indistinguishable." This should have clarified everything for Mr. Cooke's faithful British readers, except perhaps why Governor Stevenson is not running on Ike's ticket.

Anxious to elect a Republican President, we are increasingly worried about the kind of support General Eisenhower is receiving from Walter Lippmann. The other day Mr. Lippmann, whose column gets curiouser and curiouser, contended that "the most needed of all the changes is to restore the control of our great policies by the *civilian* authorities"—which, to put it mildly, is a quaint way of promoting a *General's* candidacy. Fortunately Governor Stevenson, too, has one campaigner too many: Mr. Truman is raring to take to the road.

We look to the *Wall Street Journal*, perhaps the most thoughtfully edited newspaper in the United States, for insights into American life unavailable elsewhere. For instance, the *Journal* recently reported estimates by the Movers Conference of America that 36 million, or roughly one-fourth, of our countrymen will shift their *lares* and *penates* from place to place in 1952. The figures are startling, summoning, as they do, images of our highways cluttered with crawling queues of vans as Mr. and Mrs. America move ever to greener pastures. This mass movement has, however, deeper significance. It bears on politics, as what doesn't this year? How many of these 36 million (two-thirds of whom are by the law of averages eligible voters) will lose their franchise? The standard interval during which a citizen may establish voting residence in an American state is one year. Obviously a family that moves any time in 1952 will not be able to acquire voting privileges by November. Could this American propensity for shifting home base account in part for the growing discrepancy between eligibles and voters in national elections which concerns all right thinkers?

The sterile pessimism of thought under a Fabian society was never more flagrantly demonstrated than by Bertrand Lord Russell in a recent *New York Times Magazine* article. His lordship, who views the variegated, teeming and vital American society with genuine distaste, sets as his ecumenical goal "a world government with a monopoly of armed force . . . an approximate equality as regards standards of life in different parts of the globe . . . and a population either stationary or very slowly increasing." It is evident that Lord Russell in reality is pining for "1984" and the secure and egalitarian monotony of the prison state.

A Dallas correspondent encloses a newspaper clipping that reports Sheppard Field, Wichita Falls, Texas, alive with Yugoslav aviation trainees, the Communist (Soviet) star resplendent on their blouses. The Yugoslavs, we are told, have "the run of the field, even the restricted areas!" This item is commended to the appropriate committees of the Congress. Is it good public policy to train Communist airmen of any ilk in the usages and techniques of the United States Air Force?

Those flying saucers seem unaware that the Air Force has officially and scientifically explained them away. In one strange form or another they continue to startle casual watchers of the August skies and show up in mysterious "blips" on radar screens. Their activity furnishes entertaining diversion during these dog days. But in one case it brought a result which we found less than entertaining.

That was the failure of the Air Force to send up interceptors until two hours after "unidentified objects" had appeared on the Washington radar screen, when some officers who just happened to visit the radar post learned of the "blips" and telephoned the base at Newcastle, Delaware. The Air Force later explained that the first report had been sent to its Flight Center at Middletown instead of its Pentagon command post. Presumably that made the delay O.K. But suppose the "objects" had been enemy bombers. Would they have obliged by waiting around until the Air Force got its communications unsnarled? Possibly the high brass could learn something by boning up on the story of Pearl Harbor.

Nostra culpa: Igor Bogolepov has gently chided the editors for a revision in his article, "The West Betrays the Russians," issue of August 11, describing the British government of 1921 as Tory. As everyone, even a *Freeman* editor, should know upon due reflection, Lloyd George was still at the helm in that year and Bonar Law did not succeed him until 1922. Also, through a typographical error in the column "Our Contributors," we postdated Mr. Bogolepov's graduation from Petrograd University by ten years. He was graduated in 1923.

It's an ill drought that brings no good. The Administration, playing both ends against the middle with the weather the Lord sent, solemnly assures the farmers in the drought-stricken states of a merciful rain of government checks and accepts credit in the rest of the country for bumper crops.

Deeply impressed by the articulate and general British criticism of American racial discrimination, we are happy to learn that our fair-minded British friends are always ready to notice the beam in their own eye. For instance, the distinguished Singapore Swimming Club got itself recently into a bit of trouble: the Sultan of Selangor was barred from the Club's St. George's Day Dinner, and the chap was embarrassed. The Singapore Swimming Club lost no time in correcting the *gaffe*. It voted at once to receive any color of guests, including Sultans, "on the first Tuesday of each month." We realize that the situation is touchy way out in Singapore and that, in fact, we might be called upon at any minute to help the British carry the white man's burden in the Crown Colony. But aren't they overdoing it? The first Tuesday of *each* month?

