



THE REPORTER'S NOTES

Tribute to the U.N.

While the bloody phase of the Korean conflict is coming to a close, now is the time to recognize the lesson of this horrible experience. That the war there was kept a limited one was due to a considerable extent to the fact that it was a U.N. war. The U.S. and South Korean forces had to bear most of the losses, yet enough Commonwealth and Turkish and Filipino soldiers died on the field to give the U.N. emblem more than a symbolic, ceremonial character. Our U.N. allies may or may not have been adequately consulted, but certainly they exerted a constant and wholesome check on the decisions of our political leaders.

This check hurt the feelings and the pride of our people. A war which the U.N. took on to deprive the North Koreans of the fruits of aggression had to find its end not in victory but in some sort of substitute for victory. For a nation like ours, which had fought its last two wars to total victory over powerful enemies, it was extremely hard to accept the fact that a war could end in a long-drawn-out, seemingly inconclusive stalemate.

Yet there was no other possible end, for the two halves of the world that faced each other in Korea are at best stalemated everywhere. Peace, we assume, can come only from the recognition of this fact and from the determination of both sides to continue the struggle with political rather than with military means. The President was quite clear on this point in his letter to Syngman Rhee.

We would like to add a kind word for this old man, for he never made

a mystery of how he abhorred a peace that would keep Korea divided. He must have been thoroughly bewildered when Senator Knowland asked him to act as President Eisenhower wanted, for Dr. Rhee probably knew that a few days earlier the Senator had said that the truce which was being negotiated in Panmunjom was not a peace with honor.

Yet we understand Senator Knowland's change of opinion and we congratulate him for having made it. For there is something which may be called the public opinion of mankind which made itself felt and which even the most pro-Rhee Senators could not ignore.

THERE still can be limited wars in our world, just as there is crime in our society that law-enforcement agencies keep in check. But there cannot be total victory except at the price of total war. This mankind does not want, and the voice of mankind is so powerful that it can make itself heard even through so frail an institution as the U.N.

Five Years Ago in Prague

Pessimistic as we were about the prospects of the Italian elections, we must admit that the results proved to be worse than our fears. It is clear now that over half of the Italian voters disapprove of Italy's past foreign policy. Half of the Italian people have shown that they are more interested in bread and work than in the Atlantic pact. No serious contribution can be expected from Italy to the new institutions of European or Atlantic democracy until the Italian democrats find the way to strengthen their own institutions at home.

The search for such a way presents extraordinary, possibly insurmount-

able difficulties even for the most skillful and respected among the Italian democrats, Alcide De Gasperi. Actually, he has no majority in either house of parliament, for the minor parties that formed the Center coalition during the campaign are either hesitant or unwilling to share the responsibility of government with De Gasperi's Christian Democrats. Moreover, De Gasperi's hold over his own party is far from secure.

There was a time when a triumvirate—Schuman, De Gasperi, Adenauer—was leading Europe toward unity, strength, and a more equitable distribution of wealth. Some months ago, Schuman was retired from the leadership in French foreign policy; Adenauer is now faced by ever-mounting domestic and international difficulties; and De Gasperi's leadership has been perhaps irreparably shaken.

The American press grossly misinterpreted the returns of the Italian election by overstressing the increase of the rightist vote. A misleading comparison was made with the votes that the Monarchists and neo-Fascists received in the 1948 elections, when both of these parties were still in their infancy. Actually the appeal of the neo-Fascist party has declined in recent times: from 6.88 per cent of the electorate in the 1951-1952 municipal elections to 5.83 in 1953. The Monarchist vote, while still increasing, is still less than the total of the three minor Center parties. In Naples, where Lauro, the Monarchist leader, is mayor, the people found his performance so convincing that his party's vote has dropped thirteen per cent since last year.

Yet it is exactly to Lauro and his party that De Gasperi is now urged to turn. The urging is done by the

most conservative Christian Democrats and by some influential non-Italians. This in spite of the fact that the price Lauro would ask is certainly not in line with American interests. Lauro's own paper in a recent statement said: "The whole Italian foreign policy since the war, specifically in Italo-American relations, represents the worst chapter in recent Italian history, worse than the defeat itself, characterized by servility, stupidity, prejudice, and blindness."

