

Chris Hunter

The current interest in the Republican Presidential nomination is ~~extremely~~ ^{decidedly}

~~flattering and suggestive~~

~~embowering~~

^{curiously enough} The Democratic nomination meanwhile seems almost to go a-begging. Chief Justice Vinson turns ^J down the opportunity to ^{Paul} equal the unique record of a Taft ^{it} in being Chief Justice and President. Senator Douglas sternly rejects the nomination on the ground that he is unfitted and ^{curiously enough} seems to favor a Republican. Justice Douglas will have nothing to do with it. The President continues coy. ??

^{cap} There must be shudders in many quarters as the Tennessee coonskin seems to be the only serious contender to make Americans forget mink coats. ^{hair} New York has nailed the tiger skin to the barn door in its recent election with Tammany polling less than forty per cent of the vote.

^{yet} However, ^{but} there is no time for overconfidence - nor underconfidence.

Republicans should put their best foot forward in full confidence that giving the people ^{as a Smith used to say} the facts and a candidate in whom everyone can have confidence as to his honesty and experience and understanding of our problems, domestic and foreign, the people will respond ~~without regard to party--north and south, east and west.~~

^{not only} The 22 million who have voted Republican in the last three Presidential elections but many of the 45 million who did

not choose to vote in 1948 - as
we put on a fighting campaign
that shows up the ~~real~~ record
of vacillation and dishonesty
that has resulted so
disastrously,

In the last three elections New York has supplied the Republican Presidential^{2.00}

~~candidate with high hopes and with results somewhat less than gratifying.~~

Republicans everywhere feel sure that our friends in New York will ~~under~~
~~stand~~ ^{understand} if we this time select a candidate from elsewhere - perhaps the Middle
West and rely confidently on New York joining Maine and many other states in
supporting the Republican nominee.

New York has ~~city~~ ^{already} demonstrated its determination to install integrity in public
office and along with all his other qualifications and broad experience we may
well offer a candidate whose whole record in public life uniquely qualifies him
to be called "Honest Bob", as he goes on to become President of the United States.

Let us as Republicans face the future with determination that we will
select the best ~~possible~~ ^{for President} qualified candidate and go into the campaign with a
leader who has been tested in the political hustings as a Republican ~~candidate~~ ^{nominee}
and has never known defeat.

Under the insidious argument of selecting "a ~~candidate~~ ^{nominee} who can win"
~~Senator~~ ^{Bale} Taft has been passed over by ~~two~~ ^{national} conventions only to find that the
arguments ^{based} on expediency did not bring success.

Let us in the language of George Washington "raise a standard to
which the wise and honest can repair" and go forward to victory under
the banner of principle rather than expediency.

2.

In the last few turbulent years Bob Taft has demonstrated in the Congress a leadership that is in many respects unique.

In the passage of many controversial but vital measures Bob Taft has shown a political perspicacity unparalleled in our times.

His capacity to coordinate varying viewpoints in both parties is one of the most necessary qualifications for a successful President. That quality Bob Taft has shown he possesses in extraordinary degree ~~measure~~ as his influence has been felt in all phases of the legislative process and on both sides of the aisle that separates the parties.

3.

His confidence in ^{Congress} ~~Washington~~ and in the country in ~~his~~ Bob's intelligence, indelible industry and complete integrity is a priceless asset for the American people and the world in restoring confidence in government upon which alone an enduring structure of peace can be erected.

These are some of the reasons why ~~in my opinion~~ Bob Taft ~~should and~~ will be the next President of the United States.

"For a reason or reasons best known to himself, Mr. Duff set out to prevent if possible the nomination of Governor Dewey for President. His printed attack on Dewey, and his so-called "off the record" observations were of a nature to make it virtually impossible for him to go before the people and as a loyal Republican support the nominee of his party. "

LIFE, August 6, 1951, "Taft vs. Eisenhower", A Report on the Republicans.

In the last paragraph the article concludes:

Robert T. Elson

"If General Eisenhower, as so many Republicans hope, is now to take over leadership of their party, he will have to speak up for it plainly. He will have to explain where he agrees and where he differs with Mr. Taft. He will have to rally more real professionals to his campaign and see that they pursue delegates professionally. He will have to specify policies of his own if he is now to win the confidence not only of the G. O. P. but also of the nation."

Jeff's recollection:

On the Martha Roundtree Program, on which Senator Brewster and Senator Carlson appeared, Senator Carlson in reply to a question, stated that he would not support General Eisenhower unless he were to make his position clear on all of the issues, and expressed the opinion that Eisenhower would ~~return~~ return to the United States in plenty of time to present his views on all questions to the people.

Duff's statement that Eisenhower must return in order to be elected:

Quotation cannot be found in the press. After talking to several who read this statement, the general impression is that Duff said that Eisenhower would have to return to the United States by February the 1st, in order to successfully contest for the nomination.

*Eisenhower
file*

We know Eisenhower's views on Europe; what are his views on the Far East? Is he in favor of:

- 1 Recognition of China?
- 2 Aid to Chiang and Formosa?
- 2 Bombing of Chinese Communist airbases in Manchuria?
- All-out war in Korea or negotiated peace?
- 4 MacArthur's policy in fighting the war?

* * * * *

Domestic issues

Is Eisenhower in favor of:

- 1, Repealing the Taft-Hartley Law?
- Taxing the Farm Cooperatives?
- Federal aid to education?
- Balancing the budget?
- 2 Brannan Farm Plan?
- 3 Raising income taxes, corporate taxes?
- 4 Repealing excise taxes?
- Higher excess-profits taxes?
- Continued aid to Europe? How much? For how long?
- The Point Four Program?
- Revision of the Italian peace treaty?
- A German treaty now?
- 5 A national and Federal health program?
- Reciprocal trade agreements, even those mean the destruction of American industry?

