

AMERICAN OPINION

In this number

LILLY LIBRARY
WABASH COLLEGE

EUROPEAN SURVEY

William S. Schlamm

IF YOU WANT IT STRAIGHT

A Regular Feature

WHAT WE MUST KNOW ABOUT OVERSTREET

Edward Janisch

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

Revilo P. Oliver

AN INFORMAL REVIEW

Volume II Number 9

OCTOBER 1959

50¢

AMERICAN OPINION

Editor

ROBERT WELCH

Associate Editors

HUBERT KREGLOH

J. B. MATTHEWS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

HANS SENNHOLZ

Contributing Editors

COLM BROGAN

MEDFORD EVANS

RODNEY GILBERT

EDWIN McDOWELL

ELIZABETH WILSON

Editorial

Advisory Committee

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

GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG, JR.

JOHN U. BARR

K. G. BENTSON

LAURENCE E. BUNKER

F. GANO CHANCE

JAMES L. COKER

KENNETH COLEGROVE

MARTIN J. CONDON, III

ROBERT B. DRESSER

CHARLES EDISON

WM. J. GREDE

FRANK E. HOLMAN

B. E. HUTCHINSON

ALFRED KOHLBERG

J. BRACKEN LEE

CLARENCE MANION

FRANK E. MASLAND, JR.

N. FLOYD MCGOWIN

W. L. MCGRATH

W. B. McMILLAN

ADOLPHE MENJOU

LUDWIG VON MISES

COLA G. PARKER

J. HOWARD PEW

J. NELSON SHEPHERD

ROBERT W. STODDARD

ERNEST G. SWIGERT

A. C. WEDEMEYER

W. H. WELBUR

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON

CONTENTS—OCTOBER, 1959

A Review of The News	
Cartoon	Victor Vashi 12
European Survey	William S. Schlam 13
Bullets	20
If You Want It Straight	21
Confetti	34
What We Must Know About Overstreet	Edward Janisch 35
A Review Of Reviews	Revilo P. Oliver 47
Light Verse, And Worse	Rodney Gilbert 52

September 10, 1959

Dear Reader:

If you receive more than one copy of this issue, please do not think that we have become wasteful.

For the first time in many months we are using some "outside" lists, in a drive to expand our circulation. And as any of those beleaguered souls who publish magazines will tell you, it is far cheaper to send out extra copies than to cull the duplications.

So we hope you will simply pass on that extra copy, if you get one, to some friend—if you have one. And there is more sadness than humor in that conditional premise. For if you care enough about what is really happening, to be a subscriber to this magazine, the chances are that many of your former friends now ignore your existence.

This is not because they *think* you are wrong, however, but because—deep down inside—they *know* you are right. The human mind will use every conceivable dodge and defense to keep from being awakened out of the euphoria of self-deception. When events are increasingly 'proving' a person wrong, it is much more self-convincing for him to be wrong at the top of his voice and with rising anger.

But when Washington turns out ten brass bands and two Eisenhowers, to greet Khrushchev at the airport, with cameras grinding to flood the whole world with pictures of this greatest Communist triumph since 1917, something has to give. The delusion that our government is still run by loyal Americans has become too difficult for even a brainwashed moron to hang onto in his own thoughts. So maybe this is a good time to give a friend a copy of *American Opinion*.

Or even a subscription.

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 1959 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 Review Of The News

*This is a magazine of opinion. But opinion should
be based on facts. Here are the facts for*

August, 1959

Saturday, August 1

→ The Geneva negotiations of the Big Four Foreign Ministers harden in an insoluble deadlock.

→ Nine United States Governors, on their return from a junket through the Soviet Union, urge President Eisenhower to invite Khrushchev to the United States and to visit the Soviet Union himself.

→ The military actions of North Vietnam Communist bands against Laos grow into a full-fledged invasion.

→ It is announced that the Soviet State Publishing House may publish Boris Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago" in Moscow next fall.

→ Cho Bong Am, the candidate for the Korean Presidency of the "Progressive Party" against Syngman Rhee in 1952 and 1956, is convicted by the Korean Supreme Court of spying for the North Korean Communists, and hanged.

→ The Communist Government of the Indian State Kerala is turned out of office for unconstitutional conduct and the State powers are transferred to the National Parliament in New Delhi.

→ The strike with which the copper miners union of America has threatened the copper mines and refineries in Utah and Arizona is called off.

Sunday, August 2

→ Vice President Richard M. Nixon asserts on the Soviet television that the Cold War must be ended and the United States must reach coexistence with the mighty Soviet Union.

→ It is reported that President Eisenhower has been sounding out the heads-of-state of Western Europe as to how they would feel about an American invitation to Khrushchev to visit Washington for direct negotiations with Eisenhower.

→ Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston raises "my voice against the proposed invitations to Khrushchev to visit our country" and calls "upon others who share the same sentiments to do likewise."

→ The official Polish press hails Nixon's forthcoming visit in Warsaw as an American act "emphasizing the absolute recognition of our social system."

→ Major General George Philias Vanier is appointed as Canada's Governor General to succeed, as the first French Canadian in that position, the retiring Governor Vincent Massey.

Monday, August 3

→ After extending a first invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States, Richard M. Nixon leaves Moscow for Warsaw where he fraternizes with Gomulka.

A Review Of The News

→ Leading Senators of both parties, among them the Democrat Mike Mansfield and the Republican Bourke B. Hickenlooper, announce they favor an invitation to Nikita S. Khrushchev to visit the United States.

→ British Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd urges Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko to use Soviet influence to end interference in the affairs of Laos by Communist North Vietnam.

→ New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller solemnly declares that "under no circumstances" would he accept the No. 2 position on the G.O.P. ticket in 1960.

→ The United Steelworkers of America and the major steel producers agree to meet for negotiations aimed at ending the steel strike that started on July 15.

Tuesday, August 4

→ President Eisenhower announces that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev will visit the United States in September and that the United States President will return the visit by going to Moscow in the fall. Khrushchev's conference with Eisenhower will be preceded by Eisenhower's conferences with Adenauer, de Gaulle and Macmillan in Europe.

→ The first responses of Western Europe to the news about the bilateral negotiations between Eisenhower and Khrushchev betray a growing European apprehension that America's allies may be victimized in a Soviet-American deal.

→ Nixon has a secret conference with Gomulka for five hours and twenty

minutes. On leaving Gomulka's office Nixon calls the talk "constructive."

→ The United States, Britain, France, Canada, Belgium, and the Netherlands sign agreements with West Germany covering the status of NATO forces stationed there. One of the major stipulations permits West Germany to exercise extended juridical rights over foreign troops.

→ Britain and the United Arab Republic are reported planning the resumption of diplomatic relations within two months.

→ It is disclosed at the Governors' conference in San Juan, P.R., that New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller will challenge Richard M. Nixon for the Republican Presidential nomination if public opinion polls, set for early November, give him a chance.

Wednesday, August 5

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev asserts that the Adenauer Government in West Germany and the situation in West Berlin is "a burning fuse leading to a powder keg."

→ NATO's high council decides against a Western "summit conference" before the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting and asks for bilateral Eisenhower conferences with the individual Western chancelleries in August.

→ British sources assert that Khrushchev will go to Red China immediately after his visit to Washington because of his hope "that his talks with Eisenhower will correct the negative United States attitude towards Communist China."

A Review Of The News

→ The Geneva Conference of the Big Four Foreign ministers ends officially.

→ Official circles in Bonn declare that Khrushchev, by attaining the invitation to Washington without paying for it with even the smallest concession, has achieved the first decisive success in his strategic campaign against West Germany.

Thursday, August 6

→ The Eisenhower Administration begins a high-pressure "public relations" campaign to assure "a hearty welcome" for Khrushchev throughout the United States.

→ After Richard M. Nixon's return to Washington, President Eisenhower asserts that Nixon's trip to Moscow had nothing to do with his decision to meet Khrushchev in Washington and to visit Moscow.

→ The British Government asks for the dispatch of United Nations "observers" to invade Laos.

→ French Prime Minister Debré flies on "an urgent trip" to Algiers.

→ The Iraqi Government announces it will "nationalize" all foreign enterprises.

→ United States Secretary of the Army Brucker and General Trudeau, chief of Army research, ask the American press to make "certain changes" in their recent official speeches concerning American relations with the Soviets.

→ The Governors' conference in San Juan resolves to invite the Prime Ministers of the fifteen member states of the Soviet Union to visit the United States.

→ Former French Prime Minister Georges Bidault declares the Eisenhower-Khrushchev conference is "the beginning of the capitulation of the free world."

Friday, August 7

→ Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy, expresses his hope that Khrushchev will take a good look at the military installations of the United States, including all secret bases.

→ On his return from Geneva, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declares that the Soviet Union alone is to be blamed for the failure of the conference.

→ Richard M. Nixon cancels his intended special TV-report to the nation on his visit to Moscow, allegedly on White House pressure.

→ Indian Prime Minister Nehru accuses Red China of violating the trade agreement concerning Tibet and India.

→ It is disclosed that Soviet First Deputy Premier, Frol R. Kozlov, told Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover of Nixon's party in Moscow that the Soviets were working on a nuclear-powered submarine.

→ President Eisenhower urges Congress to pass a labor bill which Senators John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson oppose as far too stringent.

Saturday, August 8

→ It is disclosed that a new radio-monitoring system, called "Project Tepee," has been installed within the continental boundaries of the United States which can detect instantaneously ninety-five percent of all atmospheric nu-

A Review Of The News

clear weapons tests and rocket launches anywhere in the world.

→ Secretary of Commerce, Frederick H. Mueller, calls upon the Soviet Union to advance "realistic proposals" for the increase of Soviet trade with the United States.

→ Buckingham Palace announces officially that Queen Elizabeth II is expecting a third child early next year.

→ Chief Justice Earl Warren makes a vacation trip to Moscow.

→ The Soviet Union's total trade is announced to have reached 8.5 billion dollars per year, of which more than two billion are in trade with non-Communist nations, more than one billion with NATO countries.

→ The Soviet delegation to the nuclear disarmament conference in Geneva charges that "ruling circles" in the United States torpedo the negotiations.

→ A Senate subcommittee opens hearings on the problem of more than 800,000 United States migratory farm workers whose pay and living conditions are called "appalling."

Sunday, August 9

→ The *New York Times* confirms that West European Governments "are privately distressed by the dramatic evidence that the decisive power (reigning over the fate of Western Europe) has passed to the United States and the Soviet Union."

→ It is disclosed in Washington that Eisenhower has time earmarked this year for a "summit meeting" of all Big Powers.

→ A Dominican revolutionary group is recruiting Puerto Ricans in West Side slums of New York for an invasion into the Dominican Republic.

→ Sixteen Democratic members of the House of Representatives call upon the United States to take the side of the Algerian rebels.

→ Father Don Luigi Sturzo, the founder of Italy's Christian Democratic Party, dies at the age of eighty-seven.

→ Official United States Statistics show that more than 200,000 American babies are born out of wedlock every year.

→ James R. Hoffa, teamsters-union president, is charged with trying to establish an illegal monopoly for companies shipping meat and other food to California.

Monday, August 10

→ The White House announces that President Eisenhower will start his European negotiations with a visit to Bonn on August 26.

→ It is announced that Soviet-American trade has risen by more than one hundred per cent in the first five months of 1959 over the same period in 1958. More than fifteen thousand American tourists will visit the Soviet Union this year.

→ French and United States experts will begin a joint military training program with the Army in Laos.

→ The Cuban Government calls a military alert throughout the island.

→ A committee is formed to prepare for 1964 a World's Fair in New York, with the theme "Peace Through Un-

A Review Of The News

derstanding," at a cost of 500 million dollars.

Tuesday, August 11

→ The Big Four have decided to set up new machinery for disarmament negotiations on the basis of parity with the Soviet bloc. According to this agreement, reached in Geneva, the new group would take over responsibility for disarmament negotiations from the United Nations.

→ Communist North Vietnam warns that it will regard "intervention by a foreign army in neighboring Laos as an act directly threatening North Vietnam's security."

→ Fidel Castro's Government confirms that a "conspiracy against the Government" has been broken up with more than one thousand former soldiers arrested.

→ After playing to more than 1,100,000 New Yorkers, the Soviet Fair closes and prepares a move to Mexico City for further propaganda.

→ According to the *New York Times*, the American National Exhibition at the Moscow Fair must be considered a propagandistic failure.

Wednesday, August 12

→ The State Department, in a formal statement, accuses international Communism of creating "a dangerous situation" in Laos as "a part of a Moscow-directed plan to create new tensions in Southeast Asia."

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev, accepting an invitation by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, will address the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York.

→ It is announced in Washington that military cutbacks and the ban of nuclear weapons will be the key problems for Eisenhower's negotiations with Khrushchev.

→ "A well-informed source" in Havana admits that more than 4,500 persons have been arrested as "plotters" within a week.

→ On arriving in Santiago, Chile, for a conference of American foreign ministers, Secretary of State Herter stressed that "law and order" should be the basis of inter-American relations, especially in the Caribbean area.

→ Japanese Premier Nobusuke Kishi declares his determination to bring Japan into a close military alliance with the United States as quickly as possible.

→ As unemployment in the United States dropped by 238,000 to 3,744,000 from June to July, 1959, employment reached an all-time record of 67,600,000 jobs.

Thursday, August 13

→ The House of Representatives approves the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, endorsed by President Eisenhower and attacked by Senator Kennedy, by a vote of 229 to 201—95 Democrats joining the Republicans.

→ Premier Fidel Castro declares in Havana that "the counter-revolution has been crushed" and that the carnival should go ahead as "there is nothing to fear."

→ Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa Garcia and Dominican Foreign Minister Porfirio Herrera Baez exchange invectives at the conference at Santiago, Chile.

A Review Of The News

→ The Laotian Government declares in Vientiane that regular Red Chinese troops have been pulled out of Laos, but a 1,200-men guerilla band has been left behind to build up support for a forthcoming offensive.

→ Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir declares that her Government will not accept conditions which would compel Israel to send cargoes through the Suez Canal in foreign-owned ships.

→ The Moroccan Government decides to take its protest against the projected French atomic tests in the Sahara to the United Nations.

→ Indian Prime Minister Nehru asserts his country is "quite awake, quite alert" over the matter of "very large" Red Chinese forces in Tibet.

Saturday, August 15

→ According to a statement by Richard M. Nixon, Nikita S. Khrushchev earnestly believes that millions of American workers are ready to revolt and institute Socialism or Communism in the United States.

→ In a final vote, the House passes the Landrum-Griffin labor bill by a vote of 303 to 125.

→ The Cuban Government announces its troops have captured a planeload of "counter-revolutionaries and arms" flown to the Cuban Las Villas province from the Dominican Republic.

→ West Germany is constructing its first nuclear power plant at Juelich in North-Rhine-Westphalia.

→ The Vatican is reported "concerned" over renewed frictions between the Roman Catholic Church and the Gomulka regime in Poland.

→ Richard C. Patterson, head of New York City's Department of Commerce and Public Events, promises Khrushchev will receive "a warm welcome" in New York.

→ The steel strike reverses a fourteen-months rise of industrial output in the United States for the first time, by sending the index down one percent.

