

# Our Fifth Anniversary

*The first issue of The Reporter was published on April 26, 1949. After five years, we look back at the prospectus in which we gave our reasons for bringing out a new magazine and in which we announced our aims. Those aims have not changed. It is for our readers to judge how we have lived up to them.*

WE ARE PUBLISHING *The Reporter* because we think there is room in the United States for a type of reporting free from obsession with headline "news" and from the conceit of "opinions." We believe that the national and international facts which affect the lives of the American people can be gathered, selected, and interpreted with a sense of their causes, inter-relation, and possible outcome. We believe that they can be reported in the perspective of what they mean to the American people and what the American people can do about them.

The American national interest is definitely tied to the welfare of a large section of the world, but at the same time America is not rich enough or powerful enough to endow the world or to rule it. In the former enemy countries still under American occupation, in the sixteen European nations of the Marshall Plan, in Asia and in Latin America, to a various and different extent, there are hundreds of millions of people whom America can help—but only if they are willing to co-operate freely with America. The safety and power of America largely depend on the co-operation that we can elicit from nations which are the objects of American assistance. America alone cannot do the job of setting the world on its feet.

If America were what the Communists say it is—an empire in the making—or if it were the hub of an international, which is about the same thing, the problem would be much simpler. We could rule foreign countries with our stooges, we could, as we pleased, use or destroy their resources for the benefit of our own economy, and we could induce their

unmanageable leaders to plunge themselves into obscurity—or out of a window. As it is, given the kind of people we are, we have no choice. We must work to create, at home and abroad, the positive conditions that make for freedom, for safeguards of personal and national independence, and for peace.

This is a staggering and utterly unprecedented job. Lend-Lease, UNRRA, the Marshall Plan, have given some indication of how the job can be done, and above all, that it can be done. But it must be admitted that all these measures have been emergency answers to immediate threats, and that a well-balanced long-range American policy has not yet been attained—a policy that may steer a middle course between the needs of domestic welfare and the demands of national defense or of foreign aid, between out-and-out isolationism and nagging interference in other people's internal affairs.

This condition of things has prompted us, the founders of *The Reporter*, to offer a new magazine to the American public. The pursuit of national interest and the cause of freedom having now become interchangeable things, we believe that the time has come to take fresh stock of the potentialities of our country as well as of the new features of the outside world. Ours will be a purposeful, focal reporting, aimed at singling out the elements which help or hinder the attainment of a national policy. It will be objective reporting, but it will not be impartial when it comes to what is true and what is fake, what is based on stubborn fact and what is the result of manipulated public opinion.

*The Reporter* is to be a magazine of facts and ideas, not of news or of opinion. Our aim is to process the news in order to reach the facts, and to dissect opinions in order to reach a clear idea of an American policy. Clear ideas will help us to recognize the basic facts; the basic facts will help us to determine the range within which ideas are workable. It is a grinding, deepening process: the

more and the better we do our job, the closer we get to our aim, which is to enable our readers to discriminate between what can be done and what cannot be done, and to know at all times what the price is for what can and must be done.

•

**W**E ASSUME that we are not alone in thinking that Communism, the most dogmatic of all opponents, can be fought only by free and uncluttered minds. We assume that a large number of Americans are as tired as we are of clichés and stereotypes, and as anxious as we are to have the major problems of our day analyzed and reported in such a way that nothing is taken for granted, not even the righteousness of our democratic position and the wickedness of our Communist opponents. We have set ourselves to be relentless cliché-hunters. We are not going to say that every Republican is a Harding, or that every general is an autocrat, or that big business is always good—or always bad. We shall talk very little of individualism and we shall never lose sight of what happens to the individuals in every concrete situation we may try to report.

Our readers are going to hear little from us about irrepressible trends and sweeping waves, no matter whether of the past or of the future. In analyzing concrete situations we shall try to go as close to the heart of things as we can. But the analysis of situations, down to the heart of things, can lead to entirely different results according to the disposition of the analyst. There are those who, at the conclusion of an analytical effort, like to sit down and cry; there are those who like to make moralistic soap bubbles on the brim of the precipice; and there are those who once they see the danger of the precipice want to have everything and everybody going down, down to the bottom. Our attitude, on the contrary, is to look for the men who are responsible for a situation and who have power to do something about it.

•

**W**E ARE NOT ALONE, we suppose, in thinking that America's policy is 'still rudderless. Since the Marshall Plan was announced, we have sometimes moved in the right direction, but there are neither the instruments nor the firm hands which may prevent us drifting all the way back again or all around. Our function should be to help the devising of the steering instruments, to set the alarm signals, to determine the range within which we can proceed with minimized risks. . . .

