

WHO— WHAT— WHY—

EVER SINCE the early days of the First World War, when French and German pilots started to shoot pistols at each other from their little reconnaissance craft, ever since Billy Mitchell was court-martialed in this country because he wanted more planes, debate about U.S. air power has raged. That debate is at its loudest now because more than ever before is at stake. In our first three articles we try to get at the facts.

The first was written by **Roswell L. Gilpatric**, a man who knows precisely what plans for air power were inherited by the Eisenhower Administration and is therefore supremely qualified to discuss how Secretary of Defense Wilson is modifying them and to what extent. For until four months ago Mr. Gilpatric was at work preparing the budget for the Air Force. As Under Secretary of the Air Force (from October 1, 1951, to February 5, 1953) it was Mr. Gilpatric's job to procure airplanes.

Irving R. Levine's article deals with air power in one theater, the Far East. For twenty-six months Mr. Levine covered the Korean War and the truce talks. He also has had assignments in Japan, Formosa, Hong Kong, Indo-China, and Thailand. This year he came home to accept a Council on Foreign Relations research fellowship.

Air power is being cut back because we supposedly cannot afford to be strong. Words like "bankruptcy" and "economic disaster" are now common Washington hand-outs. Are we advertising to the world—and to ourselves—a weakness that is mostly imaginary? **Edwin L. Dale, Jr.**, tests the metabolism of our economy to see if we can stand the strain of defending ourselves. Mr. Dale is a member of the Washington bureau of the New York *Herald Tribune*, specializing on economic subjects.

WHEN unrest and violence break out anywhere in the world, *The Reporter* wants to know the reason why. The Mau Mau revolt in Kenya continues unabated. **Oden and Olivia Meeker** have been traveling in Africa, and we have already published four of their reports. We now present the results of their personal observations in Kenya.

If you look down from the press gallery at a session of the Indian Parliament you get a strange impression of diversity. People from all over India have come in their varied dress to this new parliament of a new nation, and to us, accustomed to our Senators and Congressmen in their standardized business suits, the spectacle is exotic. Yet the New Englanders and the Southerners who traveled through the mud to our first Constitutional Convention were not dressed alike.

Our first Congress must have looked exotic to Europeans. To Europeans, Ameri-

can democracy seemed uncount, and this is something worth remembering when we are inclined to judge the attainments of democracy in Asian countries by the degree of resemblance between their institutions and our own. At least as good a basis for comparison would be to take a good look at the changes democracy has brought to life in an Indian village. **Jean Lyon**, well known to our readers, is an observer who manages to get close to the lives of individuals—upon whom depends the functioning of any institution.

Eric F. Goldman is a recognized historian of American liberalism. Educated at Johns Hopkins, Professor Goldman taught there from 1935 to 1940. He is now associate professor of history at Princeton. His article in this issue may be considered an addendum to his recent book, *Rendezvous with Destiny*, a history of modern American reform, which has recently won Columbia University's Bancroft Prize.

OUR COVER, painted by **San Bon Matsu**, a talented young Japanese-American portraitist, shows a Japanese gentleman attired in a mixture of Oriental and western clothes. At first sight the contrast between this modern Japanese and the modern Diet Building, with traditional Fujiyama in the background, is, despite the artistry and color of the design, faintly comic. (Also, the Diet Building and Fujiyama are actually many miles apart.) But the process through which Japan is becoming westernized and the great strain this process places upon traditional Japanese civilization present one of the most serious problems of modern times.

By what is happening in Japan one can measure what can happen in other Asian countries seeking to absorb the heritage of the West without harm to an ageless heritage of their own. **Harold Strauss** met Japan in 1945 and 1946, when he served under the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. Subsequently he visited Japan many times and became greatly interested in the Japanese people. He gives us conclusions drawn after his most recent stay. Mr. Strauss is Editor in Chief at Alfred A. Knopf. From his account it is evident that exporting some of the tinnier products of our country is not the most effective way in which the United States can help contemporary Japan.

Immediately upon completing his vignette of the piccolo player, **Bill Mauldin** left for England to attend the Coronation.