General theme of questioning to be on the idea of Priscilla's statement - "Why don't you speak for yourself, John?"

In Lodge's statement about enlightened Republicans, what do you mean, "enlightened Republicans"?

Use Ike's letter of 1948

Question Duff on Eisenhower's stand on FEPC as compared to Taft's.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TAFT IN CONNECTION WITH THE
INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A
FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION
September 23, 1949

I am today introducing a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color.

The bill establishes a Federal Commission of five with power to set up local commissions in all regions throughout the United States. The commission is authorized to make comprehensive studies in each district to determine how discrimination in that district on grounds of race, creed, and color can best be eliminated, and full employment provided for negroes and all other minority groups. It is given full power to call witnesses and inquire into specific cases of discrimination, make recommendations and take every step to secure community interest and cooperation and voluntary compliance by employers and labor unions.

In my opinion the establishment of this commission is justified by the fact that negroes do not have the opportunities for employment enjoyed by white men. In many places they are the last to be employed and the first to be laid off. Custom and prejudice interfere with improvement in their position. Substantial progress was made during the war and the temporary Fair Employment Practices Commission, though without legal authority, contributed materially to that progress.

I feel that the compulsory provisions of the bill heretofore introduced in the Senate will hinder progress towards solving the problem rather than achieve it. Few realize how extensive these compulsory provisions are. They are modeled on the "unfair labor practice" provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and give to anyone who is refused employment or dismissed from a job the right to bring an action against the employer, alleging some motive of discrimination because the applicant or employee is white, black, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Czech, Pole or German. Such motives are always possible to allege, and the question is left for decision to a board which is bound by no rules of evidence, and practically not subject to court review.

Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act led to demands for its amendment by labor organizations themselves. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every state as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits. Race and religion will enter into every decision. Catholic institutions, for instance, will have to employ Protestants. The Methodist Book Concern will have to employ Catholics. White waiters and porters could insist upon most of the work in the Pullman sleepers and dining cars. In the long run this board would tell every employer how he must make up his labor force. The bill even includes national origin and ancestry, so that in a city like Cleveland, Ohio, employers could be sued by representatives of every nationality group particularly if they do not have members of that nationality employed in that particular office or plant.

In my opinion any such compulsory measure will create more bad racial and religious feeling than any other method which can be pursued. I think it will do the colored race much more harm than good. Progress against discrimination must be made gradually and must be made by voluntary co-operation and education with encouragement from a Federal

(over)

Board, like that I propose, and state governments and boards, and not by inviting thousands of law suits which will get beyond the control even of the Fair Employment Practices Commission itself. A voluntary commission can develop different kinds of plans to increase good colored employment in different cities after studying the local conditions and the character of local industries. The method of solving the problem of negro full employment in Cleveland may be entirely different from that which should be pursued in New York City or in Atlanta, Georgia. No scientific study of the problem has yet been made, and that should be the first task of the boards I propose.

It is true that there may be a few recalcitrant employers, but if local committees are set up and sound plans developed I believe they will be a few indeed. If there are a few, perhaps they can be by-passed and employment provided by other means. If the voluntary method fails to continue progress, the commission is given power to recommend compulsory legislation. I should not oppose it as a last resort. Even then, I doubt if the "unfair labor practice" approach is the proper method of dealing with the situation. For instance, when a comprehensive plan of employment has been made, and efforts at voluntary compliance have failed, the board might be given the right to apply to a court for general approval of the plan, and a court order against an employer whose course of conduct interferes substantially with the success of the plan.

The bill which I am introducing proposes a constructive approach to one of the most difficult problems we face. It is so fair that I believe the opponents should be willing to withdraw their opposition.

END

Re Wall Street Journal Story:

Wall Street Journal friend tells me that Mr. Grimes, editor of Journal, visited Eisenhower last Fall. He was surprised by the Jan. announcement and cabled Shape for permission to send personal representative for interview. Request was granted. He caught Hughes vacationing in Switzerland and sent him in with list of questions prepared in Washington and N.Y. Hughes had long interview and his story was approved and cleared by Eisenhower.

Bud

you say you like
like - I'd
like to know
what like likes

TAFT COMMITTEE
National Headquarters

Memo from:

Bud Littin

The Really Reluctant "Candidate"

Eisenhower Is Hoping He Won't Be Nominated

Ike's Statement Was No "Go-Ahead"; He Plans No Public Stand on Issues, No U. S. Trip; Yet "Call to Duty" Could Precede Convention

By EDWARD HUGHES

Staff Correspondent of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

(Copyright 1952 by The Wall Street Journal.)

PARIS — Dwight Eisenhower wasn't fooling—he's really reluctant. General Ike doesn't want to be President of the United States. He genuinely prefers to stay out of politics, finish his job of building Western Europe's defense, and then move to a farm in America where he can live quietly and do a little hunting and golfing now and then.

It can safely be said the 61-year-old military leader firmly intends to make no trips to the U. S. in the next few months. He plans to make no statement or other public move which would be political ammunition for either Repub-

licans or Democrats. This is his definite intent at this moment, whether it helps or hinders his political future.

Statement No "Go-Ahead"

These are reasons why there's disappointment ahead for those who have chosen to interpret General Eisenhower's statement last week as a subtle, shrewd opening shot in a campaign for the Presidency. He said he would not seek a Presidential nomination, but implied he would take one if he received "a clear-cut call to political duty." The statement was not intended to discourage his backers, but neither was it a coy "go-ahead" signal to G.O.P. organizers.

