FIFTY YEARS AGO, the United States was pretty much disinterested in what went on in Europe. We were isolationists. We did not see why what happened in Europe could be of much interest to us. Now we have been through two devastating wars. Those events have convinced the American public that the United States and Europe are inseparable in their fates and destinies.

The United States, in the meantime, has become a great and powerful nation and has the responsibilities of such a nation. In the present situation, it seems to a great many people that we now are confronted with a world in which there are two great giants facing each other — the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Although these two countries are indeed very powerful, to portray the situation as essentially that of the United States versus the Soviet Union is an oversimplification and leads to some very bad thinking about what we should do from now on.

The reason that such a comparison is an oversimplification and is likely to lead to misinterpretation of events is that it is conducive to making European countries feel insignificant in this struggle. It is also likely to do great harm by playing up to the feeling of neutralism so that these “little ones” ask why they should get mixed up in the brawl between these two big fellows. That kind of psychological atmosphere is likely to engendered.

NOW, THERE ARE SOME genuine and sincere people who look at this situation and who believe that a third force — a third power — should be built up, which should be Europe, on the hypothesis that three great giants would be more likely to preserve the peace than two. Why this should be so is not very clear. In any case, the basis of such an analysis is the traditional “balance of power” outlook on international affairs. We feel that theory is erroneous and would lead to a bad situation.

Such an analysis overlooks a significant aspect of the present international situation. The United States sees the issue confronting the world not as one between two great giants but as a difference in two ways of life. The struggle is between the way of life representing the individual, his liberty and his dignity, and the other, with its concept of the state, sacrificing personal freedom and the dignity of the individual.

If we must talk of giants, we must speak of one giant — the people, the masses of the world, who are looking for a better way of life, who have all heard of a better way of life made possible through scientific and technical progress. Any national power must bear this force in mind. Of course there are localizations of power which create tensions such as those between the United States and the USSR.

The case of the Soviet Union is that a better life can be achieved but only at the sacrifice of individual liberty. The Soviet spokesmen make glowing promises of security in exchange for the totalitarian controls of the police state. In no case have they yet delivered on their promises, though their achievement in the exercise of terrorist control is the most efficient the world has seen.

The case of the United States is that this security can be achieved through liberty. We believe that an order of society is possible, an order based upon justice and law, on respect for and protection of individual liberty. Our foreign policy is to preserve peace in order to safeguard the possibility for this human progress. In her efforts to produce world peace, the United States has constantly endeavored to take an international line. We are persuad-

Dr. Burkhardt, representing US High Commissioner McCloy, addressed the youth of many European nations on Sept. 1 at the International Youth Camp on the Lorelei. Thousands of youth from many European nations met at the 10-day camping sessions during the summer in an effort to gain a better understanding and mutual respect among free peoples. The speech, delivered extemporaneously, made a tremendous impression on the young campers and the Allied and German visitors there. This article is an adaptation of the transcript of the recording made at the time.
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ed that the task cannot be done by isolated nations but through the cooperation of all nations. Thus we have always given our strong support to the United Nations, and now we support the unifying of Europe.

WE HAVE BEEN ACCUSED of imperialism. If we were imperialist, wanting to make a colony of Europe, we would neither strengthen nor unite Europe. We would take the classic line of dividing, weakening and conquering. There is no ground to believe the Communist propaganda that the Marshall Plan is such a device. So, it would be idiotic to believe that we would strengthen our potential victim. We want rather to strengthen Europe as an ally in our common way of life.

As a matter of fact, the Marshall Plan is a good example of US policy. In June of 1947, after the terrible winter of 1946, Secretary Marshall made a speech at Harvard University. He pointed out that Europe was in considerable despair and that in this situation there was danger of economic and social chaos. He expressed America's willingness to aid on an economic level. At the same time, he insisted that the initiative for any economic assistance toward recovery come from Europe itself.

Four weeks later, Great Britain and France invited the nations of Europe to Paris to draw up plans for economic rehabilitation. It should be remembered that all European nations received an invitation, including the satellite countries and the Soviet Union. The USSR withdrew. Some of the satellites wanted to participate. Czechoslovakia was in a peculiar situation; she actually had accepted. Then her foreign minister was called to Moscow, and later she was forced to withdraw her acceptance.

Nevertheless, 16 nations of Europe came together and developed an imaginative, creative plan. It was totally new in the economic history of the world. It was a European plan and was the basis of the Marshall aid. This was no American plan foisted on Europe.