Sunday, August 16

→ The Soviet Government accuses Laos of having violated her neutrality by permitting the United States to establish a military base in Laos.

→ Haiti asks the conference of American foreign ministers at Santiago, Chile, to intervene against a rebel invasion from Cuba.

→ General George Grivas, former Greek Cypriote underground leader with outspoken Communist support, announces he is ready to seek power in Greece with the help of "popular organizations and the working class."

→ Indonesian President Sukarno warns that Dutch capital in Indonesia faces expropriation unless the Netherlands hand over West New Guinea.

→ Official Communist sources in Prague stress that the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks "may slowly force the West to play down its basic attitude that the Governments of Eastern Europe are not representative of the people of Eastern Europe."

→ Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, says that the Soviet Union probably has submarines able to launch ballistic missiles.

A Review Of The News

→ Five square miles of Upper Manhattan with half a million residents has all electrical power supply cut off by breaks for more than twelve hours.

Monday, August 17

→ It is disclosed that the Soviet Government denied Vice President Nixon's request to visit a missile factory during his recent stay in the Soviet Union.

→ The Santiago, Chile, conference of American foreign ministers intends to empower the Inter-American Peace Commission to act as conciliator in the Caribbean crisis.

→ The Tunisian Government charges that French airplanes based in Algeria twice attacked the Tunisian town of Bhiret Zitouna.

→ Bonn Government sources assert that Adenauer will urge Eisenhower to steer clear of any detailed discussion of the German question in his talks with Nikita S. Khrushchev.

→ *Izvestia*, the official Soviet paper, publishes *Tass* interviews with nine "leading Americans" welcoming Khrushchev's visit, among them Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee.

→ The Prime Minister of the Federation of Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Sir Roy Welensky, warns that Nyasaland would become Communist if it were permitted to leave the Federation.

→ French Premier Michel Debré declares that France "must be in a position to make herself heard and understood" if she is to "avoid being crushed by agreements between very great powers" like the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev "talks."

→ Fidel Castro's brother, the fellow-traveling commander of the Cuban military forces, Raul Castro, is dispatched to the Santiago conference of American republics.

→ The Italian Government, endangered by a "popular front" propaganda drive that was encouraged by the announcement of Eisenhower's meeting with Khrushchev, intends to urge Eisenhower that he demand from Khrushchev a Soviet renunciation of the use and support of Western Communist parties.

→ Chinese Red radio claims that "vast areas" in four provinces have been "liberated" in Laos by Communist rebels and invaders.

→ Richard M. Nixon asserts that, in spite of Khrushchev's visit and gestures, the Soviets "still have the goal of a Communist world."

→ Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey dies at the age of seventy-six.

Tuesday, August 18

→ The Santiago conference of American republics ends on a note of triumph for Castro by stating officially that "the existence of anti-democratic regimes constitutes a violation of the principles on which the Organization of American States is founded and endangers the peace and the harmony of the hemisphere."

→ The Laotian Army reports that Communist rebels are on the march again in the northeastern provinces.

→ The Soviet Government has offered to Bolivia a loan of sixty million dollars in equipment and refineries.

A Review Of The News

→ According to reports reaching India the Chinese Communists have arrested the Panchen Lama who was made their puppet ruler after the Dalai Lama had fled.

→ Moscow broadcasts warn that Soviet submarines could enter the Hudson Bay from under the Arctic ice and bombard the heart of industrial America.

→ Nelson Rockefeller has "a discussion on politics" with President Eisenhower.

Wednesday, August 19

→ The State Department officially suggests "Soviet complicity" in the Communist military activity in northern Laos.

→ George Meany and a preponderant majority of the A.F.L. - C.I.O.'s International Policy Committee suggest that representatives of free American unions should shun any contact with Khrushchev on his visit to the United States, while Walter P. Reuther strongly dissents from that policy.

→ Admiral Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, declares that, if Khrushchev gets on his visit the impression "that we really do not understand what the Communists are up to, then look out!"

Thursday, August 20

→ The A.F.L. - C.I.O. Executive Council approves by a vote of 22 to 3 President Meany's policy of shunning Khrushchev, the three dissenting votes being cast by Walter P. Reuther, James B. Carey and O. A. Knight.

→ The Government of Laos reports that six provinces have been penetrated by the Red invaders.

→ The Government of Tunisia leaves the customs union with France.

→ Former Cuban President Batista arrives in Portugal on his way to his lasting exile in Madeira.

→ Philip Courtney, Chairman of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, just returned from a three weeks' trip to Moscow, reports that Soviet leaders are eager for direct trade talks with Western business leaders.

Friday, August 21

→ Hawaii is officially proclaimed as the fiftieth state of the Union.

→ The United States Defense Department bans publication of a book on nuclear strategy written by the chief of the Strategic Air Command, General T. S. Power.

→ A special Laotian envoy to the United Nations declares that Red Czechoslovakia supplies arms to the rebel forces in Laos.

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev is holding a series of conferences with European and Asiatic Communist leaders in Yalta in preparation for his meeting with Eisenhower.

→ On his return from Europe Adlai E. Stevenson reports that the impending exchange of visits between Khrushchev and Eisenhower is regarded abroad as "a great achievement for the Soviet premier."

Saturday, August 22

→ The White House announces that Nikita S. Khrushchev will visit Washington, New York, Los Angeles, San

A Review Of The News

Francisco, Des Moines, Ames (Iowa) and Pittsburgh.

→ The World Council of Churches joins the world-wide Communist-inspired movement to make the Western powers stop nuclear tests.

→ The United States Representative at the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, is designated by Eisenhower to act as his personal representative in accompanying Khrushchev on his nationwide tour.

The Soviet humor magazine *Krokodil* invites American cartoonist Herbert Block (Herblock) of the *Washington Post* and *New York Post* to become a contributor.

→ The French Government indicates that it considers a recent speech on Algeria by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Joseph C. Satterthwaite, to be an unfriendly intervention in an inner-French matter in favor of rebels.

→ Leaders of Latin-American Communist Parties meet in Santiago, Chile.

Sunday, August 23

→ Italian Premier Antonio Segni, referring to the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting, warns that an easing of East-West tension must not be bought "at the price of liberty."

→ Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev sends an aggressive and insulting note to German Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenauer.

→ Communist insurgents and invaders are approaching the capital of Laos.

→ French Premier Debré warns that France's Algerian policies "must not be

contested or contradicted" by anyone who wants France as an ally.

→ Bishop Theophilos of the Ethiopian Coptic Church visits the Soviet Union with an eye on possible affiliation of his church with the Russian Orthodox Church.

Monday, August 24

→ President Eisenhower will waive protocol, it is announced, and meet Khrushchev at the airport although he is not a head of state.

→ Former President Harry S. Truman declares that Eisenhower's trip to the Soviet Union is unwise.

→ Secretary of State Herter announces that he considers the situation in Laos as "very dangerous."

→ The Dalai Lama estimates that Tibet's struggle for freedom has so far cost eighty thousand Tibetan lives and that his country is heading towards extermination.

→ Dr. Hilger von Scherpenberg, State Secretary of the Bonn Foreign Ministry, declares his Government will give support to the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting, provided it can be sure "there will be no encroachment on the vital interests of the divided German people."

→ The Government of Haiti charges that officers and soldiers on active duty with the Cuban Army participated in the abortive invasion of Haiti on August 13.

Tuesday, August 25

→ President Eisenhower leaves Washington for conferences in Bonn, London and Paris.

A Review Of The News

→ Vice President Richard M. Nixon assures the American Legion that "under no circumstances will this exchange of visits (between Eisenhower and Khrushchev) result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the captive people of Eastern Europe."

→ Indian Prime Minister Nehru declares that his Government would go to the defense of the two Indian provinces Bhutan and Sikkim if they were attacked.

→ Huge strikes paralyze the economic life of Argentina.

→ The Cuban Government asks for another wave of executions in mass trials against recently arrested "counter-revolutionaries."

Wednesday, August 26

→ Huge crowds of Germans greet President Eisenhower on his arrival in Bonn, displaying their willingness to stay firm in the face of Soviet attacks and intrigues.

→ Khrushchev warns West Germany of the dangers it invites in allowing itself to be an atomic base for the West.

→ The State Department promises it will speed additional military help to Laos.

→ *Izvestia* charges that Truman has been trying "to poison" the forthcoming exchange of visits between Eisenhower and Khrushchev.

→ Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco announces that his city will give a civic banquet in honor of Khrushchev on September 21.

→ The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is about to make a loan of forty million dollars to widen and deepen the Suez Canal.

Thursday, August 27

→ Large crowds welcome Eisenhower in London as he resumes his talks with Macmillan after having reached a formal agreement of views with Adenauer.

→ The United States Pacific Command is prepared to begin airlifting emergency military supplies to Laos "within a few days."

→ The Soviet Embassy in Washington has received more than five hundred invitations (and the State Department hundreds more) of various United States communities and organizations for Nikita S. Khrushchev to visit them.

→ Adlai E. Stevenson declares his disagreement with Harry S. Truman concerning the Eisenhower visit to Moscow, which Stevenson considers beneficial.

→ Senator Lyndon B. Johnson tells the American Legion Convention "the greatest tragedy" would result if Khrushchev's visit would be considered "a thaw in the cold war."

Friday, August 28

→ Eisenhower and Macmillan agree on a joint policy that envisages "a series of high-level meetings with Soviet leaders."

→ Konrad Adenauer appeals to Khrushchev to resume negotiations directed at controlled international disarmament.

→ The Dalai Lama appeals to the United Nations to support Tibet in her fight against Communist China.

A Review Of The News

→ French President de Gaulle tours the military posts in Algeria.

→ Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia warns the big powers not to try to dictate any "final settlement" of East-West issues.

→ Khrushchev declares he is going to the United States "with a burning desire" to relieve international tensions.

Saturday, August 29

→ It is declared in London that Eisenhower and Macmillan have agreed on "the need for flexibility."

→ Senator J. W. Fulbright demands that the State Department take "a new look at Middle Eastern policies" and move "imaginatively and boldly" in achieving good relations with the United Arab Republic.

→ Richard M. Nixon cautions Americans against assuming that Khrushchev's visit signals a softening in the Communist goal of world domination.

→ Scientists at the London international congress of the International Astronautical Federation predict that the Soviet Union will attempt to put a man into space this year.

Sunday, August 30

→ The Indian Army dispatches troop enforcements into the border region of Assam, while President Eisenhower sees in London Nehru's sister, the Indian Ambassador to Britain, Mrs. Lakshmi Pandit.

→ Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan welcomes a visiting group of American businessmen in Moscow, among them

leading members of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

→ The Finnish Army is getting armored tanks of the type T-54 and other military equipment from the Soviet Union.

→ Dr. Klaus Fuchs, recently released from a British jail, is appointed chief of the East German nuclear research agency in Leipzig.

→ The chiefs of India's military establishment offer their resignation in a move of protest against Nehru's fellow-traveling Defense Minister, Krishna Menon.

Monday, August 31

→ Recalling Hitler's attack on Poland, twenty years ago, in alliance with Stalin, Dr. Konrad Adenauer approaches the Polish Government with a note that is generally interpreted in Europe as an appeasement step ordered by Eisenhower.

→ Nikita S. Khrushchev releases a surprisingly friendly response to Adenauer's recent note to the Soviets, which indicates a far-reaching agreement between the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States to maneuver West Germany into accepting "a compromise" on the East German question.

→ Senators Paul H. Douglas (Democrat), Styles Bridges (Republican), Thomas J. Dodd (Democrat) and Representatives Walter H. Judd (Republican) and John W. McCormack (Democrat) call upon the American people to observe a period of mourning for victims of Communism during Khrushchev's visit to the United States.

In Place Of A Thousand Words



Shake! Let's Coexist Until I Bury You

EUROPEAN SURVEY

by

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Mailed from Hamburg, August 31, 1959

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, who travels fast these days, will outrun this report. Before I can say hello to my readers, he will have said good-bye to Khrushchev. Just so, everyone has to do his duty — Eisenhower must shake hands with the manager of World Communism, and I must report that this is exactly what he is doing.

His job is tough, but so is mine. For sometimes it seems to one who is trying to report reality that he is surrounded by a nightmare. He is trying to shout the most obvious and most self-evident thing, but the people around him suddenly speak an altogether alien language or they don't hear at all. This, indeed, is the nightmare of our time. A statement that Mr. Khrushchev is a member of the Communist Party would at this point be denounced as a dirty rumor, unproved by demonstrable facts and utterly malicious. The Chambers of Commerce throughout the United States are preparing receptions of an esteemed guest from Moscow. Wall Street is flagged and American television is wrapping up a billion-dollar gift of propaganda for the Commissar. In this hubbub of capitalistic love for Khrushchev I feel downright subversive and, at any rate, embarrassingly out of step. Nor is my embarrassment confined to the United States. Europeans, too, are practically exploding with enthusiasm for their own executioners. It is, to be frank, an obscene sight.

The Germans Have No Course But To String Along...

Of course, Europeans are at this point not welcoming the *Fuehrer* of World Communism but merely the friendly and attractive President of the United States. And, in a pinch, they could claim that their applause for Eisenhower ought to be understood as a demonstration *against* Khrushchev. The Germans, for example, who a few days ago welcomed their conqueror of 1945 with a joy and a devotion Mr. Eisenhower will find in no other European capital, indubitably wanted to express their confidence in American firmness, power and sense. And yet, there is something profoundly sick in this emphatically expressed misunderstanding. One can't help being reminded of a historical cliché — of those gladiators who, upon entering Caesar's arena, greeted him with a "morituri te salutant" — "those who are about to die are greeting you."

For there is not an intelligent person in Europe who would doubt that they will pay for the conventions in Washington and Moscow with German currency. There is no handier money around. Neither Eisenhower nor Khrushchev can afford to come home without a deal. The President of the United States could not possibly act as a traveling salesman, and the boss of World Communism as a cooky-pusher, without something to show for all their

European Survey

trouble. Khrushchev, of course, is enjoying a buyer's market; it would not occur to anybody in the West to expect more from him than a few soothing words about Laos and the northern borders of India. But Eisenhower, unless he becomes willing to admit that he's been had, will have to pay for his way home through the nose — not necessarily through his own, but certainly through Adenauer's nose.

This, I suppose, *Der Alte* knows. And yet—what can he do? For one, the entire policy of the past Adenauer decade was based on his decisive insistence that Germany must support the American position; and now that Eisenhower takes this fantastic trip into the never-never-land of appeasement, Adenauer cannot suddenly separate his fate from that of America. Secondly, German "public opinion" (in a way even more "liberal" than America's metropolitan press) has massaged the German people into believing that, somehow, a meeting between Khrushchev and Eisenhower will resemble the second coming of Christ. Finally, Eisenhower's excursion into personal diplomacy has already produced one almost fatal result — the collapse of an even formal Western unity, particularly in regard to French solidarity with America. And in this worse than delicate situation Adenauer, whose second guiding principle of policy all the time was Germany's closest cooperation with France, could not possibly withdraw with an air of pouting. Should he now so much as hesitate to stay in America's camp, de Gaulle would necessarily take over German foreign policy, too. Such are the subtleties of the game of alliances.