As much as anything, the statement was intended to squelch any thoughts that, in the light of the nationwide American excitement over his political possibilities, further silence on his part would itself have political meaning.

Now, several days after his public announcement, this idol of millions of Americans and Europeans is firmer than ever in the convictions which prompted him to speak out. He will permit no man, politician or otherwise, to interfere with his difficult task of molding an adequate North Atlantic military force. And he has no definite target date on which he thinks he will be able to relax—and maybe step down from the job.

However, General Eisenhower is willing to revise his plans at any time he feels it his patriotic duty as an American to do so.

This revision of plans would follow a formula, the elements of which probably are as yet vague in the General's mind.

According to the thinking implicit in Ike's statement last Monday, if U. S. public opinion continues mounting in his favor as a presidential candidate and if construction of the North Atlantic defense force steadily progresses, a point would eventually be reached at which the importance of his political activity in America would override the importance of his international duties in Europe. At that time the General would feel duty-bound to make the change.

Personal Decision

It will be a personal decision on General Eisenhower's part to determine when or if his call to political duty becomes "clear-cut." It can be said with certainty that as of this moment he cannot describe or define the elements of a future condition which might constitute this "clear-cut call" to duty in American politics. It is the sort of thing which he will have to assess on a day-to-day basis. It is certain he will recognize it if it should come.

The nomination of General Eisenhower in July as the candidate of the Republican party would certainly be such a clear-cut call to political duty as to override Ike's international obligations in Europe. A combination of events such as landslide success in two or three of the spring primary elections plus insistent public demand elsewhere, might be enough.

But until and unless a mandate of such proportions is received, the General will stay at his job in the French countryside near this city, where from a modest wallboarded office he is busy gearing the armed forces of 12 allied nations into one coordinated force. And he won't do anything to create his own mandate.

Resolute Refusal

A visitor who stopped in for a word with the General would find him courteously willing to outline his views on world affairs in his well-known open, expressive manner, but he would get a resolute refusal in response to requests that Ike explain his views on such things as corruption in American government or federal paternalism or states' rights. He has views on these subjects—and strong ones—but he isn't discussing them, and won't be.

Although he and Mrs. Eisenhower long to return and make their home in America after 13 years in their lives of off-and-on living abroad, General Eisenhower has no intention of going back to the U. S. in the near future.

If, as is likely, there is some effort to bring him back for political reasons, perhaps in the guise of a mission to testify before Congress in support of new money appropriations for his European defense program, the General will discreetly answer that he feels continued progress in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would be far more eloquent testimony than anything he could say to Congress—and that continued N.A.T.O. progress can be best insured by his remaining on the job here.

insidious argument
1.

I do not believe Republicans should use time devising or discussing reasons why ~~any~~ Republican cannot be elected.

Let us leave that to the Democrats. I believe Eisenhower can be elected

— as a Republican — or Warren or

I believe Warren can be elected ^{Stassen}

I believe ~~Stassen~~ can be elected.

I believe ~~Walt~~ ^{Walt} can be elected.

I further believe that any ^{one} of these ~~them~~ will be a vast improvement over what we have ~~as what~~

and over anyone whom the Democrats are likely to nominate.

I happen to believe ^{also} that Bob ~~Walt~~ possesses the ~~particular~~ experience and training that particularly qualifies him to take over the Presidency at this critical time.

300% Registered A + B +

40 %

30 % unregistered, R + 2/3 + 1/3

As long as the ~~Seny of State~~

is a man who has publicly
proclaimed that he will not
turn his back on Adge Hiss
— a man convicted practically
of treason —

it is vital that we have
a McCarthy in the Senate

Sen McCarthy

Rose &
Dutch Cling

He would say exactly what
he has repeatedly said
that it has taken 9 more
500000000 American ~~caution~~
to come

The text of General Eisenhower's letter to Leonard V. Finder, New Hampshire newspaper publisher, regarding the Republican Presidential nomination follows:

Dear Mr. Finder:

Your letter and editorial have been on my desk for more than a week while I pondered the reply merited by your obvious concern for the Nation's welfare, and from a personal standpoint, by the honor you had done me. Months ago I thought that unqualified denial of political ambition would eliminate me from consideration in the coming campaign for the presidency, because that office has, since the days of Washington, historically and properly fallen only to aspirants.

That some few would misinterpret or look for hidden meanings in my past expressions was expected and discounted, but my failure to convince thoughtful and earnest men such as yourself, proves that I must make some amplification. This will necessarily partake of the laborious, due to the complexity of the factors that have influenced me to say no more than I have, but which dictate my decision that I am not available for and could not accept nomination to high political office.

I have heretofore refrained from making the bald statement that I would not accept nomination, although this has been my intention since the subject was first mentioned to me.

This omission seems to have been a mistake, since it has inadvertently misled sincere and disinterested Americans. But my reticence stemmed from cogent reasons. The first was that such an expression would smack of effrontery. I had and I have no desire to appear either as assuming that significant numbers of our people would actively interest themselves in me as a possible candidate.

or to appear as lacking in respect and regard for the highest honor American citizens can confer upon one of their own body.

A second and even deeper reason was a persistent doubt aht I could phrase a flat refusal without appearing to violate that concept of duty to country which calls upon every good citizen to place no limitations upon his readiness to serve in any designated capacity. On this point it is my conviction that, unless an individual feels some inner compulsion and special qualifications to enter the political arena, which I do not, a refusal to do so involves no violation of the highest standards of devotion to duty.

It was only the possible misinterpretation of my attitude that caused me concern and so long as I could believe that mere denial of political ambition would prevent serious misunderstanding and misdirected effort, I was reluctant to say more. It would seem almost superfluous for me to add that as long as I live I shall hold myself in instant readiness to respond to any call by the Government to military duty.