Continuing our coverage of music in relation to American life, **James Hinton, Jr.**, former managing editor of *Musical America*, argues that the best way to encourage opera in the United States is to call it by some other name.

Is mankind doomed to starvation?

This exciting book is a challenging answer to the prophets of gloom—not a utopian blueprint, but a book of urgent present-day meaning. An eminent author and a leading research chemist show how the means for attaining a future of absolute and inexhaustible abundance through chemistry are *already at hand*.

THE ROAD TO ABUNDANCE

By **JACOB ROSIN**
and **MAX EASTMAN**

\$3.50 at all bookstores

McGRAW-HILL BOOK CO., N.Y. 36

Has Russia outgrown Stalinism?

One of the few real authorities on the Soviet Union examines Russia at mid-century. From his analysis of the post-Stalin regime, he offers a forecast of what the world can expect from the shift in leadership.

RUSSIA: WHAT NEXT?

By **Isaac Deutscher**

author of
STALIN: A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY

\$3.00 at all bookstores

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 Fifth Ave., New York 11, N. Y.

Three Countries—and Us

SINCE the end of the war, nearly one-third of the French and Italian peoples have aligned themselves solidly on the side of Communism. In the same proportion, Communist rule has been extended to one-third of the human race. In both Latin countries Communism has been stabilized, or as the saying goes, contained, but with no signs so far of any rollback in pro-Soviet strength, no evidence that democracy's "political warfare" has succeeded in liberating one out of three French or Italians from the grip that the expectation or the fear of Communist revolution has clamped on them.

In both countries the hard business of living is so all-absorbing that individuals and groups are left with no great disposition to subordinate their interests to the national welfare; at the same time, the idea of the nation, just because of its remoteness, lends itself to passionate outbursts of unthinking rhetorical nationalism. The Communists cultivate French and Italian nationalism, just as they see to it that no basic cause of political instability or social unrest is ever removed. In the countries they do not control, the natural resource of local Communists is the cultivation of national liabilities.

Much more vividly than in the General Assembly of the United Nations, the political configuration of our world is mirrored in the marshes of French and Italian politics. These two ancient and vital centers of western civilization still give our world the measure of its plight. But while French and Italian politics mirror what Russia's role is in one-third of the world, they show little evidence of what America does in the other two-thirds.

Going It Alone

The American who goes to inquire about the politics of countries like Britain or France or Italy is in for a rather unpleasant time these days. Even if he happens to be an isolationist, he is likely to be disturbed by the realization that his "go-it-alone" pattern of thinking seems to be a European fashion. The British are too naturally reserved and polite to put much emphasis on it, but certainly they have

the Commonwealth, which, particularly in these days of Coronation pageantry, offers a dramatic instance of how far intercontinental, interracial partnership can go. Moreover, if Sir Winston's offers of his good services as broker between East and West are too long spurned, Britain has one more chance—to be sure, not cherished—to go it alone.

France and Italy show singular dispositions to use their full sovereignty and go it alone—straight into chaos. Yet in the backs of many Italian and French minds there is a rather deep-seated assumption: If out of chaos a right-wing dictator should emerge, America could not help being involved in his adventure; and if, on the contrary, Communism should come to power, America would be even more deeply involved.

NO MATTER what his political belief may be, any American who cares for his country is subject to acute embarrassment when asked to explain the policies of the Administration. At home, he may be inclined to lean over backward and give every possible chance to the apprentice statesmen, hoping that in due time they will learn the trade of government. But abroad the realization comes quite forcibly that history does not allow any man or any nation burdened with decisive responsibilities to take time off, or history will entrust the main roles to different protagonists. The men who form the new government team in Soviet Russia are certainly not new to the exercise of power.

Europeans are quite familiar with the causes of our Administration's difficulties in developing its own foreign policy, for they know by their own experience how bitter and devastating intraparty factionalism can be. But they cannot figure out why the Administration puts so much emphasis on keeping together a hopelessly split party. This emphasis on unity would be understandable to them if the Republicans' conquest of power had been the revolutionary culmination of a hard-fought class struggle. But although the Europeans heard about a "crusade" during our last campaign, they didn't