

Sages Revive Wrong-Way Vote Experts Active Again

By Herman A. Lowe WASHINGTON, Nov. 15. YOU'VE heard it said, no matter how bad things get, somehow we must go on living.

Paraphrasing it only a little bit, the political experts have been declaring in effect, "No matter how sour we want, no matter how far off we want, somehow we must go on living."

Washington is the lair of the experts, the place where they frolic and feast and forecast.

This is to report that, down here at least, the boys have already regained their health and aplomb. Once more they are pontificating like mad.

HARDLY had the last chill winds of the election receded when the householders started clearing their throats and typewriters.

Many a recent broadcast and article says with only slight circumlocution: "True, Harry, old man, you've had your ups. But now that you've had your rump, you can go into the corner and sit down. We're taking over from here on in. We'll tell you how to run the country."

Then the experts go on to advise President Truman and his administration what they must do during the next four years, to save himself and the rest of us from going to perdition. Some even dust off the electorate for having had the coldest nerve to vote contrary to the way the experts said it should and would.

IT HAS been claimed that one of the reasons the "experts" went so wrong during the campaign was that they talked only to other experts like themselves. They forgot to talk to people who were used to doing in the old days—to taxi drivers, farmers, shoe store clerks, the cop on the beat, the housewife studying prices on the wall of the butcher shop, and the like.

If folks are the same the nation over as they are here in Washington, then the deep thinkers are in Dutch once more. A lot of people have started to mutter and grumble at an expert who put it only a day or two back, "Imagine the gall of those Wrong Way Corrigans. First they told us Harry Truman was lousy, without any ifs, buts or maybes. Now, after burying him before he was dead, they are telling him how to run the country."

SOMEHOW the experts don't ever seem to run into words like that. Or, if they do, they don't believe what they hear. The National Press Club is a great institution. Its bar and dining room and lounge are places where experts pick each other's brains and come up with bright new ideas of what's going to happen and what should be done about it.

These boys write a lot about "the little people" but don't recognize a little person when they fall over one. If you want proof of that, here it is: After the election, several of those who predicted a Dewey victory explained sheepishly that their wives had been smarter than they had been. Typical was this comment from one radio commentator:

"My wife said a week before election if she had been back home she would vote for Truman. She said she thought he was a very nice person and not to be too certain that it was a walkaway for Dewey. I had laughed at her. She has been razing me ever since election night."

THEN there was the syndicated columnist who said, "You know, I talked to a fellow who delivers the milk out at my place and he asked me who I thought was going to win. I told him Dewey. He said, 'I live over the line in Maryland and I'm going to vote for Truman. I think he really has a chance. I've been talking to a lot of people lately who say they're for Truman.'" Laughed this columnist, "I'm going to get my political information from my milkman."

It is surprising how many times one runs into stories like that. The trouble is they are not remembered. Any so, my hearties, things will go on as usual. The thin red line of experts has closed ranks and is facing forward, unbowed and not even bloody any more.

There's thunder on the airwaves and among the typewriters. Better duck. Here come the predictions.

Tremendous Trifles

News 'Ad' Starts Red Cross

By Lewis Baltimore Sage GREAT oaks from little acorns grow, and great benefits to the human race have accrued from trifles. A great forward step in human relations resulted from a newspaper advertisement by Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross.

Clara Barton was a woman who combined humanitarianism, efficiency, and determination. At the start of the Civil War, however, her talents were confined to a clerkship in the Patent Office in Washington.

Early in the war Miss Barton's brother who was engaged in business within the limits of the Confederacy, was captured and held by Federal troops. Clara resolved to visit him and do what she could to minister to his comfort and welfare. Realizing that many families had sons and brothers who were sick or wounded, she proposed that her visit to the front should be a means of carrying aid to others. To this end she inserted a notice in a Worcester, Mass., newspaper, offering her services to any who might wish to

Washington Background Far East Milk Run To Eliminate GI Gripe

By The Inquirer Washington Bureau Staff

WASHINGTON, Nov. 15. WHEN REPRESENTATIVE J. PARNELL THOMAS (R., N. J.), the indicted chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, was making headlines with the help of Elizabeth T. Bentley, the avowed Communist who told all, this column became interested in the lady.