In full awareness, then, and not in violation of my own sense of duty, I have developed the following conclusions which are responsible for my negative decision.

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious and over-riding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Politics is a profession -- a serious, complicated, and in its true

sense, a noble one.

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces. At least this is true in my case.

I am deeply regretful if a too simple faith in the effectiveness of a plain denial has misled any considerable number concerning my intentions and so allowed them to spend time and effort under erroneous impressions. At the risk of appearing pompous, I must say that the honor paid me cannot fail to spur me in future years to work the more diligently for America, her youth, her veterans, and all her citizens, and for the continuance of peace.

I trust that this rather lengthy explanation will convince you that my conclusions are not only sound but have been arrived at objectively and have not been unduly influenced by my own desires and convenience. In any event, my decision to remove myself completely from the political scene is definite and positive. I know you will not object to my making this letter public to inform all interested persons that I could not accept nomination even under the remote circumstances that it were tendered me.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely

/s/ Dwight D. Eisenhower

"It is gratifying indeed to have this opportunity to address the citizens of Cleveland and the State of Ohio - a state which has contributed so abundantly to America's leadership both past and contemporary. Indeed, indications multiply that this leadership may even increase in the not-too-distant future. "

(Excerpt from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's address given in Cleveland, Ohio, September 6, 1951. Copied from the New York Times, 9/7/51, Page 10)

The text of General Eisenhower's letter to Leonard V. Finder, New Hampshire newspaper publisher, regarding the Republican Presidential nomination follows:

Dear Mr. Finder:

Your letter and editorial have been on my desk for more than a week while I pondered the reply merited by your obvious concern for the Nation's welfare, and from a personal standpoint, by the honor you had done me. Months ago I thought that unqualified denial of political ambition would eliminate me from consideration in the coming campaign for the presidency, because that office has, since the days of Washington, historically and properly fallen only to aspirants.

That some few would misinterpret or look for hidden meanings in my past expressions was expected and discounted, but my failure to convince thoughtful and earnest men such as yourself, proves that I must make some amplification. This will necessarily partake of the laborious, due to the complexity of the factors that have influenced me to say no more than I have, but which dictate my decision that I am not available for and could not accept nomination to high political office.

I have heretofore refrained from making the bald statement that I would not accept nomination, although this has been my intention since the subject was first mentioned to me.

This omission seems to have been a mistake, since it has inadvertently misled sincere and disinterested Americans. But my reticence stemmed from cogent reasons. The first was that such an expression would smack of effrontery. I had and I have no desire to appear either as assuming that significant numbers of our peoples would actively interest themselves in me as a possible candidate.

or to appear as lacking in respect and regard for the highest honor American citizens can confer upon one of their own body.

A second and even deeper reason was a persistent doubt aht I could phrase a flat refusal without appearing to violate that concept of duty to country which calls upon every good citizen to place no limitations upon his readiness to serve in any designated capacity. On this point it is my conviction that, unless an individual feels some inner compulsion and special qualifications to enter the political arena, which I do not, a refusal to do so involves no violation of the highest standards of devotion to duty.

It was only the possible misinterpretation of my attitude that caused me concern and so long as I could believe that mere denial of political ambition would prevent serious misunderstanding and misdirected effort, I was reluctant to say more. It would seem almost superfluous for me to add that as long as I live I shall hold myself in instant readiness to respond to any call by the Government to military duty.

In full awareness, then, and not in violation of my own sense of duty, I have developed the following conclusions which are responsible for my negative decision.

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious and over-riding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Politics is a profession -- a serious, complicated, and in its true

sense, a noble one.

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces. At least this is true in my case.

I am deeply regretful if a too simple faith in the effectiveness of a plain denial has misled any considerable number concerning my intentions and so allowed them to spend time and effort under erroneous impressions. At the risk of appearing pompous, I must say that the honor paid me cannot fail to spur me in future years to work the more diligently for America, her youth, her veterans, and all her citizens, and for the continuance of peace.

I trust that this rather lengthy explanation will convince you that my conclusions are not only sound but have been arrived at objectively and have not been unduly influenced by my own desires and convenience. In any event, my decision to remove myself completely from the political scene is definite and positive. I know you will not object to my making this letter public to inform all interested persons that I could not accept nomination even under the remote circumstances that it were tendered me.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely

/s/ Dwight D. Eisenhower

The text of General Eisenhower's letter to Leonard V. Finder, New Hampshire newspaper publisher, regarding the Republican Presidential nomination follows:

Dear Mr. Finder:

Your letter and editorial have been on my desk for more than a week while I pondered the reply merited by your obvious concern for the Nation's welfare, and from a personal standpoint, by the honor you had done me. Months ago I thought that unqualified denial of political ambition would eliminate me from consideration in the coming campaign for the presidency, because that office has, since the days of Washington, historically and properly fallen only to aspirants.

That some few would misinterpret or look for hidden meanings in my past expressions was expected and discounted, but my failure to convince thoughtful and earnest men such as yourself, proves that I must make some amplification. This will necessarily partake of the laborious, due to the complexity of the factors that have influenced me to say no more than I have, but which dictate my decision that I am not available for and could not accept nomination to high political office.

I have heretofore refrained from making the bald statement that I would not accept nomination, although this has been my intention since the subject was first mentioned to me.

This omission seems to have been a mistake, since it has inadvertently misled sincere and disinterested Americans. But my reticence stemmed from cogent reasons. The first was that such an expression would smack of effrontery. I had and I have no desire to appear either as assuming that significant numbers of our peoples would actively interest themselves in me as a possible candidate.

or to appear as lacking in respect and regard for the highest honor American citizens can confer upon one of their own body.

