Commenting on the current “dollar crisis,” The Economist notes in an editorial for December 3 the many obstacles that may prevent the American economy from recovering from its “present mild plight” by means of the seemingly right course—raising interest rates. “The obvious alternative,” says The Economist, “is to reduce the interest rate differentials between Europe and New York by putting European rates down.” In fact, “on grounds of cooperation with the United States, there is a strong case for [Britain’s] reducing Bank rate first.”

In view of Britain’s own economic situation, The Economist warns, “it is going to be fatally easy for this country to feel that it need not take any initiative about all this, but that it can sit back and castigate the Germans for not helping America in a way that they could easily afford. But if there were a collapse in international trade it would be no great satisfaction to be able to argue cogently that it was mostly Dr. Adenauer’s fault . . . It should be blazoningly obvious that Britain and America, as guardians of the world’s two biggest currencies, need to run this next lap in economic affairs together. An approach to the new American Administration with an offer of such cooperation—on burden-sharing in defense, tariff problems, gold market strains, world liquidity problems and some coordination of interest rates—should be a top item in the British Government’s agenda.”

The Annuals, the bi-monthly publication of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, devotes its November issue to “Religion in American Society.” Among the topics covered are trends in church membership and present-day theology, the role of the laity, the church and secular affairs, minority worship, and the ecumenical movement. In an essay titled “Religion and Politics” Luke Ebersole, Professor of Sociology at the University of Tennessee, contributes a report on the nature and variety of political activities among religious groups. He finds that, although there is a marked relation between religious affiliation and party affiliation, the correspondence does not usually indicate a “religious” vote. Among Protestants political behavior tends to be determined by socio-economic status. Among Catholics and Jews social and economic position do not bulk as large in determining party alliance as does the awareness of minority status.

“There is evidence, however,” writes Professor Ebersole, “that the changing status of ethnic and religious minorities is causing political change . . . For both Catholics and Jews it may be expected that as minority feelings diminish, occupation and economic and social class will gain in importance as determinants of their political behavior.”

On the fourth anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, The Reporter (November 24) publishes an account by Central European correspondent George Bailey of life as Hungarians live it today, “prisoners in their own country” who nevertheless have forced substantial concessions from the unwilling Soviets that preserve what is most characteristic of the Hungarian people—a consuming passion for excellence and modernity. The increase in the standard of living and the material enjoyment of Western culture represent cherished tokens of the insurgent spirit: “Those who died in 1956—they died so that we could live better.”

Politically, Hungarians react to Communist rule with a “sotto voce hostility that is everywhere,” sometimes referring to the Kadar regime as the “sub-government.” “The chief virtue of the puppet [regime] to the Soviets,” writes Mr. Bailey, “is the fact that it is Communist as well as Hungarian: its chief virtue to the people is the fact that it is Hungarian as well as Communist. . . . There is no hope—for the Hungarians—of controlling the puppet in its diplomatic appearances. But there is some hope—and, indeed, thanks to the revolution, there are definite prospects—of controlling at least a few of the puppet’s movements in its domestic performances, but only if the non-Communist world refuses to accept the party internationally as anything other than merely representative of Soviet interests. In this regard alone the Hungarians still expect help . . .

Also writing from Hungary, Daniel Schorr reports on Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, who is still living in the American legation in Budapest where he sought asylum four years ago. Since 1956 when the College of Cardinals met to elect a new Pope and the legation was blocked in its attempts to seek safe-conduct for the cardinal out of Hungary, there have been no plans for a change in Mindszenty’s status—and nothing is in sight to change it. The legation lives with its ‘religious affairs attaché,’ as he is sometimes peculiarly called. The engine of the AVO [secret police] car runs outside.”
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