army and her "man in the street" feel sold out—their country has leaned over backwards to please America and it has brought neither American respect nor good will. Whether Americans agree or not with this French conclusion is incidental. Of prime importance is the fact that the *basis* for their reaction has gone unaired before American public opinion — too often French feelings have been oversimplified as just "anti-American."

Time-Life (April 28th) pictured Jacques Soustelle as anti-American, an assassin of governments. However, the *Wall Street Journal* (April 25th) quite frankly discussed the difference between America's *declared policy* toward our NATO partner, France, and our *back-stage maneuvering* with her enemy, the revolutionary Algerian F. L. N. (Front

de la
paper's
Soustelle
anything
reports
"It wou
much of
the Fren
ernment
to take
it wants
self-resp
ing rep
sponsibi
insolenc
our par

The
actions
Algeria
ing ch
policy.
official
of the
from
Ameri
rebels'

We
nor th
reptiti
F. L.
thus w
resist
uncon

The
in No
airing
again
action
Suez
On
Mour
langu
three

JULY

Another Letter From Paris

de la Libération Nationale). This paper's reporting also bears out Jacques Soustelle's remarks, making his words anything but "a gimmick." The paper reports an American official as saying, "It would not do to administer too much of a shock but we want to put the French on notice that any new government they come up with will have to take a more liberal line on Algeria if it wants to get along with us." How do self-respecting Americans feel about being represented by officials whose irresponsibility leads them to such "dollar" insolence toward an ally? France is our partner—not a satellite!

III

The Algerian Problem: French reactions this week, in both France and Algeria, seem to be anticipating a coming change in United States official policy. The change would replace our official and unofficial *backstage direction* of the rebels in securing their demands from our ally, France, with *open American support* of the Algerian rebels' demands for independence!

We have not fooled the French people nor their Army. America has been surreptitiously aiding and abetting the F. L. N. to continue their struggle—thus we have strengthened their will to resist and to make their demands so unconscionable as to be unnegotiable.

The grievances of the French Army in North Africa deserve an American airing and fair consideration before we again adopt a policy as divisive as our actions concerning Nasser's seizure of Suez have proven.

On June 22, 1956, French Captain Moureau, a career officer and Arabic language specialist, was kidnapped with three other officers by the Moroccan

National Liberation Army. They were at French posts recognized by treaty. Reports drifted in that Moureau, with his eyes put out, was being shown from village to village in a cage. March, Amena and Cacciaquera are believed dead but all French demands for information from King Mohammed V have met a blank wall.

The "Moureau affair" was not mentioned in the American press. The French government, fearful of cries of "colonialism" and "menacing Morocco with American arms" did not lift a finger. *French soldiers and their parents feel that these enemy atrocities have been accepted by their weak officials rather than risk measures that might offend the U.S.A.—that Frenchmen are expendable as Americans are not.* The French recall our American reaction to the imprisonment of American aviators by Red China. Our public opinion insisted on knowing whether our men were alive and where they were. [*It did so only half-heartedly, and one-tenth successfully.* Editor.]

"If NATO is important," says your Frenchman, "is not the loss of good French officers a concern of America, too?" When Mohammed V visited Washington last winter, had our government asked the King, on the human level, to do what he could to relieve the anxiety of those officers' families, it would have thawed the French army's feelings and provided an "out" for the King. He could then have pointed out to the irresponsible National Liberation Army that Moroccan prestige, as well as his own, was at stake with America. But the Moureau affair was not mentioned! Against this morale-destroying background the French army was assigned its difficult task in Algeria.

Another Letter From Paris

IV

Enter Sakiet: The frontier village of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef has long been a haven from which the Algerian F. L. N. has made raids with impunity. (American reporting has implied that it was "a belief" or "assumption" of the French that it was an Algerian sanctuary—a reportorial device used for clouding the truth and bitterly resented by those French suffering the raids.) On January 11, 1958, a dawn raid from Sakiet developed into a battle, about three miles from the Tunisian border, that lasted from 6:30 A.M. until 1:00 P.M. Five soldiers of the 12th French Infantry, on duty at the frontier, were captured. One died, the other four were taken to Sakiet and then brought back into Algeria. To the army it could become another "Moureaux Affair," this time in Tunisia. French permission to retaliate was given.

Some 30,000 French troops patrol this Tunisian-Algerian border, nerves harassed and tempers frayed by 5,000 rebel Algerians who fall on outposts at night — then withdraw to Tunisian asylum, protected by a "one-way street" of international law! Friday afternoon, February 7, French patrol planes were fired on from gun emplacements in Sakiet. This was the 30th such attack in a period of five months. Captain Bernon, Commander of an Alsatian Company, walked down to the Tunisian border post on the banks of a stream, and informed the Tunisian officer there, "This is not to happen again. If it does we will take action." The Tunisian officer saluted and turned away without replying.

The following morning, February 8, 1958 at 9:05 A.M. a French Ouragon plane patrolled the Algerian side of the

frontier. The guns in Sakiet opened up—smoke began to pour from one of the plane's motors. It managed a landing at Tebessa. One hour and forty-five minutes later eleven B26's (purchased from America, not given), six Corsairs, and eight Mistrals took off from Bone, Telergma and Tebessa. Rendezvous: Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef. Objectives: (1) an abandoned iron mine a mile and a half from the village, whose galleries had become a barracks and arms depot for Algerians being trained and outfitted there; and (2) the seven anti-aircraft machine gun emplacements in the village center. French military intelligence insists that the school was a headquarters of the F. L. N.

The anti-French wave stirred up was vicious—the American press, reaching back into a far-away past for Tunisian grievances, made no mention of the grievances of France, our NATO ally, nor that her officer gave that final warning on February 7th.

In Paris Premier Gaillard and Edgar Faure learned of the raid over luncheon coffee, Minister of National Defense Chaban Delmas heard early in the afternoon, and Foreign Affairs Minister Pineau did not know until the following morning.

Minister of Algerian Affairs, Monsieur Lacoste, telephoned General Raoul Salan, the French Commander-in-Chief in Algeria. To Minister Lacoste's questions General Salan replied that a ground operation would have produced street-fighting and use of artillery, with heavier losses, and French parachutists would have been picked off like pigeons by the enemy if ordered to their chutes. Minister Lacoste ended it: "We shall continue to retaliate but the manner will be decided in Paris and not by local

command
To the
nothing
they took
own gov
and the
the two
sacrificed
army's
member
will hear
of the c
and mo
Month
letters o
Februar
mind in
complex
events

novel

most
whic
free
not
Tor
war
vict
find

lect

ern
ls
cal

hap

mu
we
go
ex

JULY

Another Letter From Paris

commanders."

To the army this was notice that nothing effective would be done unless they took a determined stand with their own government. Both the colonials and the French at home, whose sons are the twenty-year-old conscripts being sacrificed by half measures, support the army's position. Americans, who remember back to Korea and the Yalu, will hear an echo in their own hearts of the distress of these French fathers and mothers.

Months ago *H. du B. Reports* (see letters of August 5, December 2, and February 3) warned of the state of mind in both France and Algeria. The complexities and strains producing the events of this week compel America's

most serious attention. Reporting, either careless or deliberate, that characterizes these outraged colonials and French citizens as mobs inviting anarchy, or that presents the French army as irresponsibly flouting civilian direction, reflects a child's comprehension of the situation. Good will between France and America will do much more for Algeria in the long run than American involvement in support of Algerian rebel demands for independence. What will the rebels do with Algeria if they get control? They would not know how to develop the country. Or is American foreign aid to support their independence in a style to which they *wish* to become accustomed?

The Spoiled Child and His Inheritance

In Scribner's 1952 edition, page 624, of Thomas Wolfe's widely-circulated novel, *Look Homeward, Angel*, appears this paragraph:

"Yet, Eugene was no rebel. He had no greater need for rebellion than have most Americans, which is none at all. He was quite content with any system which might give him comfort, security, enough money to do as he liked, and freedom to think, eat, drink, love, read, and write what he chose. And he did not care under what form of government he lived — Republican, Democrat, Tory, Socialist, or Bolshevik — if it could assure him these things. He did not want to reform the world, or to make it a better place to live in; his whole conviction was that the world was full of pleasant places, if he could only go and find them."

The fictional character, Eugene Gant, bears the stamp of many an intellectual in America today.

Is it necessary that an artist should be blithely supercilious about the government which affords him the rich privileges and pleasures just enumerated? Is any American exempt from the stern dictum (which Eugene would probably call a *cliché*) that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom?

Why should any one, artist or artisan, take life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for granted? These things are denied most of the world's inhabitants.

There are times when one who would survive, and remain a free citizen, must resist threats of serfdom; must be a rebel against tyranny. The Kremlin would like to have us all float along as did Eugene, aloof from the mechanics of government, accepting our rich heritage but not protecting it. And that is exactly what entirely too many Americans are doing.

Elizabeth Staples

A Review Of The News

by

HUBERT KREGLOH

In May, 1958 . . .

→ Vice-President Richard Nixon, accompanied by Mrs. Nixon, travelled through eight South American countries. The trip was marked by extraordinary demonstrations of hostility against Mr. Nixon and the United States in Peru, Colombia, and — especially — Venezuela. Demonstrators spat at Mr. Nixon, threw rocks, sticks, and bottles, tore and trampled on our flag, as police often seemed passive. While Communists apparently were the organizers, the demonstrations nevertheless reflected deep-rooted and widespread feelings. Coupled with anti-American demonstrations in many other parts of the world, the incidents pointed to the bankruptcy of an Administration foreign policy advertised as winning for us "friends and allies" and "combatting Communism."