A second and even deeper reason was a persistent doubt aht I could phrase a flat refusal without appearing to violate that concept of duty to country which calls upon every good citizen to place no limitations upon his readiness to serve in any designated capacity. On this point it is my conviction that, unless an individual feels some inner compulsion and special qualifications to enter the political arena, which I do not, a refusal to do so involves no violation of the highest standards of devotion to duty.

It was only the possible misinterpretation of my attitude that caused me concern and so long as I could believe that mere denial of political ambition would prevent serious misunderstanding and misdirected effort, I was reluctant to say more. It would seem almost superfluous for me to add that as long as I live I shall hold myself in instant readiness to respond to any call by the Government to military duty.

In full awareness, then, and not in violation of my own sense of duty, I have developed the following conclusions which are responsible for my negative decision.

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious and over-riding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Politics is a profession -- a serious, complicated, and in its true

sense, a noble one.

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces. At least this is true in my case.

I am deeply regretful if a too simple faith in the effectiveness of a plain denial has misled any considerable number concerning my intentions and so allowed them to spend time and effort under erroneous impressions. At the risk of appearing pompous, I must say that the honor paid me cannot fail to spur me in future years to work the more diligently for America, her youth, her veterans, and all her citizens, and for the continuance of peace.

I trust that this rather lengthy explanation will convince you that my conclusions are not only sound but have been arrived at objectively and have not been unduly influenced by my own desires and convenience. In any event, my decision to remove myself completely from the political scene is definite and positive. I know you will not object to my making this letter public to inform all interested persons that I could not accept nomination even under the remote circumstances that it were tendered me.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely

/s/ Dwight D. Eisenhower

The text of General Eisenhower's letter to Leonard V. Finder, New Hampshire newspaper publisher, regarding the Republican Presidential nomination follows:

Dear Mr. Finder:

Your letter and editorial have been on my desk for more than a week while I pondered the reply merited by your obvious concern for the Nation's welfare, and from a personal standpoint, by the honor you had done me. Months ago I thought that unqualified denial of political ambition would eliminate me from consideration in the coming campaign for the presidency, because that office has, since the days of Washington, historically and properly fallen only to aspirants.

That some few would misinterpret or look for hidden meanings in my past expressions was expected and discounted, but my failure to convince thoughtful and earnest men such as yourself, proves that I must make some amplification. This will necessarily partake of the laborious, due to the complexity of the factors that have influenced me to say no more than I have, but which dictate my decision that I am not available for and could not accept nomination to high political office.

I have heretofore refrained from making the bald statement that I would not accept nomination, although this has been my intention since the subject was first mentioned to me.

This omission seems to have been a mistake, since it has inadvertently misled sincere and disinterested Americans. But my reticence stemmed from cogent reasons. The first was that such an expression would smack of effrontery. I had and I have no desire to appear either as assuming that significant numbers of our peoples would actively interest themselves in me as a possible candidate.

or to appear as lacking in respect and regard for the highest honor American citizens can confer upon one of their own body.

A second and even deeper reason was a persistent doubt aht I could phrase a flat refusal without appearing to violate that concept of duty to country which calls upon every good citizen to place no limitations upon his readiness to serve in any designated capacity. On this point it is my conviction that, unless an individual feels some inner compulsion and special qualifications to enter the political arena, which I do not, a refusal to do so involves no violation of the highest standards of devotion to duty.

It was only the possible misinterpretation of my attitude that caused me concern and so long as I could believe that mere denial of political ambition would prevent serious misunderstanding and misdirected effort, I was reluctant to say more. It would seem almost superfluous for me to add that as long as I live I shall hold myself in instant readiness to respond to any call by the Government to military duty.

In full awareness, then, and not in violation of my own sense of duty, I have developed the following conclusions which are responsible for my negative decision.

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious and over-riding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Politics is a profession -- a serious, complicated, and in its true

sense, a noble one.

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces. At least this is true in my case.

I am deeply regretful if a too simple faith in the effectiveness of a plain denial has misled any considerable number concerning my intentions and so allowed them to spend time and effort under erroneous impressions. At the risk of appearing pompous, I must say that the honor paid me cannot fail to spur me in future years to work the more diligently for America, her youth, her veterans, and all her citizens, and for the continuance of peace.

I trust that this rather lengthy explanation will convince you that my conclusions are not only sound but have been arrived at objectively and have not been unduly influenced by my own desires and convenience. In any event, my decision to remove myself completely from the political scene is definite and positive. I know you will not object to my making this letter public to inform all interested persons that I could not accept nomination even under the remote circumstances that it were tendered me.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely

/s/ Dwight D. Eisenhower

Jan. 26, 1952

Memo to Jeff:

Protective Tariff

New England is supposed to be Eisenhower territory.

I read there is considerable unemployment in textiles due to cheap foreign imports.

What is Eisenhower's position on this?

When Reciprocal Trade Agreements were up in late 1949 Morse voted :

On extension of the Act h.r.

On inclusion of the peril point clause h.r.

Exports of Scarce U.S. materials

There are supposed to be 150,000 out of work in Detroit and more to come, under present export policies.

Truman promised Churchill a million tons of steel in 1952. This is far greater than previous exports of steel to that country. In 1950 we exported only about 1,800,000 tons to the entire world, most of it to Latin America.

Does Eisenhower favor the export of more and more U.S. materials abroad at the price of more and more American jobs ?

(N.B. If the UK modernized her factories and mills, as the U.S. has constantly done, chances are she would have enough steel for both her civilian needs and the NATO program.)