For all these reasons, and some others, Adenauer had to act the teacher's pet,

in Bonn as well as in his painful correspondence with Khrushchev. But he is not fooling himself. While the Western world is suffering from the strange illusion that Khrushchev, at the peak of his career, will yield to Eisenhower's endearing old charms, Adenauer is determined to prove that, at any rate, he is not going to disturb the smooching. German policy, at this point, must consist of compliant gestures, if only because General de Gaulle has taken it upon himself to counteract Eisenhower.

Although de Gaulle Does Not...

And it would be a dangerous mistake to underrate the French determination. Another American President, Eisenhower's wartime boss, had to learn, with considerable disgust, that General de Gaulle, once he has chosen a position, can be impressed neither by a display of force nor by a promise of favors. And once more de Gaulle's policy has stiffened in the face of an American president's dilettantism. This time General de Gaulle wants to insist, come what may, on three things: one, France will not allow the United States to bargain in the name of France; two, France will not permit the President of the United States to make Khrushchev the precious present of Algeria; three, France will proceed with a nuclear armament without which it would cease to be a sovereign power. True, France being France, de Gaulle will give Eisenhower a Parisian reception of impeccable politeness and style. But even Jim Hagerty will have told Eisenhower by now that France has left the fictitious Western coalition. And as Adenauer most certainly remains the realist he always was, no one chaperones Eisenhower at his flirtation with

European Survey

Khrushchev but the peculiar Mr. Macmillan.

Harold Macmillan, I dare predict, will go down in history as the most unlikely Prime Minister even England ever had. Baldwin knew that Hitler was arming for war, and yet he kept England disarmed. Chamberlain knew that war was coming, and yet he simulated "peace in our time." But Macmillan knows much less and does much more than either: he does not know the irreducible aims of the enemy — and yet he has done everything in his power to disarm England even diplomatically. For, while Baldwin renounced Britain's military strength and Chamberlain abdicated morally, Macmillan has succeeded in scratching England off the racing chart altogether. For the first time in modern history England will not sit in on a decisive international conference. And, mind you, the President of the United States was *pushed* into the arrogance of bilateral negotiations with the Soviets by the British Prime Minister himself! Macmillan's unprecedented campaign, which was to win Khrushchev's favors for England, ends with the *one* thing intelligent Europeans have always feared more than the H-Bomb — direct negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States, with the exclusion of Western Europe's big powers.

In his proud and tragic abstention from the general joy over the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting Charles de Gaulle actually represents *all* of Europe. His personal motives may be "nationalistic," but the true meaning of his rôle, and perhaps its ultimate impact, will be universal. If Eisenhower can outsmart Khrushchev (which means: if hell freezes) then de Gaulle has lost his bet;

but that wouldn't matter much because, in that case, all of Western Europe will have shrunk to the stature of a dwarfed ward of America. Should Khrushchev emerge triumphantly from his love-bout with Eisenhower (which means: should the unavoidable happen) then Charles de Gaulle, again openly supported by Adenauer, will lead a last and desperate European resistance against the ignominious Anglo-American curse of appeasement. In either case the Atlantic alliance must end. This is the only certain result of Eisenhower's travel adventure.

* * *

As Khrushchev Buries NATO . . .

How profoundly France's confidence in American and British policies has been shaken was demonstrated by a recent statement of de Gaulle's Prime Minister, Michel Debré. The new French policy, he said, "is a reaction against alliances which took advantage of our weaknesses and subjugated us to foreign powers—powers that did not hesitate to work against our interests." Such language was not heard in the Atlantic world since 1939. And Debré's timing was ominous, not only because of the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting. As it happens, the month of September, 1959, is of crucial importance for the survival of NATO. Article 12 of the NATO-Pact commits the NATO-alliance to enter, beginning with September, 1959, into negotiations concerning "a revision of the treaty," should any member so desire. France now does.

President de Gaulle, in other words, seems determined to confront Eisenhower with the true dilemma inherent in Eisenhower's new policy: we can't have Western Europe and eat it too. If

European Survey

the United States is to embark upon a course of "friendship" with the Soviet Union, NATO will necessarily dissolve — and not only because de Gaulle prefers honor to surrender. NATO is breaking up before our eyes simply because a "rapprochement" between the United States and the Soviet Union abolishes its reasons for being. NATO makes sense only on the assumption that there remain irreducible tensions and life-perils in the relations between East and West. Once the leading power of the Western coalition has decided in favor of "coexistence," NATO vanishes. And this is exactly the major aim of Khrushchev's strategy: to deprive the United States, with a few swift strokes, of its European alliances, and thus to get the United States out of Europe. That he would be able to achieve this goal with a con-man's oily smile, and nothing else, even Khrushchev could hardly have expected. But he has done it. Even if the forthcoming meeting with Eisenhower were to produce no other Soviet successes, the one already achieved is staggering; the United States has maneuvered itself into isolation, has abandoned its Western alliances, has driven France into open and Germany into hardly disguised separation from the system of Atlantic alliances.

At the moment, Adenauer's hands are tied. But he can't continue his obedience to Eisenhower's improvised orders very long. Khrushchev is determined to get from the United States some kind of "solution" of the "Berlin crisis," and he means to get it soon. What this solution will be, no one but Dr. Milton Eisenhower knows. He has returned from his trip to Moscow (for which Nixon seems to have been

nothing but a public-relations foil) with some secretly discussed Khrushchev offers which are currently the subject of the hottest guessing game in European chancelleries. These chancelleries were greatly surprised to learn that the name of the ruling United States President was not, as everybody assumed, Jim Hagerty but Milton Eisenhower; but by now the secret is out. What Europe's statesmen would like to know is simply what kind of proposals almighty Milton has come home with. The best guess: a Khrushchev offer to grant the West German government a corridor to West Berlin—if the Western powers (i.e., primarily, the United States) withdraw their troops from that city and, thus, renounce their "rights of occupation."

By Giving Us What We Already Have...

This, indeed, would be an extremely clever move on Khrushchev's part. For it would allow the Eisenhower Administration to masquerade a decisive American defeat as some kind of Western triumph; isn't the grant of even a small West German corridor into West Berlin, across Soviet-occupied German territory, a Soviet concession worth the withdrawal of token Western troops from heretofore isolated Berlin?

But actually Khrushchev would have granted nothing that was not already a Western trump card — namely, direct access to West Berlin without Soviet interference. And in exchange for that bit of nothing, Khrushchev would attain a strategic advantage of incomparable momentum: A future thrust of East German Communists against West Berlin would no longer encounter the forbidding physical presence of Ameri-

European Survey

can soldiers. Now a cautiously manipulated *putsch* would cut into butter. Without the token presence of American troops in Berlin, whose violation might result in a world war, the East German Communists, with momentous Soviet support, can safely prepare a "peaceful" taking-over of West Berlin —relying on the West's proved determination not to resist militarily unless it is *directly* attacked. The withdrawal of Allied troops from West Berlin abolishes the chances of such a *direct* attack. Thus, it makes the Communist conquest of West Berlin *unavoidable* — and never mind Soviet "concessions" offered first to bring that withdrawal about.

In Exchange For Berlin, Our Recognition of East Germany, Disarmament Of West Germany, And The Benediction Of Christian A. Herter...

Of course, as I said, nobody knows here in Europe what kind of message Milton brought to his formally reigning brother; and it is quite possible that Khrushchev prefers an entirely different scheme. The most likely alternative to the Miltonian Proposals remains the original Soviet "solution" of the "Berlin crisis" — to leave the token Allied troops, for the time being, in West Berlin, but make the United States negotiate the supply lines with, and thus recognize, the Ulbricht regime. This alternative is not only likely but probable, because, after all, it has already been accepted by Herter in Geneva. When he "suggested" an "all-German committee" to regulate "inner-German" problems, with a built-in veto right for Ulbricht, he went beyond the boldest Soviet proposals. And so, in the

end, the Geneva conference might finally and fully *succeed* after all. Eisenhower and Khrushchev may put their seals to what Herter and Gromyko didn't dare to sign.

Nor will they stop there, I am afraid. As far as it was possible to penetrate the thick cloud of staggering banalities exuded by Eisenhower's traveling party all over Europe, the impression is growing on the continent that the central subject of the peak-palaver is to be "disarmament." Nobody believes that "disarmament," at the present stage, could mean nuclear disarmament of the two world powers. Disarmament, under the present conditions, can mean only one thing — the disarmament of Germany. Knowing people in Europe assume quite earnestly that the upshot of Eisenhower's talks with Khrushchev will be a revival of the Rapacki Plan — the most dangerous version of all existing ideas of "disengagement."

The Rapacki Plan, you will remember, suggests a "demilitarization" of a broad strip on both sides of the Iron Curtain, including Germany in the West and Poland in the East. By "demilitarization" the Communists, naturally, mean the dissolution of West Germany's armed forces, but by no means the dismantling of the police forces of the satellites. These are paramilitary forces of enormous strength which, if they don't encounter superior military force, are entirely capable of executing decisive actions. Any sensible technician would therefore insist that West Germany can "disarm" only if the satellites disband their totalitarian police forces (i.e., overthrow their Communist regimes). This I repeat, would be merely a technician's consideration,

European Survey

altogether untouched by political sophistication. However, General Eisenhower has risen high above the concerns of his Chiefs of Staff; and he now turns to the philosophical insights of his brother Milton and of Jim Hagerty when the military security of the West is at stake.

So it may well be the good old Rapacki Plan. Nixon (and even poor high-pressured Adenauer) made lately conspicuous advances to the Gomulka regime. And it is perfectly possible that the "public relations" experts, who handle United States policy, have thought up that campaign to prepare the revival and acceptance of the Rapacki Plan. At any rate (unless, of course, they'll already negotiate the surrender of Seattle), there is hardly any other subject conceivable for Eisenhower's talks with Khrushchev than some form of "disarmament" which would primarily commit the bastion and front-line of the West—Germany.

* * *

While In Italy...

Nobody tells the Italians what's going on in the world but, with the exaggerated sensitivity of a feeble and endangered nation, they are forming their own ideas. And who could say that these ideas are wrong? The thought prevailing, at the moment in Italy, it seems, is simply that all is lost — that Eisenhower's decision to negotiate directly with Khrushchev means the "beginning of a new era," an age of "coexistence." And the Italians, not always blessed with particular stamina and strength of nerve, are getting terribly busy with their age-old game of "regrouping."

At the center of the hustling, to nobody's surprise, is Fanfani, the resentful former Prime Minister and leader of

the Christian-Democratic Party's left wing. According to his timetable, the Segni Government is to be overthrown by the end of October, at or shortly after the forthcoming Christian-Democratic Congress. Fanfani's argument runs on two tracks — domestic and foreign policies. In truth, he has only one concern — Italy's "need" to turn left.

The domestic argument centers around the stubborn rebellion of Sicily's Christian Democrats against Segni's leadership. The Sicilian rebels, who have formed their regional administration in coalition with the Communists (who at this point control Sicily's legislative bodies), have established closest contacts not only with Fanfani but, above all, with the notorious Enrico Mattei (frequently mentioned in last year's *Surveys* in this magazine), and with President Gronchi. With the Sicilian rebellion as evidence, Fanfani claims that the Segni leadership has estranged the party from "the masses," has surrendered the party's self-determination to the "reactionary whims" of the Monarchists and the Neo-Fascists, without whose parliamentary support Segni cannot exist.

The other argument (and it carries enormous weight in Italy's easily scared political establishment) is simply the international change of weather. In recent days respectable "conservative" newspapers in Italy have seriously argued that Togliatti and his Communist Party must at last be considered as potential partners of "a national coalition." Why? Because Khrushchev *is* already a partner of Eisenhower. It's that simple — at least so far as the Italians are concerned. They even think that two and two make four.

European Survey

The Communists Love The Bright New Weather...

It is, in other words, no longer the notorious "opening on the left" that has disturbed Italian policies for years—the everlasting temptation for Italy's center to contemplate a coalition with Nenni's Socialists. All of a sudden the talk is now, quite openly, of a revival of the late "popular front" which de Gasperi abandoned ten years ago, and not a moment too soon; the Communists are becoming "governmental" in Italy again. I do not mean to say that they will indeed enter the Government in any foreseeable future. The perilous switch in the Italian political climate consists rather of a new readiness to see the Communists, not as a foreign conspiracy, but as a legitimate Italian party with competitive rights and titles to power. Given the profound Italian cynicism in all political matters, this change alone suffices to destroy Italy's democratic structure. And this, too, is one of the immediate successes of Eisenhower's travels.

* * *

How fast and seriously Italy is developing into one of Europe's weakest spots has been recently pointed out by Britain's most knowing military analyst, B. H. Liddell Hart. "Italy would be the first European country to suffer from a breakdown of the northern (Scandinavian) flank," he wrote in a magnificent survey of Europe's crazy quilt. "For Denmark and Norway con-

trol the Atlantic exits for the immense Russian fleet of fast long-range submarines, the greatest part of which is stationed in the East Sea and Ice Sea ports . . . Should that bottleneck be de-corked, ninety or more submarines of the Soviet East-Sea Fleet could enter the Atlantic and thus endanger all supply lines of Western and Southern Europe . . . The magnitude of the danger becomes evident if one considers that Germany, at the outbreak of World War II, had fewer than forty submarines, of which only eight could operate down to Gibraltar or the Azores."

In other words, Italy's strategic position is to a large extent determined by the defensive strength of Denmark and Norway. But these two countries refused to grant NATO troops even the most primitive bases. Why? Because, as Liddell Hart says, "they wanted to avoid any provocation of the Soviet Union. Their hesitation is under the present circumstances understandable, but it makes their membership in NATO almost absurd."

Not necessarily more absurd, I'd like to add, than the NATO membership of a United States that is building its foreign policy on Milton Eisenhower's diplomacy and Dwight Eisenhower's charms. The reliance on the charms of another President brought about Yalta and Teheran. What makes me tremble is the idea that Eisenhower is even more *charming* than was F. D. Roosevelt.

WE PAUSE TO REMARK

According to the objective report of the best non-political observers, the Soviets do not even have a missile factory that amounts to a row of beans. So it is no wonder that they turned down Nixon's request to see one. The Vice President should have asked to see a lie factory. Then his hosts, if they wished, could have shown him the largest and most productive in the world.

BULLETS

Like it or not, the great and inescapable task of our epoch is not to end the Cold War but to win it.

Eugene Lyons

* * *

In the old days, ten dollars worth of groceries would fill a pantry to bursting. Today, ten dollars worth of groceries won't even burst a shopping bag. Certainly shows how much stronger bags are now, doesn't it?

Wall Street Journal

* * *

We must not promise what we ought not, lest we be called upon to perform what we cannot.

Abraham Lincoln, Alone

* * *

The sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word liberty. (Or the word "peace.")

Abraham Lincoln, Assisted By Your Editor

* * *

For Sale: Complete 30-volume set Encyclopedia Americana. New, 1948. Never used — my wife knows everything.

Advertisement In Wayne (Pa.) Times

* * *

Some callers can stay longer in an hour than others do in a week.

William Dean Howells

* * *

We have just heard a rumor that a new plant is being constructed in Missouri for manufacturing front ends of horses — the product of this plant will be sent to Washington for final assembly.