→ France went through her worst crisis since World War II. The newly formed government of Pierre Pflimlin was immediately challenged by the French residents and the military in Algeria, and by portions of the Navy. Millions of Frenchmen, desperately seeking a solution for the Algerian debacle, called for leadership from World War II hero and symbol of French resistance, General Charles de Gaulle. With the backing of President Coty, who offered the alternatives of de Gaulle or a Communist-dominated "Popular Front," the General emerged

on the last day of the month as the leader of a new, apparently more authoritarian government.

→ On a TV program, multi-millionaire Cyrus E. Eaton declared that Communists in the United States existed only "in the minds of those on the payroll of the FBI." He compared the FBI with Hitler's Gestapo and denounced all investigations of Communism. Eaton, long an admirer of the Soviet Union and a "modern" Republican, who recently entertained Soviet Ambassador and Mrs. Menshikov on his estate, spoke under the auspices of the leftist FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, whose parent organization is the FORD FOUNDATION. On the day of this TV program, FBI director Hoover was quoted as having told a House Appropriations Subcommittee of his deep concern about the manner in which the law courts have been aiding the Red Conspiracy in recent years.

→ Several hours of knifings, beatings, and robberies in Boston by teenagers who had attended a monster "Rock 'n Roll" show caused authorities all over the country to wonder whether these moronic jungle concerts do not stimulate juvenile delinquency. A number of communities banned the show responsible for the Boston disturbance.

→ President Nasser of the United Arab Republic returned to a cheering Cairo from an eighteen-day state visit to the Soviet Union.

A Review Of The News

→ At Groton, Connecticut, the atomic-powered submarine USS "Skipjack" was launched. While Navy spokesmen described it as the world's fastest, most powerful and maneuverable undersea craft, some less sanguine observers cautioned that the Soviets might be readying a few surprises of their own in this field.

→ Among prominent people who died were: Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador (under F.D.R.) to Moscow and author of the pro-Soviet book "Mission to Moscow," in Washington, D. C. at the age of eighty-one; veteran British-born movie actor Ronald Coleman, in Santa Barbara, California, from a lung infection, at the age of sixty-seven; and Elmer Davis, leftist-liberal radio commentator and writer, chief of the Office of War Information during World War II, and co-founder of ADA (Americans for Democratic Action), in Washington, D. C. at the age of sixty-eight.

→ The Soviets publicized the launching on May 15 of Sputnik III, stated by them to be by far their biggest earth satellite. The 11.9-foot cone-shaped space traveller weighs 2,919.53 pounds, according to Soviet announcements. United States experts admitted that this country will be unable to match this accomplishment (if the statistics are as claimed) for well over another year.

→ In an accident similar to one a month ago over Las Vegas, Nevada, all twelve passengers and crew members of a Capital airliner perished on May 20, when it was rammed over Maryland by a Maryland National Guard jet trainer. Sharp reaction in Congress caused President Eisenhower to sign an emergency order designed

to keep military aircraft out of the traffic lanes regularly used by commercial planes.

→ "Modern" Republican Harold E. Stassen failed in his bid to become Governor of Pennsylvania. He was decisively beaten in the GOP primary by pretzel manufacturer Arthur T. McGonigle. Many Americans hoped that this defeat would eliminate Stassen entirely from the political scene.

→ On May 27, Samuel Cardinal Stritch died in Rome at the age of seventy. The Archbishop of Chicago had suffered a cerebral stroke a week earlier, following amputation of his right arm due to a circulatory disturbance. In March, he had been the first American ever to be appointed to the Roman Curia.

→ A contingent of Cornell students protesting a tightening of regulations governing boy-girl private parties marched on the home of University President Deane W. Malott, smashed windows and pelted Dr. Malott with eggs and rocks. Many observers wondered whether the chickens of "progressive" education were not coming home to roost in educational institutions all over the country.

→ In elections in Italy, the pro-Western Christian Democratic Party remained in power but did not gain a majority. While the leftwing Communists and Socialists made some gains, extreme rightwing splinter parties appeared to be the main losers.

→ Congress raised postal rates—effective August 1, 1958. First class and air mail go up one cent each. The new law also provides for annual pay raises of \$265 million, retroactive to January 1, for the nation's 520,000 postal employees.

BULLETS

To trust the soul's invincible surmise
Was all his science and his only art.

George Santayana

* * *

We judge ourselves by what we feel
capable of doing; others judge us by
what we have done.

Longfellow

* * *

Washington, D.C. is the only insane
asylum in the world that is run by the
inmates.

A Former Congressman

* * *

The only way to have a friend is to
be one.

*Emerson (And he didn't
say "... is to buy one.")*

* * *

A fool and his money don't make out
much worse than the average guy these
days.

A "Parting" Thought

* * *

Dean of Women, at coeducational
school: "The president of this univer-
sity and I have decided to stop petting
on this campus."

Rapid Service Press

* * *

Prisoner in penitentiary: "I was mak-
ing big money—about a quarter of an
inch too long."

Imp

* * *

Behind every successful man there's
a woman—constantly telling him he's
not so hot.

Washington Post-Times Herald

* * *

A young man received the following
letter from his girl: "I must explain
that I was only joking when I wrote
that I didn't mean what I said about re-
considering my decision not to change
my mind. I really mean this."

Good Business

* * *

In politics, he who sows boredom
will reap defeats.

William S. Schlamm

From a biography of President
Chester A. Arthur: The most pressing
questions had to do with the large and
embarrassing surplus revenues in the
national treasury. This surplus, for the
four fiscal years 1879-82, averaged over
eighty million a year.

Sixty-six Ninety-nine

* * *

The more the Government does for
you, the more it does to you.

Theodore Roosevelt, Jr.

* * *

My eyes make pictures, when they
are shut.

S. T. Coleridge

* * *

You have heard that vaudeville died?
Well, television is the box they put it
in.

But They Forgot To Bury It

* * *

Workingman, to bystander: "What
do I do here, Mac? They just hired me,
but all we talked about was wages,
hours, overtime, vacations, bonuses, and
pensions."

Lichty

* * *

The mere defensive is doomed to
defeat.

Napoleon

* * *

The press reports that Pravda now
contends that a Russian invented the
streetcar. What's a streetcar?

Cincinnati Enquirer

* * *

You can preach a better sermon with
your life than with your lips.

By Whom?

* * *

I held it truth with him who sings
To one clear harp in divers tones
That men may rise on stepping
stones

Of their dead selves to higher things.

Tennyson

We Pause To Remark . . .

A SMALL AIRPLANE is now being sold in kit form for assembly by the owner. Owners who make mistakes in their home work will themselves be assembled by the undertaker.

* * *

During the Klondike gold-rush days, Wilson Mizner was once approaching a saloon when a man came running out, followed immediately by another man with a gun in his hands. The pursuer shot his victim dead, on the frozen ground practically at Mizner's feet. "Why?" asked Mizner, who knew both parties. "Because," replied the man with the gun, "he insulted my girl, Sal." Mizner, who also knew Sal, and whose wit was exceeded only by his profanity, drove his next question right to the crux of the case. "For God's sake, how?" he asked.

We thought of that story on reading that John A. Baker, second secretary of the United States Embassy in Moscow, had been expelled by the Soviets for violating Soviet standards of diplomatic behavior.

* * *

And we were reminded of another story on reading the long-running debate-by-mail between Attorney Robert Montgomery and Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., over the errors of fact concerning the Sacco-Vanzetti case in Schlesinger's so-called history, *Crisis of the Old Order*. This wasn't really a story, however, but the most incisive epigram of the year, for the recording of which we are indebted to our favorite weekly, *National Review*:

Ezra Pound was lamenting the fate of a historian who had been banished to obscurity by the liberal educationists. "Poor fellow," said Pound, "he committed accuracy."

* * *

This item belongs in the Now-We-Have-Hard-Everything Department. Glamor-Boy Menshikov, the Kremlin's ambassador to Washington (without a drop of the blood of his

We Pause To Remark . . .

Polish victims now staining his immaculate shirt front) has just shown the kindness of his heart. He has offered to have Soviet Russia help the United States out of its economic recession! As soon as that little chore of the Good Samaritan has been performed, we assume the agents of the enlightened Soviet will be glad to come over and teach the benighted Americans how to hold a free election. It's wonderful to have such friends!

* * *

We note the glee with which the "liberals" are drooling at the mouth over the supposedly poor showing of Bill Knowland in the California primaries. To suggest that these liberals modulate their ecstasy with caution, however, we remind them that in 1952 Knowland won his present senate seat by the largest vote ever cast for any candidate for any office in any election in any state in the history of our country. And despite some clever but extensive "knifing" of him behind the scenes, which we believe has been and will be indulged in by some of his "modern" Republican "friends," we predict that he will win the California governorship by a heavy majority.

* * *

On April 23, in Scranton, Pennsylvania, Harold Stassen was asked whether, if elected governor of Pennsylvania in 1958, he would serve out a four-year term. He replied that he could not make any such guarantee, because of the possibility that a new Republican president in 1960 might want him, Stassen, to become secretary of state. Childe Harold can now breathe a sigh of relief since one-half of such a conflict for his services has been eliminated. And if he will just tell us what candidate for the presidency would consider him for secretary of state, that possibility will also be eliminated (automatically), and we can *all* breathe a sigh of relief.

* * *

In November, 1956 Mr. Richard Nixon announced that the Hungarian uprising marked the beginning of the end of the Soviet tyranny. We do not wish to be too hard on our Vice-

We Pause To Remark . . .

President, even for having spouted such nonsense, for he has just been through a horrible ordeal in South America, during most of which he handled himself extremely well. But we do hope that ordeal itself convinced him of the folly of looking at the Communist conspiracy with the eyes of a political Pollyanna. The ultimate effect of the Hungarian rebellion was to make the Kremlin gang stronger, just as they had planned when they precipitated the revolt. (See the—largely suppressed—report of the UN Investigating Committee.)

