direct supervision of United Nations agencies and special missions. And we hope that in next Monday's debate Senator Austin's colleagues on the Security Council will press for just this course of action.

In the second place, could the United Nations carry out a long-term program of economic rehabilitation that would help Greece onto its feet and put a floor under those of her citizens working for the rebuilding of Greece's democracy? The answer is plain: the plans for such programs are already made. But more than Senator Austin's glib assurances are needed to persuade us they will be put into effect. Some of those plans called for emergency efforts which will now be carried out independently by the United States. Not are we quite satisfied with the Senator's statement that the present United States' measures are of an "emergency and temporary character." Unless we've entirely misjudged the scope of the new American foreign policy, the United States will find it increasingly difficult to extricate itself and the United Nations will find it increasingly difficult to "muscle in." And we've set a precedent for "emergency action" of which other nations have, no doubt, taken full note.

Finally, we may ask, could the United Nations have acted to guard Greece's national integrity against outside aggression and internal subversion? To the first part of the question, yes, it is already acting. The Security Council's commission is now on Greece's northern borders. It will soon be presenting its report—or reports. Senator Austin has kindly pointed out to them that they might propose "a system of border control regulations and a continuing commission made up of representatives of the Security Council." Russia might veto such a proposal but, in so doing, would clearly put itself in the wrong. Had we rested our case firmly on the Security Council decision, in terms of the Charter, we should have been in a vastly stronger moral position to take any independent action should the occasion arise at a later date.

One of the tragic results of our action has been that we have lost the respect of many nations who know their whole security rests on the strengthening of the United Nations. We have weakened the United Nations. And we have weakened the case of European democracy to which we have been giving such valuable lip service. In supporting the reaction regimes of Greece and Turkey, we have brought those regimes a temporary stability, perhaps, but have made more inevitable the final struggle between those extremes of right and left with which American democracy has nothing in common. But American democracy has much in common with the struggle of the common people of Europe, whether in Greece or Yugoslavia, to lead a secure and free life. To those aims, the United Nations is committed, and if they are not realized we, more than any single nation, will be to blame.

—The Nation

Liberals Beware!

by Freda Kirchwey

In these days people who have lived long enough feel as if they had suddenly been transported back to 1919 and 1920 when A. Mitchell Palmer was protecting American institutions from the aggressions of the Reds. The period after World War I was marked by hysteria, repression, and the start of a federal police system which has survived to this hour in the shape of J. Edgar Hoover's FBI. Before the fever dropped, along in the early twenties, the country was subjected to a legal reign of terror that broke the strength of the progressive forces for a grim ten-year stretch. It was not until economic collapse had discredited the Republican Party even in the eyes of its own followers that the people gained enough courage and cohesion to reassert their political will.

One week soon, The Nation is going to publish a brief history of that historic red-hunt. It is important to recall at this critical time the ugly weapons which American reaction turned against all groups that advocated a decent peace in Europe and a better life over here. Today, two years after the end of World War II, the hunt is on again, and the prospect of an early return to sanity is poor. Not only are the Republicans, in control of Congress, set for a quick kill, but Democratic members of all shades seem eager only to beat their opponents to the draw. And whereas in the early twenties right-wing panic was generated by a new-born revolution struggling to establish itself in a vast and turbulent country, today our statesmen, peering out from under their roll-top desks, see communism full-grown, armed to the teeth, and making unfriendly gestures and clanking noises.

Still worse, the liberal and progressive forces in 1947 are badly demoralized. Fear of Russia has become an obsession in groups which a generation ago had a more solid faith in the country's capacity to remain both democratic and free. The liberals of the post-Wilson era fought well against nationalistic panic and reactionary fury; they lost, but at least they resisted. Today an alarming percentage of liberals are either taking to cover or digging up reasons to believe that the Truman purge order, the inquisition now going on in the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the rash of repressive legislation before Congress, are merely signs of a healthy resistance to communism.

The threat of communism in this country is insignificant; while the threat of reaction is explicit in the Washington red-hunt and implicit in Mr. Truman's new foreign policy. However provocative Russia may be, however infuriating the obstructive maneuvers of the American Communists, liberals know, or should know,
that it is only in countries sunk in economic misery, like Greece, where hunger and idleness conspire with injustice, that communism wins the support of the democratic masses. Instead of obliging the reactionaries by focusing their chief attention on the remote possibility of Communist control in America, our liberals would do better to consider the present fact of a repressive drive which may indeed force Communist activities underground but will certainly strangle the progressive movements that operate in the open.

Let liberals review the record of 1919-1922 before they join the hunt. Let them read Professor Commager’s acute and ironic comments in this issue on the logical implications of Mr. Truman’s executive order. Let them consider the injustices already perpetrated against their ideological blood-brothers: against Warren of the Labor Department and Menefee of the International Labor Organization and many others. Not to mention the infamous attacks, not yet ended, on David Lilienthal. And then let them pluck up their courage and show that liberals know the value of liberty. The hour calls for protest and political action, not for ingenious rationalizing.

And this leads me to a few somewhat relevant remarks about an article appearing in this issue of The Nation. Since James Burnham’s “The Struggle for the World” is clearly destined to become the bible of the Bomb Russia First boys, I was rather surprised by Arthur Schlesinger’s review of the book (page 398). Without fully accepting the Burnham thesis, Mr. Schlesinger does not conceal his admiration for the bold strokes with which the author slices through our remaining national hesitations and scruples. In a conservative, this susceptibility would be easy to understand. But our reviewer is not a conservative, much less a near- or neo-fascist. His own writings attest to his liberalism. And it is this fact that makes the obvious enthusiasm lurking behind his disagreement—he is glad Mr. Burnham is not Secretary of State—a disturbing phenomenon. In other countries, when fear of Russia sent liberals scurrying toward the campfires of the militant right, the final result was something worse than communism. I hope Mr. Schlesinger’s review is an individual impulse, not a symptom. But whatever it is, I think he should have risen superior to such dubious devices as to tell the audience (page 399) that “the Progressive Citizens of America and the Chicago Tribune have now clapped hands” in an “interesting joint effort” to prevent any “interference with the Communists.” It would be as apt and as accurate to retort that the “Americans for Democratic Action and Bill Bullitt have clapped hands in an interesting joint effort to launch an immediate atomic war against Russia.” In other words, it would be silly and inaccurate. These days, the bedfellow argument has at least two sharp edges.

**Washington Witch-hunt**

**BY HENRY STEELE COMMAGER**

It is not improbable that President Truman’s executive order on disloyalty in the executive branch was designed to steal the thunder of the Thomas committee or head off such extreme bills as that proposed by Representative Rankin—that it was intended, in short, to furnish some protection to persons in government employment wrongfully accused of disloyalty. If so, it is a pity that it was not more carefully drawn, that it does not more scrupulously observe legal and constitutional proprieties. For as it stands it is an invitation to precisely that kind of witch-hunting which is repugnant to our constitutional system. And as it stands, it should be added, it is liable to instigate persecution not only of radicals by red-baiters but of reactionaries by radicals.

The crucial clauses are in Part V: Standards, and these merit close attention. Most striking is the looseness, the almost unbelievable looseness, with which standards are fixed. Here are the “activities and associations” of an employee which are to be considered as a test of loyalty:

Membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons, designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

Note first how all-embracing these terms are. It is not only membership in or affiliation with subversive organizations that is proscribed, but “sympathetic association” with them. What is sympathetic association, and how is it to be distinguished from unsympathetic association? Is a member of the Democratic Party in New York sympathetically or unsympathetically associated with the Demo-