It must be added, however, that the heart of Lauro and his Monarchists is set, rather than on foreign affairs, on more immediate domestic goals, like stopping the land reforms, easing taxes, and improving the lot of the privileged classes. These are things about which the Monarchists care even more than the return of the King, for they are economic rather than dynastic royalists.

THE thunderous news of the Italian elections does not come from the Right but from the Left. In the successive elections of 1948, 1951-1952, and 1953, the Communists and Nenni Socialists have moved on from 31.0 to 33.1 to 35.3 per cent of the popular vote. There has been no rollback or even containment of Communism in Italy.

Communists and fellow travelers have suddenly been taken by an extraordinary nostalgia for the good old days of "popular-front" coalition Governments. After the war, the experiment of democracy with Communist participation ended in the East with the tragic farce of the People's Democracy. In the West, the defense of freedom made it imperative that the Communists and fellow travelers be thrown out. The coalition idea seemed to have reached its irrevocable end when Jan Masaryk fell from the window five years ago in Prague.

"Seemed," we say, for Communists and fellow travelers, who are at it again, have quite a chance to reach their goal, at least in some nations. In Italy, for instance, where their power has been steadily growing and where even their archenemies, the Saragat Socialists, are willing to have another try at a popular front. Or in France, where

EVEREST

London Times, June 8: "As often in great expeditions, the scene fell short of expectations. . . ."

And so, beekeeper and guide, they touched the sky,
Straddled the ridge of the world, ate cake, and prayed,
Looked down and found the view monotonous:
They were too high.

And so it seems to happen. When mortal eyes
Lift to the hills they see the vision there
And when they attain it, turning down their gaze,
The vision dies.

—SEC

experience has taught the Socialists that it pays to stay out of the Government alongside the Communist Opposition. There are signs that there too the Socialists are tempted to share the responsibility of government with the Communists. If the Kremlin goes on with its alleged policy of de-Sovietizing East Germany, it is quite conceivable that a provisional coalition Government, with representatives of the democratic West and of the Communist East, might be set up to prepare nation-wide elections in Germany.

THESE are actual possibilities, and they are to an extraordinary degree the concern of the American people. The Atlantic alliance is being undermined in its most vital sector: in the nations that are exposed to the brunt of a Russian aggression. Our government certainly has a minimum of influence over the democratic forces in Allied countries, while the Kremlin has the power to do what it pleases with the Communists everywhere—including selling them down the river.

But if the Russians have decided to further their purposes by using diplomacy and internal politics rather than war or the threat of war, then our government should have some countermeasures ready. Now that the Russians have started stealing the "liberation" policy from the Eisenhower Administration, we should be ready to push them along that road. Our government, for instance, could ask that not only in East Germany but in every eastern European country genuinely free elections be held. We know much

better than in 1945-1946 what the Communists are up to, so we should be much better prepared to define our own guarantees for free elections. Moreover, we should count on what the people of eastern Europe have got to say. If we are to go back to Potsdam, as the new Russian leaders desire, the internal politics of the European countries, East and West, can well become the object of Allied-Soviet negotiation.

WE ARE FACED with the need of thoroughly reshaping our foreign policy—if only because we realize how great and immediate our peril is.

We have waited for such a warning to come from our President. Recently, we heard him say at Mount Rushmore that everything is going just fine.

Backward, Turn Backward . . .

At a national conference on Federal-state relations held on June 10 by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the following suggestions were made from the floor:

1. Enjoin the states to refuse Federal grants.
2. Urge the opening of welfare rolls to public inspection.
3. End Federal Old Age assistance.
4. Strengthen the fiber of the family and look to the family to take care of the welfare problem.
5. Amend the Constitution so as to strike out the welfare clause.

The last of these ideas was presented by a Republican Congressman. It was greeted, we are reliably informed, by a generous scattering of applause.