American Eagle

* * *

Sign In Laboratory: Are you helping with the solution or are you a part of the problem?

Noted By J. H. Williams

The American Way — using instant coffee to dawdle away an hour.

Dan Kidney

* * *

Some like it cold, some like it hot,
Some freeze while others smother.
And by some fiendish, fatal plot
They marry one another.

Richard Armour

* * *

During the past twenty years there has been approximately an eight hundred percent expansion in our Federal taxes. During the last twenty years there has also been approximately an eight hundred percent expansion in the total membership of the world-wide Communist parties, in the number of enslaved subjects ruled by the Communists, and in the general extent of Communist power. Just who do you think paid for that Communist expansion—through wartime and peacetime alike?

Our Own Question

* * *

Profit from our past mistakes is not taxable. (But don't remind the government!)

Pulpit Digest, Annotated By Us

* * *

A little flattery now and then makes husbands out of single men.

Automotive Dealer News

* * *

Monsignor Knox says that Hilaire Belloc saw "the evils of our time in a clear light and with a steady hatred."

The Wanderer

* * *

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?

Second Corinthians, VI, 14

IF YOU WANT IT STRAIGHT . . .

Please, Mr. Senator, Do!

By Monday, September 7, the appeal of the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, to President Eisenhower to ask the Soviet Premier to "postpone" his visit, had appeared as a full-page advertisement (except as noted) in the following newspapers.

Union Leader, Manchester, New Hampshire
Standard Times, New Bedford, Massachusetts
Haverhill Journal, Haverhill, Massachusetts
Brooklyn Tablet, Brooklyn, New York
Sarasota Herald, Sarasota, Florida
Oakland Tribune, Oakland, California
News and Courier, Charleston, South Carolina
Colorado Springs Gazette, Colorado Springs, Colorado
Fort Lauderdale News, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Orlando Sentinel, Orlando, Florida
Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Oklahoma
Richmond News-Leader, Richmond, Virginia
Richmond Times-Despatch, Richmond, Virginia
Houston Chronicle, Houston, Texas
Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati, Ohio
Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Arizona
Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Indiana
New York Herald Tribune, New York, New York
Milwaukee Sentinel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Utica Observer, Utica, New York
Borger News Herald, Borger, Texas
Wall Street Journal (Three-fifths Page), New York,
New York
Park City News, Dallas, Texas
New York Times, New York, New York
Amerikai Magyar Nepszavunk (Hungarian), New York,
New York

If You Want It Straight . . .

Chicago Abendpost, Chicago, Illinois
Bangor Daily News, Bangor, Maine
Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, South Carolina
Greenville News, Greenville, South Carolina
Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, North Carolina
Dallas News, Dallas, Texas
Washington Star, Washington, D.C.
Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Illinois
Davenport Times, Davenport, Iowa
The Draugus (Lithuanian), Chicago, Illinois
The Polish Daily Sgoda, Chicago, Illinois
The Sarasota News, Sarasota, Florida
The Detroit Suburban Newspapers, Detroit, Michigan
The Wanderer (Two-thirds Page), St. Paul, Minnesota
Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Indiana
The Register, Denver, Colorado
Latrobe Bulletin, Latrobe, Pennsylvania
Lusk Herald, Lusk, Wyoming
Santa Ana Register, Santa Ana, California
The Daily Calumet, Chicago, Illinois
Providence Journal, Providence, Rhode Island
Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Michigan

And in more than fifty other weeklies and smaller dailies throughout the country.

As a result of these advertisements, and of many tremendous efforts by various other groups and individuals, a veritable flood of petitions and letters had been poured on Washington, protesting the forthcoming visit and trying to get it stopped. If we had had two more weeks in which to build up the opposition, or if the period for this buildup had not been so cleverly scheduled at the exact season of any year when it is most difficult to reach people you need and bring them into action, we believe the battle could have been won. But the Communists and their dupes and sympathizers, while not knowing the specific forms the opposition would take, had studied the calendar well. They had allowed us but six vaca-

If You Want It Straight . . .

tion-time weeks, of which five were now gone. And the conclusion had become fairly certain that no amount of pressure on the White House (really on its leftwing advisers), which could be mustered in the time available, was going to induce a cancellation of the invitation, because of the strength of the influences which had brought about the invitation in the first place. The visit was of far too much value to the Communists who had planned it.

So on that Labor Day, September 7, your editor sent the following paid night letter, as a separate telegram to every one of the one hundred United States Senators.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

HAS THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES SIMPLY SURRENDERED ITS AUTHORITY AND DUTIES QUESTION MARK IF SO WHY GO THROUGH THE SILLY MOTION OF HOLDING SESSIONS QUESTION MARK PARAGRAPH

THE APPROACHING VISIT OF KHRUSHCHEV IS NOT IN THE SAME CATEGORY AS THE USUAL STATE VISIT PROPERLY ARRANGED BY OUR STATE DEPARTMENT PERIOD IT IS A MORE DECISIVE AND FARREACHING ALIGNMENT OF OUR COUNTRY IN ITS FOREIGN RELATIONS THAN ANY ORDINARY TREATY COULD POSSIBLY BE PERIOD IN AN ARTICLE IN THE MAGAZINE FOREIGN AFFAIRS KHRUSHCHEV HAS ARROGANTLY ANNOUNCED ON THE EVE OF HIS ARRIVAL THE TERMS ON WHICH HE WILL CONSENT TO LET US SURVIVE TEMPORARILY AS A NATION DASH PROVIDED WE UNDERSTAND AND TACITLY CONSENT THAT WE ARE EVENTUALLY TO BE ABSORBED INTO THE COMMUNIST EMPIRE PERIOD HIS VISIT AS AN HONORED GUEST OF OUR NATION UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES IS ITSELF THE GREATEST VICTORY

If You Want It Straight . . .

HE COULD POSSIBLY ACHIEVE TOWARD MAKING THIS OVERBEARING BLUFF BECOME TRAGIC REALITY PERIOD YET THE INVITATION AND PLANS FOR THIS VISIT WERE MADE NOT ONLY WITHOUT THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE BUT WITHOUT ANY NOTICE EVEN BEING GIVEN YOU PERIOD PARAGRAPH

OUR STATE DEPARTMENT ITSELF SAYS THAT THE SOVIET UNION AND COMMUNIST CHINA AND COMMUNIST NORTH VIETNAM ARE TOGETHER DIRECTING AND SUPPORTING THE COMMUNIST INVADING FORCES IN LAOS RIGHT NOW PERIOD THERE IS NO QUESTION BUT THAT THIS MOVE HAS BEEN DELIBERATELY TIMED TO COINCIDE WITH KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT TO AMERICA IN ORDER TO SHOW THE WORLD WHAT HE CAN GET AWAY WITH AND STILL HAVE OUR GOVERNMENT ACCEPT IT AND HIM PERIOD THIS ARMED INTERFERENCE BY THE SOVIET IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF AN INDEPENDENT NATION IS MADE AT THE EXACT MOMENT WHEN KHRUSHCHEV IS PROCLAIMING THAT THE SOVIET UNION STRICTLY ADHERES QUOTE TO AN OBLIGATION ON THE PART OF ALL STATES TO DESIST FROM VIOLATING EACH OTHER'S TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY AND SOVEREIGNTY IN ANY FORM AND UNDER ANY PRETEXT WHATSOEVER UNQUOTE PERIOD THIS IS CALCULATED INSOLENCE AGAIN FOR THE PURPOSE OF SHOWING THE WORLD WHAT OUR GOVERNMENT WILL SWALLOW WHILE STILL KOWTOWING TO THE SUPPOSED SOVIET POWER PERIOD PARAGRAPH

THE ARMED AGGRESSION IN LAOS HOWEVER IS ALSO PERFECT JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PRESIDENT TO WITHDRAW HIS INVITATION AND ASK THE SOVIET PREMIER TO POSPONE HIS VISIT PERIOD A FIRM RESOLUTION BY THE UNITED STATES

If You Want It Straight . . .

SENATE REQUESTING THIS ACTION COULD NOT BE IGNORED PERIOD THE ONLY POSSIBLE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE VISIT HAS BEEN THAT IT COULD DO NO HARM AND MIGHT DO SOME GOOD PERIOD THIS VIEW ALREADY WAS COMPLETELY CONTRARY TO ALL PAST EXPERIENCE IN DEALING WITH THE SOVIETS PERIOD BUT THESE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS HAVE MADE EMPHATICALLY CLEAR THAT THE VISIT NOT ONLY WILL DO IMMENSE HARM TO THE WHOLE RESISTANCE WHICH STILL EXISTS AGAINST THE IMPERIALISTIC COMMUNIST ADVANCE BUT HAS BEEN CAREFULLY PLANNED FOR EXACTLY THAT PURPOSE PERIOD ONLY THE SENATE CAN SAVE AMERICAN HONOR PRESTIGE AND POTENTIAL FIRMNESS IN THE FACE OF THIS IMPENDING SUBSERVIENCE TO AN ARCHMURDERER WHO HAS OPENLY BOASTED THAT HE WILL BURY US PERIOD THIS VISIT IS ITSELF AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE STRATEGY BY WHICH HE INTENDS TO DESTROY OUR INDEPENDENCE PERIOD HE AND HIS ACCOMPLICES IN THIS COUNTRY EXPECT THE UNITED STATES SENATE TO LET THE ISSUE GO BY DEFAULT PERIOD IF YOU DO IT IS YOUR COUNTRY GENTLEMEN AND THE COUNTRY YOUR CHILDREN WILL HAVE TO LIVE IN WHICH YOU ARE SURRENDERING STEP BY STEP TO THE SOVIET TYRANNY PERIOD PARAGRAPH

QUOTE ONCE TO EVERY MAN AND NATION COMES THE MOMENT TO DECIDE UNQUOTE PERIOD FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE THIS IS IT PERIOD THIS IS THE POINT AT WHICH BY ONE DETERMINED ACT YOU CAN BEGIN TO TURN BACK THE ADVANCE OF SOVIET RULE WHICH HAS INFLECTED SUCH INCREDIBLE CRUELTY AND HORROR ON MANKIND PERIOD YOU CAN DO SOMETHING OF WHICH YOU PERSONALLY WILL BE

If You Want It Straight . . .

JUSTLY PROUD ALL THE REST OF YOUR DAYS AND THE MEMBERS OF THIS SENATE CAN EARN AN HONORED PLACE IN HISTORY FOR HUNDREDS OF YEARS TO COME BY ONE COURAGEOUS ACT PERIOD THAT ACT WILL CAUSE A WORLDWIDE SHOUT OF APPLAUSE PERIOD IT WILL BE GREETED WITH TEARS OF HAPPINESS AS A BASIS FOR NEW HOPE BY HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF OUR SUFFERING FELLOW HUMAN BEINGS WHO ARE NOW IN UTTER DESPAIR PERIOD I BEG OF YOU AS DO THOSE HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS AND CERTAINLY THE VAST MAJORITY OF YOUR AMERICAN FELLOW CITIZENS TO RISE TO THE OCCASION AND SEIZE THIS OPPORTUNITY FOR GREATNESS PERIOD

HUMBLY AND SINCERELY

ROBERT WELCH

BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

This was a final attempt, by using the one resource of authority which a sufficiently strong appeal might enlist on our side, to win our case. As of the last day we can hold this copy from the printer (even after delaying this issue more than we should have), and although a number of influential people are working on the proposal, the odds are still against the Senate considering and acting on any such resolution. So the odds, while greatly reduced, are still strongly on the side of Khrushchev's arrival on American soil long before this magazine can have been mailed to our readers. Which brings us to the points we have tried so hard to avoid.

The Significance Of Our Hospitality

It would hardly be possible to exaggerate or to overestimate the size or importance of this Communist victory. The former Prime Minister of France, Georges Bidault, has said the acceptance of Khrushchev as an honored guest of our nation, and his tour of the United States in that role, is "the beginning of the capitulation of the free world." And, unless there can be aroused

If You Want It Straight . . .

forces of resistance which do not yet seem visible, we agree. As a help towards making those potential forces aware, we call the attention of all the patriotic Americans we can reach to the following facts and considerations.

1. It is fully known everywhere in the world — in the United States as well as in Russia, in the remaining free countries as well as in the satellites—and not even questioned, that Nikita Khrushchev is, and all of his life has been, a professional liar, thief, and murderer; as vicious a thug and as foul a beast as the human race has ever produced in the guise of a man. By our present action our government has made clear that we have completely abandoned one of the foundations of our position; that moral considerations mean absolutely nothing in the choice of our friends or the determination of our course in international affairs.

Since the Communists publicize and glorify, as a cardinal principle of their doctrine, the assertion that material progress by man's own collective effort is the only good, and that morality is only a superstition, our leaders have now succeeded in bringing our own position much closer to that of the Communists. We have tossed aside one of the strongest ties by which we bound men of good-will, everywhere, to our side. And we have told our own younger generations not to be silly enough to think that character means anything; that only "success," by *any means*, is what counts in the long run.

2. We are already giving to the Soviet tyranny, and throughout Khrushchev's stay here shall increasingly be giving it, on a silver platter and absolutely free of any price or concessions, the greatest amount of favorable propaganda that has ever been put together in one package in the history of the world. Among the purposes of this propaganda are:

(a) To have the Soviet rule, over the peoples and countries already subjugated, accepted as an irreversible *fait accompli*—by the United States, by the rest of the free world whom we are supposedly leading, and by the enslaved peoples themselves.

If You Want It Straight . . .

(b) To destroy Adenauer and with him all really effective opposition to Communism in Germany, by the *entente cordiale* established between Moscow and Washington. The supposed pillar of anti-Communist strength, the United States, on which the West Germans had thought they were leaning, is being converted before their eyes into an obvious outpost and agency of Soviet diplomatic and propaganda pressures.

(c) To knock down and apart, with a great thud made to sound like a huge Communist accomplishment, that straw man called NATO. This greatest and most expensive hoax of all time, fathered by Dean Acheson and nourished by his spiritual successors in our government, has wasted—and worse, spent in ways that were bound eventually to be helpful to the Communists—at least five times as much as the colossal total of admitted “foreign aid” handouts. As a military alliance, and despite the good soldiers of many countries who have been sucked into the motions of implementation, NATO has never been anything but a monstrous and deceptive fraud—as we pointed out in print from the very day Dean Acheson’s gang announced in Lisbon, many years ago, that the new plans for NATO called for the expenditure of three hundred billion dollars! But worse than useless as it has been, the visible crack-up of even the pretense of this allied military solidarity against Communist aggression can be made into a psychological triumph for the Soviets. That crack-up will be complete by the time Eisenhower and Khrushchev finish drinking Vodka and Bourbon together in this exchange of visits.

(d) To give tremendous impetus to all forms of “cultural exchanges.” If the heads of state can hop back and forth across the one-way Iron Curtain, to fraternize with each other in their respective palaces and villas, then certainly the artists and writers and scientists and “religious leaders,” and even manufacturers and farmers and ordinary citizens, can and will gradually wipe out any lingering “reactionary” thought that there is any difference between their citizens or their “culture” and our own—or even any significant difference between our

If You Want It Straight . . .

two "systems" and ways of life. We will be sold the "understanding" that the Soviet system is approaching capitalism in its freedoms and achievements, while we are approaching socialism in our methods and outlook, to the extent that the differences are no longer basic or material. The ultimate goal, of so changing the political and economic structure of the United States, and of *appearing* so to change the "way of life" in the Soviet empire, that both "can be comfortably merged" into a one-world socialist government, will be many long steps nearer by the time Khrushchev gets through being "honored" in Los Angeles, and Eisenhower in turn finishes drinking all the toasts offered in the Kremlin.