President Truman has vetoed a recommendation of the Tariff Commission to reduce the import of Italian garlic. Strong believers in both earthy spices and free trade, we find ourselves in the unaccustomed position of applauding Mr. Truman. Moreover, we would like to take exception to the ironical undertone in the *New York Times* comment that this "is probably the first time in American history that a President has written a state paper of about 2000 words on garlic." Judging by what is known of Mr. Truman's previous writings, we are on the contrary delighted that the author has at last found a subject matter to match the characteristic fragrance of his style.

Far Eastern Munich

The news from Korea is mixed. Under Mark Clark's energetic command, the United Nations forces bomb North Korea's strategic grid. Old Baldy shifts back and forth between the hostile ground forces. At Panmunjom the dreary farce runs out, hopefully according to Admiral Fechteler, forbiddingly according to General Van Fleet. Meanwhile President Syngman Rhee, triumphantly reelected, and his ambassador, You Chan Yang, afford in this issue of the *Freeman* the only note of optimism concerning the future of that unhappy and embattled land.

If the fruits of Panmunjom are the necessary fruits of collective security, then they are bitter fruits indeed. Since the negotiations began fourteen months ago our forces have suffered 40,000 casualties. We absorbed without retaliation evidence that the imperial Soviet forces had tortured and slaughtered thousands of our men, their captives. We have endured with only perfunctory disclaimers the savage beat of world-wide propaganda accusing us of waging war with the grossest inhumanity by the use of disease-laden bombs.

The *Freeman*, noting no study or recapitulation of our concessions at Panmunjom in the general press, asked Mrs. Geraldine Fitch, an authority on the Far East, to compile for us the record of our diplomatic defeats since the "truce" began. In her report Mrs. Fitch calls the negotiations "a Far Eastern Munich," and with that characterization we are persuaded to agree. If you wish to know how steeply American diplomacy has descended since the days of Cleveland and Hay, Roosevelt and Root, read Mrs. Fitch's definitive record of our quibbling, evasiveness and surrender in the conference tent at Panmunjom. It is a sorry tale.

Sir Gladwyn Jebb, the eloquent Briton representing his government in the United Nations, endorsed the Korean stalemate the other evening on TV as a preventive of World War III. So it may seem to minds called upon to vindicate collective security and to men whose nations are not bearing the burden of an ignominious war. To us what has happened in Korea since the recall of MacArthur, especially what has happened at Panmunjom, is the least honorable chapter in the long history of America's relationships with the outside world.

HST Won't Outlaw Them

The first trial of Communist leaders under the Smith Act lasted nine turbulent months, and in the end the defendants were found guilty of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence. The third has just ended, after six months, with the same verdict. A fourth is still dragging its way through the courts. A fifth and sixth are scheduled for the near future. And the question inevitably arises, how long must the taxpayers continue to defray the expense of these interminable and unedifying spectacles, while the foreign conspiracy headed by the defendants is permitted to mask as a legal political party? Is the U. S. government against subversion, or merely against individual subversionists—if they are Communist Party officials?

There is a mass of incontrovertible evidence that the so-called Communist Party of America is an anti-American conspiracy directed by a foreign power. It is to be found in the records of these trials, in the testimony of former Communist Party members and former Soviet officials before state and Congressional committees, and in official Communist publications, both Soviet and American. Indeed, the most striking thing about the international Communist conspiracy is that unlike any other conspiracy in history—except Hitler's—it has been proclaimed from the world's housetops by the conspirators themselves. The U. S. government, which in spite of all this evidence continues to respect the fiction that the Communist Party is a political movement, none the less tacitly recognizes its foreign, subversive character in its "loyalty program," whose purpose is to screen Communists and pro-Communists out of Federal agencies—although in the observance its effect has been rather to keep them in.

There is also an ever-increasing mass of evidence that espionage in behalf of Soviet Russia is an important function of every Communist party. As Boris Souvarine says in a pamphlet sent us from Paris on the trial last February of 29 Greek Communists and collaborators for military espionage: