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While the US position on Nehrui's mediation effort continues to draw strong support, some commentators feel the rejection of Nehru's offer may have adverse effects on the attitude 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 "harshful 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. "As 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
Eliner (Ohio Sun-Telegram) and Leonard Bergman (American).

San. Jepa is reported to have said that UN forces will have
to "search 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, Phip. Inquirer, N.Y. Sun-Tribune).
Most of these 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, Eppa.
Inquirer, C.S. Frontier, Chicago News, and Foreign Mag, although
manifesto that the US will bear the principal burden.
President's Message

President Truman's July 16 message to Congress continues to receive
the wholehearted support of editors throughout the country. Among
the themes brought out in this message 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 con-
vinced 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 con-
quest already is well established. Korea was merely the
first of a series of tragets, 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 pro-
gram 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.