

affirmative action, or announcements of intention to take affirmative action, that spurs great protests. On the Western side, there have been a number of affirmative actions and statements, but in the face of what the Russians did during September and October, and of their attitude since then, it has been hard for even the most ardent opponents of testing to feel that the Anglo-American response has been entirely unreasonable. Additionally, in this country, the civil defense program has provided a substitute for people who were mainly seeking an outlet for their disgust over the arms race in general.

The change from great public interest up to the point where the U.N. resolutions were adopted to rather general apathy almost immediately thereafter was foreshadowed by the attitude on the resolutions within the U.N. The feeling at the U.N. was reported in some detail here (3 November). It was generally that the U.N. had to ask the nuclear powers to resume the moratorium, but that there was no likelihood that the resolution would have any effect, since, aside from the Russian opposition, if the U.S. and Britain felt their security would be threatened by a new unpoliced moratorium, they could not be expected to abide by the resolution. The resolution was not regarded as a prelude to a resumed moratorium, but as a moral statement which no one expected to have much effect on the countries concerned. It was mainly a formal reflection of despair at the way things were going, and once having formally registered its despair, that is, having done all it could do, the U.N., and it seems nearly everyone else, turned its attention and its despair to other matters. Even at the time the U.N. was debating the question so ardently, there seemed to be not only no expectation that the resolution *would* be obeyed, but not even any great feeling that it *ought* to be obeyed. At the time of the debate, this reporter asked a Canadian, a Russian, a Pole, a Pakistani, and an American not connected with the American delegation whether, in view of the Soviet handling of the test-ban issue, they thought, off the record, that the U.S. and Britain ought to abide by a U.N. resolution calling for a new moratorium. They all gave nearly identical answers. All thought the U.N. had to pass such a resolution; none would say that the U.S. and Britain ought to accept it.—H.M.

"Population Explosion": U.N. Postpones Debate

Debate on a proposal for the U.N. to provide population-control assistance for lesser-developed nations has been put off until the next session.

The proposal is a particularly ticklish one for the Administration, which has openly expressed concern about the effects of rapid population growth on the economic development of these nations. Because of domestic political sensitivities, the Administration would happily see population-control assistance become a U.N. concern, but not at the expense of arousing further antipathy to that troubled organization.

The proposal is contained in a resolution which was offered jointly by Sweden and Denmark. Its most significant part is a section which invites nations seeking "technical assistance with regard to problems of population" to request such assistance from the U.N. Implicit in this invitation is the suggestion that the U.N., which now offers some help in population control through its technical assistance programs, should make available a great deal more.

The resolution was placed on the agenda of the second economic committee last fall, but, without any noticeable disappointment on the part of the United States, was one of a number of remaining items when the session was recessed last month.

In the last days of the session, it was voted to place the resolution on the agenda of the committee's next session. Virtually all the predominantly Catholic nations abstained on this vote. The United States, which generally follows a policy of accepting any proposed subject for debate, voted in favor.

Administration officials say that the resolution in its present form may be a bit too strong for domestic political consumption. Wording of a somewhat more subtle nature, they suggest, would ease the way for the United States to deliver its support.

The resolution in some respects is stronger than the so-called Draper Report of 1959, produced by the President's Committee to Study the United States Military Assistance Program. The report was followed by an angry statement from the Catholic bishops of the United States, who warned that American Catholics will not "support any public assistance, either at home or abroad, to promote artificial birth prevention, abortion, or sterilization,

whether through direct aid or by means of international organizations."

The current Administration has shied away from what might be considered provocative policy statements, while at the same time it has virtually abandoned the Eisenhower policy of indifference to population problems. The Administration's concern over the U.N. resolution boils down to a desire for action unaccompanied by proclamations that may arouse spirited retorts and make population-control assistance a lively political issue. The Catholic Church, which is not unaware of the Administration's active interest in population matters, has had nothing to say publicly on the matter for some time now, and the Administration has no desire to spur it into activity.—D.S.G.

Educational TV: Los Angeles Next?

The Federal Communications Commission, which was instrumental in bringing educational television to the New York metropolitan area, is looking into prospects for an ETV channel in Los Angeles.

The FCC's interest in Los Angeles has been aroused by unconfirmed reports that one of the area's commercial stations may be put up for sale. At present, the very-high-frequency band, which is the standard band for television reception, is fully occupied by commercial stations in the Los Angeles area. The only possibilities for ETV are to acquire a channel by purchase from one of the commercial operators, or broadcast on the virtually empty ultra-high-frequency band. ETV groups have generally been reluctant to undertake UHF operations because relatively few sets are equipped to receive UHF signals.

If the New York case, involving WNTA, channel 13, is any precedent, the FCC is likely to play an aggressive role in behalf of ETV if a Los Angeles station should go on the market. When channel 13 was put up for sale, FCC Chairman Newton Minow made it clear that the FCC was cool to the prospect of continued commercial operation of the station. Armed with its licensing authority, the FCC offered little encouragement to commercial interests, while it showed brotherly concern for the ETV group that was bargaining for the station.

FCC officials said that the Los Angeles situation was uncertain at present, but they indicated that they are ex-