Admiral Joy, our chief negotiator in Korea, flew back to Tokyo yesterday to talk to General Ridgway; also to General Hull, army vice-chief of staff, and Alexis Johnson of the State Department, who had both flown out from Washington. General Hull denied that he brought any fresh instructions but said he did talk to Ridgway and Joy about the armistice, so as to get a better understanding of their problems; Johnson, officially, is said to have gone along just for the ride. The enemy gave ground on one point, agreeing that prison camps on both sides shall be visited by Red Cross teams representing both sides when—and only when—an armistice is agreed on and exchange of prisoners begins; on other issues in dispute, the deadlock continues.

Last night the enemy put on their largest ground attack for a month past—some eleven hundred men, with artillery cover, attacking in the Mundung valley, but they were driven back after an hour's fighting. A somewhat smaller operation near Yonchon drove our troops out of their positions; but they went back to retake them and found the enemy had moved out. Air action was less than usual due to bad weather.

The Chinese Communist Premier Chou En-lai says that our truce negotiators are stalling while we prepare for a new aggressive war on a still larger scale in Asia. He seems to take Senator Taft seriously, perhaps not realizing that Mr. Taft does not yet make national policy. Governor Warren last night raised a question about Mr. Taft's proposal to send Chiang Kai-shek's army to reinvade Communist territory—a question which was raised last spring when others made that suggestion, and has never been satisfactorily answered. Suppose, said the Governor, we land Chiang's army on the mainland and it starts getting licked. Do we just go away and leave it to its fate? If we did, nobody in Asia would ever trust us again; and few people anywhere else. Or would we be prepared to follow through and finish the job ourselves, no matter what the cost? Many people would like to know—including, probably, Chiang Kai-shek.

As for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who oppose such an operation and in whom Mr. Taft has no confidence, the President said that he has the utmost confidence in them; but they are not political appointees and he doubts if they are a proper subject for political controversy. On the Senate floor Mr. Morse took the same view, saying that it is a great public disservice to try to shake confidence in our military leaders in a partisan campaign; and to try to explain away what he called the greatest military defeat in our history, suffered a year ago in Korea. Mr. Morse was in favor of giving Chiang Kai-shek free rein—if he wants to fight on the mainland let him fight; but be doubted if he would get very far and it might risk all-out war. Let those politicians, said Mr. Morse, who are dividing the people come on the floor of the Senate and propose a declaration of war; but we don’t want to be drawn into war by the back door... Well—A year ago, when there was much the same kind of pressure as there is now to make the administration extend the war, Senator Cain made just this honest proposal; that Congress exercise its constitutional powers and declare war. Nobody seconded the motion; nobody at all.

Administration policy was hit from another quarter when Senator Connally introduced a resolution calling for a diplomatic break with Hungary on account of the hundred-and-twenty-thousand-dollar ransom exacted for our fliers forced down there. This, he admitted, could be only advisory; but Congress could make it effective by refusing funds to maintain our legation in Budapest. It is a sad day, said Mr.
Connally, when the government of the United States has to resort to blackmail pay-
ments to a gang of ruffians. When asked later if this was a break with the admin-
istration, he said the resolution speaks for itself.

So it does; but has Mr. Connally thought this through? If another such incident
happened, in a country with which we had no diplomatic relations, we might not have
a chance to pay ransom; the prisoners would be kept in jail... Senators travel much
around the world, in the performance of their duty to see that other nations are
behaving properly. Suppose a plane carrying half a dozen Senators lost its way,
and was forced down in a Communist country with which we had no relations. Would
their colleagues insist that they must rot in jail, rather than that we stain our
national honor by paying ransom? Mr. Connally should consider what kind of prece-
dent he might set.

Senator Chavez added to the tension and dissension by vigorously opposing the
trade of a million tons of steel to the British. He said we might need it at home
to build defense highways. Just imagine what would happen in Washington, said Mr.
Chavez, if even a rumor started that an atomic bomb was coming; there would be a
paralyzing traffic jam. So don't send steel to our allies to make things to shoot
at the enemy; keep it here at home to build roads to run away on. That would cer-
tainly enhance the prestige of the United States.

Premier Faure of France is going to make his National Assembly stand up and be
counted; he has called for a vote of confidence--to be taken on Saturday--on the
European army plan which has been so kicked around in the last few days' debate.
If Faure is beaten his month-old government goes down and the European army plan
goes down with it, at least for the time being; which would not ruin the Atlantic
alliance, but would seriously delay and derange its military plan. For this
threatened crisis the Germans are chiefly responsible; the free world is already
so closely articulated that the negative men in every country build up the negative
men in every other.

The President has asked Congress to grant to Newbold Morris, appointed to in-
vestigate corruption in government, power to subpoena persons and documents so that
he can require information from outside the government; the President says he will
see that Morris gets all he wants from inside. But the bill introduced would also
give him power to grant immunity to witnesses and Senator Mundt says this is an
outrage--that it would prevent the new administration which he thinks may take of-

The President tried this morning to shush down the wurra-wurra of speculation
as to whether he will run again or not; he said it is a difficult decision to make;
that when it is time for an announcement he will tell the White House reporters;
and in the meantime he wishes they would talk about something else. But many of
them won't.

I've just been looking over an estimate of the relative merit of our Senators
made by fifty-two professors of political science, whose opinions have been col-
lected by Dr. Byron Johnson of the University of Denver. The professors include
Republicans, Democrats and independents; their single bond of similarity is that
they are all specialists in legislative problems. And they were asked to rate the
Senators in order of their merit, as based on their positions on domestic and fore-
ign policies; their legislative ability; their intellectual ability; and their
personal integrity. Each man seems to have written down his estimate in percentages--with the qualification that nobody could be a hundred per cent on any point, or zero either; and then these figures were averaged up. And I must say this mathematical estimate comes pretty close to the rating that would be made by at least this one observer who has seen them in action. By a wide margin, the political scientists voted that Paul Douglas of Illinois is the best Senator. The rest of the first ten, in order, are Kefauver, Morse, Lehman, Fulbright, Margaret Smith, Lodge, Aiken, Saltonstall and McMahon--five Democrats and five Republicans. It would be hard to give them much argument on that; though it seems to me that while Kefauver is good he is not that good; and that Senator Russell, whom they rated no better than twenty-fifth, belongs up in the first half dozen. Senator Taft came out twenty-fourth; he rated high in legislative and intellectual ability; but about three quarters of the political scientists thought poorly of his views on foreign policy; and about one fourth of them had doubts about his integrity--doubts based on his support of McCarthy. His colleague Senator Bricker rated high on personal integrity and on nothing else.

As to the worst Senator--McCarthy came out at the bottom of the heap, though Senator Jenner gave him strong competition. It was the unanimous opinion of the scientists that McCarthy rated lowest in personal integrity; though a few of the Republicans thought well of his legislative ability. How about McCarran--a powerful man, capable at present of doing more harm than McCarthy? He was well down toward the bottom; but the points on which he was rated included legislative ability and intellectual ability; and he has plenty of both, even though many citizens deplore the use he makes of them.

From that the political scientists went on to estimate how well the various states are represented by an average of both their Senators. It often happens that a state has one good Senator and one terrible Senator--sometimes, of course, they are both terrible. But sometimes they are both good. The political scientists put Massachusetts at the top, with Lodge and Saltonstall; and it would be hard to quarrel with that. The next four states in order are New York with Lehman and Ives, Connecticut with McMahon and Benton, Alabama with Hill and Sparkman, and Vermont with Aiken and Flanders. Two states with both Republican Senators, two with both Democrats, and one--New York--with one of each. Again, not much argument; though I would be inclined to move Alabama up to second place. The scientists noted the high quality of the Senators from New England of both parties; only Bridges and Brewster, out of the whole dozen, were rated as of poor quality. Senators from the Middle West, they thought, averaged worst--and yet they put Illinois in sixth place. That's hard to figure; since though one of its Senators, Douglas, was first in the individual scoring, the other one, Dirksen, came out no better than forty-eighth. Maybe the scientists had in mind Everett Dirksen's excellent record in the House of Representatives, and hoped that he might come back to his old ways if he ever gets out from under the shadow of the Chicago Tribune.

And the worst state, on the average of its Senators? The political scientists gave the booby prize to Indiana, with Jenner and Capehart. I was born and raised in Indiana; but while local pride impels me to applaud this choice, I don't think we quite deserve it. I don't believe any state can get under Nevada with its combination of McCarran and Malone, which the political scientists rated only next to worst. These of course are the opinions only of professional students of government; so Senators unfavorably mentioned may feel that they needn't worry.