One day when the klieglights in the House caucus room became unbearable, Thomas ordered a 10-minute recess. We cornered Miss Bentley and asked her what she thought about the whole furore.

"You know," she replied, "I would like to go to some beach, get the sun and take it easy."

Now investigators are hunting for Miss Bentley to serve papers on her to appear in connection with the defamation suit filed against her by William W. Remington, suspended Commerce Department employee, whom she had named in connection with one of the wartime spy rings operating here.

Incidentally, while Miss Bentley was under subpoena by the Thomas committee as well as the Senate Investigations Committee headed by Senator Homer Ferguson (R., Mich.) she was under 24-hour guard by capital police.

During this time she was the center of controversy between Thomas and Ferguson. The argument between the two investigators was who was to pay her hotel and food bills.

Don't worry about your boy! Armed Force Magazine discloses that the Army will eliminate one of the biggest gripes of American soldiers based in the Far East.

Soldiers who have been griping that they are tired of powdered milk will get a change. The army finally has done something about it. Under plans now in operation the entire Far East command will come under the milk run.

Beverage milk will be prepared in seven plants located in Japan, Guam and Okinawa. In producing the milk, dry ingredients are placed in suspension, homogenized and then pasteurized. Inspectors will assure a proper percentage of milk fat and a minimum of bacterial count.

The recombined milk also will come chocolate-flavored.

A special type of police will make their appearance here on Jan. 20 when President Truman and Vice President-elect Alben W. Barkley are inaugurated.

The District of Columbia has awarded a contract to supply 800 special police badges. The badges will be worn by auxiliary police who will assist the regular police department.

These badges will differ from the regulation police badges. They will have the names of Truman and Barkley stamped on them.

No doubt they will become collectors' items.

Another of the governments in-exile has taken the bull by the horn and is telling American people of the Russian terror. This time the Lithuanian legation is putting out a 27-page current news bulletin on what is happening behind the Iron Curtain.

Only last August, Secretary of State George C. Marshall reminded the Russians that the United States has not recognized the conquest of Lithuania. The bulletin has news from the Soviet Union as well as comment on the other Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia.

—Edited by John C. O'Brien.

Why They Prayed for Heir King, Cockney Enthroned Mutual Love Above Politics

By Merrill Paritt

LONDON, Nov. 15. AN AMERICAN in London may be inclined to look upon the crowds of people who stood and cheered before Buckingham Palace last night as curiosity seekers—like those who gather at society weddings or in front of restaurants where movie stars are dining.

There may also be, at least for anyone who has seen the mechanics of publicity used to attract crowds and build emotion, a hint of something contrived in the flowery phrases in today's London newspapers, in the shooting of guns, ringing of bells and raising of flags to celebrate the birth of an heir to a power-shorn throne.

But Britons' reverence for their royal family is a genuine and deep-seated thing, despite the paradox of a monarchy adored in a state that has turned to the class-leveling of socialism as a cure-all for antiquated factories and hungry mouths.

ONE man qualified to answer Americans' questions as to the significance of the new Prince to the British people is Hector Bolitho, biographer of Queen Victoria, Prince Albert, George V, Edward VIII (now Duke of Windsor) and the present King George VI. For 30 years Bolitho, often termed "official biographer of Britain's monarchs," has devoted his life to the study of the royal family and people over which it reigned.

"What you must first understand," Bolitho said today, "is that history is deeply important to the British. Go any Sunday to Henry VII's castle at Hampton Court or to any other landmark in life of our country and you will find great streams of people gathering in refreshment out of history."

Great Britain, he asserted, is the only nation in the world that has had "continuous" history since the Elizabethan era. Other countries have changed their form of government or their ruling houses, but Britain has retained its monarchy.

(The new Royal Prince is a direct descendant of all 11 families that have ruled England since the ninth century.)