(e) To bring the whole world, including the people of the United States, closer to the conviction that resistance to Communism is doomed; and that the ultimate victory of the Soviet tyranny in establishing its one-world rule is inevitable. The next step for millions of waverers in the fight is to relax and ride the wave.

(f) To make millions on millions of people throughout the world, and especially otherwise intelligent American citizens, believe that the alternative to the "peace" offered by the Communists — if we do not accept their terms — is a horrible war which they would instigate. The "peaceful coexistence" which they offer is to be tied to economic cooperation and competition, which really means our doing everything possible to help their sick economy, while giving them enough time to complete their infiltration and propaganda drive to take us over. But Khrushchev will do just enough sabre-rattling at the right times and in the right way while here to make clear that, if we do not accept this "peaceful competition," the Soviets will use military means to gain their objectives.

The truth is that even in the final stages of World War II, when the German High Command finally had sense enough to put the Russian anti-Communist General Vlasow in the field in a German uniform, a quarter of a million Russian soldiers, even with the smell of victory in their nostrils, deserted and

If You Want It Straight . . .

went over to the Germans. The truth is that, as recently as 1956 in Hungary, so many thousands of the Soviet troops went over to the freedom-fighters that Khrushchev had to use Mongolian crews for his tanks that subjugated the youth of Budapest. The truth is that Khrushchev could not today count on even his own best trained divisions, in any clearcut war between Communist tyranny and those fighting against it. The truth is that, as Lloyd Mallan and others have recently pointed out, all the Soviet pretense today of having such invincible and destructive bombs and missiles and other weapons is just as big a lie as those Khrushchev tells about everything else. And the most important truth of all is that a clear-cut war of any real size between the Soviets and their enemies would be an *automatic* signal for the one thing the Kremlin tyrants fear above all else: a *simultaneous* uprising of the enslaved peoples.

The Soviets do not use their vaunted divisions and tanks and supermodern weapons to fight, except in tiny piecemeal wars and "police actions" to subjugate rebellion in already conquered territory. It is only the *threat* of using this supposed military might to which their thinking — or their military resources — are adjusted. But Khrushchev has and will have plenty of propaganda agents and misguided dupes in this country to help him make huge numbers of the American people believe that his third-rate country — with everything in the show case and nothing in the storage room — could enter at will on a huge war in the conventional sense. This will be the most false, and yet probably the most effective, strain of the total bleating of the tremendous propaganda chorus started on its meticulously synchronized croaking by his visit.

(3) All of the harmful and dangerous results of the Khrushchev visit are not only well known to plenty of people high up in our government; but many of these same people have helped in the planning to bring about both the visit and these foreseen results. You might as well stop all of that wishful thinking, gentle reader, and get over that reluctance to face the horrible truth. Stupidity on our side cannot possibly account

If You Want It Straight

for the marvelous meshing together and brilliantly ordered procession of these disastrous developments.

Any school child who will stop swallowing the disingenuous hypocrisy pouring out of our State Department and other government agencies, long enough to look objectively at what is happening right before his eyes, can see one thing clearly and unmistakably. Handing Khrushchev a royal reception and tour as our honored guest, under the conditions which have led up to the visit and under the international circumstances which prevail today, is giving aid and comfort to the most vicious and dangerous and determined enemies this country has ever faced. It is being done in the midst of a war — in which actual fighting is going on in Laos, in Tibet, in Cuba, in Indonesia, in many other parts of the world today—which is none the less war because the Soviet Union fights that war with its own preferred weapons of trickery, terror, and treason. And Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States defines the giving of aid and comfort to our country's enemies as *treason*. There is no other word to describe the course of those men in our government who have plotted and engineered this betrayal.

(4) But the visit of Khrushchev is, basically, only one manifestation and one result of those treasonous influences at work. As early as 1944 Stalin quietly boasted that he was in virtual control of the American government. That control by the Kremlin — or Communist influence, if you prefer a more euphemistic expression — has increased steadily since 1944, and by leaps and bounds since 1953. Practicing "togetherness" with the Kremlin butchers, on the part of our front men, is merely or mainly a colossal propaganda and psychological "assist" which they have been pushed into by these Communist influences and controls — or in some cases have opportunistically gone along with because they too wanted to ride the "wave of the future."

For twenty years, however, this treason at work—throughout misguided idealists and dupes as well as conscious agents —

If You Want It Straight

has been steadily handing the Kremlin more tangible victories. Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Yugoslavia, China, and many other nations come to mind at once. The chief difference today is in the greater brazenness, and more arrogant contempt of the opposition, with which the same treasonous course is pursued. Our government for months has been furnishing the arms with which the Communist Sukarno — making clear his pro-Communism and his hatred of the United States at every turn — has been suppressing the anti-Communist rebels in Sumatra and sending his SOBSI gangs to murder the Christian natives of the Moluccas. Our government supplied the necessary help to oust Batista and install the Communist, Fidel Castro, in Cuba. Our government is boldly and effectively supporting the Communist-led guerillas in Algeria, who are an exact replica — in their methods, cruelties, and purposes — of the Mao Tse-tung-led Communist guerillas in China of a quarter of a century ago. For more than a year our government brazenly poured its foreign aid millions into the hands of Souphannou Vong, as Minister of Planning in the government of Laos, despite the fact that Vong was admittedly the leading Communist in the country — and despite the fact that this magazine, and many others, repeatedly printed the story of this betrayal while it was happening. Today Souphannou Vong, after being so aided and financed, is leading the Communist invasion troops in Laos. And the list is interminable.

The truth is not only that our own Federal Government in Washington, D. C., is now completely under the control of increasingly impudent and shameless traitors, whose treason is perfectly obvious to anybody who will quit looking at their deeds and the unchanging results of those deeds through rose-colored spectacles. It is, far worse, that the most powerful help and effective support of Communist activities, operations, and rapid advance, everywhere in the world, is now being supplied by our government — and has been, though with more cunning and concealment until recently — for several years. By 1953 or 1954 the Communists had succeeded in their two greatest

If You Want It Straight

achievements since the October Revolution of 1917. One was in taking over our government, for all practical purposes, to such an extent that it became in fact, and has remained, the most powerful and useful agency of the International Communist Conspiracy. The second was in acquiring sufficient influence over our press and mass media of information as to keep the first accomplishment hidden — as much and as long as necessary — from the vast majority of the American people.

Even today, despite all of the ground the Communists have gained through our aid and support, and despite the terrifying momentum of their present progress, we would not even have to consider *fighting* the Soviets to stop them. All we would have to do would be to make our government stop *actively helping* the Communists, everywhere in the world, to have the whole overextended fraud of bluff, terroristic but thin shell of police power, and imperial pretenses, start falling apart under the millions of hammer blows of internal and native resistance.

We have been saying all of these things — over and over, unfortunately — in this magazine for four years. We pointed them out, with equal emphasis, in a small book called *May God Forgive Us* in 1952. Little by little we, and other toilers in the same vineyard, have waked up a few more and then a few more of our fellow citizens to what was actually happening right under their noses. And those few in turn have waked up others. Maybe the Khrushchev visit will have one further result, besides those we have listed, and one definitely not intended by the cunning enemies of our country — and of mankind — who planned it with such beautiful timing from their point of view. It may help us and those now sizable numbers who are aware of its significance, to awaken more millions of good Americans to the horror and imminence of the danger that is closing in on us from all sides. The need is certainly upon us. For a much more massive resistance must be aroused, and firmly led, if we are to save for our children and their children any semblance of the glorious country and humane civilization which we ourselves inherited.

CONFETTI

We like the honest old gentleman with a lot of ailments, who was asked by the newcomer in the town:

"How are you today, Uncle Billy?"

"Son," the old man inquired bluntly, "are you sure you got time for the answer?"

* * *

The English minister was having a heart to heart talk with one of his younger parishioners.

"John," he said, "I hear you have been raising false hopes in the breasts of some of the young girls. Rumor whispers that you are engaged to one girl of this parish, another in Little Dells to the north of here, and a third in Fair Oaks, south of here. How can you do such things?"

"It isn't too hard," John replied. "I've got a bicycle."

* * *

The professor in the Medical College passed around a large x-ray plate.

"This patient limps," he explained. "One leg is an inch shorter than the other. Now, Smith, what would you do in a case like this?"

The student thought a moment before declaring: "Well, sir, I imagine I'd limp, too."

* * *

It was open house on board ship. A young sailor was dutifully escorting an old lady around, explaining the workings of the craft.

Inquisitive old lady: "And what do you do, sonny, if it leaks?"

Bored sailor: "Oh, we just put a pan under it, Ma'am."

* * *

As they pulled onto a lonely section of beach the car suddenly stopped. The boy gave a resigned shrug.

"Out of gas," he muttered.

Nenchalantly, the girl opened her

bag and pulled out a flask.

"Hey, you're all *right!*" exclaimed the lady-killer. "Is it Scotch or Bourbon?"

The girl smiled sweetly and said, "Gas."

* * *

Mark Twain was visiting H. H. Rogers and the host led the humorist into his library.

"There," he said, as he pointed to a bust of white marble. "What do you think of that?"

It was a bust of a young woman, coiling her hair—a graceful example of Italian sculpture. Mr. Clemens looked at it for a moment, and then said:

"It isn't true to nature."

"Why not?" asked his host.

"She ought to have her mouth full of hairpins."

* * *

In honor of a visit paid to his factory by a party of distinguished Englishmen, a well known automobile manufacturer had a complete car assembled in three minutes.

Some weeks after the feat was heralded in the daily papers, the phone at the plant rang rigorously. "Is it true that you assembled a car in three minutes at your factory?" the voice asked.

"Yes," came the reply. "Why?"

"Oh, nothing," said the calm inquirer, "only I've got the car."

* * *

"I see you have your arm in a sling," said the inquisitive passenger. "Broken, isn't it?"

"Yes, sir," responded the other passenger.

"Meet with an accident?"

"No. Broke it while trying to pat myself on the back."

"Great Scott, what for?"

"For minding my own business."

WHAT WE MUST KNOW ABOUT OVERSTREET

by

EDWARD JANISCH

FEW BOOKS ON Communism have been favored with the bright publicity that has surrounded the Overstreets' *What We Must Know About Communism*. The late Mr. Dulles recommended that the President read it. Newspaper and TV pictures followed, showing Eisenhower with the book in his hand. With such high endorsement to help, the book has gone through many printings. Some metropolitan dailies have run it in installments. An inexpensive paperback edition of this "masterful study of Communism" has been prepared for use as a college text. And the ghost of Stalin must be whispering to Khrushchev, "for this, there should be dancing on our side of the street."

I say this because Overstreet, over the years, has lent his name to Communist causes and his pen to a program of softening us to the threat of the conspiracy. His recent book on Communism does not, in my opinion, represent a departure from the general line of his leftist thinking, except for a clever surface attack, on Communism. The book is dynamite for the unsuspecting general reader who may pick it up as a guide to Communism because of the official fanfares of praise he has heard. If what I say sounds alarmist, it is because I intend that it should. What we must know about Overstreet is just as alarming as what we must *really* know about Communism.

Harry Allen Overstreet, retired pro-

fessor and chairman of the philosophy department at City College of New York, and now lecturer and writer on psychology, mental health, adult education, and communism, has fostered in his writings a materialistic outlook that has ranged from orthodox Marxism to cultural relativism. It is Overstreet who fathered the notion of the "mature mind." If you agree with his radical beliefs, you are "mature." If, on the other hand, you are one of those *backward souls* who believes in God, love of country, free enterprise, investigations of Communism, and if you have other similar attitudes respected by the overwhelming majority of Americans, then you are "immature"; and quite possibly, according to Professor Overstreet, you are on the road to mental illness.

What I have said is not *my* imagination running wild. It is the core of Overstreet's thinking, made abundantly clear for anyone who will take the trouble to read even a few of his books. Some of them are: *The Enduring Quest* (1931), *A Declaration of Interdependence* (1937), *The Mature Mind* (1949), *The Great Enterprise* (1952); and those books written jointly with his wife, Bonaro Overstreet, *The Mind Alive* (1954), *The Mind Goes Forth* (1956), and the recent, *What We Must Know About Communism* (1958).

All of these books have had wide circulation. But I must caution the prospective reader. Overstreet is as slick and slippery as an Owen Lattimore. His

What We Must Know About Overstreet

writings are one of the little webs which, along with many other webs, the Communists weave together to make up the Big Lie of their total web of deception. He does his work with half-truth, glittering generality, misplaced emphasis, significant omission, and other tricks that mark the profic popularizer and propaganda hack. The trained reader, however, who is able to find his way through the silver linings into the dark clouds themselves, will soon see that what appear on the surface of Overstreet's writings to be the grandiose schemes of a super-idealist are, in fact, rank examples of leftist propaganda.

II

A SAMPLE OF THIS master of confusion at work might serve as a good introduction to his background. Professor Overstreet writes in *The Mind Alive*, 1954, that he and his wife recently "had occasion . . . to try to clear up, not only for the record but for our own minds, certain tenuous associations one of us had a decade or more ago with several groups that were later shown to be tainted by Communist infiltration . . . we went to Washington and to the office of one individual who . . . was known for his 'toughness toward anything that savored of Communism. We put our problem to him—particularly with regard to one organization which we could only vaguely place but that he told us had been practicing a calculated subversion even at the time when one of us had unsuspectingly signed one of its petitions. He laid the facts before us—and they were striking enough to make us feel abashed . . ."

Here is indeed a touching picture of

injured innocence, painted with tears. But it is highly deceptive. Before I deal with those "tenuous associations," I should like to skim over the social philosophy of poor, unsuspecting, abashed Professor Overstreet.

His *Mature Mind*, 1949, had an unusually profound respect for Karl Marx, whose "piled up proofs" of the abuses of the economic processes "was a job well done." For Overstreet, this was a "triumph of logic," and Marx's "urgent demand that working men stop taking the economic order for granted was a bid for the increased use of the mind." It's unfortunate though, the professor tells us, that the "social regeneration" was to be accomplished by force. What, other than Marx's exhortation to revolution and violence, does Overstreet mean by "urgent demand?"

Karl Marx in his own lifetime would have been delighted to know what an American professor would proclaim in 1949: Our economic system uses fear as a weapon to such an extent that everywhere, men and women are terrified over the prospect of losing their jobs; the system is so bad as to cause a *dominant* fear by ten-year-old American children that their fathers will lose their jobs and end up on the industrial scrapheap. And that's not all. According to Overstreet: "Our strange economy has never been interested in the whole human being, but only in those aspects of his nature from which some monetary profit could be derived." Unsuspecting, "abashed" Overstreet is of the opinion that industry, business and some of the professions have acted as a conspiracy to prevent raising the standard of living, so that they could make bigger profits.