THE SOVIET UNION immediately began her well-known propaganda attack about American colonization. They claimed that participation in this plan meant subjugation to America. This claim was not what they really felt. What they really felt was that any country included in that plan could not be a Soviet colony.

When one tries to make up his mind concerning the policy of this or that government, he should not put too much faith in the fine words of her representatives. Check the actions of that government with the words of her officials.

On checking the Marshall Plan, one sees that in no case has an attempt been made to interfere with the economic or political structure of any nation. We are a liberal, capitalist country, but in no case has the United States interfered with nationalization or socialist planning in the Marshall Plan countries. There were only two conditions for aid: first, that general, democratic principles be observed in the organization of the plan;

second, that Marshall Plan money be used to increase the productivity of the participating countries.

Large as this Marshall aid has been, let us remember the fact that it has represented only five percent of the goods produced in Europe. The other 95 percent was European, the result of the peoples' initiative. Granted that five percent was important as an added shoulder to the wheel, which otherwise would have remained at a standstill, yet we, as Americans, never have claimed that our help was solely responsible for the reconstruction of Europe.

AS FOR A UNITED EUROPE, there are many reasons why the United States should and does endorse such a plan. We remember the two wars into which we have been drawn since 1914, two wars that grew out of national misunderstanding and hate. We feel that a united Europe can become a concrete reality and can eliminate such dangers in the future.

We in the United States feel that it is to our interest to see a strong Europe because a strong Europe, economically and politically stable, means security for the world and also for us.

In addition, there is the immediate threat of aggression. A strong and united Europe is a crucial factor in defense against that threat. A strong, united Europe is, in the immediate context of existing tensions, one of the greatest contributions toward enduring peace.

That is the real reason for the recent Soviet phony peace campaign. They are trying now with this last effort to lull the people of Europe to sleep, so that they will not unite and form the basis of strength and vitality which will, in coming years, be a nullifying and a peaceful threat to their own power.

A strong, united, democratic and economically stable Europe is one of the greatest threats to Soviet power today. It will mean, without any doubt whatever, that their power over their own people and over the satellites will dwindle, because when the peoples of the USSR and the satellite nations see a Europe with a high standard of living and with freedom, too, their regime cannot last. It cannot stand against the magnetic pull of a Europe which has demonstrated that security can be achieved through freedom.

A UNITED EUROPE in this context is a program not only for the freedom of Europeans but for the freedom of all peoples in the world. Such a movement is already too well underway. We have the Council of Europe, the Schuman Plan and plans for a European army. There are already more plans, I understand — agricultural Schuman plans, transportation Schuman plans. Nothing can stop the momentum of these combinations.

The rapidity with which these programs are fulfilled, and the wisdom with which they are fulfilled, depends upon the young people of Europe, their understanding of the issues and the work that they do. That is why the International Youth Camp on the Lorelei has been one of the most significant things in Europe this summer. To
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Cooperation Brings Swift Results in Augsburg

Cooperation between Germans and Americans in the Augsburg district recently has resulted in improvements ranging from construction of sport facilities to furnishing a youth hostel.

In Fussen, the local tennis club courts were not sufficient for the great demand on them by soldiers, local population and tourists. The organization moreover was without funds to improve the situation. The city administration recognized the need and released enough ground for five courts in an ideal area. The US Army Fussen sub-post supplied a bulldozer for leveling the ground and also transportation for the hauling of cinders and clay.

The formal opening of the courts in August marked a year of cooperation among the Americans, the city officials and the club. This type of working together is especially effective since the simple granting of "help for the sake of being helpful" has often been misunderstood or misinterpreted by the Germans.

In Guenzburg, a field has been leveled as the first step toward construction of a sport stadium on the north bank of the Danube. The work was made possible through close cooperation among the US Army Leipheim sub-post, the Bundesbahn (state railroad system), the people of Guenzburg and the local HICOG resident office.

Landsberg Air Base authorities helped 35 underprivileged children of Landsberg to attend a YMCA camp near Eichstaett by furnishing bus transportation to the camp grounds.

In Kaufbeuren, a recent monthly gathering of German leaders and American troop commanders discussed the control of "camp followers" who have appeared simultaneously with the troops. The sub-post commander declared he intended to place "off limits" those guesthouses which became "pick-up" centers. However, he added that the ban would be removed from places which had raised their own standards.

In an attempt to foster closer, informal relationship between the troops and townspeople the district councilman suggested that his office would be happy to conduct tours through the county for American service men.

Liaison efforts of the US resident office in Kaufbeuren resulted in the loan of 20 cots from the Army sub-post to help furnish a spacious attic as a hostel for young travelers.