WITH such a long and uninterrupted history, Bolitho said "it is to be expected that love of history should mature here. This love is concentrated in the royal family, which, after all, represents the history of our country more than any monument or building ever could."

Since the royal family resides chiefly at Buckingham Palace, Bolitho said, people of England always move instinctively toward the palace in time of grief or of celebration.

"We go to the palace, it seems, whenever we turn toward our conscience," he said. "There from the central balcony Queen Victoria waved to troops returning from the Crimean war. There our monarch or a member of the royal family has always appeared at important moments in our modern history."

The Queen Mother Mary stepped onto the central balcony of the palace last night and waved to the crowds assembled to hear news of the prince's birth.

BOLITHO explained that the power of the throne began changing in Victoria's time, with the monarch losing political power but gaining the power of ruling by example.

"We can elect people to make our laws," he said, "and appoint people to see that laws are kept, but we can't elect or appoint guiding spirit of those laws. By his example the king has become the guiding spirit of our laws."

The biographer admitted that the point was a difficult one to explain. He said that the greatest men in history were religious leaders who ruled by example rather than force. Men like Hitler and Napoleon, Bolitho said, were not truly great because they ruled by force alone.

Thus even though the Commonwealth of the British Empire were freed under the statute of Westminster, the King still exercised tremendous influence in Australia, Canada and New Zealand, Bolitho pointed out.

BOLITHO quoted Winston Churchill who, when discussing the important part the present royal family plays in British life, said: "The King and Queen have the rarest talent of being able to make the mass of people realize in a flash that they are good."

As to the seeming paradox of the royal family and the Socialist government, Bolitho asserted that the monarchial position above politics has not changed a bit since the Labor government took over.

It is difficult for foreigners—and especially Americans—to realize that the monarchy and aristocracy in England do not go hand in hand. There is no bond between the King and the aristocrat, for the King belongs to the people. But the bond between the Cockney and the King is strong once more.

Samuel Grafton Policy Based On War Idea Cripples U.S.

WHAT would happen if we were to change the basis of our foreign policy, from the idea that we must hastily prepare against the danger of war with Russia, to the entirely different idea that Russia can't make war upon us, even if she should want to, because she is too battered, too poor and too weak?

In other words, what would happen if we were to build our foreign policy on the startling assumption that there is no danger of war? What would we build? Where would our thinking take us?

(I admit it is a novel idea that there is no real prospect of war. Yet, certain modern mathematicians have done rather wonderful things by chucking out such well-established ideas as Euclid's notion that parallel lines can never meet. They have thus built a non-Euclidean geometry which has, in its own way, been useful to the world.)

What I propose, speculatively, is a kind of non-Euclidean foreign policy, built on some other basis than the commonly accepted one.)

IN the first place, if we were to decide that war, for practical reasons, is not a real danger, in spite of Russia's admitted malice toward Western capitalism, we would undergo an important social reorganization. The influence of the soldier in our society would go down, that of the social philosopher would go up. That is perhaps not a bad thing in the case of a world struggle between conflicting social systems.

By thinking only, or mainly, in terms of possible foreign policy, we are opposing Russia with only part of what we have; we are opposing her with fist alone, instead of with mind and fist. We are, for example, distorting ERP to make it fit into our military conceptions, instead of really using it to rebuild Western Europe economically.

Though obviously the latter development would, in its own way, be a decisive stroke. In the same way, we are spending fifteen billions a year on arms at home, instead of using that money to solve those problems which Communism in Western Europe cannot solve, such as housing.

THE funny thing about a program of outright and sturdy military opposition to Russia is that it cripples us in our fight against her. Strangely enough, it doesn't let us fight fair, with all we have. The big hullabaloo about rearming comes nearer making us its one hand behind our back than does to making us genuinely stronger, in a world historical sense. And these dangers are avoided by what I call the non-Euclidean approach to foreign policy.

