in the magazines

What Karl E. Meyer has classified as the prevailing official mood in Britain regarding the French veto of entry into the Common Market—"a determined, teeth-gnashed optimism" for the future (New Statesman, February 1)—appears to be the prevailing editorial view in the British week-end press. The Economist (February 2) summed up this feeling in the statement: "Our exclusion is a body blow but not a mortal one; we have to work out our own economic salvation, as we always had to do, but now by other and harder means."

Among those other means, The Economist includes the necessity of getting "America even more inextricably entangled with Europe than it is now." "The stirrings of European feeling" (as opposed to "the top garb of full-dress Bonapartism that has to be rejected out of hand") can be worked to advantage by the United States, the magazine feels. America should not, as is the temptation now, turn its eyes from the European Economic Community; it should, instead, make concessions to it. Such actions as further tariff reductions, The Economist feels, "can serve to remind the majority of those who find themselves shut into the now uncommon market with the General that there exists another view of the future of the Atlantic world, the more liberal view of the European community's founders who wrote the Treaty of Rome, to which, in time, a return can be made." Britain herself can derive strength from the thought.

The Manchester Guardian Weekly sees a potential role for Britain in holding the Atlantic alliance together—especially in the area of maintaining an American guarantee of support—while de Gaulle pursues his own search for a European settlement. "To hold the alliance together in the coming years will be a hard task," the Guardian concludes, "especially if France continues to weaken her conventional forces in order to build an illusory nuclear striking power. But impatience will only break up the alliance, without putting anything in its place."

The New Statesman's weekend review of February 1 stated that "in fact de Gaulle's veto may well prove a blessing in disguise." In a brief for a Labour Party victory to counteract what it considers to be Tory failures in the economic sphere, the publication finds itself unconvinced by "the argument that the weaknesses of Britain's economy could be corrected only by a plunge into Europe..." If it is the case that "British industry is inefficient, shackled by restrictive practices and hidebound port-and-pleasantries, it is surely more prudent... to mend these abuses before, not after, we expose ourselves to the full fury of continental competition. At some future date, when de Gaulle and Adenauer have been handed over to the historians, we shall move closer to Europe economically." The article concludes: "We should be grateful that, in the meantime, we have been given a further opportunity to set our industrial house in order."

U.S. News and World Report asks in its February 18 issue, "Who Really Makes U.S. Foreign Policy?" The article names those in Washington who appear to have a hand in such policy making, but bemoans the fact that with the tangling of lines of authority and influence that now exists, it is impossible to tell "which one man is making what decisions."

In Think, a publication of IBM, Arthur Herzog has surveyed the problems encountered by foreign students in America and the solutions advanced by educators concerned with the 60,000 who are currently enrolled in colleges and universities here (January 1963). He also discusses why it is desirable to have foreign students, citing the ultimate practical political and business gains to the United States and the instructive value of cultural exchange in America itself. But the "ultimate reason... for educating foreign students," he states, "is because they want it and need it... In the world of today, education seems the least, and the most, the U.S. can offer."

Of special interest to readers will be the series of articles contributed by Hannah Arendt to the New Yorker magazine on the subject "Eichmann in Jerusalem," begun in the February 16 issue.

In the February 12 issue of National Review, Frank Meyer discusses "just war in the nuclear age." His ineptness in applying the theory of the just war to present conditions shows how readily a civilizing tradition can be corrupted and how necessary is the work of restoring it. Meyer's conclusion: "In defense of a just cause, uncontaminated by impure intentions, strictly proportional in force employed (destruction of the enemy's nuclear power), a first-strike counter-force nuclear blow, minimal in its effects upon the civilian population, meets every moral criterion."
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