* * *

In September, 1954, at a "national people's congress" in Communist China, one Shao Li-tse made a speech "Concerning the Problem of the Dissemination of Knowledge about Contraception." In this speech he gave the swallowing of live tadpoles as a most effective method of birth control. This spring, after extensive tests—and after thousands of Chinese peasant women had died of swallowing live tadpoles from contaminated ponds—the Chekiang Medical Research Institute has solemnly announced that swallowing live tadpoles not only will not stop women from bearing children, but is downright harmful.

We wonder if the Chekiang Medical Research Institute, having thus disposed of Shao Li-tse and his tadpoles, would now care to take a good look at some of the nostrums being rammed down the throats, or injected into the skins, of the American people. Since these nostrums have been promoted by government-sponsored or government-encouraged propaganda campaigns, which so much resemble the Peiping drive let loose behind contraceptives in 1954, the experience of the Chekiang crowd ought to be helpful.

* * *

We wish General Charles André Joseph Marie de Gaulle the best of success in giving France a new lease on life. For all of his fame, he is something of an enigma, and apparently nobody knows exactly where he stands on many important issues. But

We Pause To Remark . . .

he is bitterly hated by both Jacques Duclos (leader of the French Communist Party) and former Prime Minister Pierre Mendès-France. Those two achievements—corresponding roughly to an American statesman having earned the enmity of both Earl Browder and Earl Warren—are strong points in favor of de Gaulle.

It is possible, of course, that the General may be able to give France enough renewed stability, in both the form of government and the substance of patriotism, that he will be succeeded eventually by Jacques Soustelle. And that would be a real cause for rejoicing on the part of the whole anti-Communist world.

* * *

The National Federation of Republican Women has come out with the suggestion that its members raise money for the Grand Old Party by putting on strip-tease acts in their respective communities. As the finale of a style show, following cocktails and dinner, members acting as models are to parade on runways and sell to the highest bidders—for delivery then and there—each item of accessory and clothing the model is wearing, from hat and costume jewelry right down to, and including, panties and bra. ("She wears flesh-colored tights or bathing suit" underneath, the brochure explains.)

Some readers of *AMERICAN OPINION* sometimes say that we are too frequently bitter over the cheapness to which the influence of this administration is reducing everything in America, from its morals to its money. We plead the above provocation as all the defense necessary. We further submit that not one in ten, of the patriotic individual women who are members of the four thousand Women's Republican Clubs, or of those women for whom the National Federation presumes to speak, would approve of this monstrous suggestion. But we are equally sure that these individual members will not have enough interest and determination to kick out of office the slick operators and "modern" Republicans who did suggest it.

We Pause To Remark . . .

In this issue we carry an advertisement, by the publisher, of René Wormser's book, *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*. Last month we carried a highly favorable review of this book. And we wish now to recommend it again, to all patriotic Americans, as one of the most important publications of the decade. While Wormser does not say so, we have the information from an equally unquestionable source, and it seems clear just from the actions of the largest foundations themselves, that at least some of them are working on a definite program "so to change the economic and political structure of this country that it can be comfortably merged with Soviet Russia." What is more important, they are succeeding beyond the most extravagant guesses of even well-informed Americans. Read Wormser's book and judge for yourself.

* * *

We see that some good patriots have protested the serving as clam chowder, in the American tragedy at the Brussels Fair, of "a tomato concoction which has no resemblance to true clam chowder." They say that Europeans are thus being given a "misconception" of what American clam chowder really is. And that even Leverett Saltonstall has protested the display there of an ethnic map of Massachusetts, which gives Europeans the misconception that there are no people of Anglo-Saxon stock left in this part of the country.

Considering the immensely more important "misconceptions" about America being promoted at the same exhibit, these complaints are on a par with that of the proper Bostonian mother, whose small son shouted his excitement over the circus elephant with "Gee, Mom, ain't he a big son of a bitch?" "Johnny," his mother spoke sharply, "you simply must stop saying *ain't*."

We do not know where the ultimate responsibility lies, for making the United States offering at Brussels "a dull and clammy zombie" (as Dillard Stokes has so aptly described it). But we do know that America's putting its worst foot forward, in

We Pause To Remark . . .

so many different directions within so small a compass, could not have been due to either chance or stupidity. It took exactly the same kind of skill which, in connection with our shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia, contrived to make both the Arabians and their enemies, the Israelis, bitter towards us over the same incident.

It is obvious that there have been forces assiduously and successfully at work for years, right in our government, to make the United States look bad and Russia look good, at every opportunity all over the world. With our own money, and through our own policies and their implementation, these forces have managed to make the United States increasingly hated, and looked on with contempt, in eastern Asia, in the Middle East, in Western Europe, in South America, everywhere. And this campaign is, of course, only a part of a still larger plan.

When the conspirators set out to degrade, cheapen, and weaken the United States, ours was the greatest nation in the history of mankind: in the form of its government, in the level and solidity of its material prosperity, in the character of its self-reliant yet compassionate people; in its lack of class hatred or even class lines, in the freedom and opportunity for its individuals, in its composite outlook for ever more freedom and better times ahead, in its prestige with the people of other nations. Now all of its great traditions and characteristics and prestige are visibly being eroded, ground down and hollowed out to thin shells without substantial strength, by the abrasive and burrowing efforts of traitors and their dupes. For in the Cold War it is more important—because much easier—to pull America down to the level of Russia than to raise Russia to the level of America.

To the forces so insidiously engaged in this tremendous undertaking of willful destructiveness, it was mere child's play to arrange for the United States exhibit at the Brussels Unfair to be tawdry, flat, tasteless, and far surpassed in effectiveness by the Russian show.

THE SCOREBOARD

Our complacency in the face of a known deadly peril amounts almost to insanity. DR. FREDERICK SCHWARZ

AT THE LAST CONGRESS of International Communism, just before World War II, delegates from all the Communist Parties of the world represented a total of slightly more than four million members. But in November, 1957, at the triumphant meeting in Moscow to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, delegates came from seventy-five Communist Parties, with thirty-three million members. This is approximately an *eight hundred percent expansion* in the twenty years. And that is just about the rate of growth of Communist power throughout the world during that time, no matter from what angle you measure it, or with what unit of comparison.

Since the Communist masters do not have — nor want — but from one to five percent of any subject population as members of the actual party, we can assume three to four percent as a rough average. These thirty-three million party members, therefore constitute the hard core of tyranny over almost a billion subjugated people. This figure is confirmed by our information from many other sources. But twenty years ago the total Communist-ruled population was only around a hundred and twenty-five million. And practically all of the huge difference has been added since the end of the war.

From the summer of 1945 to the summer of 1958 the Communists have *averaged* adding to their empire seven thousand newly enslaved subjects

every hour. We have quoted these statistics many times before—as in the first of these “Look At The Score” articles which appeared nearly a year ago. But permit us to repeat them again. And let us remind you that these people — of Czechoslovakia or of China or wherever they may be—have the same love for their families, think of concentration camps with the same despairing horror, and feel exactly the same pain under torture, as do you and I. Seven thousand more human beings, just like ourselves, have been brought under the incredibly brutal rule of a Communist police state, on the average, *every hour*, twenty-four hours of every day, 365 days of every year, for the past thirteen years. And today this rate of conquest and enslavement is steadily increasing.

A far-flung and insidious tide may not even seem to be rising, at any specific spot briefly watched. But the rate of its rise can be determined, by measurements made at long enough intervals—as we have done above. And how much it has already climbed up the sides, and seeped into the eddies, of areas once firm and dry, can also be noted. We set out to estimate how far the Communist tide had gone, percentage-wise, towards swallowing up such areas entirely. Our observations for that purpose have been as conscientious and objective as we could make them. We present their results, on the next two pages, in *The American Opinion Scoreboard* for 1958.

The American Opinion Scoreboard

In the following tabulation we have undertaken to estimate the present degree of Communist influence or control over the economic and political affairs of almost all of the "nations" of the world. (The omissions have been due to lack of size, importance, or autonomy.) The chief source of such control or influence may be Communist-run labor unions (as in Uruguay), or Communist sympathizers in government (as in India), or powerful Communist political parties (as in Italy), or highly successful Communist agitation and propaganda (as in Mexico). The total extent of Communist control or influence over any country, however, is due to the impact of all Communist pressures, direct and indirect, visible and undercover, working together. In most cases, of course, that total cannot be

measured with any exactness. But we believe the appraisals given below to be conservative, as of June 1, 1958.