But there is something else. If we would change the basic assumption of our foreign policy to the novel idea that there is going to be peace, we would find it much easier to fight for peace. If we believed there was going to be peace we could, for example, yell for disarmament, we could scream like banshees for it; but it sounds like a yell for a thing that is not a thing at a time when you are also yelling for arms.

WHEN you build a foreign policy on the assumption that there may be war, the policy you seek to conduct is weak and strengthened the assumption on which it is based. Even if the assumption were wrong in the beginning, it may become true if you build enough policy on it. It is not the assumption which makes the policy correct; it may be the policy which makes the assumption correct.

I wonder if, in the same way a foreign policy based on the assumption that there is going to be peace would not also work backward and strengthen its own assumption, ending by making its postulates true.

HAVEN'T the militarists of this world always done something like that, build force on the basis of fear, until the force thus built up makes the world so uncertain and uneasy that the fear finally becomes justified? My non-Euclidean approach proposes relaxation and confidence instead, as novel bases for a foreign policy, in the hope of attaining equally vivid, but more useful results.

And I cannot close these non-Euclidean notes without mentioning that a nation which based its appeal on relaxation and confidence might come to be invested with a certain unusual charm, perhaps better suited for attracting adherents and allies than the stricken countenance and the hoarse planetary cry of "Help!"

THEY'LL DO IT EVERY TIME

AT LAST LUGLOW GOT HIS BIG OPPORTUNITY TO ENTERTAIN HIS GAFFER

CLEAN THE HOUSE! GET OUT THE GOOD SILVER! THE BOSS IS COMING TO DINNER! I DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE TO CALL YOU! GET ALL DOLLED UP! THIS IS IMPORTANT!

SO WHO COMES A-VISITIN' JUST BEFORE THE BOSS IS DUE? READ ON, PAL, READ ON -

'LO, COUSIN LUG—JUST AS SOON'S I GOT MY PAROLE I SAYS TO AMY—'LET'S GO SEE GOOD OL' LUG—'

THANKS, AND A TIP OF THE HAT TO JERRY LOBARTZ, ROCKVILLE CENTER, LONG ISLAND.

©1948 KING FEATURES SYNDICATE, INC. WORLD RIGHTS RESERVED.

Gossip of the Nation: Walter Winchell

NEW YORK, Nov. 15. INTERVIEW—Following Sunday's broadcast. I of Miami and senior high school editors, who witnessed it, put us on the following spot:

O. What do you think will happen to the two newly formed parties, the Dixiecrats and the Progressives? A. The Dixiecrats are cracking up now. But they should join the Republican disband. The Liberal Republicans should join the Democrats. Senators Morse, of Oregon, and Ives, of N. Y. (Republicans), are far more liberal than Senator Byrd, of Virginia, a bitterly conservative Democrat. . . . I don't know what the Progressives (the Wallaceites) will do next and neither do they, until they read the party-line in The Daily Scumminator.

Q. What is your personal prediction of things to come out of the Truman Administration? A. None of us predicted a Truman Administration, much less anything to come out of it. One thing that is certain to come out of it, however, is certain politicians—on a dead run. . . . The President will do his best to put across his platform, but even with Democrats all around him (in both Houses) he will run into trouble with Congress.

Q. WHAT basic advice have you for young people planning a journalistic career? A. You can't plan newspaper work. It is the only profession where irregularity happens regularly. . . . Reporting is an addiction, not a vocation. The only excuse for being a reporter is that you can't help it. Unless you'd sooner have a press card in your hat than a million dollars in your wallet, don't waste your time—or an editor's.

Q. What is your solution for combating juvenile delinquency? A. The first step is for adults to be honest with themselves. I'm enough of a reporter. I think, to know that there's always too much self-complacency (plus smugness and hypocrisy) present when unlucky people are put in a class and given a bad name. I think juve-delinquency needs more attention and less publicity. There's very little wrong with the younger generation that couldn't be cured by more honesty in the older one.

Q. HOW did you start your career, when and where? A. It's a long, dull story—been written up by nearly all the dull interviewers in all the dull mags. Was a song-and-dance man in vaudeville; landed on The Vaudeville News in the early 1920s, then to the N. Y. Graphic in Sept., 1924; then in June, 1929, to the N. Y. Mirror. I also work on the radio.

