is that neither Major Long nor Dr. Bush really knows whether the Russians have perfected their air defenses or not. But if nobody really knows, it would be the mark of prudence to proceed on the more pessimistic assumption. We know from both Major Long and Dr. Bush that such things as radar, guided missiles, jet interceptor planes, night fighters, the proximity fuse and plane-to-plane rocket propulsion make it entirely possible for a defensive-minded power to make unescorted bombing attacks prohibitively costly. This being so, the B-36 *is* a tanker.

What to do about the situation? One answer is this: the United States must hold air bases close to the Soviet Union. From American bases in Japan, in Turkey, in North Africa, "tanker" bombers could be sent over Russia with rocket-armed fighter-plane protection. Major Long doubts that the United States will be able to hold air bases in Japan or Turkey or North Africa for very long. The editors of the *Freeman* disagree with him on this point. But whatever the truth may be about our ability to hold overseas air bases, the United States can not move too quickly to lessen its dependence on the unescorted B-36.

Stewart Alsop, of the team of columning Alsops, has reported that Senator Taft "now appears firmly to have embraced substantially the *Chicago Tribune* version of foreign policy" — meaning, we suppose, that he has become "isolationist" in a big way. Mr. Alsop also reports that "astute observers" see a solid Senator Taft-Senator Joe McCarthy "alliance in the making," and asks dramatically how a man of Taft's reputation for integrity could ally himself with a McCarthy. Leaving Joe McCarthy's reputation out of it for the moment, what we want to know is how Stewart Alsop can possibly read isolationism into Taft's recent utterances and record. Taft has gone along with the Lodge compromise on American divisions for Eisenhower, and he has stated publicly that he believes the United States should extend the Monroe Doctrine to western Europe. He has also called for an American declaration of war on Russia the moment a Soviet tank pokes a nose through the Iron Curtain. Is that the *Chicago Tribune* version of foreign policy? Is it "isolationism"? It seems to us that Stewart Alsop is indulging himself in a rather outsize bit of so-called "McCarthyism" on his own.

We've been applying a little arithmetic to the United States Bureau for Indian Affairs, which reportedly has one bureaucratic employee for every thirty Indians in the country. Assuming that there are at least three Indians to a family, this means one guardian on the Federal payroll for every ten Indian families. Now if each Indian Bureau employee gets an average annual pay-check of $4000 (another reasonable guess on our part), that comes to $400 per Indian family. Inasmuch as the official American philosophy of Indian-protection seems to assume that Indians must remain wards of the government in perpetuity unless they strike oil or become professional ballplayers, the $400 annual expenditure will probably go on until the last living Indian goes to the Happy Hunting Ground.

How much simpler — and how much more gratifying to those who believe Indians could be men, not wards — if every Indian family were to be presented with, say, a $4000 farm, the cost to be amortized over a ten-year stretch. If that could be brought within the ken of our philosophy of Indian-protection, the Indian question might magically disappear within a decade. This would give our children some respite amid paying for the social security we have already paid for and had stolen from us, and the professional Indian-guardians could be heaved off the public payroll and put to some useful work. . . . Alas, we know we're merely daydreaming; it's just hopelessly naive to believe a government could ever take a direct road toward solving anything that involves separating a bureaucrat from his bureau.

Every year, come March, there is a solemn announcement from Albany that the State government has graciously consented to "forgive" New York State citizens a small proportion of their income taxes. It's certainly nice to know that you have to be "forgiven" every twelve months for keeping something that belonged to you in the first place. We thank thee, dear Stalin — er, we mean dear Dewey — for your charity. And just to be nice to you in a turnabout way, we're sending you a book on the subject of semantics. No charge; we'll "forgive" you the price.

For those who believe that a government monopoly of broadcasting such as exists in Great Britain is no threat to liberty the recently published "Report of the Broadcasting Committee 1949" (Cmd 8116) provides ample food for thought. The report of the committee, presided over by Lord Beveridge, is revealing more by its implicit assumptions than by its awareness of the problem. We shall confine ourselves to quoting a few lines from one particularly significant paragraph (386): With respect to broadcasts from foreign countries it is there argued that

> In the last resort, if we do not want either political propaganda or commercial broadcasts from abroad, we may be driven to jamming, as Soviet Russia has jammed much or most of the information about the world outside which the British and American broadcasting authorities have endeavored to supply to the Russian people. . . . In dealing with broadcasts from abroad the choice may come to lie between jamming them and making bargains to keep them under control.

Where exactly is the difference between this view and the attitude of totalitarian governments?

The London correspondent for the *Baltimore Sun* comes up with the information that socialism is losing its appeal among Oxford and Cambridge undergraduates. If this is true, it is the most heartening news that the editors of the *Freeman* have heard in a blue moon. For as the mind of the undergraduate goes, so goes the nation — a decade or so later. The young Britishers who flocked to listen to Professors Harold Laski and G. D. H. Cole in the thirties created the mode that made for British Labor government socialism in the forties. Similarly, the American students who sat at the feet of Rex Tugwell and Felix Frankfurter in the twenties set the intellectual fashion which resulted in the New Dealism of 1933–40. If the same sort of political-intellectual rhythm pertains in the future, England will have a real non-socialist Conservative government by the time 1960 rolls round. We hope the British can survive their lack of proteins and the rest of their "ordeal by planning" until the advent of that happy day.

