carry passports of either Monaco or Luxemburg —two small but really sovereign states whose governments, unlike ours, have enough guts to go to bat for their citizens. The Duchess of Luxemburg, an upright lady, would respond to the flagrant mistreatment of a Luxemburgian correspondent in Prague with immediate reprisals against two, or better three, Czechoslovakian "diplomats" in Luxemburg. But then, she of course can afford to turn her back.

When the Office of Price Stabilization says that unless the Administration's price control law is passed prices will rise 7 per cent, it is guessing, and everybody knows it. When the Economic Stabilization Administration says that if the bill is not passed every family's cost of living will rise one dollar a day, it is guessing, and everybody knows it. And when Mr. Eric Johnston says, "We do not want an economic Pearl Harbor," he is absurd. Why must the propaganda for price control be so stupid?

Seventy-eight members of the House signed a petition to call the Townsend Plan bill out of the limbo where the Ways and Means Committee had it locked up. Representative Angel made the speech. He said:

> The plan is a self-financing, non-contributory retirement system under which beneficiaries will receive annuities as a matter of right without reference to charity or prior contributions. It is nation-wide and covers all citizens sixty years of age or over. Annuities will be paid currently out of currently raised revenues.

Who will be taxed? All those under sixty. So the young will support the old, as they always have, only now it shall be done under compulsion. A government bureau will take it from the children and give it to their fathers and mothers—and the bureau for its own livelihood will shave the old folks' dollar.

General Lewis B. Hershey, director of Selective Service, suggests in the July *Esquire* that American fathers are guilty of overprotecting their sons. He advises the fathers to take a lesson from the birds and shove their young out of the nest so that they will learn to fly by themselves. This impresses us as excellent advice. But it comes with little grace from the man who is in charge of taking boys from Poppa Parent only to put them under the compulsory control of Poppa State. We have yet to hear of a bird shoving its young from a small family nest into a bigger nest covered by the protective wing of a Universal Bird Training Law. When a young robin goes out into the world he is on his own. There is no robin drill sergeant to see to it that the fledgling does what he is told on a diet of Government Issue worms. . . . If we must have Selective Service, let us take it as a compulsion that is a lesser evil when compared with possible Soviet enslavement. It only confuses the vocabulary—and hence our powers of thought —to have it implied that a compulsory draft of the young is something that encourages self-reliant free choice.

The news columns of the *New York Times,* we regret to say, have in recent months been more and more openly departing from the fine objectivity that once distinguished them. The daily news stories on the MacArthur hearings, for example (apart from the columns and columns of full text through which only the hardiest reader could breast his way) were in their selection, emphasis and presentation consistently loaded against MacArthur and in favor of Acheson. And here is an example from a "news" story by James Reston beginning on page 1 of the issue of July 2:

> The ranking Republican member of the committee, Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, said he thought "that the Administration ought to be wiser in these [Korean cease-fire] negotiations than it was at Yalta and Teheran."

This is straight news. But Mr. Reston continues:

> Mr. Wiley did not propose, however, that the United States should reject the cease-fire proposals and go on fighting until General Ridgway was standing on the banks of the Yalu.

This is not by the wildest stretch of the definition news, but a gratuitous and sarcastic editorial appendage by Mr. Reston. Its purpose is apparently to suggest that such a proposal by Senator Wiley would have been the only possible alternative to another Yalta or Teheran. If Mr. Reston is now going to tell us all the things that Mr. Wiley does not propose, and all the things that each of more than two hundred other Republicans in Congress does not propose, he can fill the *Times* with them every day.

The American Heritage Foundation makes this the Year of Rededication to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, with a national program that includes public service advertising sponsored by the National Advertising Council, the slogan to be, "Now—Freedom Needs You." This is the same worthy organization that recently executed the Freedom Train idea. Our feeling is that if such measures are necessary it may be already too late. In the days of the Little Red School House and McGuffey's Readers a Freedom Train would have been incomprehensible. What is the matter with American education that now freedom has to be sold to the people by slogans, advertising and ballyhoo?

One who wants to know what has happened to education might begin by reading the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education —Vol. I, entitled "Establishing the Goals." On page 20 you may read: "There is urgent need for a program of education for world citizenship."

