

outbreak in Kenya show how easily the central part of this continent might be drowned in blood if the tribes became convinced that they had no way of gaining their rights except by uprisings against the colonial rulers and the white colonists.

But the U.N. has offered an alternative. Literally hundreds of complaints from African tribes, and even from individual Africans, have been received by the U.N. African delegations have appeared before the U.N. to plead their wrongs. Champions of the rights of the African tribesmen, such as that dedicated Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Michael Scott, appear to present the complaints of the tribes and are given a sympathetic hearing by the proper U.N. bodies, even though a state that proclaims white supremacy as its goal for Africa - the Union of South Africa - uses every device possible to silence this voice of Christian conscience and keep its spokesmen away from the U.N.

To be sure, about all the U.N. has been able to do in most cases has been to make impartial investigations and then to place on the conscience of the colonial powers the conditions which have been discovered. Africa's revolt against colonialism and white rule is a long way from settled. The U.N.'s moral suasion can only work slowly. But isn't it better to have the Africans able to resort to the alternative of peaceful appeal to the U.N.'s Trusteeship Council than to face repetition all over the continent of the tragedy in Kenya?

But, someone objects, how about Korea? Did the U.N. provide an alternative there? On the contrary, didn't it involve us in a terrible war - a war which cost the United States the fourth-largest number of casualties in our history and from \$15 to \$20 billion?

We shall speak of Korea again and in more detail. Yet it should be made plain that the U.N. did give us an alternative in Korea. At the start, it provided the alternative of a country peacefully divided into two parts, a democratic and a communist part, instead of one left to be fought over until one part conquered the other. Then when the Communists refused longer to accept this peaceful division and invaded the south, the U.N. gave the United States an alternative. It did not have to act alone; it could take the crisis to the U.N. and call on the U.N. for help.

Suppose there had been no U.N. when North Korea invaded the south. What would have happened? If the United States had done nothing, South Korea would quickly have been overrun and a Communist Korea established, pointing straight at the area of American interest in Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines and the rest of the far Pacific. Certainly the United States would not have let that happen. It would have plunged in alone to keep the Communists out of South Korea.

An out-and-out war between the United States and the Communist state of North Korea would have brought Communist China rushing in officially and immediately. (It is worth remembering that Communist China never technically entered the war against the U.N. The Chinese troops who fought did so under the legal fiction of being "volunteers" who went of their own free will - like the German and Italian "volunteers" in the Spanish civil war - to help their