TO OUR FRIENDS IN EUROPE

We know from our mail that we have some very good friends in Europe. We know from the same source that the foreign policy ideas which have been advocated from time to time in the *Freeman* mystify some (though by no means all) of our good European friends. Victims of the sloganized thinking that emanates from more than one Washington source, these European friends seem to think it a mark of "isolationism" that:

1. We have considered it necessary, with Herbert Hoover, to stress the overwhelming importance of building up United States air and sea power;
2. We have asked that future commitments of United States troops to the defense of European soil be made in accordance with a mandatory "matching" ratio of one American division to five or six European divisions; and
3. We have talked a good deal about the need for protecting the United States flank in the Pacific by keeping Formosa out of the hands of the Communists and by helping the forces of Chiang Kai-shek to carry the war against Mao Tse-tung.

These three points that have been stressed in the *Freeman* seem to us to be based on a proper estimate of the strength of 140 million American citizens as it might be most effectively applied to the job of keeping Stalin at bay in both the eastern and western hemispheres. Since the three points cover the sea, the air and, inferentially, *all* of the continents, it is hard to see how anyone can wring a proof of "isolationism" out of them. Yet the mail bag tells us that it is possible to do so.

How to explain ourselves to our good European friends? How to prove that the main end of *Freeman* policy is to save, not merely the solitary isle of Formosa, but the interlocked civilizations of Europe and North America? Maybe the best way to begin is to make the simple and incontrovertible assertion that the earth is round. This is a fact that may not seem of prime importance to west Europeans who see an extra-huge colossus threatening them from one direction: the East. But the roundness of the globe is the only thing that has saved western Europe to date. If Stalin, following out the precepts of Lenin, did not consider himself bound to bring colonial Asia into the Communist orbit before tackling the "old" lands of capitalism, western Europe would long since have fallen to superior numbers of Red troops.

Time and again the theoreticians of Marxism-Leninism have told the activists of the Bolshevik party that the way to win the West is first to win the East. The theory has been epigrammatically formulated by Trotsky as "the law of uneven and combined development." This theory, which was Lenin's own theory before Trotsky put it into highly polished literary form, stresses the special vulnerability of capitalism's colonial domain. Put crudely, it means that historic periods can be telescoped in lands that have never developed a bourgeoisie. Lacking a strongly entrenched middle class, the colonial countries are considered ripe for quick and easy overthrow by a manufactured "proletarian" push against the remnants of ancient ruling cliques. It matters not at all that colonial nations usually have only the rudiments of an urban "proletariat." "Worker" leaders can be created out of willing dupes to provoke tenant farmers into rising against landowners; these same "worker" leaders can be set up in business as "patriots" who are against the "devils" of alleged foreign exploitation.

If the Communists are bent on fatally weakening the capitalist world by outflanking it in Asia, it follows that any action which tends to obstruct Stalin's program in Asia must give western Europe an extra breathing spell. And, since time is of the essence when it comes to rearmament, the way to give Europe the opportunity to raise and train sixty or a hundred divisions is to keep the pressure on Stalin in the Far East. Stalin can't very well switch his attention from Asia before his program is completed without putting the whole vital artery of the trans-Siberian railroad at the mercy of Western airpower based on Japan and the southern Asiatic tier.

Because the United States is a large island-continent on a round earth, it should have a rounded foreign policy appropriate to its geopolitical position on the map. Unlike France, or Denmark, or Italy, or western Germany, the United States is vulnerable to Soviet attack from either the east or the west, or from both quarters simultaneously. If the United States concentrates on Europe to the exclusion of the Far East, it can lose its Japanese and Philippine bases and see its Hanford atomic energy works blasted to rubble from Soviet forward bases seized by Red paratroopers in Alaska. If it concentrates on the Pacific to the exclusion of Europe, it can see the process reversed, with destruction coming by way of Soviet bombers based on the fields of northern Europe.

Hence the intimate strategic interconnectedness of Formosa and France, which is something that even so astute a commentator as Elmer Davis tends to miss. (It is not true, Elmer, that responsible Republicans wish to trade France for Formosa; they want to save France by using Formosa to keep Stalin tied up in the field of his major effort.)

Now, the wealth and the energies of 140 million Americans are admittedly great. But they are not so great as to be unlimited, even though many American commentators seem bent on giving just that impression to Europeans. It would take a mathematician as skilled in "Alice in Wonderland" *divertissement* as Lewis Carroll to prove that 140 million Americans constitute a larger population than the 200 million Europeans who still live outside the Iron Curtain. Even with their advanced machine-power, if 140 million Americans are to hold the anti-Communist front in the Far East (where the enemy is actually being engaged in Korea), they need considerable help from 200 million free Europeans. They also need help from whatever Chinese still actively believe in fighting the Communist enemy. Hence the *Freeman's* foreign policy. Hence our insistence that Europe raise five or six divisions to every American division marked for service on the Elbe or the Rhine. Hence our insistence upon the common-sensical project of enlisting the aid of