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 4

Wednesday, January 23, 1952

Washington, D. C.

The Eisenhower Plot: In the past forty-eight hours, the first outlines of the pattern which his friends here will use to nominate General Eisenhower became visible.

It has been obscured by the deafening gabble about what went on at the GOP meeting in San Francisco ("why doesn't Governor Warren act like a Republican?", and other such trivia). But old stagers, who watched how the business was accomplished in 1940, greeted the appearance of the first outlines with cynical smiles and "told-you-so's". "It's the old game that put over Wendell Willkie, all over again", they remarked.

What these initial signs are may be put, in brief form, as follows: Some Wall Street international bankers are up to the same old tricks they pulled off so brilliantly in 1940. (In that year, the Willkie blitz machine utilized a vast network of utility and banking interests to pressure the GOP delegates.)

Specifically, we can report that pressure is now being applied (by these banking interests) on businessmen who favor Taft but have the misfortune to owe money to these Eastern bankers. We have, on investigation, spotted several cases in which businessmen (leaders in their trans-Appalachian communities) have received communications from their New York creditors, urging them to join pro-Eisenhower committees and to raise or contribute funds thereto. These debtors happen to favor Taft and/or MacArthur and are not happy about the communication. For, they want no trouble with the gentlemen who hold the notes. At this moment, we cannot as yet ascertain just whether or not the debtors will surrender their political independence.

Anyhow, word about this kind of pro-Eisenhower operation has been getting around, and has been followed by indignation, consternation and — what is more important — cogitation among those in the Taft camp.

Taft Counter-Attack? What is the outcome of this cogitation? What will Taft do, in the face of this developing menace to his nomination?

We do not profess to know the answer. But we do know and can report some of the talk which has followed the advent of this development in Washington.

First of all, it is being eloquently argued that, on the plane of principle, Taft can be urged to make an issue of this. Bankers and financial interests which play ball with and profit from the Fair Deal (in contrast to those who engage in "straight" banking) are just as much a menace to the weal of the country as Socialists, Communists and corruption practitioners. These elements of high finance played a role, and a big one, in getting us into both World Wars. What they are up to now should be discussed in the public forum.

Also — so some Taft men agree — the GOP should place their appeal to the voters on the basis of U. S. national interest. Those bankers, doing business in the international field, who collide with this principle justifiably face attack. Such forensics would be in no sense "class warfare". There are lots of financial people who do not truckle to the handout boys in the nation's capital.

Next, there are potent reasons why Taft, if he chooses this course, would emerge the victor. The plain people everywhere — it is urged — would rise to such a tocsin. Those who had been deceived by the false appeals of Big Government — which surreptitiously plays with these financial elements —

would suddenly see the political picture clearly. Additionally, Taft, because of his known integrity, will never win, nor be burdened with, the support of these elements. They will knife him to the last.

Finally, such a Taft counter-attack would lay the basis for his election campaign, once he is nominated. He could then expose the true picture of the Fair Deal, its alliance with venal financial interests and the names of the financiers on the roster of the Fair Deal commissariat. This course — say those who advocate it — would be far sounder than piddling concessions to Fair Deal thinking, like “a little Point IV”, “a little Federal aid to education”, etc., etc.

What Taft will do about all this remains uncertain. But he is too intelligent a man not to understand the situation which has inevitably arisen.

Ike's Return: You can get a date — guaranteed absolutely — for the General's return to this country from almost anyone supporting his candidacy. But in this skeptical city, few trust these prognostications.

However, there have been, in the past month, several “cold turkey” reports to the effect that the General will retire and come back to this country sometime in the first fortnight of March. We checked on these reports at the time and found they come from no interested parties, no Democrats nor Eisenhower Republicans, indeed from no one who has an axe to grind. The source is one which has a unique position to know such facts — purely as facts.

Now in the past two days, we learn that this coldly impartial source says the General has postponed his return and will not be back here until approximately the first two weeks in May. Make what you can of that.

Watch For: A speech on the air by former President Herbert Hoover next Sunday, January 27, over CBS-TV and CBS radio, from 1:30 to 2 p.m., EST. It is reported this address will be another “re-examination” of our foreign political and military policies.

Strategy of Committees: Smooth working relationship between the Taft forces and the new GOP Senate floor leader was seen last week. Senator Styles Bridges, the minority leader (who is by no means a Taft enthusiast), got support from the Ohioan and his friends, to put Senator Joe McCarthy in the place Joe has ardently wanted: on the Appropriations subcommittee dealing with State Department requests for funds (subcommittee on State and Judiciary of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate).

The Wisconsin Senator was pushed off that place last spring when the death of Senator Vandenberg caused a committee re-shuffle. Now he's back with the blessing of Bridges, Taft and Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska. The latter, as allocator of Republican committee posts and friend of Taft, collaborated willingly. The way is now paved for McCarthy to interrogate critically the State Department functionaries, in the next few months, as the latter seek money to pay the salaries of personnel whom the Wisconsin legislator has so consistently lambasted.

Likewise, that Administration-controlled group, the Senate Committee on Elections, dedicated to smashing what they call “McCarthyism”, received a bad bump during the past week. The GOP leadership decided to remove Senator Margaret Chase Smith from that Committee and to transfer her to another post; and then to substitute a good friend of McCarthy, Senator Dirksen of Illinois. Senator Smith of Maine is no friend of the Wisconsin Senator, but she has indicated willingness to be transferred. With Dirksen on the Election Committee, the chances of a vote of censure of Senator McCarthy by the Committee have diminished perceptibly.

