

The Plight of the Liberals

BY LOUIS FRANCIS BUDENZ

ON THE national scene, there now appears an array of knights in shining armor, charging at full tilt against "the climate of fear." Upon the banner of each is inscribed: "I am a liberal." In the heat of battle, they storm the "enemy" with books galore, magazine articles, and orations. Much of the daily press records their exploits with awe. The majority of book reviewers acclaim their books and the Book of the Month Club often selects them. Great foundations heap gifts upon them, in order that they may have sustenance for the fray. The "liberals" have become a power.

But truth compels me to report that these bold warriors, despite their privileged position, are actually in a bad way. Too many of them are "hollow men," reliving Byron's taunt against the Lake poets. In the name of "democracy" and "freedom," to which they are supposedly dedicated, they advance the greatest present danger to our freedom, the Communist line. In loud opposition to "totalitarianism," they afford aid and comfort to the aggressions of the climax of totalitarianism, the Soviet dictatorship.

The "liberals," by and large, are the victims of political schizophre-

nia. What makes matters worse, they are unaware of this distressful disease — all of them save the concealed Communists in their midst, who are striving to make the affliction more incurable.

It is little wonder that the Communists commend these knights errant or praise them with faint damns — which is the same thing in the Red lexicon. It is fitting that the May, 1954, issue of *Masses and Mainstream*, the Soviet fifth column's publication for the intellectuals, recommends four books by these "liberals" for use among the masses, while of course cautioning the comrades not to take seriously the "liberal" trimmings of these Olympian utterances.

Outstanding among the warriors is Theodore H. White, whose 1953 work, *Fire in the Ashes*, was a Book of the Month Club selection and for a long time stood out among the best sellers. We can therefore take it for granted that it reached hundreds of thousands of educated Americans, thoroughly befuddling their minds. Several good and intelligent persons have told me confidentially that they could find "nothing wrong" in Mr. White's pages. Alas, the sole thing that is

basically wrong with his production is that it leads anyone who takes it seriously to accept the main features of the Communist line. It is a continuation of the same procedure by which the author made his contribution to the betrayal of China into the hands of the Reds, with his book of appeasement, *Thunder Out of China*.

Gifted with a facile style and an ability at anecdote, Mr. White leads us through a welter of words, which disdains documentary proof, to his pro-Communist conclusions. Stalin is presented as a "diabolical genius," who nevertheless made so many colossal blunders that we can negotiate ourselves into victory over the Kremlin. The historical reality that these alleged blunders have placed 900,000,000 human beings under the iron rule of no more than 10,000,000 Communists is a mere bagatelle in Mr. White's cheery view of the present scene. Nor is he apparently aware of the dreary road leading from Yalta to Geneva, strewn with the wreckage of American hopes. Nor does he take the pains to tell his readers that it is precisely "the Big Power negotiations" which he recommends that are shouted aloud as essential by every Communist source from the Kremlin and the *New Times* of Moscow to *Political Affairs* and the *Daily Worker*.

By recommending "deals" with the Kremlin by a "process of bargaining," Theodore White is urging that we do exactly that which

Moscow wants us to do for our destruction.

But this author leads us into a veritable wonderland when he discusses China and Germany, which play such a large part in Soviet designs. Proof is foreign to Mr. White's way of thinking, and thus without any proof of any sort, he asserts: "The Chinese Communist Party, as it stands today, is indeed the result of a conflict with Russian leadership." Thereupon, he proceeds to present Mao Tse-tung as one who differed constantly with the Kremlin, picturing the possibility of a breach between Peking and Moscow.

IT MAKES little difference to the facile Mr. White that his whole account flies in the face of the entire history of the Chinese Communist Party, which has always been second to that of Soviet Russia in its loyalty to the Kremlin. It is of little account to him that in 1935, at the Seventh World Congress, it was the Chinese Communist Party which was chosen to give the greetings to the 65 other Parties assembled in Moscow.

His fairy tale about the continual strain between Mao Tse-tung and Moscow is completely refuted by the declaration of the Chinese Communist Central Committee on that occasion that it would "facilitate the preparations for the decisive barricade fights for the Soviet power throughout the world." It would do this "filled with a practical Stalinist spirit, with Stalinist wisdom, with

Stalinist belief in the justice of our cause, and a Stalinist will to victory!"

And the fictions which Mr. White creates about Mao are refuted further by the Chinese Red leader himself in his writings from 1926 to 1936, which are now available in Volume I of his *Selected Works*, and in which he expresses complete adherence to Moscow.

Nothing daunted, our author goes on to recommend that the United States patiently wait until "Mao, himself, feeling his strength, conscious of Russian ambition and blunders, finds an opportunity to think for himself." This Theodore White presents as a "strategy" which requires that "we must turn quickly and shrewdly, our wounds still aching, with sorrow in ten thousand homes, to offer Mao Tse-tung an exit out of the Russian world into a larger and freer one where he can make his own decisions and act in his own interests."

This flood of words, disguising the nonsense which it contains, is a proposal that the United States betray itself once more by moves toward recognition of Red China — to allow Mao to search his soul!

The "strategy" put forward for Germany is even more like a fairy tale. In the following words it appears in all its glory: "What appears to worry the Russians, fundamentally, is the specter of an armed Germany as spearhead of an Atlantic coalition. By postponing the arming

of Germans, or yielding on it altogether, we can exact an enormous price. We can exact, in the first instance, the reunification of Germany by free elections, which is necessary to bring the Germans wholeheartedly into European Union. We can advance, and possibly ultimately get, the next proposal on our program, which is the promise of free elections in Czechoslovakia, the only people of democratic tradition in Communist grip."

The great strategist would have us believe that the United States, merely by waving the wand of wishful thinking, could induce the hard-bitten masters of the Kremlin to surrender East Germany and Czechoslovakia — of course, *after* we had opened up West Germany for Soviet conquest! No thought could give more succor to the Communist line for Europe than this.

NECESSARILY, the strategist who has such confidence in the Soviet dictatorship has many fears about the United States Congress, the representatives of the American people. "Congressional inquisitions" and "Congressional interference" with the Executive, in its yielding to Soviet Russia, are condemned. This dread of the Congress is an occupational disease with the "liberals," and pervades all their thinking.

Among those conspicuous in breeding this dread of the legislative branch of our government is Dr. Henry Steele Commager, professor

of history at Columbia University. In his latest opus, *Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent*, Dr. Commager goes so far as to take up the cudgels in defense of the National Lawyer's Guild. In his pages we read: "The House Un-American Activities Committee has launched an attack on the Lawyer's Guild as a pro-Communist or subversive organization. The chief basis for this attack is, as far as we know, that the Guild has proffered its services to the defense of Communists under indictment under violation of the Smith Act."

THE worthy doctor then goes into a lugubrious discussion which accuses the House Committee of seeking to deny the right of Communists to have counsel. Of course, the whole trouble with Dr. Commager's comments is that they are not based upon facts. He has given himself an escape by that qualifying phrase "as far as we know." But as a historian, the Columbia professor should know that the National Lawyer's Guild was condemned as "the legal bulwark of the Communist Party" in a careful report on September 17, 1950. The indictment read in part:

"The National Lawyer's Guild is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions. Since its inception, it has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents. It has consistently

fought against national, state, and local legislation aimed at curbing the Communist conspiracy. It has been most articulate in its attacks upon all agencies of the Government seeking to expose or prosecute the subversive activities of the Communist network, including national, state, and local investigative committees, the Department of Justice, the FBI, and law enforcement agencies generally. Through its affiliation with the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, an international Communist-front organization, the National Lawyer's Guild has constituted itself an agent of a foreign principal hostile to the interests of the United States. It has gone far afield to oppose the foreign policies of the United States, in line with the current line of the Soviet Union."

At the conclusion of this report, which is based on hearings and documentary evidence, the House Committee on Un-American Activities appends twenty-seven pages of comparative citations from the Communist Party declarations and those of the National Lawyer's Guild, which show that the Guild is consistent in following the Communist line. All of this evidence Dr. Commager waves aside, without any mention of the report whatsoever. It does not fit in with his preconceived intention of indicting the House Committee for an alleged offense which cannot justly be laid at its door.

THIS is one instance of scores that could be cited, indicating the scorn with which the "liberals" disregard the laws of true scholarship. When the facts do not fit in with their ideas or contentions, they simply omit or alter the facts.

Dr. Commager displays the same peculiar propensity when he declares that "independence and non-conformity" were under attack in "Senator McCarthy's assault upon the State Department and particularly upon Professor Lattimore and other Far Eastern experts." Here again, the doctor relies only on the material which suits his purposes, citing the notorious Tydings Committee and relying upon its whitewash of the State Department. So far as Commager is concerned, there have never occurred in recent American history the careful and extensive hearings and report under the chairmanship of the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada. There was never unearthed the Lattimore correspondence nor did there ever occur the amazing Lattimore testimony which caused the McCarran Sub-Committee to declare "the Far Eastern expert" to be "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Dr. Commager relies upon Theodore White's *Fire in the Ashes* to inform his readers of the sad impact of the McCarthy charges upon our Foreign Service, "especially on the China Service."

But Dr. Commager does not re-

fer to the evidence which showed conclusively that John Stewart Service of that China Service had presented the Soviet espionage agent, Philip Jaffe, with countless secret documents. Nor does he disclose the evidence on which John Carter Vincent, to cite one other of many, could be declared by the Senate Sub-Committee to be "the principal fulcrum of IPR pressures and influence in the State Department," and that such pressures had been such "as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States."

This is an old custom of the "liberals," to disregard evidence from authoritative sources and to cite the words of other "liberals" instead — words which are based on opinion and have little or no substance.

THIS unique procedure is no better shown than in the case of Dr. Jerome Davis and his work, *Peace, War, and You*. The author quotes a letter from an anonymous radio commentator, whom he declares to be "an anti-Communist." We have no way of checking up on this man, and the doctor's measurement is scarcely one upon which we can rely, since he has been a member of at least fifty Communist fronts. He is so cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 1, 1951, and his various services to the Communist cause fill the files of that committee.

But Dr. Davis quotes his "anti-Communist" radio commentator as stating that "the fear today is endemic" and as denouncing our effort to halt aggression in Korea as "the Korean barbarity."

Dr. Davis proceeds to follow another interesting method of the "liberals" — the presentation of a case in "objective" terms, leading either to confusion or to a pro-Communist conclusion. This was the method developed in such full bloom by Owen Lattimore, in always telling us what "the peoples of Asia" think, and always having them think in a pro-Soviet direction.

AND so the "liberal" trail meanders — through the acts and sayings of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, former Attorney General Francis Biddle, Elmer Davis, Leland Stowe, the Alsops, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and others — always shouting for "democracy" and helping to destroy it by aiding the immediate Communist objectives.

This plight of the "liberals" arises in large part because they have no philosophy. Liberalism proper — the unrestrained and untrammelled exaltation of the individual — is the source of their inspiration. Because it has led to so many obvious evils, including the barbarous exploitation of the worker in the past, they draw back from fully accepting it. Many of them rush into the camp of pragmatism, which means after all, hav-

ing no principles of any kind. For under pragmatism, that which is growing is moral and that which shows signs of dying is immoral. The methods by which the growth is attained are indifferent — and under this measurement, Communism should be today the most moral force in the world.

The "liberal" mind shrinks from this conclusion, for the "liberal" viewpoint is a negative one. These self-confessed free minds are, according to their own admissions, cringing with fear.

But the great question arises: What are they afraid of? It is not of Soviet Russia, whose growing power, by reason of the success of its psychological warfare, they constantly pooh-poooh or ignore. It is not the Communist conspiracy in our own country, for they declare it to be practically non-existent and decry any attack on the Soviet fifth column as "anti-intellectual."

In the "liberal" lexicon, it is the United States Congress, the ex-Communist who seeks to make amends for his past, or any measure which will effectively halt Red infiltration and aggression which must be feared. To do anything along these lines to save our freedom, in their eyes, is born of a "fear of freedom."

It is a strange world in which the "liberal" lives. Perhaps it is time we do something to see that this world does not come to dominate our own.



Trapping the Tax Dodger

BY BLAKE CLARKE

SPECIAL AGENT Jim Burke of the Internal Revenue Service was stymied. For several days he had been investigating the case of an obviously prosperous dentist who had reported a suspiciously low income. Burke had never gone over a neater set of books. They were kept by the dentist himself. At the top right corner of each patient's case history card was the fee, and it always matched the sum in the account book.

But Burke felt sure something was wrong, and he refused to give up. He picked up another case card, scrutinizing every mark on it. Suddenly something leaped out at him. The dentist routinely initialed each card. On this one, just below the first initial was a tiny dot. Did it mean anything?

Burke examined another case card. Dots this time were under the first initials — a dash was under the third.

The tax man made notations on his pad and then spent several days calling on the dentist's patients, asking them the fee paid for their last visit. In nearly every case, it was larger than the sum stated on the case card. Studying these differences, Burke broke the code. A dot under one initial meant that the dentist had not reported to Internal Revenue \$5 of his fee; a dash meant \$10 unreported. Three dots followed by a dash, and Uncle Sam was out tax on \$25. The dentist's actual income was almost half again as large as he had reported.

Jim Burke, along with some 1,300 others, has the all-important job of seeing to it that those who deliberately try to chisel on their income tax are criminally prosecuted.

Most Americans pay their taxes. They may not pay them gladly, but they pay them willingly, as long as they know that everyone else is