

the job of the leadership is unusually difficult.

I recall very vividly the many hours of work we put in recently on legislation proposing to restore a 90 per cent price support program for basic agricultural commodities. I was particularly interested in getting the House to approve that bill—I am a member of the Agriculture Committee, in addition to my other duties—and I spent a good many hours sounding out members on it. Our hard work paid dividends because the House approved the bill by a margin of five votes, the final vote being 206 to 201.

We of course knew in advance that the vote on the agriculture bill was going to be very close. Another of the functions of the Whip is to poll the members of his party on important legislation and to arrive at a fairly accurate estimate of the final outcome.

We are quite proud of the record we have made in our polls. We were able to determine in advance that we should be able to carry the agriculture bill by a very narrow margin. Our forecast on a tax bill vote earlier in the session was equally accurate; we found that it too would be approved by a close vote. We try to be as accurate as possible in our polls because it would be embarrassing to get a bill to the floor that is important from a party standpoint, and then to have it defeated.

Although my job of Whip has meant longer hours and harder work for me, there has been a compensating side, too. I have derived a great deal of personal satisfaction out of the results we have been able to obtain in the House in this session of Congress. It has been an illuminating experience.

Another feature that has made the job particularly attractive is the opportunity to work closely with Speaker Rayburn, the man known in Washington as "Mr. Democrat." I have long admired Mr. Rayburn for his skill as a legislator, for his eloquence as a speaker, and for his unusual ability to take charge in a particularly difficult situation and swing the House toward his viewpoint.

My new position has enabled me to observe Mr. Rayburn at close range. This in itself has been worth the additional burden entailed in being Whip.

I also have worked closely with the Majority Leader, John McCormack of Massachusetts, a veteran of many legislative battles and an "old pro" when it comes to almost any aspect of Congressional proceedings. This association has been very pleasant and, from my standpoint, quite fruitful because I have learned a lot from him too.

Continued inside back cover

THE 1954 ELECTION and the EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

By CORTEZ A. M. EWING

THE election of 1954 was both an emancipation and an enslavement. Freeing America, temporarily at least, from the tyranny of inference and innuendo, the voters were decisive in restoring politics to traditional healthy partisanship. In this regard, the 1954 election was the most important off-year election within the memory of even our oldest citizens, because it marked the triumph of the idea of decency in what Mr. Spender calls the public life.

Not since the unregretted passing of the Reconstruction era had a majority political party suffered the indignity of being smeared with the swill of disloyalty. In the distorted perspectives of the Nixons, McCarthys, Reeces, and others of that careless breed, the emergence of Russia as a world power and the victory of the United States were totally unrelated phenomena. We should have won the war without permitting Russia to profit by it, a dispensation devoutly to be wished, since it would have prevented the borning of the harassments of contemporary world politics. I deem it natural that men, and states, should aspire to the rewards of heaven both before and after the trauma of dying. But the ticket-taker at the gates of the heavenly city should be permitted the authority of denying entrance to those bearing forged credentials, otherwise the amenities of heavenly decency will be attenuated by the Appleton ethics.

It is extremely dangerous to representative democratic institutions to stigmatize the only visible opposition as a party of treason. A technique of temporary advantage, it explodes in the face of its practitioners, for when the government loses the confidence of the country, which may result, as in 1952, for no tangible reason other than the desire for new faces on the Washington scene, the incoming government possesses the mandate to implement a treat-

sonable program. Therefore, such tactics of branding the opposition as treasonable, become treasonable *per se*, and violate the very *raison d'être* of political parties themselves, for parties are presumably organized for the public good and none would be so obscurantist as to contend that what was good for the Republican Party was inevitably good for the country.

The perpetrators of this neo-authoritarianism may be excused upon the ground that they do not understand their moral obligations under our non-ideological party system or, at least, their actions would seem to imply that they were prepared to substitute an ideological system for it. The tender sapling of the middle thirties had, by 1950, become as menacing as Daniel Leonard's great tree of sedition. As he said, the vilest reptiles were concealed at its roots, the foulest birds roosted in its branches. It shaded the fallow of American patriotism and was prepared, like all irreverent ideas, to cover the earth with its own imperialistic adumbration.