We shall deal with trends, not to ride on them, but to see whether they can be controlled, how and by whom. We shall deal with situations, but not in order to make ourselves the mouthpieces of the nothing-can-be-done-about-it school of thought. Above all, we shall deal with policies, and our reporting of facts and ideas will be aimed at promoting the constant development of an American policy adequate to the responsibilities and to the limitations of America in the present moment of history. And we shall never lose sight of the policy-makers—what kind of people they are, how they live up to the people's trust, and how the breed can be improved. We shall look for the individuals and for the mental attitudes that determine a situation. For we believe that the impact of power on human beings is most clearly shown when power is presented through the specific people who hold it or who bear its brunt.

In our focal, purposeful reporting on policy and policy-making we shall be guided by basic beliefs:

¶ In freedom, which means the capacity that men have of exerting some control over the conditions of their own lives, a capacity that cannot be denied or crippled without making men into the tools of their own destruction.

¶ In America, as a nation whose freedom and well-being are inseparably tied to the freedom and well-being of other nations.

¶ In the function and responsibilities of journalism—provided it meets exact and exacting standards.

¶ And finally, in the I.Q. of the American reader, whose capacity to grasp facts and ideas is crudely underrated by most of the existing media of information.

•

**W**E ASK of our contributors what we ask of ourselves: to remember that in the professions, in business, in the trade unions, in the educational institutions, in the public at large there are thousands upon thousands of men and women who want to see the facts of our days in a clear perspective, and who have the capacity for exerting a measure of leadership in their own groups or communities. These are the people for whom *The Reporter* is written. . . .

Of our readers we ask that they consider themselves members of our group, for we think of them as partners, not customers to be courted.

To those who will recognize their magazine in *The Reporter* we make no extravagant promise—we just say that we shall do our best to tell the truth.

# Geneva: To Recognize Or Not to Recognize

VERNON ASPATURIAN

"I HAVE now come to believe," wrote John Foster Dulles in his book *War or Peace*, three years before he became Secretary of State, "that the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world actually is . . . without attempting to appraise closely those [nations] which are 'good' and those which are 'bad.' . . .

"Some of the present member nations . . . have governments that are not representative of the people. But if in fact . . . they 'govern'—they have a power which should be represented in any organization that purports to mirror world reality." Then comes a passage that must now be a constant source of mental anguish and political embarrassment: "If the Communist government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then, it, too, should be admitted to the United Nations."

"THE United States," Dulles reported four years later upon his return from the Berlin Conference, refuses to recognize Red China "not because, as suggested, it denies that the régime exists or that it has power. . . . It is, however, one thing to recognize evil as a fact. It is another thing to take evil to one's breast and call it good."

Among the many popular American ideas about recognition is the conviction that it means moral approval of the government being recognized. It is obvious that Secretary of State Dulles, in contradistinction to Author Dulles, has been forced into accepting this view in part. The Red Chinese régime has been branded an aggressor by the U.N. General Assembly and has inflicted thousands of casualties upon U.S. forces

defending South Korea. It is the most powerful ally of America's principal antagonist, the Soviet Union; it has imposed an oppressive tyranny upon nearly half a billion people and has indoctrinated with hatred of everything American a nation that has had the help and sympathy of the American people for over a century.

## Soothing Senators

Public reaction to this rapid turn in the fortunes of international politics was violent. A good indication of this



was the experience of Mr. Dulles upon returning from Berlin, when he was astounded to discover that his creditable performance in exposing Molotov's mischief and preserving western unity was all but ignored. His attempt to assuage the anxieties of almost the entire hierarchy of Republican Senatorial leadership on the matter of inviting Red China to the forthcoming Geneva Conference was painfully obvious. Molotov, Mr. Dulles pointed out proudly, had signed on the dotted line that "It is understood that neither the invitation to, nor the holding of, the above-mentioned conference shall be deemed to imply diplomatic recog-

nition in any case where it has not already been accorded." Earlier, he had told Congressmen categorically that "the United States would in no case recognize Communist China."

Despite Mr. Dulles's assurances, the Senators were aware of certain ineluctable and unhappy facts. The Peking government obviously gains in diplomatic prestige, even though it was invited to the conference only by the Soviet Union and was not named as one of the sponsoring powers as Molotov demanded. The negotiations will not take place in a makeshift Korean hut but in the splendid Palace of the former League of Nations, which, the Senators fear, may have tremendous significance for the symbol-conscious people of Russia and China. No longer will unknown military officers or subordinate diplomats sit and deal with faceless Chinese generals; the American Secretary of State in person will break political bread with Chou En-lai, scholar, revolutionary, erstwhile fugitive from a Kuomintang gallows, and now Communist China's Foreign Minister.

A number of Senators feared that all this must inevitably constitute some sort of recognition. The Peking radio apparently agrees with the Senators, for it has been boasting that "the agreement now reached by the four Foreign Ministers shows incontrovertibly that the voice and position of the People's Republic of China in the settlement of international issues, particularly Asian questions, cannot be ignored." To add to the discomfiture of Secretary Dulles, Molotov reported to the Soviet people that at Geneva the "Chinese People's Republic will occupy its legitimate place at a meeting with other great powers."