There is nothing in the Declaration of Independence or Constitution about world citizenship. On page 102 you may read. "The task of the colleges is to make the transition from a curriculum centered almost exclusively on the American-West tradition to one that embodies the intellectual experiences of the whole of mankind." So it was wrong to center American education on the American tradition; wrong even to center it on the American-West tradition, whatever you may suppose that to be. By implication there must be something like a tradition of the whole of mankind, and American education must be centered upon that. Who then will teach the supreme importance of the American tradition? That becomes the task of private citizens because our progressive educators think its importance is relative only.

Theodore Meyer Greene, professor of philosophy at Yale, tells a Senate committee that he is "appalled at the lack of teaching in the first rate colleges of this country on communism," and at the "growing suspicion of anyone who, as a loyal and intelligent citizen, has taken the trouble to learn something about communism." That kind of talk now is in the wind. Will Dr. Greene please mention a course on political science anywhere that does not include the Marxian thesis? Will he name one of the many professors who, he says, try to hide the fact that they have ever read Marx? What book on communism has ever been forbidden in this country? Lenin? Stalin? You can buy them anywhere across the book counter, even though they teach the technique of revolution and advocate the overthrow of the American form of government by force.

The current literature of communism—pamphlets, magazines and newspapers—is freely exposed on the newsstands. Many conservative publications have reprinted the Communist Manifesto for the information of their readers. The defense of the eleven Communists convicted of conspiracy, theory and all, was spread in the daily press. Never since the word was printed has a society ever been so tolerant of an alien doctrine. Dr. Greene may retort that he said the American ideology was better than the Communist ideology. So he did. Let that be pinned up. Americans died in Korea for an ideology comparatively better than that of the Communists.

Dr. Greene might also note that at the University of San Francisco a course in communism will be compulsory hereafter for upper division students. Besides reading and hearing lectures, students will be required to submit reports and term papers on direct studies of Communist activities in the real world of San Francisco. There is even a library of Marxian literature. What is the matter with the University of San Francisco? Nothing. That is why it is not afraid to do it.

Miss Margaret Truman is safely back home, and this ought to bring relief to all of us. While she was sightseeing in Europe, enraptured editorials have been written here in praise of the fact that she seemed to be behaving herself. But why, pray, should anybody have expected otherwise? That the quite natural road performance of Mr. Truman's daughter merited such attention of audibly astonished editorialists is weirdly characteristic of the political and moral climate under the incumbent Administration: When nothing really awkward takes place, that's tremendous news nowadays. If, say, Mr. Truman had dispatched the Marines in revenge for some unkind Dutch press comment on his daughter, no one here would have been particularly surprised. But nothing happened and so the bells of thanksgiving keep ringing all over our apprehensive country.

The sudden death of Francis Adams Truslow at the age of 45, on his way to begin his duties as head of the United States-Brazil Joint Commission for Economic Development, is a great loss to the nation. "Frank" Truslow had extraordinary gifts and great integrity; he could have filled with honor and distinction the highest political office that this nation has to offer. The actual assignments which were given to him, either in private or in public affairs, were minor in comparison with his talents. That our higher political offices today are occupied mainly by nonentities does not mean that men of talent do not exist to fill these offices; it is a sign, rather, that we do not make proper use of greatly gifted individuals in our public life. Francis Truslow was one of these.

The Mises Seminar

The seminar on social problems conducted by Dr. Ludwig von Mises at the Faculty Club of New York University under the auspices of the *Freeman* was extremely well attended by eager and enthusiastic students. The seminar ran from June 25 through July 6 inclusive, and included the following participants:

Reverend Armand-Jean Baldwin, Bettina Bien, Julian Gerard Buckley, Oliver Carlson, Helen Cartier, Zack R. Cecil, John J. Devoe, S. Feinstone, H. Bernard Goldstein, Percy Greaves, Andrew W. Green, Thomas E. Harney, M. Adolph Heikkila, Hoyne Howe, O. B. Johassen, Vigdor W. Kavaler, Robert S. Kendall, George Koether, Sheridan A. Logan, Mildred J. Loomis, Georgette McCoy, Duane L. Patterson, Reverend Norman S. Ream, Richard S. Rimanoczy, J. Ray Risser, A. Franklin Ross, John T. Tetley, Robert van Cleave, James L. Wick, James F. Wilson, Alvin Wingfield and Leland B. Yeager.

These participants came from all parts of the country. In the group were writers, editors, teachers, college professors, businessmen, librarians, farmers, attorneys and editors.