The germ for this American brand of authoritarianism appeared in the first years of the New Deal experiment. It developed out of the inability of the opposition to understand the plain facts of political life. Somehow, the timbers had fallen about their ears, destruction lay all about them, and, the worst of it, a majority of American citizens regarded the rubble as an evidence of social progress. These outraged purists, not numerous until joined by those who had nightmares about the Sovietization of the entire world, refused to make peace with the *Zeitgeist* of America. In its incidence, this was the most important aspect of the New Deal era—the failure of some members of the opposition to recognize the plain facts of history. In the words of Bernard de Voto, "They resented the Twentieth Century." After three of their presidential

nominees had failed, some members of the party realized that it was later than they had thought. Beginning in 1944, the intelligent wing of the Republican Party has won each of those convention struggles, the 1952 path to victory being marked by the mellifluous oratory of a protesting Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Eisenhower fought the good fight and won the "splendid misery" that is the Presidency, but he was no sooner inaugurated than the sniping started from the unreconstructed rebels of his own party. The internecine struggle practically silenced the criticism that might have come from the Democratic opposition. Unfortunately for the "die-hards," the junior senator from Wisconsin forged his way to the front and became the popularly accepted leader of his faction. A Bridges or a Jenner would have been a better choice, for, more discriminating in tactics, each knew the hazards of thin ice for the impulsive skater.

THE struggle between the two wings of the Republican Party took on the coloration of a Congressional conspiracy to usurp the constitutional power of the Presidency. The Bricker Amendment constituted the hard core of that reactionary program. Future Yaltas and Teherans would be impossible!

This was followed by a frontal attack upon the Department of State. The oversight function of Congress was so interpreted as to give a Congressional committee, or its omniscient chairman, the right to demand the dismissal of any foreign-service officer. Finally the *ne plus ultra* was reached when Mr. McCarthy sought to establish his subcommittee as the agency to which a government employee owed his first, his primary allegiance.

A veteran of Pentagon politics, the practices of which are always limited by the ethics of those made gentlemen by act of Congress, Mr. Eisenhower showed little facility for adjusting himself to the demands of the new situation. He was caught in the crossfire of the Republican recalcitrants and Democratic partisans. Political counsellors sought to impress him with his higher obligation to retain leadership of the Republican majorities in both houses. The majorities were too insignificant to permit the luxury of internal dissension. Unity, even though illusive, was necessary for the future of Republican success. Parochialism in Congressional representatives will out, as is its wont, despite the textbook logic of the party system. All presidents must learn, no matter how painful the experience, that the party whips cannot be applied to every member who kicks over the traces. Presidents must cultivate the art of patience,

rather than Mr. Jefferson's "art of being honest."

The counsel's strategy would bring qualms to the conscience of any honest man, for it demanded a compromise of first principles, like trying to establish a common ground between the Notre Dame cathedral and an atheist publishing company. Nevertheless, the President followed the doctor's prescription. On Monday, he warned against following our contemporary Savonarolas who shouted for bigger and better book burnings as a prerequisite to the preservation of our Christian civilization. Civilization, he contended, was born to struggle and blossomed only as contradictory opinions fought for supremacy in the market place of ideas. The Margaret Chase Smiths were properly elated. On Tuesday, he spoke of the dangers of Communist infiltration and the moral obligation of the government to root out the last loyalty risk who huddled in the anonymity of a petty government job. Thousands had been bodily thrown out for loyalty and for other deficiencies. Democrats thought they could define the substantive content of "other deficiencies!" The Jenners were gleeful!

Close observers could predict with fair accuracy the tact of the next Presidential pronouncement. But the country was not sure of anything, except that the President, a novice in this new kind of fratricidal conflict, was sincerely trying to do his best for the national welfare. The vultures were all about him! And he, poor man, just didn't quite realize the role of vultures in the political ecology. A grisly wag seasoned the political fare of this period with his observation that "things would have been different if Eisenhower had lived!" Much of the Eisenhower popularity sprang from the sincere sympathy of common people who were above and beyond the arts of simulation.

And then it happened! McCarthy attacked the integrity of the Army, or, as he said, of some military politicians. The President abandoned his Monday and Tuesday double-talking technique. The in-

tegrity of his administration was at stake. And even though he abstained from venting the proper spleen against the foremost enemies of his public ministry, presumably on the grounds that such would constitute unwarranted interference with the operation of the Congressional oversight function, he started, or there was started for him the machinery of political offense.