Q. What are your feelings toward a world gov't? A. I think the idea of World Federal Gov't is like the teachings of the great religions. The great ideas are so great—that people ought to try them. It would advance the world 10 centuries overnight—if people acted as if they really believed in the things they say they do.

Q. WHAT are your feelings on the USSR-U. S. relations? A. There is no more deadly quarrel than between two men using the same words with different meanings.

Q. If it becomes law—then Pres. Truman lost the election.

meanings. The argument has now advanced to its most dangerous point. The tragedy is that fighting never won any argument. You don't shoot to prove a point. You shoot to keep from getting killed. Unfortunately, it takes only one to start a fight. Then everyone must defend himself because he has no choice if he wants to live. Most people and most nations fight from fear—the fear of rage and hate. . . . Q. What are the main shortcomings of the U.N.? A: Its shortcomings are that it was stabbed in the back by its own bodyguards. . . . That the nations of the world measured it in power instead of in souls. . . . That it was begrudged a few acres in which to make peace—in a world in which there are hundreds of square miles of military cemeteries. . . . The nations have even refused to cooperate on the feeding of 30 million orphans. . . . In short, there is nothing the matter with the United Nations, except that the nations never unite—except for war.

Q. HAS the U.N. accomplished anything to its outstanding credit? A: Yes, it has. It has been and it is the hope of the common people all over the world. The diplomats are so afraid of this greatest of all forces—the will of the common people—that though they despise it in private and insult it in public, no nation on earth feels itself powerful enough to take the responsibility for killing it. The U.N. (in the diplomatic world) is hated by the diplomats the way a crook hates his conscience. The U.N.'s greatest service is that no nation dares leave its fingerprints on the throat of peace. There's hope—because no one has nerve enough to kill this baby.

Q. Have you a solution to the Palestine problem? A: Stop sending U. S. arms and money to England, which keeps sharing it with the Arabs. Our Founding Fathers didn't like it when the country was having labor pains and the Russians butted in.

Q. WHOM do you think the Republicans will nominate next time? A: Eisenhower, if they can get him away from the Democrats.

Report to the People: The Civil Defense Plan put forth by the Dept. of Defense is dangerously near a blueprint for American Fascism. . . . It provides that every American community will be policed by a special force capable of handling any weapons and under the control of a small staff in Washington. . . . That's how the Storm Troopers operated. . . . The FBI is ignored and no other Gov't dept. was consulted on the plans.

Russell J. Hopley, its author, hates labor worse than Taft and Hartley. . . . Chairman McGrath protested his appointment when it was made, bluntly telling President Truman that Hopley was a Republican reactionary and labor's bitterest enemy in Nebraska. . . . This plan is part of the Forrestal-Eberhart-Goose plan to take over the FBI.

Your Bill of Rights, which can be printed on a single sheet, is being strangled in this 200-page report.

If it becomes law—then Pres. Truman lost the election.

Polonia Negri heads for Hollywood within four weeks, bringing her autobiography, "As Much As I Dare."

Scrappers who will publish the book in which Polonia says she tells a little more than she dares, says it won't be out until next September.

Polonia returned from France a few days ago, bringing her mother, Madame Eleanor Chaluppe, and some pieces of signed furniture from her villa in the south of France.

Gene Tierney goes to her home studio, 20th Century-Fox, Feb. 1 for "Mistaken the Lady," which will precede the commitment 20th made for her with Paramount in exchange for Ray Milland.

Harry Ginsberg is just as well satisfied that Gene comes to Paramount later, since, at this writing, he has nothing ready for her to make the picture at Paramount some time in the early part of next year.

Snaphots of Hollywood collected at random: Pretty Mary Hatcher's new heart is Bill O'Brien, a war correspondent. He is a brother of Edmond O'Brien, the actor.

Sam Goldwyn is dicker-ing with Sally Benson to write a screenplay for "Billions-Dollar Baby."

