

bases and a fleet of ten million tons. Except for Poland and the de Gaulist Movement, they are self-supporting and their cost to the United Nations is negligible. The oft-heard charge that these governments are "spendthrift" is sheer propaganda.

In most cases the exile governments are composed of responsible statesmen who enjoy great prestige in their countries. All except the Fighting French Cabinets are composed of former Ministers; the Prime Ministers of Belgium, Norway, and Luxembourg were in office at the time their respective countries were invaded. All nine of the governments-in-exile have declared themselves ready to submit to elections when the war is ended.

In contrast with these legal governments are the activities of some irresponsible groups, associations

and individuals whose background is obscure, whose funds come from unrevealed sources and whose plans are dubious. Among these are various active Croatian, Slovene, Slovak, Ruthenian, Rumanian, Albanian and even German "pretenders," as well as fascist-minded backers of certain French, Hungarian and Austrian groups. The confusion stems in most part from such sources rather than the governments-in-exile. In 1855, Alexander Vinet, a French philosopher, wrote: *Quand la reputation d'un homme est établie, elle est toujours meilleure ou pire qu'il ne la mérite.* (When the reputation of a man is established, it is always better or worse than he deserves.) A conscientious scrutiny of the situation shows that the established reputation of the governments-in-exile is worse than they deserve.

ON SEEING TWO OLD LADIES ON A BUS

Do not deplore the pursed lips, the rigid mouth,
 As signs of bigotry,
 But turn aside, remembering,
 Such grim compression may well be
 To keep the lips from trembling
 And still the sad and frightened soul within.

ELEANOR PHINNEY

THE STATE OF THE UNION

What Price "Security"?

BY EUGENE LYONS

THE totalitarian animal has been described for the benefit of Americans in thousands of books, lectures, articles and news dispatches. Denunciation of its nasty ways of life accounts for roughly two-thirds of all public and private oratory. Recently a lot of plays and movies have done their stint in exposing the monster. We are fighting a war to keep its breed from our soil and if possible to expunge it altogether.

One would suppose, therefore, that the average American by this time has a pretty good idea of what the animal looks like. Though he has not yet felt its claws and its fangs, he can presumably imagine the horror without the privilege of direct experience. Yet there are on every hand proofs that the lesson hasn't quite taken. Our politicians and publicists, indeed, need only camouflage the beast with a bit of democratic foliage to have it enthusiastically accepted as a house pet by their countrymen. And curi-

ously, the very self-styled liberals who pride themselves on seniority in the matter of hating and defying the totalitarian abomination seem to be the most gullible in accepting its "democratic" versions. Every day one sees them cuddling up to "big government" and the omnipotent state with the unsuspecting delight of an infant reaching out for a lovely panther.

There are plenty of other signs of pervasive misunderstanding of the real nature of the modern dictatorship. The clinching evidence is provided by the statement one hears so often on nearly all levels of political thinking in our country. "There may be no freedom under dictatorship," it runs, "but at least there's security." There are any number of variations, but that's the main theme. When it is not expressed in so many words, it is implied by those who think they see some saving grace in dictatorships abroad or seek to make the state all-powerful at home.