

In delivering this reply Mr. Acheson informed His Majesty's Ambassador in Washington that the State Department has been giving considerable time to the problem of Greece and that it hopes to have proposals ready for the President on his return from Mexico on the 6th March. These will include a request to Congress to authorize the Export-Import Bank to extend credits to Greece. The United States Government are apparently ready to make every effort to maintain the territorial and political integrity of both Greece and Turkey, and they propose that consultations be held at once between the State Department and His Majesty's representatives in Washington regarding the financial considerations involved. They also suggest conversations with His Majesty's Government on more general problems of common concern relating to Asia as well as to Europe. (This reflects perhaps the state of mind induced in Washington, not only by the appeal for assistance in the case of Greece, but also by what the American press has been saying about possible changes in the disposition of British power abroad as a result of developments in India and of the economic crisis at home. In this connexion it is probably not surprising that, in delivering the American reply on the 1st March, Mr. Acheson laid great emphasis on the desire of his Government that our troops shall not be withdrawn from Greece.)

Mr. Bevin's reference, in his House of Commons speech of the 25th February, to the way in which the problem of Palestine had been "made the subject of local electioneering" by American political leaders, and his own efforts to reach a solution had thereby been impeded, has given rise to a spate of lively comment. Reactions have ranged all the way from the angered retort of Representative Emanuel Celler (Democrat, Brooklyn) that the whole speech was a "damnable lie" to the equally strong assertion of the *Los Angeles Times* that Mr. Bevin was right and that President Truman "demeaned his office by wooing Jewish votes." Some commentators admit that the President's statement of the 4th October last, which was referred to in the House of Commons debate, "smacked of electioneering," and they recall that they as good as said so at the time. (Mr. Truman was, in fact, reproached last October for bringing Palestine down to the level of "ward politics" and for possibly jeopardizing Mr. Byrnes' good work on the subject in Paris.) In these quarters the White House *démenti* of the 26th February, which stated that it was

"unfortunate and misleading" to suggest that American interest in Palestine was "motivated by partisan and local politics," has tended to fall completely flat. Others, however, have been inclined to question whether the President's action could really have had the effect on the London negotiations ascribed to it by Mr. Bevin, the *Washington Post* remarking that "there could have been no negotiations worthy of the word if Bevin was trying to duck the issue over immigration."

With characteristic readiness to believe only the worst of Soviet conduct in the international sphere the majority of commentators have imputed none but the most sinister motives to the Russian decision to accept without further question the proposed U.S. trusteeship over the former Japanese mandates in the Pacific. This unexpectedly amicable gesture on the part of the Kremlin, to which General Marshall referred at his press conference on the 25th February, is generally believed to stem from a desire to establish a precedent in the disposal of ex-enemy territory which will work to the advantage of Soviet claims in Europe. Thus the consistently Russophobic *New York Daily News* has been prompted to ask "just what *quid pro quo*" Stalin wants for this "seeming generosity" and to add that "until we know the answer to that question let's go easy on dancing in the street." In view of the firm line which he is known to favour in dealing with the Russians, and in view of his recent positive contribution to Republican thought on the subject of Germany (see *Summary* No. 377), the choice of Mr. John Foster Dulles as General Marshall's "special adviser" at the forthcoming Moscow Conference has given much satisfaction in all but left-wing quarters. As the *New York Herald-Tribune* has observed, "it is most unlikely that Secretary Marshall would have issued the invitation unless he believed that Mr. Dulles' approach to the German problem was compatible with his own, or that Mr. Dulles would have accepted unless he felt that his views were sufficiently representative of those of other Republican leaders to be more than a personal contribution."

On the 26th February it was announced that President Truman had appointed Mr. Lewis William Douglas, a former Congressman-at-large from Arizona and Director of the Budget from 1933 to 1934, to be U.S. Ambassador to the Court of St. James's in succession to Mr. O. Max Gardner, who died suddenly on the 6th February, only a few hours before he was

due to leave for this country. Like Mr. Gardner, Mr. Douglas is a successful business man. Since 1940 he has been President of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York. From 1938 to 1939 he served as Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University, Montreal. His appointment has been well

received among American Conservatives. A few Liberals, on the other hand, while admitting his lifelong friendship for this country, have suggested that his known antipathy towards the New Deal at home will not make it easy for him to see eye-to-eye with a Socialist Government in Great Britain.

## LATIN AMERICA

### Bolivia

The inauguration of the new Bolivian president is envisaged for the 10th March, following confirmation of the results by Congress. It is reported in the press, however, that the event may be postponed, apparently on account of the recent disastrous floods at Trinidad, which are described as a national calamity.

The complete electoral returns give Dr. Enrique Hertzog a narrow victory over Dr. Luis F. Guachalla by 43,581 votes to 43,302. Dr. Paz Estenssoro, the leader of the disbanded *Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario* (M.N.R.)—the "fascist" party under the Villarroel régime—received 5,194 votes; his very appearance as a candidate is a sign of broadmindedness on the part of the Government. The number of votes cast represents nearly 72 per cent of the total electorate of 130,000. This is the highest percentage recorded in Bolivia, though the electorate remains a bare twentieth of the population.

Dr. Hertzog is a member of the "Union of Republican Socialists," which will have 14 out of 27 seats in the new Senate and 45 out of 111 in the Chamber of Deputies. With the aid of Señor Juan Lechín's miners and other small groups, Dr. Hertzog's supporters should command a majority in both houses. Dr. Guachalla was supported by the Liberals (who are extreme conservatives) and the Left Revolutionary Party (P.I.R.): these two disparate groups have 15 and 35 seats respectively in the Chamber, and could therefore outvote the Republican Socialists if these failed to come to terms with the minority groups.

## UNITED NATIONS

### Security Council

#### Japanese Mandated Islands

On the 26th February Senator Austin presented to the Security Council his

Government's claim to the trusteeship of the islands. In submitting the draft agreement to the Security Council, he pointed out that the U.S. had conquered the islands in its struggle against Japanese aggression: