

# DAILY OPINION SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 1418

July 24, 1950

## KOREA

*Monday*

While the US position on Nehru's mediation effort continues to draw strong support, some commentators fear the rejection of Nehru's offer may have adverse effects on the minds of Asian people, and urge that the UN right against aggression be stressed in counterpropaganda. There is increased talk of the need for a "genuine" UN force, though most commentators accept the fact the US will have to bear the "brunt" of the fighting.

The Wash. Star finds it "unfortunate" that Nehru has been unable to agree with the US view on mediation, warning that because of Nehru's great influence in Asia, the propaganda results may be "harmful to us". A similar view is presented by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the N.Y. Post, the latter emphasizing a general theme: "There was not one word in the Stalin-Nehru exchange to alter the fundamental fact that the Soviet Union is the author of an act of inexcusable aggression".

Meanwhile the Wash. Post contends that it is "high time" to tell "precisely" what the free world is fighting for in Korea. "At the very least, UN objectives ought to include unification of Korea, with free UN-supervised elections to follow", says the Post. A UN settlement is urged by Irving Pflaum (Chic. Sun-Times) and Leonard Bertsch (America).

Sen. Taft is reported to have said that UN forces will have to "march right on over the 38th parallel" to occupy southern North Korea--a view endorsed by Elmer Davis.

The State Dept's White Paper is applauded by a number of observers (e.g., Wash. Star, Phila. Inquirer, N.Y. Her. Tribune). Most of those commenting agree that the Paper gives clear evidence of Russia's responsibility for the Korean crisis. However, James Reston (N.Y. Times) maintains that the Paper is "incomplete", and deplores the fact that no effort has been made to release documents to give the "full" picture of US Korean policy.

The need for a UN force is stressed by the NY Times, Phila. Inquirer, C.S. Monitor, Chicago News, Des Moines Reg. although most agree that the US will bear the principal burden.

~~RESTRICTED~~

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

President Truman's July 19 message to Congress continues to receive the wholehearted support of editors throughout the country. Among the themes brought out in this comment are the following:

"President Truman made plain...what we are up against in the world today. It is not just a police action in Korea. It is a Communist world conspiracy against this people and all free peoples. It is ruthless aggression in many forms, against other governments" (Milwaukee Journal).

"We will have no rest, no normal life until Russia is convinced that she cannot remake the world" (Rochester Democrat and Chronicle).

"The people are, we believe, most pleased that the President did not attempt to minimize the seriousness of the threat to peace and our security. The pattern of Communist conquest already is well established. Korea was merely the first of a series of targets, more in the nature of a test" (Atlanta Constitution).

"The U.S. must put itself on a wartime basis. This does not mean that World War III is inevitable. It does mean that unless our armed strength, our productive resources and our national economy are made ready for a major war, we not only invite one, we invite defeat" (Louisville Courier-Journal).

The Providence Journal is among those who think the President's program is "thoroughly justified", but it warns against the idea that "building the military strength of the United States is the sole answer to the long-range problem of our relations with Soviet Russia".

Walter Lippmann stresses that the price of the Korean campaign "will have to be paid until there is an honorable settlement in the United Nations", but he adds:

"Under no circumstances should the Korean campaign, or any other action under the Truman Doctrine against satellite armies, be allowed to divert us or to distract us from our paramount interest, which is to build up and to maintain uncommitted American military forces designed entirely and especially to balance the uncommitted military forces of the Soviet Union itself".

Among the few forthright critics of the President's message are C. B. Baldwin (sec. of the Progressive Party) and the Chicago Tribune.