The Oscar Homolka-Johnson-Tetzlaff romance is hotter than a California day in November. Don't be surprised if it ends in marriage.

Reports have it that Robert Montgomery turned down \$275,000 to direct and star in a movie with one of our top stars. Says he couldn't afford it, on account of the taxes.

John Ford will probably be called a genius all over again. He shot some rain scenes for "The Yellow Ribbon" and the odd effects obtained in color are very dramatic. The reason John shot so many rain scenes was because it rained on location all the time. John's money was in the movie and he didn't want to lose any time.

One thing about Jane Nigh, you are never in doubt who the boy friend is. Now it's Kurt Kreuger, who has been giving her devoted attention since his return.

Shirley Temple and Clifton Webb who are in Reno—not for the usual reason, but making a picture—took time out to appear at a charity entertainment.

Flora Robson cables that she left the cast of "Christopher Columbus" because she wanted to play comedy for a change, and not because of Florence Eldridge.

I just heard that M. G. M. has a picture commitment with Montgomery Clift. It's "Murder Is My Business," an original by Syd Boehm.

The hero is a mail carrier. It shows how any man in a false step can be involved in a crime. It will be shot in New York after Clift, who is in Europe with Gene Kelly, returns.

Mary Bard is walking in the literary footsteps of her sister, Betty McDonald, who made the country laugh at her farming experiences in "The Egg and I." Mary has written her true-life experiences as a doctor's wife, called "The Doctor Wore Three Faces."

Being married to a doctor can be more exciting than raising chickens—I know—I'm married to one. 20th Century-Fox must think so, too. Because although the book will not be published until next spring, the studio has already purchased the screen rights.

Lonella Parsons Crosby Joins Capra for 'B'way Bill'

HOLLYWOOD, Nov. 15. THOSE two blue-ribbon boys, Bing Crosby and Frank Capra, who have enough Oscars between them to start a store, will work together for the first time when Frank starts his first movie on his Paramount contract.

Frank has selected "Broadway Bill," a short story by the late Mark Hellinger. What a combination of talents this is—the one and only Bing, top director Capra and Hellinger who has made a Broadway Broadway in his own human nature as he would never get so stuck on his own acting that he would make a movie without songs—smart boy.

I doubt if the Crosby-Capra movie will start before March because "Broadway Bill" in its original form, is just a story idea and has to be expanded.

Judy Canova is a girl who can fight when the occasion requires it. She has just lodged a protest with the Italian government to gain possession of a 40-room villa in Fasano, Italy, which she inherited in 1945 from the late Antonio Canova, the Italian sculptor, to whom she was related. She turned the villa over to the government at that time, with the provision that it be used as a school or hospital.

Now she has learned that racketeers got possession of the villa and are operating it as a hotel and gambling resort. She will ask the government to hand it back to her.

Polonia Negri heads for Hollywood within four weeks, bringing her autobiography, "As Much As I Dare."

Scrappers who will publish the book in which Polonia says she tells a little more than she dares, says it won't be out until next September.

Polonia returned from France a few days ago, bringing her mother, Madame Eleanor Chaluppe, and some pieces of signed furniture from her villa in the south of France.

Gene Tierney goes to her home studio, 20th Century-Fox, Feb. 1 for "Mistaken the Lady," which will precede the commitment 20th made for her with Paramount in exchange for Ray Milland.

Harry Ginsberg is just as well satisfied that Gene comes to Paramount later, since, at this writing, he has nothing ready for her to make the picture at Paramount some time in the early part of next year.

Snaphots of Hollywood collected at random: Pretty Mary Hatcher's new heart is Bill O'Brien, a war correspondent. He is a brother of Edmond O'Brien, the actor.

Sam Goldwyn is dicker-ing with Sally Benson to write a screenplay for "Billions-Dollar Baby."

The Oscar Homolka-Johnson-Tetzlaff romance is hotter than a California day in November. Don't be surprised if it ends in marriage.