It is only when this scoreboard is compared with any similar one, which might have been compiled as recently as 1952, that its significance becomes so shockingly apparent. The progress of the International Communist Conspiracy has now become so great and so rapid that the Kremlin's biggest concern is no longer guns or butter. It is how to keep the remainder of the free world, and especially the people of the United States, from realizing the speed and certainty with which the Communists are completing their conquest of the planet. We intend to publish a revised scoreboard once a year until the conspiracy is entirely successful or has been entirely destroyed.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE As A Percentage Of Total Control

1. Aden	20 - 40	19. Chile	40 - 60
2. Afghanistan	80 - 100	20. Communist China	100
3. Albania	100	21. Nationalist China	0 - 20
4. Argentina	40 - 60	22. Colombia	20 - 40
5. Australia	0 - 20	23. Costa Rica	20 - 40
6. Austria	20 - 40	24. Cuba	40 - 60
7. Belgian Congo	0 - 20	25. Czechoslovakia	100
8. Belgium	20 - 40	26. Denmark	20 - 40
9. Bolivia	40 - 60	27. Dominican Republic	0 - 20
10. Brazil	40 - 60	28. East Germany	100
11. Britain	20 - 40	29. Ecuador	0 - 20
12. British Guiana	80 - 100	30. Egypt	100
13. Bulgaria	100	31. El Salvador	20 - 40
14. Burma	60 - 80	32. Ethiopia	60 - 80
15. Cambodia	80 - 100	33. Finland	60 - 80
16. Canada	20 - 40	34. France	40 - 60
17. Central African Federation	0 - 20	35. French Equatorial Africa	20 - 40
18. Ceylon	60 - 80	36. French Togoland	40 - 60
		37. French West Africa	40 - 60

38. G
39. G
40. C
41. F
42. F
43. F
44. I
45. I
46. I
47. I
48. I
49. I
50. I
51. I
52. I
53. I
54. I
55. I
56. I
57. I
58. I
59. I
60. I
61. I
62. I
63. I
64. I
65. I
66. I
67. I
68. I
69. I
70. I
71. I
fin
(I
re
th
ar
th
th
th

The Scoreboard

38. Ghana	80 - 100	72. Outer Mongolia	100
39. Greece	40 - 60	73. Pakistan	20 - 40
40. Guatemala	60 - 80	74. Panama	60 - 80
41. Haiti	20 - 40	75. Paraguay	0 - 20
42. Honduras	40 - 60	76. Peru	20 - 40
43. Hungary	100	77. Philippines	20 - 40
44. Iceland	80 - 100	78. Poland	100
45. India	60 - 80	79. Portugal	0 - 20
46. Indonesia	80 - 100	80. Roumania	100
47. Iran	20 - 40	81. Saudi Arabia	60 - 80
48. Iraq	20 - 40	82. Sierra Leone	20 - 40
49. Ireland	0 - 20	83. Singapore	60 - 80
50. Israel	40 - 60	84. Somalia	40 - 60
51. Italy	40 - 60	85. South Korea	0 - 20
52. Japan	20 - 40	86. South Vietnam	40 - 60
53. Jordan	20 - 40	87. Soviet Union	100
54. Kenya	20 - 40	88. Spain	0 - 20
55. Laos	80 - 100	89. Sudan	20 - 40
56. Lebanon	40 - 60	90. Sweden	20 - 40
57. Liberia	20 - 40	91. Switzerland	20 - 40
58. Libya	60 - 80	92. Syria	100
59. Luxembourg	20 - 40	93. Tanganyika	20 - 40
60. Madagascar	20 - 40	94. Thailand	40 - 60
61. Malaya	40 - 60	95. Tibet	80 - 100
62. Mexico	40 - 60	96. Tunisia	80 - 100
63. Morocco	60 - 80	97. Turkey	0 - 20
64. Nepal	60 - 80	98. Uganda	20 - 40
65. Netherlands	0 - 20	99. Union of South Africa	0 - 20
66. New Zealand	0 - 20	100. United States	20 - 40
67. Nicaragua	20 - 40	101. Uruguay	40 - 60
68. Nigeria	20 - 40	102. Venezuela	20 - 40
69. North Korea	100	103. West Germany	0 - 20
70. North Vietnam	100	104. Yemen	80 - 100
71. Norway	40 - 60	105. Yugoslavia	100

THE OVER-ALL RECKONING

Basic Communist strategy for conquest of the world, as laid out thirty-five years ago and relentlessly followed ever since, consisted of three steps: (1) Take eastern Europe; (2) next take the masses of Asia; (3) then take the rest of the world, including the United States. The Communists completed their first step in 1950; the second step is now about three-fourths accomplished; and they have gone at least one-fourth of the way towards carrying out their third step. Which means that the Communists have now covered about two-thirds of the total distance to their final goal of world-wide dominion. And the momentum and the speed of their progress are steadily increasing.

A Footnote To No. 100

Naturally we expect controversy over our score for the United States. But all we can do here is to point to a few gauges where the markers support our appraisal.

One such indicator shows the Communist domination of the unions which control many strategic parts of our economy and our defense. Just for an instance, seventy-five vital links in the most secret communications of our government, including those of the Pentagon to Air Force bases in New York, Maine, England, Canada, and Newfoundland, are all available to the members of one union, the American Communications Association. But this union was kicked out of the CIO in 1950, as being too Communist even for that outfit. In May, 1957, the president of this union and five other officials and members invoked the Fifth Amendment when questioned about Communist membership. Yet the members of this union are—and for years have been—in position to put their hands on any and all messages over these top-secret channels of our government's own communications system.

The significant point of the above paragraph is that this door of betrayal is known to be wide open, and nobody—in Congress, in the executive branch, in the Pentagon itself—nobody even dares to try to close it. That is one indication of how powerful the Communist influence has now become in almost all of our federal agencies. A twenty-five-year career man in our State Department resigned two years ago, to tell the American people in his book, *Inside The State Department*, of the treasonous falsification of information concerning our foreign affairs which is going on there all of the time. And the Communist influence over our mass media of communication—press, radio, television—is so great that you probably never even heard of his book.

The best informed authorities say that there are at least thirty huge Communist espionage rings operating in this country today, against the only two or three that have been partly exposed. Every delegation from Russia, in the "cultural exchange" program, is known to be loaded with active spies, and expansion of this program is constantly urged by our government. Known Communists of important rank have been walking right into our country by the dozens without any documents at all, through our Miami immigration office, thumbing their noses at our immigration officials as they do so—under a special ruling by

our State Department. There are three to five million aliens *illegally* in our country right now, and our government is steadily breaking down our immigration barriers further.

J. Edgar Hoover himself has said that beyond any doubt secret Communist agents have worked themselves into thousands of strategic positions in our whole national life, ready to step out and act for Mother Russia when the time comes. All really effective exposure of these espionage rings and agents has now been stopped, by smearing into death, defeat, retirement or despair those legislators who were most determined to expose them. For the FBI to name such agents that it could specifically identify, even with conclusive evidence, would be an exercise in frustrating utility, damaging only the FBI itself. Supreme Court decisions have made prosecution of Communist conspirators, even those actively advocating violent overthrow of our government, almost impossible; and have restored scores of known Communist sympathizers to their former jobs within our federal bureaucracy.

But—as Hoover again has pointed out—our danger from actual Communist agents is far surpassed by the danger from vast numbers of American pseudo-liberals who carry the ball for the Communists on every play. Communist sympathies and even actual Communist subversion are daily made more respectable by the actions of our government, of our great universities, of most of our press, and by the complacency of our people. The surest way to honor and promotion, in much of our educational world, in several of our great church organizations, and even in political careers in many states, is to join Communist fronts or to show a pro-Communist slant—and the surest way to obscurity is openly to oppose Communism. The highest officials of our government break the heart of resistance to Communism, both here and abroad, by fraternizing with the Kremlin murderers in summit conferences, and by felicitous expressions of friendly regard on every feasible occasion. And this whole all-pervasive Communist influence is spreading and reaching deeper month by month.

We believe that the Communists have already gone more than twenty percent of the way towards taking us over. We do not believe that their influence has yet reached forty percent of total control. And we believe that the bracket which we have assigned to the United States on this scoreboard is correct.

RECOMMENDED READING

J. Edgar Hoover:

Robert Morris:

René Wormser:

Col. Victor J. Fox:

Lewis A. Alesin:

Col. Kenneth K. Hansen:

Edward J. Rozek:

John C. Caldwell:

Rosalie Gordon:

Masters Of Deceit

No Wonder We Are Losing

Foundations

The Pentagon Case

Mental Robots

Heroes Behind Barbed Wire

Allied Wartime Diplomacy

South Of Tokyo

Nine Men Against America

(Holt)

(Bookmailer)

(Devin-Adair)

(Freedom Press, Inc.)

(Caxton)

(Van Nostrand)

(Wiley)

(Regnery)

(Devin-Adair)

HOW TO READ THE FEDERALIST

by

HOLMES ALEXANDER

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

IV

WHEN THE PURITANS SAID "Trust God—but keep your powder dry," they were putting first things first. Trust in the Lord is traditionally more important to America than the defenses, military and materialistic, against real and imagined perils.

Early Americans believed—and we should revive this credo—that all our man-made protections won't save us if ever our reliance on the Almighty is lost. Indeed, that loss would make national self-defense useless and an enemy attack unnecessary, for we would be already goners as a nation and a people.

Are we nearing that death-like condition? Have we lost touch with God? The plain evidence is that we Americans have wandered a long way, and in manners which perhaps we do not know, from the faith of our fathers. These commentaries—like the famous Papers of Hamilton, Madison and Jay—constitute a secular document, a political tract, if you will; certainly nothing describable as a sermon. But it just isn't possible to understand America, to write about her or to love her, without acknowledgment that she was in the beginning and in her finest hours, as Lincoln phrased it, a nation "under God."

This doesn't mean, and never did, that we claim to be God's chosen people. It means that we have chosen God. It means and will mean, so long as we remain a nation, that we Americans have taken God as the foundation rock for our political philosophy and for our nationalism. Nobody ever claimed that the Declaration and Constitution were handed

How To Read The Federalist

down from Sinai like the Decalogue. But it's incontestable that our sacred documents were written in the light of Christian belief to almost the same extent that the State Papers of Communism were written in the brimstone glow of Marx's dialectic materialism.

American religio-political tradition can be documented with massive and ancient records. They go back to the first Thanksgiving Day in 1631 and extend through hundreds of proclamations — messages, addresses and resolutions — by the Continental Congress, General George Washington, the Congress of the Confederation, the national Congress, the Governors and Legislatures of the States, Federal and Confederate armies in the field and navies at sea. As a nation we are so used to seeing "In God We Trust" on our coins, to asking grace at our dinner tables, to saying prayers before court and legislative sessions, to taking solemn oaths before God, that it all becomes our second nature and is not regarded by us as in the least unusual. But when the United Nations was founded in 1945 and set up its international headquarters in New York City, the fact came home to us—hard. Not every nation by any means relates its political life and beliefs to God.

