British news agency, on the choice of Senator Knowland as Republican leader in the Senate, following the death of Senator Taft. "Senator Knowland", said Reuters, "has an almost fanatical dislike for Communists." After all, Communists have only set up the most durable and abominable tyranny of modern times, built up a vast militarized empire with 800,000,000 enslaved subjects, kept up underground agencies for espionage and general mischief-making in all free countries, killed some 30,000 Americans and maimed a larger number in Korea. One can fairly see the eyebrows in some circles on both sides of the Atlantic go up in shocked disapproval at the thought of a man so crass, so narrow-minded, so "fanatical," that he actually dislikes Communists.

Mrs. Roosevelt, wined and dined by Tito on the island of Brioni, responded with a rather indecorous gush of girlish enthusiasm over the "whimsy and youth" of the leader of the "Socialist" country of Yugoslavia. As at most of the stops on her world tour, she felt she had to reassure our foreign friends by denouncing Senator McCarthy, whose methods, she stated, "look like Hitler's." Thus the "nice" Marxists are cultivated, and the Senator from Wisconsin is attacked, both on a global scale. Incidentally, there is no record of Mrs. Roosevelt's humanitarian impulses having motivated her to inquire about the health of Cardinal Stepinac.

There is something intriguing and suggestive in the news item about a reform school for vicious dogs which conspicuously failed to achieve its purpose. Although the managers of the school professed complete confidence that the fiercest bulldog or mastiff would emerge from their ministrations as meek as the proverbial lamb, precisely the reverse seems to have happened. Canine alumni of this school started to bite unwary passersby with greater zest and abandon than ever. Several suits are reported to be pending between disillusioned dog-owners and the school. Could it be that Fido and Rover, when entered in the school, were given a curriculum along approved progressive lines, and permitted and encouraged to do whatever their aggressive instincts prompted?

"In the quarter-finals, facing the United States' fourth-seeded team of Straight Clark and Harold Burrows, who hadn't even played together this year, the supposedly invincible champions of Wimbledon, Australia, France, and Italy proceeded to commit more boners than the Chicago Cubs have committed all season, and lost a marathon comedy of errors, 6-7, 14-12, 18-16, 9-7."—*The New Yorker.*

And the most inexplicable error, which even *The New Yorker* doesn't try to explain, is how the Australians managed to lose a set by the score of 6-7.

The Absurdity of the United Nations

In his August 26 address to the American Bar Association, the Secretary of State put on record a few plain truths concerning the United Nations. "The United Nations, in its present form," he declared, "has not met all our expectations. . . It does not provide adequate security.

"The . . . Charter reflects serious inadequacies. One inadequacy sprang from ignorance. When we were in San Francisco in the spring of 1945, none of us knew of the atomic bomb which was to fall on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. The Charter is thus a pre-Atomic Age charter."

Getting closer to the crux of the trouble, he went on: "A second inadequacy sprang from the fact that the three leaders who planned the United Nations . . . inevitably . . . looked upon the United Nations as a kind of peacetime prolongation of the wartime triumvirate . . . We now see the inadequacy of an organization whose effective functioning depends upon cooperation with a nation which is dominated by an international party seeking world domination."

Mild as is this criticism in view of the facts, it represents a big advance over any previous official statement. Unfortunately, the Secretary failed to draw clear-cut practical conclusions. He spoke vaguely about "revising the Charter," and then drifted off on an unconvincing attack against the Bricker Amendment.

The problem of the United Nations is rapidly approaching the absurd. Gulliver, dozing while the Lilliputians tied him into knots, was a model of good sense compared to ourselves. We have trussed up our national interest and laid it at the foot of the altar of One Worldism, where it can be kicked around at leisure by any friend, neutral, or enemy who has been initiated into the U. N. brotherhood.

It would be sufficiently outrageous if the U. N. were nothing more than "a harmless debating society." The scores of millions of dollars that the U. N. costs American taxpayers are a high subsidy for an international talkathon. If it's just words we want, the TV networks could assemble a smarter, funnier cast, and make money on the operation.

But the U. N. is not just "harmless." As it now functions, it has quite positively been injuring our security and thwarting our national interests.

In Korea our U. N. entanglement prevented us from conducting the war in accordance with the elementary strategic and political requirements of the situation. The U. N. compelled our military commanders to act directly contrary to their own judgment, in spite of the fact that we and the Republic of Korea (not a U. N. member) had supplied more than 95 per cent of the troops, money, supplies—and casualties. It then eased us into the most abject military defeat of our history, a defeat the most significant result of which is the blow to *our* prestige and influence in all Asia.