I don't want to belabor the point, but

What We Must Know About Overstreet

one of Overstreet's earlier ideas, penned in 1931, is as good an index of his thinking as any: "Until various sharp-eyed men of a more realistic turn saw through the pleasant sham, it was a prevalent habit to praise the workers as the salt of the earth and quote Scripture to them about the virtue of industry... In those days the simple workers, thus bedazzled, would fling up their caps and cheer lustily in honor of their own greatness and glory." Marx put it much more simply: "Religion is the opium of the people." And Lenin, another favorite of Overstreet, used the words, "spiritual gin." When the facts were laid before him, unsuspecting Dr. Overstreet felt "abashed."

III

WITH THIS AS BACKGROUND, it might be well to investigate those "tenuous associations" that Overstreet could only vaguely recall. After all, this man-of-the-mature-mind tells us in 1949, the "thing we can do to make clear the image of maturing is to associate ourselves with groups that promote maturing." He associated himself with the following nine Communist front organizations, stretching from the 1930's to August, 1950:

Member, New York Committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on letterheads dated September, 1939 and December, 1939. Signer of petition, January, 1940; sponsor, according to a leaflet, of a Rally held in April, 1940.

The Daily Worker, August, 1950 reported that Overstreet had signed a statement against denaturalization is-

sued by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. This Committee had been officially listed *as subversive a number of years before Overstreet lent it his support.*

Signed a public statement of the American Committee to Save Refugees. Again, this Committee had been officially declared subversive *before Overstreet gave it his support.*

Professor Overstreet was listed on the letterhead of the Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, February, 1938; also, he was Committee member of the Medical Bureau, American Friends (see their letterhead, November, 1936; *New Masses*, January, 1937).

Member of Descendants of the American Revolution, as shown by the *Daily Worker*, February, 1939. Also named as sponsor on the pamphlet, "Descendants of the American Revolution."

Signed circular for Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Signer, 1943, of message of National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to United States House of Representatives. *Again, this front was listed before Overstreet lent it his support.*

Signer of a letter sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee, October, 1944. *Again, this front was listed before Overstreet lent it his support.*

"Children in Concentration Camps" reveals that Professor Overstreet was

What We Must Know About Overstreet

a sponsor of the Spanish Relief Campaign.

Surely there is nothing "flimsy" or "slight" — or *tenuous* — about so impressive a background of Communist front associations. And when Overstreet writes "associations of . . . a decade or more ago," he apparently does not mean, by "decade," ten years. What of his claim that several groups "were later shown to be tainted by Communist infiltration?" A quick check of the list will show that American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, American Committee to Save Refugees, The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, The Schappes Defense Committee — *all of these*, as we have indicated above, *were listed before Dr. Overstreet lent them his services*. Some one is telling tales, and it is not the public record.

In sum, what Overstreet wrote in *The Mind Alive*, 1954, is a calculated mis-statement of the facts; the "associations" were specific, not "tenuous"; the "decade or so ago" omits his more recent activities; and the "later shown to be Communist-tainted" is a bold fairy tale.

Dr. Overstreet fails to mention, in *The Mind Alive*, that six months earlier, on July 21, 1953, he had filed an affidavit with the House Un-American Activities Committee at *his own* request. He did this, he claims in the affidavit, to set the record straight, and because patriotic groups were disturbing his lecture plans in California and Arizona. Possibly the Professor had other reasons for attempting to "purify" himself, but he has not made them public.

His reasoning in the affidavit is well

worth a close examination, and it is just as loaded as the statement on "tenuous associations."

Dr. Overstreet states that he has never been a Communist or a sympathizer with Communist tactics or philosophy, except for a brief hope that the Russian Revolution might lead to democracy in Russia. Also, that he never knowingly helped a movement or organization that had Communist aims. Can it be that this educated man, this professor of philosophy and psychology, this nation-wide lecturer, this "mature" mind, who is mentioned nine times as lending his name to Communist causes, did *so all nine times* without knowing what he was doing? Yes, he tells us, and without blushing.

He tells us that one of the reasons why he made these "mistakes" was because he was "profoundly aware of the rising menace of fascism," but that he was not "in any equal measure aware of communist infiltration." Our *new expert* on Communism adds, that when appeals came to him that sounded humanitarian, he had "little or no suspicion that they might be communist." How much, Professor Overstreet, is a "little?" Further, since his retirement at CCNY, he has led a "nomadic life," lecturing all over the country. Hence, he reacted to these organizations on "cursory" information. A most immature thing for a mature mind to do. Besides, claims Overstreet, as if to clinch his argument, in his writings he has consistently "stated and restated (his) confidence in our American way of life." This should prove that he was not favoring Communism. In this double talk Professor Overstreet could hardly have been referring to his passage on "Our strange economy," which

What We Must Know About Overstreet

is a good example of his "confidence" in our way of life.

The specific reasons he offers for lending his name to the Communist fronts include: A number of names on a list were so impressive, he thought this reason enough to sign; a petition sounded convincing; he always tends to contribute to refugee causes; for the Spanish fronts, he had a complete belief and he was "very tardy and reluctant" about changing his mind on these; some strangers came to his hotel room and asked him if he would like to join a group more liberal than the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution, and he said yes; he hated Schappes, a fellow teacher, and felt guilty about it, so he signed the petition to make sure he was being fair.

Time won't permit a detailed analysis of all of these tenuous excuses, but I do want to examine his statement on the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. Here, he signed a Communist protest against the proceedings of the Dies Committee, and he adds, "I still feel that the House Committee hearings *as they were being conducted at that time* called for protest." Professor Overstreet adds that, "almost up to the present" he had underestimated Communist infiltration; hence, he did not see the need for the Committee.

The reader might get the impression that Overstreet is talking about the 1930's. I shall show shortly that one of the most savage attacks in either English or Russian was made by Overstreet, not only against the Hon. Martin Dies, but against the Committee in general, and "McCarthyism," in 1952! When Overstreet tells us in his affidavit of 1953 that he has now "definitely" changed his mind, he is using

Newspeak or his personality has undergone shock treatment—and I do not think it is the latter.

Professor Overstreet explains that "there may seem to be a discrepancy between my prolonged self-searching . . . and my signing . . . of petitions that I did not investigate at all. I can only say that . . . I was not yet suspicious of Communist infiltration of humanitarian causes." Seem to be? This is more calculated nonsense! These are listed *Communist fronts*, pure and simple, and *not* "humanitarian causes."

For what it's worth, our new expert on Communism ends his 1953 affidavit by stating: "I am no longer in doubt about the Communist threat." To show his good faith, he indicates that he testified before a Senate Committee, where he stated that Communists ought not teach; and, that he is writing a book about the psychological threat Communism poses. And woe to us from that book and the others he has written.

IV

OVERSTREET QUOTED from his own writings to demonstrate to *his* personal satisfaction that he had never been sympathetic to Communism. I shall use this method to examine his writings from 1949 to the writing of his book on *Communism* in 1958. From an examination of themes from *his* books, the reader can decide to what purposes Professor Overstreet has been sympathetic.

(1) First, though the order is not important, he *savagely denounces Congressional investigations of Communism; and, later, he steadily minimizes their work to nothingness.* Dr. Overstreet in 1952, shortly before he filed his affidavit with the House Un-American Activities Committee, wrote one of the

What We Must Know About Overstreet

most vicious attacks on Congressional investigations ever printed. He pictures the Hon. Martin Dies as a malicious reactionary, who has used the cover of a feigned Communist threat to smash liberal ideas, and all ideas. Similarly, Overstreet finds "McCarthyism" a "ruthless" imitation of the techniques of totalitarianism. The professor charges that the House Committee, "far from guarding our nation against subversives," has used the trust of the American people "to subvert certain American freedoms . . . It has been able, in an alarming degree, to terrorize non-conformity into silence." Venom-spewing Overstreet insists that the Committee's practices "had been a favorite method of totalitarianism." The hearings "appear" to be imitating "the mass trials of Communist China (where) thousands of the accused were disposed of by the roar of the 'People's' Court—Kill—Kill—Kill!"

That is what Overstreet wrote in 1952. The discerning reader will not be amazed by the shifts and dodges concocted in *The Mind Alive*, two years later, 1954, where the professor piously tells us that, in 1952, he and his wife sat at a Senate Internal Security Committee Hearing and observed some cynical Communists "actually" using obstructionist tactics. It doesn't take "abashed" Overstreet long to get back to his line. The trouble is, he writes, these Committees were "amateurishly set up," because we are all amateurs to this "age of conspiracy," and, "the type of person to be hunted out and exposed was so vaguely defined that wide latitude was given to ignorance, prejudice, partisan animosity, political ambition, and/or the publicity hunter. Also, because the methods to be used

were so unprecedented, proper safeguards were not provided "against harming the innocent." What is the difference between this double talk and his vicious slander in 1952?

Overstreet next quickly gets rid of the various government listings with a slick discourse on: "What kind of research has preceded the listing? Does it mean . . . ?" And with a host of similar absurd questions, unsuspecting, duped Overstreet demonstrates that listings are subject to error and no answer to the Communist threat. Loyalty oaths go the same way. And he writes that the alternative to government investigations "is an effective inside program for preventing Communist infiltration."

This man who himself claims that he was duped, and who allegedly would not himself read the reports citing the Communist fronts to which he lent his name, is now asking citizens to do *their own* policing and to read about Communism.

His line two years later, in 1956, cautions us against "cynical Communists," and at the same time warns us against "subverting the constitution by using words such as "Fifth Amendment Communist." In 1958 the House Committee is not mentioned, in what purports to be a guide to *what we must know about Communism*, except in *one* sentence, where the Committee is included among an assortment of groups that have said that Negroes are loyal.

Is it necessary to mention that Overstreet stated in his 1953 affidavit to the House Committee that he has "definitely changed his mind," and now recognizes the necessity for the Committee to investigate "undercover subversion" of the Conspiracy "on a full time

American Opinion
Belmont 78, Massachusetts

Gentlemen:

Please enter my subscription to AMERICAN
OPINION for one year, for which I enclose \$ 5.00

*(The paragraphs below should be ignored unless you
wish to enter additional subscriptions for others.)*

Also, on the back of this sheet are the names
and addresses of friends for whom I should
like to have you enter subscriptions for one
year. The total enclosed for these subscrip-
tions is \$_____

To enable you to reach as many congressmen,
senators, state legislators, educators and
other opinion-molders as possible, by your
own selection of names from your own list, I
am covering the cost for you to enter such
subscriptions at \$5.00 each, by enclosing an
additional \$_____

The total of my remittance is \$_____

Sincerely,

(Name) _____

(Address) _____

Names And Addresses For Additional Subscriptions

Name _____

Address _____

Name _____

Address _____

Name _____

Address _____

Name _____

Address _____

Name _____

Address _____

basis
supp
and
keep
(2
Prof
syste
who
cists
orde
that
1953
and
Amc
some
Over
itari
(tha
ing
sum
brav
ener
kick
the
may
ceiv
ernn
Orw
Ove
that
brav
D
a we
triot
phra
the
thin
acten
ican
agai
T
ne a
Russ
about
houn

OCT

What We Must Know About Overstreet

basis?" Maybe it is. He changes his supposed views so rapidly, so cleverly, and so boldly that you need a guide to keep up with him.

(2) A second important theme in Professor Overstreet's writings is his systematic *attack on anti-Communists, whom he likens to hate-mongers, fascists, and—especially—personality disorder cases*. The reader will remember that Overstreet stressed in his affidavit, 1953, that he has consistently "stated and restated" his "confidence in our American way of life." Let's look at some more of that "confidence," *à la Overstreet*, in 1949: "Political authoritarianism is now in such full swing," (that) "while a man looks silly kicking a chair, he can,—our political assumptions being what they are—look brave, loyal, and patriotic kicking an enemy who has been officially labelled 'kickable'." The Professor adds that if the man "kicks hard enough . . . he may even be appointed to office or receive a monthly stipend from his government." Freedom is slavery, and Orwell's ghost might well consult Overstreet to get the proper *Newspeak* that equals "confidence" in this age of brave, new experts on Communism.

Dr. Overstreet uses "psychology" as a weapon for his smear attacks on patriots. *Character structure* is a key phrase in his arsenal, and from 1949 on, the professor insists that there is something deficient or defective in the character or personality structure of Americans who are resolute in their fight against Communism.

Thus, in 1952, Overstreet whined that he and his ilk who "saw hope in the Russian Revolution," and who cared about "injustice," were now being hounded by patriots who were skeptical

of his dodges. More often than not, Overstreet claims, these *hounders* were satisfied with "prevailing inhumanities; or were ignorant of them; or were morally indifferent to them . . . They hate communism . . . much as communism hated fascism and Nazism." Sly Overstreet cautions his readers to: "*Beware of the wolves in our midst in anti-Communist clothing.*" All of this "hostility" and "disguised totalitarianism," claims the professor, is a conspiracy, not to root out subversives, but to "smash the liberals." And if you don't know this, you're "a lamb among the wolves. *And what are we among the Overstreets?*"

Dr. Overstreet wages the same psychological warfare in 1954, as he smashes out at the determined efforts of patriots by labelling them "exaggerated expressions of personality problems; as hostility and frustration on the rampage; as deep emotional insecurity venting itself."

The line doesn't change with time. In 1956 he simply has found more "scientific evidence" for his former notions on *authoritarian personalities and sick anti-Communists*. By 1958, our new what-have-you-in-Communist-expert-clothing has it that the "majority" of anti-Communists "are still inventing the Communism to which they are opposed: fashioning it out of what they have hated and feared in the American scene." Please note the use of the word "majority"—*Overstreet has not been attacking some lone crank or disgruntled clique.*

(3) The first two themes eliminated Congressional investigations of Communism and the vigilant work of private citizens. The next important theme represents one of Overstreet's *solutions*

What We Must Know About Overstreet

to the problem of Communism. Dr. Overstreet would "enlighten" his readers about the Communist Conspiracy, but then tell them that "understanding," not tough laws, is the way to deal with it.

The time is 1952, as he asks: "Has the reader had the uncanny experience of being called a Communist because he has expressed a liberal view?" A few of Overstreet's liberal views in that year include his denunciation of security procedures for obtaining passports (the professor must be happy on that score today), and his belief that loyalty oaths are an imitation of "Communist methods" and an infringement on personal rights "so long as (the person) performs no acts that go counter to the laws of the land." They further include such a "liberal view" as that the way to resolve the conflict with Russia is through "contacts with cultures" or that we must achieve "the toleration of certain minimal differences within even the most tyrannical culture, with all such toleration implies in the way of the re-animation of men's minds." *Let's all get re-animated with a certain minimal amount of Communism.*

Overstreet in 1954 alerts us to the "new and startling story we are beginning to learn." "We must do something," to counter this "'real and present danger.'" But contrary to the Court, which used 'real and present' instead of *clear and present danger*, to show that conspiracy to initiate a revolution when the time is ripe is a grave crime, Overstreet orders our common defense as follows: "The program does not invite us to do enough things to the enemy directly and forcibly." Rather, we are supposed to "do things to ourselves" — whatever that double

talk means —that will make us less vulnerable to a "Conspiratorial Communist." Overstreet tells us that a "direct hitting out" at Communism is a "dubious contribution." It's rather strange that Professor Overstreet can use the *real and present danger* language of the Court, and still recommend that we defend ourselves by doing nothing about Communism.

But it's not strange that Overstreet's 1954 "real and present danger" becomes a chapter on "Clear and Present Danger" in 1956. The double talk was no longer necessary by then. The professor now tells us that we must do the opposite of the "extremist" and adopt "the far more exacting and lonely tactics of the moderating mind." This means "respecting the established habits and attitudes, vested interests, traditions, and deep loyalties of the individuals and groups on both sides of a given issue." We ought to invite both sides to think of these issues "as able to be modified." After all, writes Overstreet, the position on a given issue is "partly, rather than absolutely right," and it is a product of "human history rather than 'nature.'" Isn't Dr. Overstreet saying, let's *respect* Communism, and *modify* our stand? After all, we're only partly right, and besides, our belief in natural principles will fall to pieces once we accept the human history concept of Marxism.

(4) The 'we're only partly right' tactic of Overstreet goes back to his *Mature Mind*, 1949, and serves as a key to the next interwoven theme: *Seek understanding and agreement with the Soviet Union*. Despite the Communist gobbling up of Eastern Europe, he tells us not to adopt the "we-are-good-and-you-are-not-so-good" attitude in dealing

What We Must Know About Overstreet

with Russia.

In 1952, Dr. Overstreet gives us the startling news that the Soviet Regime has murdered upwards of 3,000,000 peasants (how modest he is with his statistics). But before long he advises us that people are never as bad or as good "as the doctrines they profess." It would be a "great mistake" to believe that "all of the Russian government" is "irrevocably committed in practice to the wholly collectivised man." And I think it would be a fatal mistake to believe Overstreet.

Professor Overstreet's defense program in that year of the Korean war called for "weakening the enemy from within" . . . making his resistance less because he finds less he is called upon to resist . . . we are fighting, "not an immutable doctrine called communism but mutable people who call themselves communists."

Two years later, in 1954, Dr. Overstreet writes approvingly that in Korea "the way to settlement is being sought *without either side having won.*" It is not surprising that he is pleased that we were fighting a war we were not permitted to win. What is needed, Overstreet tells us, is participation in United Nations projects that foster "mutual respect." He isn't, of course, referring to a police action.

And what is our mature mind thinking in 1956? Nuclear developments are such "that the *danger inherent in war* now precludes *the danger of there being a war.*" This new tactic of his, throwing a smoke cloud over the Kremlin's clear plan to use military stratagems and pre-emptive wars, depending on the chance of success, should be watched closely. The thing to do in this cold war, which Overstreet *insists*

will not get hot, is to work through the United Nations for "mutual understanding rather than . . . proud stand-pattism." Our "weapons" will be "ideas" and "patterns of human relationships." Overstreet's line doesn't change one bit in *What We Must Know About Communism*, in 1958.

(5) Now that we've got rid of every imaginable program of defense against Communism, and realize that our best defense is "mutual understanding," we might consider briefly the fifth theme from Overstreet which I have selected: *Renunciation of patriotism for world citizenship.*

Harry Allen Overstreet has no room in his heart for singular love of his country. He attacks patriotism as if it were a disease. In 1949 he tells us that "an emotional tie-up" with our own group, so that we think it is more right and reasonable than other groups, makes us "hostile." Dr. Overstreet especially denounces our political institutions for making us "hostile," and for shouting "treason" at those who are trying to build the "supra-ethnic mind."

In 1952, the professor lauds "the mature individual" whose "voice and vote can be enlisted in opposition to the chauvinistic nationalism and in support of the more genuine patriotism of a united mankind." Two years later, it is the same thing, only more so. Now, our "good-will" ought to include even the "enemy"; unlike the "emotionally disturbed individual" who is against the unfamiliar and the foreign, we need the "extraordinary health and faith" of a "sense of the species."

In 1956 Overstreet spells out precisely what he means by "one world." "Why," he asks, "should we lock ourselves up

What We Must Know About Overstreet

with our tight walls of national suspicion—glaring at one another—when we might have a far better time of it by talking things over together; getting the hand of one another's problems; lending a hand?" *Lending a hand (tenuously?)*.

This brief picture I've developed — and it *is* brief in relation to all of the things Overstreet has said and written — represents the background of our new expert on Communism. His past record is enough to alarm even the most forgiving and gentle nature.

But what is truly fantastic, is that Professor Overstreet could take his former leftist notions, plus some deadly new ones, and boldly throw them into a book on Communism that has won the approval of our top policy-makers.

V

ANOTHER GENERATION—if we are still free—may well remember the Overstreets' *What We Must Know About Communism*, as a stupendous attempt that was designed to soften us at the very hour of our crisis. I say this, because the book attempts to make palatable certain notions which would, if accepted by large numbers of Americans, render us helpless in the face of the onslaught of World Communism.

Here is a book on Communism in which not one of J. Edgar Hoover's somber warnings is mentioned—(Overstreet mentions the F.B.I. chief as being opposed to outlawing the Party). Here's a book in which espionage, a major activity and purpose of the Party, gets less than a page of asides. In short, it is a book as conspicuous by what it omits as by what it includes. A brief examination of some of Overstreet's central ideas will show what I mean.

The first stick of dynamite planted by the professor is a "new look" for Khrushchev. The Red boss is a "leader of the Lenin type," who is opposed to a Stalinist cult-of-the-personality dictatorship. Good evidence of this is Premier Khrushchev's February, 1956 speech exposing Stalin. Actually, "Khrushchev adheres consistently and most strictly to the principles of collective leadership and fights energetically for the observance of the Leninist standards of Party life." *Every quotation in this paragraph is taken from the latest official Soviet biography of Khrushchev—and I have used it without fear because it summarizes concisely Professor Overstreet's position, and duplicates much of his language.*

The second phase of this "new look" is to picture "professional" Party-man Khrushchev as a "humane" sort of fellow who is opposed to using terror on a Stalinist scale, unless it is forced on him, as it was in Hungary, where he was protecting a vital interest of the Revolution. Thus, the Overstreets would have us believe that "No one, perhaps, has felt the brunt of Khrushchev's terror more decisively than have the Soviet writers." Hungarians, treated as an aside in this context, would hardly agree with Overstreet's estimate of Khrushchev's terror or its most likely target. They, as do countless millions of others, know him for the savage that he is.

What is the purpose of this "new look," which pictures Khrushchev as a humane, collective-type leader dedicated to Partyism? It is to show us that this "professional" does not want a hot war with us. This is Overstreet's second stick of dynamite.

Khrushchev wants to defeat us

What We Must Know About Overstreet

through economic competition, and only in this way, claims Dr. Overstreet. The Russians intend to win, the professor tells us, and this new type of "co-existence" is part of the "permanent revolution." Watch the tricks of propagandist Overstreet:

"It would be sheer folly, however, for us to think that such competition with the Soviet Union can be peaceful. Khrushchev has already made clear that he rates it as a non-shooting phase of the 'permanent revolution' . . ."

Please reread that statement. It is perfect Newspeak: It's folly to think that the competition can be peaceful; but it is non-shooting! Let me complete the quotation to show once more what we are up against with Overstreet.

"... This means that every positive policy we adopt, every creative program we set up for cultural exchange or foreign aid, *will be declared by the Soviet Union and all Communist Parties around the world to be a form of imperialism.*"

We'd like to have Professor Overstreet name for us just one Communist, of his acquaintance or otherwise, who is opposed to "cultural exchange"! No amount of build-up, with words like "positive policy" and "creative program," can alter the fact that "cultural exchange" is a dearly held Communist idea, never denounced. As to foreign aid, just where are the screams from Moscow about our aid to Tito, Gomulka, and Sukarno, among others?

It might be well to have Professor Overstreet sum up this second major notion of his: "Soviet Imperialism . . . is a specific product of the Khrushchev era of 'peaceful competition' and it represents one major aspect of the

USSR's effort to take over the world without the risks involved in open warfare." I could cite a dozen experts who are warning us about Soviet plans for limited war. [*And the very day this is being put in shape for the printer, the Communists are using armed forces in an attempt to take over Laos.* Editor.] The question to be asked is: *Why has Overstreet completely omitted military stratagems and force, the bolshevik standard tactics, as well as subversion and espionage, from his study?*

There are two possible answers. The first is, to soften us by giving us a dream world in which Communist tanks are absent. The second is what I consider to be the third stick of planted dynamite: *A demand that we negotiate and go to the Summit*—and by so doing, also give Khrushchev permanent title to Eastern Europe. Harry and Bonaro Overstreet insist that Khrushchev demands that the West respect the *status quo* in Eastern Europe at any Summit Conference. The Red leader will permit no discussion on the satellite countries, about whom we must forget. And what does our expert on Communism suggest?

"*We believe in negotiations.*" Dr. Overstreet insists that we negotiate "whenever there is hope of achieving even small dependable agreements." And he specifies that we dash off to the Summit.

Professor Overstreet, who knows all about these things, tells us that we must bargain with the Communists. And this *bargaining* "embodies both a respect for what each party has declared indispensable to *separate well-being* and what all parties have agreed on as indispensable to their *common well-being*."

In short, we are to run to the Summit

What We Must Know About Overstreet

after telling Khrushchev we have no more interest in Eastern Europe; and then, at the Summit, we will see what more we can bargain away.

The fourth stick of dynamite—there are more, the ones I've selected are simply more glaring—deals with an old problem of Overstreet's: *Communist control*, (or should I say, "understanding?"). The professor has a huge dialectical discourse on the problem of what to do with "conspiratorial communists," but he resolves it all with a quotation: "Freedom for the wise is so supremely important that it is worth the price of making the silly free, too." We have remembered this comment because it expresses a point of view which most of us Americans profoundly cherish. It is in the spirit of this viewpoint that a great many anti-Communists have opposed all attempts to make any legal distinction between Communists and non-Communists in terms of freedoms to be exercised."

Does the reader know any anti-Communists who consider Communists to be "silly," or who have opposed making laws to protect ourselves? Because we mustn't legislate or investigate or apparently do anything about Communists, the professor tells us, "We as citizens, therefore, must equip ourselves to do *by understanding* what cannot be done *by law*." This is Overstreet's plan of defense.

The book ends with pleas for more "tenderness" and less hostility; for more rights for the "individual"; for "inclusiveness," rather than narrow national-mindedness; and with a plea to halt nuclear tests. Dr. Overstreet — fittingly, we think — quotes Norman Cousins:

"The question is not what policy we should devise that makes sense for America alone but rather what policy makes sense in human terms." Of course the nine hundred million enslaved subjects of the Soviet tyranny do not come within the "human terms" for consideration. Their condition, as simply Soviet cattle without human rights, is a *fait accompli* which has no bearing on American policy to be determined with regard for the whole human race.

VI

THE REPORT OF THE 1958 American Bar Association Special Committee On Communist Tactics, Strategy, And Objectives, listed the following among the major Communist Tactics:

- Nullification of the Smith Act and other anti-Communist legislation
- The Peace Offensive
- Summit Conferences
- Cultural Exchanges
- Halt Nuclear tests

You will note that Professor Overstreet batted one thousand for the Communist objectives in that list. And you will already have noted that the Overstreets' most distinguished reader, President Eisenhower, has invited the humane and professional Party man, Khrushchev—with some twelve million coldblooded murders in his record — to a summit of the summits. The only surprise left for you is the fact that, in the latest editions of that same Bar Association Committee Report, Professor Overstreet's book appears in the bibliography as suggested reading. As the little boy said, when he heard the clock strike fourteen, "it's later than it has ever been before."

C
our
won
DIAT
SUE
(D
301
Pro
vers
sion
disa
pro
wha
whi
rept
indi
that
Max
call
this
poss
civil
the
D
cinc
scie
dian
reve
on t
and
tion
clar
in t
capa
of h
pixie
ated
beca

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS

by

REVILO P. OLIVER

One of the most important books of our time is the singularly courageous work of Richard LaPiere, *THE FREUDIAN ETHIC: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SUBVERSION OF AMERICAN CHARACTER* (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York; 301 pages, \$5.00). The author, who is Professor of Sociology in Stanford University, has limited himself to a dispassionate and objective description of the disastrous effects on American society produced by the general acceptance of what he calls the "Freudian ethic," which has gradually and almost surreptitiously replaced the doctrine of individual responsibility and rationality that sociologists, following the lead of Max Weber, somewhat inaccurately call the "Protestant ethic." (Historically this view of human nature, which made possible all the achievements of modern civilization, may be traced directly to the Italian Renaissance.)

Dr. LaPiere begins by showing succinctly but clearly that there is no scientific basis whatsoever for the Freudian psychology. Its method is the very reverse of scientific, for it depends not on truths demonstrable by experiment and self-evident to reason, but on revelation. The Freudians unabashedly declare that a man must accept and believe in the Freudian doctrine *before* he is capable of recognizing the motivations of human beings. You must believe in pixies before you can tell who is pixilated. Fire is caused by unseen spirits, because people who think otherwise

are not competent to study chemistry. Such propositions can be maintained only by fanatics, and it is small wonder that, as Dr. LaPiere puts it, "the Freudians profess to an omniscience that is, to the scientific mind, simply frightening."

Although "a case of sorts can be made for the claim that Freudianism is a new version of Judaistic doctrine," it cannot properly be considered a religion, because "it is a doctrine of social irresponsibility and personal despair," whereas every religion necessarily imposes on its adherents ethical obligations and holds out to them a hope of becoming morally better. Freudianism is as much an inversion of religion as it is of science; it is an anarchical and purely destructive superstition. It is, in the strict sense of the word, witchcraft.

Dr. LaPiere, who carefully follows the ethically neutral methods of sociology, finds the social essence of Freudianism in its denial that man is a creature of reason and, above all, its denial that a man is responsible either toward himself or others. "The psychoanalyst . . . strives to relieve the patient of all responsibility for his difficulties, and to shift it to society." Man is the helpless victim of society, which is the only evil in the world, because it frustrates him by repressing his natural and necessary desire to commit incest with his mother and to castrate all his male children.

Now Freudianism, in defiance of all

A Review Of Reviews

logic and even of Freud's own conclusions, is used to disseminate and justify the grotesque belief, rapidly becoming universal in this country, that man is an imbecile creature whom government must somehow protect from society and even from himself.

With emotionless lucidity Dr. LaPiere shows that under the influence of this delusion we are now committing national suicide. In our homes children are systematically corrupted by gullible mothers who treat them "as though man were in fact what Freud's fancy made him out to be." Our public schools perforce "strive to prevent any individual from rising above the intellectual mediocrity of the majority." Our colleges are being taken over by ignorant and feckless bureaucrats, the instinctive enemies of learning and of intellectual integrity. Our government madly attempts to relieve citizens of responsibility for themselves, and therefore "necessarily becomes itself irresponsible."

We can already see all about us the ineluctable consequences of Freudianism, "the creation of a population of indolent, undisciplined, unprincipled, and incompetent people quarreling in random and fretful ways over the diminishing fruits of a dying social system."

