



## New Hope For Europe

ALMOST unanimously, the US Zone newspapers see in the proposals made by Secretary of State Marshall in his address at Harvard University a fresh opportunity for Europe to shake off its post-war stagnation.

The **Main-Post** (Wuerzburg) compares the plan with the Truman doctrine: "People tried to contrast the Marshall Plan with Truman's doctrine which means support of liberally governed countries in their fight against Communism. Hunger, misery, and distress are consequences of war which would have appeared and had to be fought even if Soviet Russia, in her desire for expansion, did not use the Communist minorities of European countries for her purpose. But as pauperization and distress are the best auxiliaries of Communism, all measures which decrease the unbearable economic and social tensions, should also hit Communism itself."

"The Marshall Plan which also offers peace and aid to Russia, could mean the end of a policy of distrust between East and West, and the beginning of a new cooperation on the basis of equality for all. Each program for helping all Europe, however, should presume a drastic revision of economic policy of the individual countries. The countries on their side should be willing to administrate and exploit the raw materials of their soil less according to ideas of sovereignty than along true European conceptions. Such a development would be of great value for the creation of a united Europe . . ."

Along the same lines, the **Rhein Neckar Zeitung** (Heidelberg) says: "The situation in Europe threatens to develop into catastrophe. Not only we Germans have learned that measures should be adopted without depending on an agreement of the Big Four's foreign ministers on peace treaties for Germany and Austria. How important Europe's attitude towards the Marshall Plan may be, its

realization must chiefly depend upon the authorization of the US Congress, and the further development of US foreign politics. It is not easy to predict the reaction of a Congress who a short time ago recommended raising duties, while at the same time representatives of the American Government were at Geneva negotiating on the reduction of general tariffs . . .

"The European countries tied closely together by their distress and needs, have through the Marshall Plan the chance to overcome economic nationalism, to share all goods through low tariff policies, and by this means to be as self-supporting as possible."

The **Heilbronner Stimme** comments on the far-reaching repercussions of the Marshall address: "This speech could at first have been considered a more academic discussion of this urgent problem. Now, however, it seems to have been the conscious introduction of a great political action with the purpose of preparing the field, particularly of familiarizing the American people—the American taxpayer—with the idea that the USA as usual will have to furnish the money for this reconstruction."

THERE are three reefs on this road which may cause the wonderful enterprise to fail, and which we wish to watch soberly: 1. The reconstruction of Europe must not sharpen the contrast between East and West. Or to state it quite distinctly: the money spent must not be used for the military armament of Western Europe. 2. The delivery of such immense capital must not, even unintentionally, result in financial and political slavery of the supported states. 3. It would be fatal if the United States should begin the job but not follow it through either because of an economic crisis that some people expect to rise, or because of discouragement over failure in the beginning.

". . . That does not change our opinion that the action started by

Secretary of State Marshall gives us a new great hope that it might perhaps be possible to save the West, the world's deep source of spiritual activity, from the threatening, already beginning decay."

The **Fraenkische Presse** (Bayreuth) sees in the Marshall proposal "certain parallels with President Roosevelt's Lend-Lease Plan which he carried out against all opposition at the beginning of the war in order to give the threatened Allies a sound common economic basis for waging war. The idea of lend-lease was to start the political offensive of the Western countries, and to unite the different nations and their economies, as otherwise they would not have been able either to carry out their defense nor to begin the attack.

TODAY Europe is struggling against a paralyzing crisis in the same way as the world fought against totalitarian dictatorships before . . . The Marshall Plan seems to show a way out which may guide our tortured continent to a better future. But it will only succeed if Germany is also given the place that should be hers."

The **Offenbach Post** warns that "People should clearly understand that there is no way to prevent the decay of the West as long as statesmen try to rebuild Europe on antiquated foundations. Unlimited national sovereignty, high protective duties, and differences of currency will only develop chauvinism, national competitive armament, and so bring up a new war which will be the end of Europe. The leading politicians, too, seem to gain increasing understanding for this fact. The plan of creating a 'United States of Europe' has come to a new stage. Truman's speech before the Canadian Parliament testified to that, as well as Marshall's speech at Harvard University. England's initiative in discussing with Russia the American Secretary of State's plan for aid to Europe, has the same goal . . . Such courage is necessary to follow this road, but we must realize that there is no other way."