Academic documentation can be stupid stuff. But occasionally we Americans ought to grin and bear some. We need to look back over the centuries to see where our beginnings were in the glorious name of God. As a digested digest, this outline might do:

1. Plato was the philosopher-architect of the Greek-Roman belief that the City-State was the idealized embodiment of Goodness and Truth.

2. Christianity, which pictured man in the divine image, brought along the concept which we call "consent of the governed," a phrase first suggested by St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo.

3. Jefferson in the Declaration and Hamilton in the Constitution extended these ideas and wrote them into our basic

How To Read The Federalist

national charters. Both men spoke directly and often of a higher law, a set of divine principles, which overtops our mundane statutes and temporal leaders. It was Jefferson who said that "resistance to tyranny is obedience to God." And Hamilton, in *The Federalist Number 31*, wrote this incisive passage about religion-over-reason:

"In disquisitions of every kind, there are certain primary truths, or first principles, upon which all subsequent reasonings must depend. These contain an internal evidence which, antecedent to all reflection or combination, commands the assent of the mind."

In *The Federalist Number 1*, Hamilton spoke for the religio-political principle, as previously asserted by Jefferson in the Declaration, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The practical-minded Hamilton said the same thing in the following manner: "For in politics, as in religion, it is equally absurd to aim at making proselytes by fire and sword. Heresies in either can rarely be cured by persecution."

Throughout all of the American State Papers, both old and modern, runs the theme "truth equals freedom." Where did the equation originate if not in the Biblical text: "Ye shall know the Truth; and the Truth shall make you free"? Such were the Laws and the Prophets of the early America.

But enough of evangelizing. The modern American may want to know how the religious motivation, so vigorous in our forefathers, has petered out in later times and how—if at all—we can rediscover and resuscitate it.

First, religion for the past hundred years has been pushed from its pedestal by the popularization of science. It can't be said that Charles Darwin started it all, but it's a fact that ordinary people lost "face" when they heard that they were descended from apes instead of God. Darwin didn't quite say that, but that's how the theory of evolution got translated into the vulgate.

How To Read The Federalist

Then, in this country at least, the triumph of material wealth has pushed out the spiritual values. A siren of the superficial has dethroned the goddess of truth, so that we turn to statistics instead of to song, to literature and—best of all—to Nature, for our inspirational thinking. It's revolting to compare the speeches and pamphlets "proving" that we are an "underprivileged" nation with the simple prayers of the Early Americans at their Thanksgiving ceremony, the only national festival like it in world history.

God was thanked, not solicited, in those days. He was praised, not blamed. The Pilgrims, the pioneers and the horse-and-buggy Americans believed that the Lord had treated them well when He allowed them opportunity to work and worship, dry powder to defend their homes and families, full hearts to rejoice and be happy, among "our templed hills." It wasn't until much later that the materialism of the More Abundant Life taught and encouraged Americans to be discontented, greedy, jealous, avaricious and demanding something-for-nothing from their Government.

Also, there's a good deal of evidence that the tear-down of religion was part of a larger conspiracy. We had the era of debunkery in which our heroes were systematically smeared as slave-breeders, non-believers, money-chasers and frauds. The destruction of veneration for American traditions seems far too calculated to be accidental. But it's a melancholy fact that we have abetted the tear-down of our own country by giving approval, sometimes vocal and sometimes silent, to the denigration of American purposes in war and peace. This country is a human institution and not infallible; but when we believed in God, we acted in His name more often than not—and, if we can rediscover our faith, we will act that way again.

Actually a return to religion may have begun with our entry into the Atomic Age. Some historians believe so, as do many other modern thinkers. But if the return is based on fear for personal safety, it is not the same as the faith of our fathers.

How To Read The Federalist

This latter was an infinitely more assertive and positive thing. With no pretensions at originality, these papers suggest that the heart and center of the American politico-religious code is acceptance, not rejection, of the way things are "under God." There are at least three forms of affirmation which concern us today.

(1) Acceptance, to begin with, of our natural advantages as a nation, guarded by two oceans to the East and West, and Polar wastes to the North. Even in modern times, distance is distance. These are blessings we have no moral right to belittle or to throw away. John Jay wrote at length upon this subject in *The Federalist Number 2*:

"It has often given me pleasure to observe that independent America was not composed of detached and distant territories, but that one connected, fertile, wide-spreading country was the portion of our western sons of liberty.

"Providence has in a particular manner blessed it with a variety of soils and productions, and watered it with innumerable streams for the delight and accommodation of its inhabitants.

"With equal pleasure I have often taken notice that Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people—a people descended from the same ancestry, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government.

"This country and this people seem to have been made for each other, and it appears as if it was the design of Providence that . . . a band of brothers . . . should never be split into a number of unsocial, jealous and alien sovereignties."

(2) Acceptance, also, of the national motto "In God We Trust." It means if it means anything that God knows better how to order the Universe than we do. It is an arrogant thing

How To Read The Federalist

of us to assert after so many centuries that all injustices, inequities, poverty, pestilence and hard luck must be banished from human life. The theologians have never accounted for sin and suffering on earth except in the precise language of our national motto. Some things must be left to God.

(3) Acceptance, finally for our purposes here, of a deeper meaning in the familiar words "consent of the governed." There are mountains of evidence to indicate that the Founders meant "consent" in its obvious and literal connotation. Consent means agreement; it never meant initiation and demand. But even if the documentation were not there, the proof of the matter lies in the politico-religious tradition. The Declaration tells us that:

"All men are created equal . . . endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" and that the purpose of government is to "secure these rights."

The Government cannot give what is already Creator-given; but Government preserves with the people's consent a set of divinely ordered blessings "for ourselves and our posterity," not by any means for others and theirs. The spirit of acceptance is the humility to confess our own limitations and the right of other people to their own form of governance.

Many other fine things flow from religious faith—loyalty, honor, kindness, veneration for what is traditional, salvation from enemies within and without. But verily, the Pilgrims were right about first things first: "Trust God—"

Cultural Note

On Page 12 of this magazine Hubert Kregeloh tells of the "several hours of knifings, beatings, and robberies in Boston by teenagers who had attended a 'Rock 'n Roll' show." The impresario of the "moronic jungle concert" which stimulated all of this juvenile barbarism was a disc jockey named Alan Freed. It should surprise nobody, therefore, to learn that the Voice of America is now "arranging to beam Alan Freed's disc jockey show to the Orient." It is so helpful to America's leadership and prestige to have the Asiatics become acquainted with the very best of our culture.

Somew
1984 and
we expect
mechanic
particular
ment-own
happy e
eleven ho
(The o
era will
the emer
have inc
years bef
and final
riod, how
employ
half the
—just fo
at work
excavati
instead o
jobs. Th
that yea
roduce
Humph
to reduc
by twen
the wor
"Hon
will sho
inside t
home o
Today
cent. A
gressive
to be g

SOCIAL INSECURITY

by

ELIZABETH WEBB WILSON

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Somewhere between George Orwell's 1984 and Edward Bellamy's 2000 A.D., we expect to see a young American mechanic come home one night, to his particular chicken coop in a government-owned slum, with an unusually happy expression on his face after eleven hours in the local boiler plant.

(The official work-day in this utopian era will be six hours. But "because of the emergency" the government will have increased it, "temporarily," some years before, to eight hours, then ten, and finally eleven. During the same period, however, in order to provide "full employment," it will have broken up half the machinery in the country; and—just for an illustration of the wisdom at work—it will have decreed that all excavating be done with hand shovels instead of steam shovels, to make more jobs. The hottest political argument of that year will be over legislation introduced by elder statesmen Hubert Humphrey and G. Mennen Williams, to reduce the size of the hand shovels by twenty-five percent, so as to "spread the work" even further.)

"Honey," the happy young mechanic will shout to his wife, as soon as he gets inside the one room which is the total home of the family, "it's wonderful. Today my pay was reduced by ten percent. And that changes all of the progressive brackets so that now I'll have to be giving the company only forty-

four dollars per week to work there instead of sixty."

The situation prompting this outburst of relief will be approximately as follows. Our mechanic's federal income tax, withheld from his pay, will be forty-five percent. (As in England today.) The payroll deductions for the government's social security program will be thirty-three percent. (Roughly what social security is costing a Frenchman right now.) The combined income taxes withheld for his state and city governments will be ten percent. (Please note our bow to Governor Furcolo of Massachusetts.) The enforced "savings" deducted by the government from the worker's pay envelope, to be invested for him—in special government bonds, of course—will be twelve percent. (The fact that the government, following the example of the glorious Soviet Union, will periodically wipe out the value of these bonds, will have no bearing on enforcement of the program.) The young mechanic's contribution to the local Community Fund, which by then will have become an official and compulsory bite from his weekly wages, will amount to five percent. (Some of the promoters and beneficiaries of these united charity drives are visibly annoyed that this has not already happened.) And of course by that time five percent of the mechanic's pay will be collected by the government for his

Social Insecurity

labor union, and turned over to the union without any charge for the service. (Expect no ruth from Reuther.)

These total deductions will amount to 110 percent of the mechanic's wages. So that only when his pay is reduced to the minimum wage allowed by law (which will have been fixed by the Kefauver-Morse Bill of 1977 at \$440 per week) will his payment to his employer, for the privilege of working and of receiving all the wonderful fringe benefits, come down to the minimum of forty-four dollars per week. (The government, which by this time will own the factory where our mechanic works and all other factories, will be using the forced return of this "overpayment" as a means of confiscating all remaining private property in the hands of individuals. When the mechanic has nothing left, then the "overpayment" will become merely a book-keeping entry.)

"But," you say, "this is silly." It certainly is. Which doesn't alter its possibility as a fact in the slightest. Your government already has in effect, at this very minute in 1958, at least a dozen programs just as absurd, and as contrary to all common sense. And while we cannot spare the room in this issue of this magazine to explore the trends now leading to all the deductions itemized above, we can at least take a good look at one area of these developments—as an example of them all. In the following brief article Dr. Elizabeth Wilson, one of the world's best actuaries and an outstanding authority on our social security system, shows you that the attack of acute social-securityitis, from which we are now suffering, may produce results to make our forecast optimistic.

I

THE NEWDEALERS of the Roman Empire offered the populace both bread and circuses. We are more efficient. We make a circus out of the bread-doling agency.

Most Americans have already forgotten, in fact, that when Social Security opened its doors in 1935, it was sold to the country as a charity for the needy rather than as a pension plan for the total population. The most important division of the whole scheme, Old Age and Survivors Insurance, was supposed to be "merely a floor of protection," a cushion against starvation and dire want. (Some twenty years before, the reader should remember, the progressive income tax had been imposed on us by ridiculing the suggestion that its rate, even for the wealthiest individuals, might ever rise as high as ten percent.

But within the past decade Congress has changed its philosophy about the very function of social security. It is now expected to provide an appreciable part of every retired man's income. The benefits paid, and the number of people covered, by OASI, have mushroomed in very much the same way as did income tax rates a decade earlier. (Congress long ago revised its attitude toward the income tax. The function of this measure changed from the provision of revenue for the government to the prevention of the continued acquisition of "too much" wealth by individuals). The income tax became a means of subtracting from the substance of those who had more; social security, a means of giving more to those who had less. Both had become a part of the great "leveling" process—with equal poverty for all as the ultimate goal of both.

As a re
1950, the
out by C
year. Dr
Congress
"liberaliz
monthly
times the
mon we
amend h
'It is eno
add "po
security.
present
ther in
twelve p
accordin
Proximi
adequat
fits have
since fro
lars of a
forty-tw
would l
five hun
an unbr
from the
sion of
The
worker
increas
to indiv
ity unbr
million
million
rolls. A
workin
zoomed
to seve
1957.
This
six tim
that ye
made
estima

Social Insecurity

As a result of amendments passed in 1950, the total of monthly benefits paid out by OASI in 1951 doubled within a year. During each of the next three Congresses the program was further "liberalized." By December, 1957, these monthly payments were more than ten times those made in 1947. If King Solomon were living now, he would have to amend his list of those who "never say 'It is enough.'" He would be obliged to add "politicians tinkering with social security." There is a bill before the present Congress to provide for a further increase in benefits, of about twelve percent. But even that would, according to the bill's sponsor, Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, be grossly inadequate. The base on which such benefits have been computed was raised long since from the first three thousand dollars of a man's annual wages to the first forty-two hundred. Senator Proxmire would like to revise this base to seventy-five hundred dollars. This would allow an unmarried retired worker to receive from the government a permanent pension of \$181.20 a month.

The expansion in the number of workers covered has kept pace with the increase in the amount of benefits paid to individuals. In 1938, the social security umbrella was spread over thirty-one million workers. In 1956, there were 103 million people on the social security rolls. As a result of these two factors working together, the total outlay zoomed from ten *million* dollars in 1938 to seven and one-half *billion* dollars in 1957.

This 1957 expenditure was more than six times what had been anticipated for that year, in the "actuarial illustrations" made in 1935. Indeed, the actuaries estimated in 1935 that, given "normal

economic conditions" (as if any such conditions ever existed, except in retrospect), the total benefit payments in 1980 would amount to three billion, two hundred million dollars. This is far less than one-half of the annual outgo right now. These same actuaries, or their "heirs and assigns," now estimate that in twenty more years (or two years before 1980) the total annual payments will exceed seventeen billion dollars! And even this figure, if it does not presuppose "normal economic conditions," is predicated on only coherent change and normal abnormality.

Where does the money come from now, and where will the much larger amount come from in the future? The ordinary voter has the impression that the taxes he pays, added to those his employer pays on his behalf, exceed the benefits he will receive. Actually, as stated in 1953 by the present chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, all current workers will be dependent, for their social security checks, on future taxes paid into the system—after they have ceased paying and are drawing benefits. The false reports on the solvency of the system (which lull the ordinary worker into thinking he is paying too much) stem in part from the Ponzi-style nature of the operation in its early decades. In the beginning, to millions who were playing *put* by becoming subject to social security taxes, there were only thousands playing *take* by reaching the retirement age and starting to draw the (then) comparatively modest benefits. And before this unbalance is corrected by the continuity of the undertaking, so that there is approximate equality (after adjustments for life expectancies) between those coming on the rolls at one end and those going off the rolls

Social Insecurity

at the other, and before the aged can thus claim that they have given *quid pro quo* for their retirement checks, we shall be well into the twenty-first century.

II

IN THE MEANTIME, and until fairly recently, the special taxes received for this purpose naturally had exceeded the outgo required. (Just as Ponzi was for a while taking in thousands in new money against the hundreds he was returning to earlier "investors.") The government has been paying the benefits due, as well as expenses of the operation, out of the money thus received. It has been selling its bonds to the Social Security Administration for the remainder, and having those bonds put into a "trust fund" towards taking care of future Social Security obligations. Less than a year ago, this "trust fund" had reached the total of twenty-three billion dollars. Even to our ears, calloused by and to astronomical figures, this sounds like a lot of fund—until we look at the commitments it is supposed to satisfy. But, in fact, it is probably not more than one-half of the cost of the payments which will be collected by those *now on the pension list*.

And this fund has started to decrease. The lowered mortality rate among older people, a burgeoning total population, and Congressional extravagance have already combined to put the system "in the red" as to current operations. This decline in the nest egg will clearly continue through 1959. But in 1960 the total of the OASI tax, paid by employers and employees together, is scheduled by law to go up from four percent to five percent. This, the Pollyannas emphasize, will put the system in the black again. They *do not* emphasize

how short-lived will be even this pseudo-solvency.

The real facts are revealing. The actuaries at the Social Security Administration have estimated, officially, that for the Agency to maintain a satisfactory financial balance, the worker and his employer must each pay four percent of the worker's wages from the day he starts until the day he retires. Under the present law, however, this amount of tax will not be exacted until 1975. And a very distinguished actuary has stated flatly that eight percent will not be enough. In reality, who can tell what an adequate rate will be twenty years from now, especially if the Congress continues to yield to a biennial attack of supergenerosity in social security benefits? Ten percent? Possibly. Most probably, twelve percent would be a far safer guess for the tax needed in the 1975 period.

In the meantime, the government's accrued liability—through the difference between total receipts from individuals as workers and total payments due those same individuals as pensioners (until that approximate balance is supposedly reached in the twenty-first century)—will continue to grow like Jack's famous beanstalk or Ponzi's real indebtedness. Politicians treat this mushrooming liability like a family skeleton, to be kept carefully hidden in the most remote closet and (above all) never to be talked about. Actually, it is already a colossal government debt, variously estimated at from 350 to 500 billion dollars—and certainly far more, alone, than the total *admitted* national debt of some 280 billion dollars.

This raises the question, of course, as to whether any such obligation will really ever be paid. Probably not, for there are only two ways in which it

could be. social security date, actuarial payments current in this back expect a generational underpayment realistic whistle.

The tremendous liquidation of continuous some citizens as to the membership force (which might be benefits "Impossible For the the debt pension two workers now seen be taken workers wise cost by the month that n was en take the and co [We at such them political govern call we sh not o ment

Social Insecurity

could be. One method would be to have social security taxes, at some far-off date, actually exceed the average premium payments adequate to pay the then-current benefits, thus catching up on this backlog of indebtedness. But to expect any such overtaking of future generations, to compensate for present underpayments, is politically as unrealistic as waiting for shrimps to whistle.

The second way in which this tremendous debt might possibly be liquidated would be through the discontinuance of social security. Under some circumstances of enlightenment as to their own self-interest, the members of the then-current laboring force (who would be the real creditors) might give up their rights to future benefits—thus wiping the slate clean. "Impossible," you say? Not necessarily. For these same creditors would also be the debtors. After 1975, social security pensions will take the equivalent of two weeks' pay out of every year, from the workers' envelopes—even at the rate now scheduled. The same amount will be taken, for the account of each worker, from his employer (who otherwise could increase the employee's pay by that much). This is a total of a month's wages. And it could well be that many workers, feeling this levy was entirely too high, would prefer to take their chances on personal savings and company pension plans.

[We think the workers should arrive at such a conclusion; but that to expect them to do so, in the face of what the politicians will be telling them about the government's generosity, is also politically unrealistic to a high degree. But we think Dr. Wilson has overlooked not only a third possibility for the payment of this huge accrued liability, but

the one way in which it actually will be wiped out. That is, through constant inflation of our money supply, deliberately brought about by the government. The obligations to those on the rolls being created today, while the government is taking in twenty-five cent dollars, will be paid off some years from now in ten-cent and five-cent dollars. And the parallel obligations then being assumed in five-cent dollars will be paid off in one-cent dollars. Until, eventually, the whole outstanding indebtedness, running to exponential figures, will be "liquidated"—by completely worthless currency, that makes all debts payable in currency of equal worthlessness. Editor.]

III

SUPPLEMENTING the Old Age and Survivors Insurance program is the one known as Old Age Assistance. It was originally designed to take care of those needy persons, over sixty-five, who could not qualify for benefits under OASI. (Now half a million beneficiaries get payments from both!) When the eligibility rules for OASI were relaxed, and its umbrella opened wider, the expectation was created that the need for Old Age Assistance would gradually fade away. It is true that there are fewer persons on the OAA rolls today than a couple of years ago. But two and one-half million persons still get checks from that source.

The reader, having heard that this program is just for the really needy, may well wonder how there can be so many destitute people in this era of prosperity. The answer lies in the definition of the word "needy"—a politically flexible definition indeed. For Old Age Assistance is a joint venture of the federal government and the states. So, while federal welfare

Social Insecurity

officials carefully eliminate any vestige of opprobrium or even of charity from the receipt of OAA payments, by putting "respect for human personality" foremost among considerations in administration of the program, state legislatures are steadily making it easier for new applicants to qualify. Many states allow recipients of this aid, legally classified as "destitute," to own an automobile, a television set, and a home (with no limit on the home's value). In some states a legally determined "minimum" income does not bar the person having that income from Old Age Assistance. The result has been that, although many former beneficiaries of OAA have now been transferred to OASI, other new and less needy applicants have been added to the OAA rolls. In Louisiana, for a glaring example, six out of ten old people are now getting these public-assistance checks, paid by the state out of money furnished in part by the federal government. Also, as the cost of living has risen, state legislatures have increased the size of OAA payments. Colorado, the most generous state, is now devoting twenty-seven percent of its budget to such pensions. And nationwide, despite the decrease in the number of recipients, the total amount of benefits paid has gone up until it now stands at one billion seven hundred million dollars per year.

In the same welfare category are payments to children, almost as many of whom get aid from federal-state bounty as do old people. In 1956 children received about two-thirds of a billion dollars. Similarly, the blind, the crippled, and the totally disabled were given about half a billion dollars. Altogether, the public-assistance bill, outside OASI, was about three billion

dollars in 1957.

Then there is unemployment insurance, which is paid by the states, but subsidized by federal grants. Originally, the tax for this purpose was three per cent on the first three thousand dollars of each worker's pay. During the recent era of prosperity and full—or over-full—employment, this rate accumulated a total reserve fund that now stands at something over eight billion dollars. Such a reserve, unused for a few years, is about as popular with politicians as a red rag with a bull. So state legislatures have been reducing the taxes for unemployment insurance to an average annual rate of only 13 per cent. And, with mounting unemployment, the funds have been melting away. Without going into the probable ups and downs of both employment and the tax rates, we can assume that at least a two per cent rate will become standard. And "cash sickness benefits," supplementing unemployment insurance, will probably add a further 1½ or 2 per cent tax on the first three thousand dollars of wages, as the clamor for this added welfare measure grows. But only four states have it yet, so we'll skip that item in our appraisal here.

IV

SO LET'S TAKE STOCK of the situation that has resulted from the Social Security Act of 1935, and from subsequent voter-wooing extensions of that legislation. By 1975 OASI will be sucking into its gaping maw at least eight per cent, and probably twelve per cent, of the first forty-two hundred dollars (or possibly the first seventy-five hundred dollars) of all wages and salaries received.

To this we must add approximately

Social Insecurity

one per cent of the total national income for various types of other "assistance," and about two per cent of all wages, up to three thousand dollars per employee, for unemployment insurance. Plus another one to two per cent in those states where "cash sickness benefits" may be in force. This means that the "little" man, who makes three thousand dollars per year or less, could be paying—or having paid for him—from one-eighth to one-sixth of his income, for social security benefits alone. (This has nothing to do with the income tax which the government extracts from the same worker for "general" purposes.) And it also means, as Representative Noah Mason has estimated, that—on the basis of present social security legislation—workers and their employers will, in 1975, be paying at least twenty billion dollars per year for welfare benefits.

But all of this, in reality, only indicates the trend. For such socialistic dryrot not only undermines our economic structure, by channeling into the coffers of government paternalism funds which might otherwise be used to strengthen our private-enterprise system. It also undermines the self-reliance of our individuals, and encourages those who have eaten one kind of pabulum at the public trough to cry for more and different kinds of handouts.

Despite the extensive and excellent job which health insurance underwriters are doing in helping the people of this country to meet their medical bills, the clamor for federal government health insurance is now steadily increasing. Already introduced is a new version of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell "socialized medicine" bills of a decade and more ago; but this time more limited in scope *at the start*, and with

a much better chance of passage in an early Congress. Already some thirty million of us, including veterans, military personnel with their dependents, and public assistance beneficiaries, are entitled to medical aid direct from Uncle Sam. Already, Representative Forand of Rhode Island is sponsoring a measure to add to such recipients of free hospital care, free drugs, and free surgery, the thirteen million people now eligible for OASI benefits. All such measures and pressures are really aimed at and are leading directly towards—eventually—a national health service for all of us.

The best "educated guess" I can make is that an all-inclusive national health service, such as the British now have, would cost upwards of thirty billion dollars a year—or about twice the present total expenditure for medical service today, when it is not "free." No one really knows. Before socialized medicine started in Britain in 1948, statisticians estimated that its cost would be 170 million pounds per year. This year, the government has budgeted the total cost of the medical service at 680 million pounds—four times the outlay anticipated only ten years ago. The only certain thing about such a program in America is that it would be breathtakingly expensive. And the estimate above, of nine to ten per cent of our national income, is not on the extravagant side.

With this expense added to the cost of other forms of social security, somewhat more than twenty-five per cent of the national income would be collected by the federal and state governments to pay for "welfare." Not only is this entirely possible. Not only has it already happened before—as in France, where the current figure is

Social Insecurity

32½%. But it is what the Marxists and their dupes and allies are thoroughly determined to bring about, *in our country, in the near future*. And, of course, these social security levies will all be on top of the approximately thirty percent of the national income which the various governments are now taking, altogether, in individual income taxes.

The ostrich is not a wise bird. At least, his reputed habit of putting his head in the sand to avoid seeing danger is not deserving of emulation. But the American people of today make the ostrich of this fable sound wise and provident by comparison. They seem to be utterly unwilling to listen to the voice of clear and incontrovertible experience.

During the week of July, 1948, when the British National Health Service began to function, the *Investor's Chronicle* declared: "The conclusion seems inescapable that, in endeavoring to provide the population of Britain with the maximum safeguards against insecurity, the Government may, in fact, be undermining the whole structure of our society." The accuracy of this prophecy is already evident on every hand in Britain. Equally grave warnings are being issued from responsible quarters in America today. A Boston bank, in its February "letter," said: "If we follow the easy path of spending (this includes 'taxing selected Peter to pay handouts to collective Paul') to the point of inflation, we shall weaken our economy. Thus we could lose the battle for survival through the folly of extravagance."

That, as the Boston bank does not remind us on this occasion, is a huge part of the Marxist plan for our destruction. But even without an infiltrating

deadly enemy to take advantage of our weakened foundations with a final shove, no national economy can survive as a free economy, and no people can maintain their freedom as individuals for any length of time, under the circumstances we are rapidly creating. Not only will savings for capital investment be steadily reduced, far below the needs for new plant and equipment. Not only will the incentive to create jobs, or to produce more goods, also be reduced in the same way and to the same extent. Not only will the American standard of living necessarily and rapidly decline. But most important of all, no government can possibly handle so much of a people's income for them, more than a brief period, without the tremendous power thus lodged in the hands of the bureaucrats becoming concentrated into fewer and fewer hands at the top, with complete police-state controls as the inevitable result.

The constantly expanding social security program on which we are embarked today is visibly and rapidly bringing about the complete *insecurity* of our whole sociological system. What good are the promises of a debtor who pays off in worthless currency? How much security is there, in the nests built in the branches of a tree, if in order to build those nests the tree is constantly denuded of so many of its leaves that the whole tree dies and falls? How much freedom—or security from either slavery or starvation—is there for a laborer who puts so large a part of his earnings in the hands of a bureaucracy to handle for him that eventually he must do everything the bureaucrats order? Where could any of us possibly find more insecurity than in a society which undertook to guarantee one hundred percent security?

Social Insecurity

Thomas Jefferson once wrote: "If we can prevent a Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, we shall be happy." Flouting this advice, as we

are now doing so determinedly and completely, with a runaway social security program, is a sure way to become very unhappy—and very insecure—indeed.

The Game of Darts

The Eisenhower labor program has all the mouth-watering, rib-sticking satisfaction of boiled watermelon.

Tom Anderson

If all the automobiles in the world were placed end to end, some jerk driver would pull out and try to pass.

Driver's Digest

The trouble with the Democrats these days is that every time they discover a new issue, they learn that Ike has already staked claim to both sides of it.

Fletcher Knebel

A Hollywood actress so deeply mourned the death of her third husband that she insisted on black olives in her martinis.

Gilcrafter

There is not a single state in the Union that is not financially better off than the United States.

Lewis L. Drill

When we look at the opposing candidates for certain public offices, there is at least some satisfaction in the reflection that only one can be elected.

News and Views

One great trouble with the world today, especially on the international level, is that people don't trust one another, and have excellent reasons for not doing so.

Olin Miller

"I do know what a dollar's worth," the son said to his old man. "That's why I asked for two."

Uncle Mat

If President Sherman Adams finds it prudent to step down, we wonder if his assistant, Dwight Eisenhower, will move to the White House.

From Our Own Quiver

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

by

EDWIN McDOWELL

America would not be in such a predicament today, a wag recently observed, if the Indians had had stricter immigration laws. But this wisecrack ignored an important point. Laws mean nothing unless they are enforced and kept alive. An excellent illustration of what happens otherwise can be seen in our reciprocal trade agreements.

Originally the Constitution entrusted tariff-making (and unmaking) solely to Congress. But at the insistence of FDR and Cordell Hull, this power was delegated to the Executive Branch. The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 empowered the President to negotiate such agreements, for three-year terms, without Congressional approval; and allowed him to raise or lower the existing Hawley-Smoot rates by as much as fifty percent. Slowly but surely the barriers protecting American industry then came tumbling down, before the blasts of the internationalist trumpeters. MAINLINE (The Long House, New Canaan, Connecticut; 126 pages, \$3.00 clothbound, \$2.00 paperback), by Senator George W. Malone of Nevada, is an illuminating analysis of the whole tariff problem. It is also a frank plea for protection for American business.