This is a book which should be read by everyone interested in the future of the United States. The sorcerers' guild will undoubtedly try to howl it down, and the innumerable parasites who find in "social welfare" a license to feed upon us will try to have it suppressed with either obloquy or silence. It is therefore incumbent on a reviewer to point out that Dr. LaPiere has written with an extreme restraint. At seven major points, either by stopping short

his analysis or by failing to raise crucial questions, he magnanimously gives the Freudians the advantage of every possible doubt.

There is, for example, abundant evidence that, under the veneer of culture and urbanity imposed upon it by a great university, Freud's mind was hopelessly diseased. You may find the evidence for yourself even in a eulogistic biography, such as Helen Walker Puner's *Freud: His Life and His Mind* (Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1947).

Someone should expound in detail the remarkable similarities between Freud's doctrine and the tenets of the Hasidim, a strange sect which flourished in eastern Europe in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—tenets which the learned and generally sympathetic historian of Kabbalism, Dr. C. D. Ginsburg, can explain only in terms of "the evil effects of nervous degeneration." Was Freud directly or indirectly influenced by the doctrine of the Hasidim?

Anyone who dares to speculate concerning the motivations of Freudianism could profitably examine the appalling history of demonolatry and Satanism, which almost attained the proportions of a mass movement in western Europe at the close of the Middle Ages.

Other inquiries will suggest themselves, but there is one question of great and immediate urgency: To what extent has this weird witchcraft been used as a subtle and terrible weapon by the Communists in their unremitting warfare on Western civilization?

* * *

Dr. LaPiere's book should remind us of the frenzied agitation about "mental health" which is principally financed from the three-billion-dollar budget of the Department of Health, Education,

A Review Of Reviews

and Welfare, although, of course, an effort is made to wheedle contributions out of every available sucker.

The main purpose of this hypocritical propaganda is to induce fatuous Americans to waive their few remaining legal safeguards, and to confer powers of arbitrary imprisonment on "experts"—most of whom, at least, are Freudians. One wonders how many Americans realize that under the proposed legislation their sanity will be determined by persons who passionately believe that every father really wants to castrate his son, and that every boy spends his childhood in abject terror lest the old man grab a butcher knife and go to work.

This plan obviously provides so effective a weapon against the American people that even if we did not have the explicit statements of ex-Communists, we could be quite sure that the Communist conspiracy has not overlooked its greatest opportunity. In an effort to obtain information a few weeks ago I consulted in Washington several persons who are intimately acquainted with the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and whom I believe to be entirely reliable. These persons

(1) confirmed the estimate made some time ago by entirely different sources that between seventy and eighty percent of the responsible officers in the Department are members or accomplices of the Communist conspiracy.

(2) assured me that a congressional investigation would disclose such falsification of travel records as to create presumptive proof that some members of the Department really serve as Communist couriers.

(3) declared that an intensive "mental health" campaign is now under way

within the Department to purge it of all employees suspected of anti-Communist tendencies. Such persons are accused of "incipient mental or emotional disorders," and forced to retire for "their own good" by a kangaroo court set up with the connivance of Civil Service. The victims acquiesce because they have no appeal and are offered "disability," i.e. a very substantial part of their salary for life without duties of any kind and with complete freedom to obtain equally or more remunerative employment elsewhere. Unless the present Congress acts to place all federal employment under security regulations (as all loyal employees ardently desire) or provides an independent and non-Communist board to which employees may appeal from the decisions of their supervisors concerning their "mental health," the Department will be completely purged of pro-Americans by 1960.

* * *

Perhaps few Americans outside the universities will have heard of a revolution that must sooner or later affect the lives of all of us. Quietly and without publicity the academic study of political philosophy and government is being taken over by a young, aggressive and monopolistic group who call themselves "behavioral scientists." Perhaps the first description of this movement addressed to the general public appeared in the Summer issue of *Modern Age*, in which Professor Francis Graham Wilson reports that, using the vast sums of money placed at their disposal by the notorious Fund for the Republic and other foundations, "the behaviorists have all but captured the seats of academic power."

The behaviorists do not formally re-

A Review Of Reviews

pudiate the philosophical concepts of truth and error, or the ethical concepts of right and wrong; they merely ignore them as irrelevant or dismiss them as "preferences" variously felt by irrational creatures who, like ants and minnows, are significant only in agglomerations. Men must therefore be studied in masses statistically, and only batteries of digital computers can tell us what men are and how they should be manipulated. This makes the study "scientific" because it is "value-free," and, since the behavioral scientists profess complete neutrality, their discoveries will impartially be placed at the disposal of any group that is in a position to impose its preferences on society.

Once upon a time the American people believed that they were men, not lemmings—believed it so strongly that they legally defined insanity as the inability to distinguish between right and wrong. But that was long ago in the Dark Ages before the Freudian invasion.

* * *

Every true-born bureaucrat dreams of the blissful future, so vividly portrayed in George Orwell's *1984*, when history will have been abolished. But the time is not yet. In Europe and America the techniques of systematic lying, when combined with control of the channels of communication, can be wonderfully effective and even induce national hallucinations, but the truth cannot be permanently suppressed. It remains recorded in documents that cannot be destroyed, and in the memory of men who cannot be liquidated, and so in the end History, like the gods, takes a vengeance that may be tardy, but is sure.

It now seems probable that within

twenty years, if no new disaster is brought upon us, the true history of the war of 1939-1945, complete in all essentials, will be generally known. The "revisionist" historians, whose special task it is to clear away from the recent past the rotting masses of official falsehood, have made an effective beginning in such works as the collection edited by Henry Elmer Barnes, *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* (Caxton, Caldwell, Idaho, 1953), and every week there is some significant addition to the published source-material. The most recent document of importance is Luigi Villari's *The Liberation of Italy* (C. C. Nelson Co., Appleton, Wisconsin; 290 pages, \$5.00).

The author, an Italian jurist who entered his country's diplomatic service in 1906 and was in one way or another intimately connected with the Italian government for almost forty years thereafter, has written, largely from personal observation and the reports of friends who were eyewitnesses, the story of the Anglo-American occupation of Italy in 1943-1947.

His account of the events of these years commands confidence. In a few places, to be sure, his judgement of men's motives may have been affected by his personal relations with them, and there are a few points at which he seems to have overlooked the possibility of alternative explanations. For example, he makes no allowance for the possibility that in July, 1943, King Victor Emmanuel may have received secret assurances from Anglo-American sources, and, like the ill-fated Marshall Pétain, have been so naïf as to believe them. The author's reluctant conclusion that treason on the part of Italian officers in Supermarina is a necessary in-

A Review Of Reviews

terence from certain incidents in the naval war in the Mediterranean would, I think, be modified by a careful reading of the published memoirs of the British commanders.

For most Americans the major importance of this book lies in the fact that it is the first fairly complete report in English on what happened in Italy while it was occupied by our army. What happened was that in Italy, as elsewhere, we used our military victory to further the advance of Communism. American ships brought to Italy experienced and vicious Communist organizers, including the notorious Palmiro Togliatti, who, on our demand, was given a place in the Italian cabinet. The most influential newspaper in Italy was handed over to another notorious Communist, and the Italian news agency was permitted to resume operations only on the condition that Communists be placed in control. In many areas we gave orders "to appoint no labor officer who was not recommended by the Communist Party." And the Italian courts were so packed with Communists that it is estimated that there are now four hundred judges who are Party members. But the real horror lies in the fact that we armed and financed the gangs of Communist terrorists who, under our protection and after the war was over, proceeded to murder between fifty and one hundred thousand Italians.

I should suppose that every American who has gone to Italy since the war with an open mind and a fair knowledge of Italian will, if he lived for any length of time among the Italian people, find nothing astonishing in this report. He will have known men and women of culture and integrity

whose relatives and friends were murdered by the Communists during the "liberation." He will have heard from responsible sources circumstantial accounts which corroborate this part of Dr. Villari's narrative.

Many Americans who have never left the United States can supply confirmatory details unknown to the Italian author. They will remember having seen in the newspapers a few years ago the disclosure that a major in the American army while on duty in Italy in 1944 had been murdered by two of his subordinate officers, who were Communist agents. Or, if they were in Washington during the war, they may remember that in informed circles the extent of Communist penetration of our supersecret and super-numerary intelligence agency, the O. S. S., was so well known that the initials were sardonically interpreted, with only pardonable hyperbole, as meaning Office of Soviet Stooges.

It is yet too early to attempt a comprehensive and critical history of the strange war that we fought to make the world safe for Communism. But little by little the materials for that history are accumulating, here and there some parts of the pattern are being revealed with pitiless clarity, and in the end Clio will be served. In the meantime, of course, the revisionist historians will be under continuous attack, and the light brigades of the "Liberal intellectuals" will be sent in desperate charges against each new bastion of established fact.

Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to rant and lie.

Next month Dr. Oliver will review Wm. F. Buckley's UP FROM LIBERALISM.

Light Verse, And Worse

by

RODNEY GILBERT

The honor guest at the pacifists' ball
Was wishing he hadn't accepted at all.
"I scrub 'em and scrub 'em," Nikita said
As he looked at his hands, "but they're still bloody red."

"Peace and Friendship," Nixon declaimed in Moscow, Novosibirsk, and sundry way stations. By a happy coincidence, "Peace and Friendship" was the *leitmotif* of the Communist Youth Festival in Vienna. "Peace and Friendship" is the banner under which the thug, Khrushchev, is now invading our country. And nobody is talking about "peace" through wiping out the despotism of the Red gangsters, nor "friendship" with their victims. The peace contemplated is that of the slave with his chains, and the friendship suggested is with those who enslave him.

Not that the "liberals" aren't doing alright, even without Nikita to Khrushify us. For years they have been holding our nation on a course where some of the progressive signboards read: Social Security, Welfarism, Crypto-Socialism, Socialism, Bureaucratic Absolutism, Gangster Despotism. And the kind of ideological terrain we have already reached can be readily surmised from the croaking chants which we hear along the way. Such as the following popular number at our present stage.

"I wanna be kept, I'm gonna be kept,"
The unwed mother cries,
"But not by any old bum of a man
Through stuffy old marital ties.
I want my modern American right
To be kept at the public expense;
And for every new brat I produce, I demand
A government handout in dollars and cents."

But Khrushchev's visit will certainly help, as will be made clear on his return in a colloquy between himself and the ghost of Lenin.

Nikita, Nikita, and where hast thou been?
"I've been with the sheep where it's lush, rich, and green."
And didst thou go goofy and bleat with the flock?
"I sure bleated and bleated around the damn clock;
But *bad's* not the *bleat* in those luscious domains,
It's *peace* and more *peace* till it curdles your brains."
And what peace didst thou bleat, tovarish so tender?
"The peace of the grave, or else total surrender."
Bully boy, said the ghost as it faded away.
The seed that I sowed yields a good crop today.

HOW COMMUNISM REMADE THE WORLD DURING AND AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

THE LIBERATION OF ITALY

by

Luigi Villari, *Jur. D.*

The dean of Italian publicists and diplomatic historians, Dr. Villari has written the sequel to his authoritative work on *Italian Foreign Policy under Mussolini* (Devin-Adair). Of this definitive book, the reviewer in *Current History* wrote:

"Mr. Villari, who saw and interpreted the events of this period, does not throw any bouquets at the Italian Foreign Office with which he was associated, but tells the story from the Italian's point of view, presenting his facts with organized precision and offering an interesting picture of the political scene during this controversial period."

The Liberation of Italy brings the story down to date with the same "organized precision" in presenting the facts. Dr. Villari was an almost uniquely equipped and experienced eye-witness of the Allied "liberation" of Italy, and his whole book is entitled to rank as a documentary source for the period.

While the volume is devoted mainly to the Allied "liberation" of Italy following the deposition of Mussolini in July, 1943, it has much wider significance in that it presents the Italian experience against the broad background of world events and policies from 1939 to 1947.

It makes clear the manner in which Communist ideology, semantics, imperialistic aims, political biology and juristic euthanasia supplanted the quickly discarded Atlantic Charter as the basis and guidepost of Allied policy and procedure when Axis defeat was assured.

The book shows how the very term "Liberation" was derived from Communist propaganda and had been devised to disguise and ennoble Communist aggression in China, Spain, eastern Poland, Finland, the Baltic region, and the Balkans before June 22, 1941.

It reveals how Communist policies and demands dominated the "Summit Conferences" during the War and its aftermath, thus creating the Cold War and the threat of world-wide nuclear extermination which now hangs over the world.

Publicly announced by the Allied victors as a benevolent crusade to deliver oppressed peoples from tyranny, the actual "liberation" imposed a far more drastic tyranny over hundreds of millions who had previously been free from Axis dominion. It led to the wholesale massacre of hundreds of thousands of helpless and patriotic citizens of Germany, Italy, France, Poland, the Baltic area and the Balkans. Fifteen million Germans were expelled from their ancient homelands, some five million of them perishing as a result of murder, starvation and exposure. Millions of Japanese were driven out of Asia back into their already overcrowded island homeland.

In Italy, the "liberation" episode produced the revival of Communist power, with the special support of the United States, which later spent billions of dollars to bring Italian Communism under temporary and incomplete control. It also led to the freeing of the *Mafia*, whose agents were thus enabled to revive and extend their organized criminality on an international scale.

C. C. NELSON COMPANY — Appleton, Wisconsin

xxv, 265 pp. Profusely illustrated. \$5.00

ORDER BLANK

You may order the books reviewed or advertised in AMERICAN OPINION from THE BOOKMAILER—the Complete Bookstore-by-Mail representing all United States publishers. You pay only the bookstore price. THE BOOKMAILER pays the postage, anywhere in the world.

(No. of copies)

.....	<i>Brainwashing In The High Schools</i> , Root	\$4.50
.....	<i>Collectivism In The Churches</i> , Bundy	5.00
.....	<i>The Continuing Struggle</i> , Walker	3.00
.....	<i>The Freudian Ethic</i> , Richard LaPiere	5.00
.....	<i>From Major Jordan's Diaries</i> , Jordan	2.00
.....	<i>Germany and the East-West Crisis</i> , Schlamm	3.75
.....	<i>A Guide To Anti-Communist Action</i> , Bouscaren	4.00
.....	<i>The Herbert Hoover Story</i> , Lyons	5.90
.....	<i>The Liberation Of Italy</i> , Luigi Villari	5.00
.....	<i>Look Southward</i> , Uncle, Tomlinson	6.00
.....	<i>Managed Money At The Crossroads</i> , Palyi	4.75
.....	<i>Masters Of Deceit</i> , J. Edgar Hoover	5.00
.....	<i>Metaphysics and Ideology</i> , Martin	2.50
.....	<i>Nine Men Against America</i> , Gordon	3.00
.....	<i>No Wonder We Are Losing</i> , Morris	2.50
.....	<i>The Pentagon Case</i> , Fox	3.95
.....	<i>The Rise and Fall of Society</i> , Chodorov	3.95
.....	<i>Walter Reuther</i> , Dayton	4.50
.....	<i>Wedemeyer Reports</i> , Wedemeyer	6.00

Or any other book, published in the United States,
which you have seen reviewed or advertised.

.....
.....
.....

..... Total number of books ordered Total price \$

THE BOOKMAILER,
Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, New York.

Please send the books checked above to:

Name

Street

City Zone State

Enclosed find \$