The State Department's obsessive subservience to the U. N. trapped us into denouncing our serious ally, Syngman Rhee, for carrying through the most gallant and dynamic action of the entire dismal war, an action that we should have initiated ourselves: the release of the anti-Communist prisoners.

The U. N. induced us to accept an armistice commission in which two members (Czechoslovakia and Poland) are openly our enemies, one (India) sides with our enemies in the clinches, and the remaining two (Sweden and Switzerland) are timidly neutral.

A majority in the United Nations tried to railroad through a vote on the composition of the political conference for Korea that would have meant a pro-Soviet majority against us, and would have excluded the Republic of Korea altogether. That is to say, a majority of the United Nations was ready to turn the political conference over to the aggressors—headed by the Soviet Union, the chief aggressor—and to ditch the victim of aggression. Although this proposal did not quite get the necessary two-thirds vote in the Assembly session which ended August 28, it will probably be revived at the new session, under the slippery eye of Madame Pandit, whom we are incredibly supporting for Chairman against our proved friend, Prince Wan Waithayakon of Thailand.

We are told that the United Nations, in spite of its inadequacies, does "help to solve" international difficulties. Even this faint praise is not borne out by the record. The procedures of the United Nations often exacerbate difficulties. Problems that might be settled by quiet and responsible diplomatic negotiation between the two or three countries directly involved are blown up out of all proportion in demagogic U. N. speeches designed to "appeal to the masses." Having taken a public ultimatist stand, the delegates cannot compromise or change their minds without "losing face."

Inevitably, blocs of nations (the Asian, Middle Eastern, Latin American blocs) are formed among the U. N. members. An issue that might be arranged satisfactorily between two nations—Britain and Iran, for example; the Netherlands and Indonesia; India and South Africa—becomes part of a general struggle between blocs, and cannot be settled on its specific merits. The troubles between France and Morocco, or between Britain and Egypt, have been aggravated rather than lightened through the existence of the United Nations.

The all-out United Nationalists threaten that if the U. N. should break down, then the United States would be "isolated." They are suffering from semantic delusions. If the U. N. should vanish overnight, the United States would be not one millimeter more or less isolated than today. Friendship and enmity among nations did not begin or end with the United Nations. Whether the U. N. flourishes, flounders, or dies, allies will continue to be allies, the indifferent will remain indifferent, and our enemies will still be against us. The Republic of Korea is not a U. N. member, but her troops and ours together carried the brunt of a terrible war. India is a U. N. member, but no Indian soldiers fought alongside ours in Korea, while Indian diplomats sabotaged our interests. The Soviet Union supplied and directed the fight against us, and the Soviet Union is an honored member of the United Nations.

The Secretary of State put his finger on the fundamental absurdity of the United Nations as at present constituted. We have set up an organization for the alleged purpose of preventing war and aggression, and we have included in its inner command the power that is carrying on perpetual war and aggression. We have put the top criminal on the Police Commission.

To continue to muddle along the present U. N. course is to play heedlessly with the fate of our country. The following decisions have become a minimum condition of national safety:

1. We should make clear to ourselves and to the world that we are no longer prepared to sacrifice our lives, liberties, and honor to the intrigues of an international organization that has given no proof of its ability to defend anything except the bureaucratic privileges of its spy-ridden staff.

2. We should insist that the United Nations be reorganized to exclude the chief totalitarian aggressor and his puppets, or that it be dissolved as a fraud, and a hindrance rather than an aid on the road to peace.

Pattern of Subversion

The Senate's Subcommittee on Internal Security has recently issued a remarkable report which ought to be widely read and studied by responsible citizens. It is called *Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments,* and it describes the pattern that has gradually been emerging from the entire series of inquiries into Communist penetration of the government.

Some years ago, when the first disclosures were made, they could be dismissed, if not as outright red herrings, then as individual, isolated aberrations that had no important bearing on the course of events. What this new report establishes is that there was nothing individual, accidental, or isolated in the Communist infiltration of government, any more than in any other field of our national life. The Communists proceed step by painstaking step, according to a deliberate plan and tested methods.

Senator Jenner, Chairman of the Subcommittee, observed: "The Subcommittee has been impressed by the extent to which the Communists it has ex-