

U.N. dilemma— fight or run

*Will 'honor' lead to a
Red trap in Asia?
Is holding Europe a
greater issue?*

World War III could start almost instantly. World War III could be forestalled—for the time being, at least. Soon, the nation and the world would know which it was to be.

Though the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the leaders of the other United Nations could ostensibly make the choice, theirs could not be a free decision.

Their hands were forced. Cruel and humiliating defeats on Korean battlefields and diplomatic strangulation at Lake Success had, by last Tuesday night, left the United Nations but three courses of action. None was completely good. Any one could be tragic.

Weighted by the awful responsibility for untold human lives, for national honor and integrity, the men who fight on freedom's side had only a little time left to determine whether:

- • The U.N. forces should flee the field in Korea, quitters in the eyes of the world to a superior force.

- • U.N. commander Gen. Douglas MacArthur should continue the fight, holding the line somewhere, risking honorable defeat but not shameful surrender.

- • The U.N. should take the offensive, bombing the Chinese bases which supply the near million Communists who are driving U.N. troops out of Korea.

Abandoning Korea would be more than a military defeat. It would mean that the nations had abandoned the pledge made when they banded together in San Francisco in 1945: to fight any aggressor who threatened the freedom of any people. Such a course could save thousands of American, British, Australian and Turkish lives.

U.N. dilemma

If MacArthur fights on until the defeat which now seems inevitable, it could mean the sacrifice of a quarter of a million men for a principle, the same principle which would be discarded in a surrender. But such a rout was not yet a certainty, and even so, it might not be too high a price to pay for maintaining international honor.

The Kremlin's Trap. The moment the U.N. resumes the offensive, World War III begins. The U.N. and the U.S. will then have fallen into the trap of a war of attrition, a trap designed for them by the Kremlin. It is possible that the U.N. could win in Asia. But to do so could mean the loss of Europe. And if Europe is lost to Russia, the U.N. could march to oblivion—and the U.S. with it.

If an offensive against China is rejected because the U.N. cannot or will not fight World War III now, adoption of one of the remaining courses would demand an unprecedented brand of courage.

In effect, the President of the United States and his fellow leaders would have to say: "For he that fights and runs away may live to fight another day."

To Americans, imbued with the faith that they are invincible, this might be repugnant. To Americans possessed of the courage to lose a battle in order to win a war, this may be the only course.



President & premier. *Attlee fears for Britain's life.*