The villain of the story is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, nicknamed GATT. This villain was born, illegitimately, in 1947, at that "international White House" called Geneva. Instrumental in its conception had been the Red "traveling salesmen," Harry

Dexter White, Harold Glasser, and V. Frank Coe, each brazenly denying any dishonorable intentions toward the farmer's daughter, (in this case, the American Constitution). But now the visible evidence has made it embarrassingly clear that trickery was indeed contemplated, and achieved.

The creation of GATT, according to Senator Malone, was an economic Yalta. Only this time the United States herself was sold out, instead of her allies. This international authority, based on multilateral agreements, is making us gradually "dependent upon foreign sources for our defense and war-making potential." And whatever happens to the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, due to expire at the end of June, rejection of the scheme *in toto* by Congress is most unlikely. Putting the exercise of the tariff-making authority back in the hands of Congress would be a healthy restoration of some of "the representative nature of our union of sovereign states." And that is something which the interventionists and internationalists are too well entrenched to permit.

* * *

The Communist Party, U.S.A., at the July, 1957 meeting of its National Committee, went on record as demanding a summit conference to work for the suspension of nuclear tests. Ever since then the Communists have been putting their massive influence behind a "ban-the-bomb" campaign. Naturally,

they have
canor R
Bertrand
Lester P
Condon,
ers of th

The r
ennial a
line has
to becom
danger
are told
and the
idiot ch
corner,
and the
Kremlin
with TT
(Of cor
are cor
bombs
case!)

Our
N. Y.;
Teller
and ex
nuclear
large o
readily
sorbed
obtain
a lumi
cal X-
"we k
that t
fallout
effects
and d

To
munis
Latter
myth
"disar
one v
of a

A Review of Reviews

they have had plenty of help from Eleanor Roosevelt, Norman Cousins, Bertrand Russell, Norman Thomas, Lester Pearson, Linus Pauling, Edward Condon, and other busy petition-pushers of the Left.

The noise stirred up by these perennial amplifiers of the Communist line has caused the whole free world to become acutely conscious of the danger from "nuclear fallout." We are told that future sterile generations and the mass production of deformed idiot children loom just around the corner, unless we follow the advice and the example of the peace-loving Kremlin, and go back to killing people with TNT instead of hydrogen bombs. (Of course, the fact that the Russians are comparatively short of hydrogen bombs has nothing to do with the case!)

OUR NUCLEAR FUTURE (Criterion, N. Y.; 184 pages, \$3.50), by Edward Teller and Albert L. Latter, is a sharp and expert answer to these critics of nuclear testing. There is danger from large doses of radiation, the authors readily admit. But the radiation absorbed from fallout is less than that obtained from wearing a watch with a luminous dial, or from having medical X-rays. "In other words," they say, "we know enough to state positively that the danger from the world-wide fallout is less than many other radiation effects which have not worried people and do not worry them now."

To the further chagrin of the Communist propaganda peddlers, Teller and Latter do a devastating job on the myth of disarmament. They think that "disarmament is safe only when no one wants to impose his will by force of arms upon his neighbors"; and

they do not think a world containing Russia exactly fits that description. "Is it wise," they ask, "to make agreements which honesty will respect but dishonesty can circumvent?"

Perhaps the surest proof of both the soundness and importance of the book is the unanimity and vigor with which it was attacked by the liberal press. The war cries were led by the New York *Herald Tribune* and the *Washington Post*, but their smoke signals were soon answered by the pious *Saturday Review* and the enervated *Nation*. None of them so far forgot themselves and the approved "liberal" technique, however, as to attempt to refute the facts. They stuck strictly to the "liberal" practice of trying to discredit the authors.

"It seems probable," Drs. Teller and Latter speculate, "that the root of the opposition to further tests is not connected with fallout. The root is deeper. The real reason . . . is connected with our desire for disarmament and peace." We agree with the authors that the root is deeper, and to the left. But we do not agree with their idealistic explanation, implying abiogenesis. We think it is quite clear just who planted the root, and for what purpose.

* * *

John Dos Passos, "liberal" author of the popular trilogy, *U.S.A.*, excoriator of capitalism and applauder of socialism, was the darling of the New York *Times* and *Herald Tribune* book review sections. Anything he wrote they praised to the skies. Then Dos Passos' "liberal" outlook towards Communism caused him to go to Spain, during the Civil War. There he finally realized that Communism, instead of being a noble crusade, was a deliberate and foul

A Review of Reviews

conspiracy. He wrote of his disillusionment. And that, of course, was the end of Dos Passos, in those charmed and esoteric circles which determine, for the poor dumb and benighted American people, what is and what is not literature.

It is not surprising, therefore, that *THE GREAT DAYS* (Sagamore Press, N. Y.; 312 pages, \$4.50), a new book by John Dos Passos, has been viciously maligned by the liberal press. The *Saturday Review* said: "Somehow the collapse of Dos Passos' faith in the Russian Revolution brought about a loss of both historical perspective and creative vitality." (If Shakespeare were alive today, and failed to glorify the Russian Revolution, you can be sure that the *Saturday Review* would regard him as a hack.) The *Herald Tribune* spoke of "the ingredients of a novel that is still to be written." The *New York Times*, in an especially defamatory review, charged "it is not the novel we have a right to expect from John Dos Passos after his truly great achievements in the past." And *Time* called it his "saddest, sorriest novel."

The Great Days is none of these things. It is a poignant story of a war correspondent who cannot forget his own great days, when he was a famous writer. Out of favor because of his political conservatism, and still grieving the tragic death of his wife, Roland Lancaster tries to find solace in Cuba, with a young girl friend. Through the use of flash backs he brings out the pathetic history of James V. Forrestal (called Roger Thurloe), and the hapless decline of America during the past two decades. The tale is told effortlessly and sympathetically, in the brilliantly polished Dos Passos style. It

is in every way a worthy addition to his greatest accomplishments of the past. As John Chamberlain appraised it in the *Wall Street Journal*, this is an excellent historical novel, of great insight. Let's hope that some day, despite the liberals' villification, it will be so recognized.

* * *

After Vice-President Henry Wallace returned from his jaunt through Russia in 1944, he stated that no slave camps existed in the Soviet Union. The millions of slaves then incarcerated in such camps as Magadan and Vorkuta would undoubtedly have regarded this statement as Mark Twain did the report of his own death—as a slight exaggeration. And John Noble, an American citizen arrested during the "liberation" of East Germany, could be forgiven for regarding this as one of Bubblehead Wallace's more unforgivable stupidities. For Noble spent nine years in one of those "non-existent" camps.

I WAS A SLAVE IN RUSSIA (Devin-Adair N. Y.; 183 pages, \$3.75) is the shocking account of Noble's enslavement, and of his life in a world of horror where hunger and cold were his perpetual companions: where he worked pushing two-ton coal cars, in a temperature of minus sixty degrees, while his weight dropped from 155 to 95 pounds; where death, from frostbite or freezing, often seemed preferable to the "justice" of the MVD secret police or of the *Blatnois* group of Russian criminals who ruled the slave camps by blackmail and murder. It was "a world of fear, terror, deceit, Godlessness, and slavery" to which a lot of bubbleheads, now advocating peaceful existence and "cultural exchanges" with the masters of this tyranny, should be exposed.

Another Hard-Hitting Book From

DEVIN-ADAIR

FOUNDATIONS



As counsel to the Reece Committee which investigated foundations for the last Republican Congress, René Wormser gained a unique insight into the inner workings of the various Rockefeller, Carnegie and Ford-created giants.

His revealing, thoroughly documented analysis shows that many foundations are violating the conditions laid down in their own charters, and that some of the greatest are given to imposing on an unaware public a one-sided, left-oriented political brain washing. Others shelter and encourage collectivist propagandists and undermine constitutional government in favor of an internationalism whose policies they themselves will in large measure control.

This book will stand as a monument to the scholarship of René Wormser.—“He has rendered a great service in preparing this sober and thoughtful work.” —B. Carroll Reece

Price \$7.50 per copy

The Devin-Adair Co., Publishers, 23 East 26th St., New York 10, N.Y.

Gentlemen:

Please send me copies of Foundations: Their Power and Influence by René A. Wormser at \$7.50 per copy. I enclose \$.....

Name

Address

ADDITIONAL COPIES

of all issues of AMERICAN OPINION are available in bulk:

1-11 copies	50¢ each
12-99 copies	40¢ each
100-999 copies	35¢ each
1000 or more copies	30¢ each

The above prices are for shipment by us in one package to one address. Or we will mail individual copies on a list you supply us, at 50¢ each.

The above prices also apply to all numbers that were published of ONE MAN'S OPINION. They are listed below, with the feature article indicated for each:

- No. 1 A Biographical Sketch of Syngman Rhee
- No. 2 A Biographical Sketch of William F. Knowland
- No. 3 A Biographical Sketch of Frank J. Lausche
- No. 4 A Letter To The South, On Segregation
- No. 5 Miscellaneous Articles
- No. 6 A Brief Review Of Recent Events
- No. 7 A Short Biography of Chiang Kai-shek
- No. 8 A Biographical Sketch of Konrad Adenauer
- No. 9 The New Americanism
- No. 10 Look At The Score—The Nature of NATO
- No. 11 The Life of John Birch

(Complete sets for \$5.00 each)

AMERICAN OPINION REPRINTS

Article	1-99	100-999	1,000 or more
The World Health Organization by J. B. Matthews	10¢ each	8¢ each	7¢ each
The Federal Reserve System by Hans Sennholz	5¢ each	4½¢ each	4¢ each
A Letter To The South	10¢ each	8¢ each	7¢ each
A Letter To Khrushchev	3 for \$1.00	25¢ each	20¢ each
The American Opinion Scoreboard	5¢ each	4¢ each	3¢ each

AMERICAN OPINION, Belmont 78, Massachusetts