The point of all this is that the new GOP leadership in the Senate is working smoothly (so far). Neither Senator Margaret Smith nor indeed Senator Butler of Nebraska are exactly overflowing with good will towards McCarthy. But the important thing is that the interests of the Party have triumphed over personal frictions.

Farm Front: It is no secret around there that the Democratic Administration has privately dropped (perhaps, only put in cold storage) the famous Brannan Plan for bribing the farmers into bureaucratic slavery by farm subsidies. Two years ago, conservative farm organizations, led by the American Farm Bureau Federation, put up an effective fight against the Brannan version of totalitarianism.

Moreover, another change in Administration strategy looms — according to shrewd watchers of the farm field. This — it is forecast — will be Administration advocacy of legislation for 100 per cent of parity price supports. We hear prophesies that this will be the policy of the Department of Agriculture. Already, emphasis on this policy has risen in the ranks of the National Farmers Union, left-wing organization, which in the past has had a way of being just ahead of the Department's shifts in policy. The cry of "100 per cent of parity" might prove very good election bait.

On the other hand, the leaders of the powerful American Farm Bureau Federation are said to be cool towards this cry. They fear that, if such policy were enacted, the non-farm consumer would rebel at the very heavy costs. This view, however, is that of the leaders. While election tubs are being thumped, the rank and file of the Farm Bureau might find such a rhythm rather pleasing.

Meanwhile, quite a different approach is being explored by Congressman Howard Buffett of Nebraska. He believes that much sentiment would rally to legislation along the following lines: a bill which would (1) wipe out the whole apparatus of price supports, but (2) at the same time would abolish price controls on farm commodities. Since farmers — it is argued — at the present time are more anxious to get rid of ceilings on farm prices than they are of maintaining price "floors", they might go for an elimination of the whole system of controls and hand-outs in the field of agriculture.

China: News that the Reds are building big air bases in Southern China and in Hainan as springboards for an attack on French Indo-China stirs demands in Washington for accelerated aid to Chiang Kai-shek.

From this stronghold on the island of Formosa, Chiang could raid the Southern China coast and break up Red communications leading to the Indo-China border. He has, at present, some 400,000 soldiers on Formosa, but only about 70,000 are equipped for fighting. Military aid from the U. S. has been stepped up in the past six months, to some extent. The Nationalist forces include many soldiers whose homes and families are in the southern coastal areas of the mainland. If properly equipped, they would fight well in landing operations. Finally, there is talk again of the need for blockading China; Chiang's navy was doing no little harm to the Red trade when it was stopped by the Acheson policy.

In circles which watch closely the Far Eastern picture, there is suspicion of the Japanese Premier's talk about recognizing the Nationalist Government of Formosa. It is believed that the Premier's statement was inspired by John Foster Dulles as a move to allay Congressional doubt about the Japanese Peace Treaty and to hasten its ratification by the U. S. Senate. Once the treaty is ratified — it is suggested by the doubters — talk of Japan recognizing Chiang will subside, at the insistence of the State Department. Meanwhile, it is reported that British diplomats in Tokyo are working hard to prevent Japanese recognition of the Nationalist Government.

Subsidizing Socialism: Anger is rising in banking committees on Capitol Hill against the Export-Import Bank, which gets Treasury dollars for lending abroad and not always to the most careful of debtors. Notice has been taken of an item in the January 2 issue of Professor Walter Spahr's excellent "Monetary Notes". Prof. Spahr, always alert for misuse of American funds, spotted the following:

"The Government of Israel 'according to the International Financial News Survey' has decided to nationalize part of the installations of the Palestine Potash Company Ltd. — presently owned by the British — and to abrogate the Company's concession. The nationalization is to be financed by £900,000 *supplied from loans previously obtained from the Export-Import Bank.*" [Our italics.]

Members of Congress indignantly ask why we should lend money to a government to nationalize an industry. It is expected that officials of the Export-Import Bank will be hailed before the Banking and Currency Committee to explain these doings.

Sweden Starts It: Harvard Professor Schlichter proposed, more than a year ago, that the government issue a "purchasing power" bond — one that would be redeemed, at maturity, at what the dollar would buy then as compared with the purchasing power of the dollar at the time of issuance. The idea was to protect the bondholder from loss due to inflation. The fact is that as wartime "savings" bonds mature, many purchasers are realizing that they suffered a loss in purchasing power, and as a result the government finds itself redeeming many more of these bonds than it can resell to the public. The professor's suggestion stemmed not only from concern for the bondholder, but more so from concern over the plight of the government. The Treasury Department, for various reasons, did not accept the suggestion; but it cannot be written off. It is "one of the things" that a spendthrift government can resort to in its desperate need for money.

Sweden, author of a number of Socialistic schemes, has taken the plunge. But, not yet the government of Sweden; it is the Kooperativa Foerbundet, the national association of Sweden's cooperative associations, that has taken upon itself the job of introducing the "purchasing power" bond to the world, according to a dispatch in the *New York Times* of January 20. A formula has been worked out whereby the redemption value of the bond is tied in with a cost-of-living index. In that way, the K. F. protects its bondholders from loss due to inflation; in that way, also, it advertises its recognition of the government's intent to further depreciate the currency. Its lack of faith in the national money is emphasized by the provision that the depreciation bonus will be limited to fifty per cent of the face value of the bond it is issuing; if the government cuts the kroner to more than one-half its present purchasing power the bondholder must take the loss.

The action of the K. F. is simply an admission of its rather quivering faith in the money of its country. When that lack of faith becomes general, when people will not accept money in exchange for goods or services, then we have the final act in the tragedy of money.