Reports have it that Robert Montgomery turned down \$275,000 to direct and star in a movie with one of our top stars. Says he couldn't afford it, on account of the taxes.

John Ford will probably be called a genius all over again. He shot some rain scenes for "The Yellow Ribbon" and the odd effects obtained in color are very dramatic. The reason John shot so many rain scenes was because it rained on location all the time. John's money was in the movie and he didn't want to lose any time.

One thing about Jane Nigh, you are never in doubt who the boy friend is. Now it's Kurt Kreuger, who has been giving her devoted attention since his return.

Shirley Temple and Clifton Webb who are in Reno—not for the usual reason, but making a picture—took time out to appear at a charity entertainment.

Flora Robson cables that she left the cast of "Christopher Columbus" because she wanted to play comedy for a change, and not because of Florence Eldridge.

I just heard that M. G. M. has a picture commitment with Montgomery Clift. It's "Murder Is My Business," an original by Syd Boehm.

The hero is a mail carrier. It shows how any man in a false step can be involved in a crime. It will be shot in New York after Clift, who is in Europe with Gene Kelly, returns.

Mary Bard is walking in the literary footsteps of her sister, Betty McDonald, who made the country laugh at her farming experiences in "The Egg and I." Mary has written her true-life experiences as a doctor's wife, called "The Doctor Wore Three Faces."

Being married to a doctor can be more exciting than raising chickens—I know—I'm married to one. 20th Century-Fox must think so, too. Because although the book will not be published until next spring, the studio has already purchased the screen rights.

Today

Continued From First Page majority government and the increasing movements of troops and equipment everywhere in the Red occupation zone of Germany, should convince the alert diplomat that there's more than a peace desire behind the Soviet program. The Red's first project is to pretend peace aspirations while waging a relentless political war. Threatening small fry, overrunning weak sisters like China with Kremlin-directed Red armies, establishing fifth columns in every South-east Asiatic area, including British Malaya; clubbing the democratic Berlin Council into submission, cheating with worthless Soviet occupation marks and trying to beguile the West into sharing productive Bizonia since they've ransacked Eastern Germany, the Russians now faster upon idealists like Evatt and Lie.

As one Western spokesman bluntly said today: "The U.N. appeal might as well have been written in the Kremlin. It is aimed at the same purpose."

This observer has long wondered over the Australian Evatt's feelings in the East-West crisis. A year ago he fought the loudest and strongest against the Soviet bloc. But when the Assembly opened and he won the presidency, after two previous defeats, his immediate actions were almost slavishly conciliatory toward Russia.

Australian unofficial contribution otherwise toward this U.N. session has come from Col. A. W. Sheppard, former UNRRA official and most-quoted Westerner by Communist spokesmen.

The Western Powers will, in all probability, restate what Philip Jessup told Vishinsky immediately after the Red purge-master announced he would veto the Berlin discussion. They also may remind the Assembly president and secretary-general that while they appreciate their efforts, it was Vishinsky who violently protested and denied the U.N.'s rights to meddle in the Berlin situation. It's now the West's turn to decline more appeasement.

The signed columns of America's leading writers and commentators appearing on this and other pages of The Inquirer are presented so that our readers may have the benefit of a wide variety of viewpoints on important issues of the day.

These viewpoints often contradict one another. They have no connection with the editorial policy of this newspaper and sometimes, in fact, may represent exactly an opposite opinion. The opinions and views expressed belong solely to the writers.

Opinions

The signed columns of America's leading writers and commentators appearing on this and other pages of The Inquirer are presented so that our readers may have the benefit of a wide variety of viewpoints on important issues of the day.

These viewpoints often contradict one another. They have no connection with the editorial policy of this newspaper and sometimes, in fact, may represent exactly an opposite opinion. The opinions and views expressed belong solely to the writers.

The signed columns of America's leading writers and commentators appearing on this and other pages of The Inquirer are presented so that our readers may have the benefit of a wide variety of viewpoints on important issues of the day.

These viewpoints often contradict one another. They have no connection with the editorial policy of this newspaper and sometimes, in fact, may