McCarthy and Marshall: War-made heroes seem to hold up no better than most war-time products. Under the glare of peace-time scrutiny, the accolades heaped upon them melt away, and all we have left is the naked form of a mere mortal. It doesn't take long, these days. The case of Gen. George C. Marshall is particularly in point. Others have indicated the inadequacies, personal and official, that hardly justify the stature accorded him by official propaganda; it remained for the intrepid Senator from Wisconsin, Joseph R. McCarthy, to show by the record that the ability of the General (and the former Secretary of State), were less than brilliant; that the country's affairs did not prosper under his management. The Senator set forth the facts in a speech from the Senate floor on June 14, 1951. The speech has been revised and has been made available to the public in a book by The Devin-Adair Co., 23 East 26th St., New York, N. Y., at the sensible price of \$1.00.

The substance of the argument is that as both military and civilian leader, Gen. Marshall pursued a policy that was peculiarly orientated so as to promote the foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. The documentation of this charge is most convincing, particularly because Senator McCarthy relies on sources admittedly favorable to the General-Secretary. The Senator does not impugn Mr. Marshall's patriotism; the question which the book still leaves open is whether the poor judgment displayed was his own or resulted from following the advice of men of sinister motive; and finally, whether these men still have influence in the shaping of our foreign policy.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for \$3. Six months, \$5.50. One year, \$10. Two years, \$18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, \$12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, \$11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change in address to become effective.

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

WESTERN
UNION

1201

SYMBOLS

DL=Day Letter

NL=Night Letter

LT=Int'l Letter Telegram

VLT=Int'l Victory Ltr.

W. P. MARSHALL, PRESIDENT

The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is STANDARD TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination

WA 126 PD=WUX NEWYORK NY 25 1247P=

SEN OWEN BREWSTER=

1924 JAN 25 PM 1 43

ATTN MRS DUSTIN

RESERVED DOUBLE ROOM HOTEL COMMODORE JANUARY 27TH YOUR NAME=

ELIZABETH S COLCLOUGH=

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

WESTERN UNION

W. P. MARSHALL, PRESIDENT

1220

SYMBOLS

DL=Day Letter

NL=Night Letter

LT=Int'l Letter Telegram

VLT=Int'l Victory Ltr.

The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is STANDARD TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination

WA092 PD=WUX NEW YORK NY 25 1145A=

SENATOR OWEN BREWSTER, ATTN MRS AUSTIN=

SENATE OFFICE BLDG=

SORRY OUR LETTER U RECEIVED BUT DELIGHTED HAVE YOU ON
OPENING TV PROGRAM SUNDAY JANUARY 27 SPONSORSHIP REICHHOLD
CHEMICAL CO TELECAST 630 PM 58TH STREET THEATRE. SUBJECT
"EISENHOWER OR TAFT" WHAT ARE THEIR CHANCES? OTHER SPEAKERS
SEN MORSE. SPEAKERS CONFERENCE 200 PM SUNDAY MY OFFICE 125
WEST 43RD STREET SECOND FLOOR. BUFFET SUPPER AFTER TELECAS.
HOPE YOU AND MRS BREWSTER CAN ATTEND. HONORARIUM THIS FIRST
PROGRAM \$200 PLUS EXPENSES. IF YOU WISH TICKETS SENT TO
FRIENDS PLEASE ADVISE NAMES SOONEST. DEEPLY GRATEFUL YOUR
EXCELLENT PARTICIPATION LAST TUESDAY=

ELIZABETH S COLCLOUGH=

=27 630 PM 58 200 PM 125 43 \$200=

Portion of speech of Senator Owen Brewster
at Republican Rally at McClure, Pennsylvania,
under auspices of Snyder County Republican Committee
on Saturday afternoon, September 13, 1947

WHY PRICES ARE HIGH?

Living costs are going out of sight because America is trying to feed the world.

A prudent, thrifty housewife knows how much can be spared from the winter supplies of vegetables and preserves in the cellar to help the neighbors without ruining the family short.

That is the whole problem here.

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson buys 133,000 tons of dried fruit to prevent a glut and to keep up prices.

We export 18,000,000 tons of food in 1946-7 and prices go sky high.

This year our harvests indicate a decrease of 21,000,000 tons in our ground crops and we talk of exporting 14,000,000 tons of food. Even Henry Wallace knows what that means in terms of domestic prices. The sky is literally the only limit.

If there is a conspiracy to raise prices it is by those responsible for such a program under such conditions.

The American people are not that dumb as the recent election in Pennsylvania showed very conclusively.

In 1918 with two successive wheat crops that were less than the normal domestic consumption for food and seed we tightened our belts by voluntary controls and exported 200,000,000 bushels of wheat to our allies.

American housewives fought the First World War on ten per cent less calories per capita than were required in the Second World War when Washington bureaucrats imposed controls.

The answer to the world food problem so far as America is concerned is Hooverizing.

The imagination and understanding of American housewives can be relied on to meet this problem far more effectively than can any system of arbitrary regulations.

Milling and distilling may well be the subject of regulation but beyond that one may not safely go.

A great selling campaign to enlist all Americans in voluntary restrictions of their diet can accomplish infinitely more than any other approach.

The experience of two wars has shown this beyond a doubt.

Europe is safe from starvation for a few months with their current harvests.

Meanwhile let all the selling talent of America be dedicated to getting Americans to save food to save America.

The example of a free people saving food to feed suffering humanity will challenge totalitarian ideologies everywhere.

Any other course seems likely to end in disaster to all alike.

An attempt at arbitrary controls will end in confusion, corruption and chaos. Black markets far worse than any bootlegging of Prohibition days will be the inevitable result. Neither rationing nor price controls can reach the roots of this problem which finds its nourishment in domestic shortages resulting from foreign exports.

Balancing our economic budget is the problem before the American people at this time.