WITH all its puerility, the McCarthy-Army bout was of tremendous importance to American politics. In it, the curtain was lifted for the 1954 elections. Fortunately, the television cameras were brought into the hearings and, though it may have down-graded its evaluation of Washington operations, the citizenry quickly observed the manifest amorality of the McCarthy conspiracy. Fumbling as he was, Secretary Stevens could scarcely be cast in the role of a willing Soviet tool.

On the millions of screens, the crusading senator looked less like a White Knight than a Little Caesar. Brazen, callous, refusing to be bound by any rules of decent behavior, McCarthy, the self-appointed guardian of America's future, failed utterly in this, his supreme thrust for power. Shorn of his mantle, he slunk off to his millionaire's retreat to lick his wounds and repair the armor of his egomania. Who did him in? Not Mr. Eisenhower, not Mr. Stevens, not even Mr. McClellan! Like Thomas Hobbes' rebel, he merely committed suicide! For he chose to disregard a powerful moral convention—in part the product of Edward G. Robinson's immaculate artistry—that gangsters are monsters on the American scene.

The campaign for the November elections came on. No candidate, not even a McCarthyite, could risk having the junior senator campaign for him. But the circumstances were of no avail. Everywhere the McCarthyites went down to defeat—in Maine, New Jersey, Illinois, and Wisconsin. Even Homer Ferguson, a leader of parts, was unable to convince Michiganders that he was serious when he publicly declared that he did not want Joseph Mc-



About the Author

In April, 1955, Dr. Cortez A. M. Ewing, Research Professor of Government, read this paper at the meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, in Dallas. He was president of the organization in 1947-48. At present Dr. Ewing is writing Government of the United States, a text book which will be published by the American Book Company. This is the second article by Dr. Ewing which the Quarterly has had the pleasure of printing.

Carthy to speak for him. Fully two-thirds of each house of Congress were on record as opposed to that concept which is everywhere known as McCarthyism, a therapeutical regimen as fatal as the disease it seeks to cure!

The McCarthy enemies came crawling from behind the senatorial woodwork. The integrity of the United States Senate was involved. Just why its integrity was not involved when he strode like a colossus across this land, smiting little people behind the cloak of his immunity, has never been thoroughly explained. Was not the principal responsible for his agent? Little people will ask that embarrassing question for a long, long time and representatives of official impudence will ponder the amazing lack of political enthusiasm.

Condemnation was voted in the Senate. Though the vote was overwhelmingly against them, the few whose records were so closely parallel to that of McCarthy protested that such action would set a very dangerous precedent. Even they could not defend him. They were forced by the state of the public temper to explain that their protection of indecency was really only an incidence of their attachment to the higher virtues.

The plain fact is that twenty years in the wilderness had taken their toll on Republican leadership. Bit by bit, they were trained in the arts of opposition. They hurled unverifiable charges on the erosion of individual initiative, the enervating aspects of both creeping and galloping Socialism, and the Democratic conspiracy to further Russian imperialistic aims to the unmeasured detriment of American national interest. Some of the more inconsiderate, "inebriated by the exuberance of their own verbosity," to filch a phrase from Disraeli, appeared to be implementing the "big lie" formula of *Mein Kampf*. Bred in such an atmosphere of inadvertence, they found themselves, after 1952, utterly unable to assume the responsibility of a majority party. For two years, they did nothing except re-play the old records on corruption in government, on creeping socialism, on Communists in official positions, on deficit financing, and on the plain treason of Yalta, Potsdam, and the leashing of the war lord of Formosa. It is small wonder, then, that many voters, in 1954, were disillusioned with the great moral crusade.

Mr. Eisenhower was emancipated in the election, but the road to freedom was, for him, long and tortuous. Mr. McCarthy's mistake was in attacking an institution—the Army—for he was immediately confronted with all of the institutional apparatus of power. It had its political strategy men, its public relations counsel, its law-

yers, and business and social connections which reached into the very roots of national power.

The little Appleton shepherd boy, sling in arm—he was later to reverse that relationship to impress upon the sentimental portion of the American public his status of helplessness and his claims to martyrdom—went forth to do battle against this Goliath. He hurled his missiles, but they hit only the insignificant hirelings who manned the institutional parapets; and the future psalmist, if he sings at all, must sing of the stripling's courage and perseverance, his insurmountable odds, and the downright recreancy of the pagans.

The 1954 campaign was bitterly fought in every bi-party state and Congressional district. The Republicans got credit for terminating Mr. Truman's war in Korea, but they had lost Indo-China. Nevertheless, American boys were not dying on battlefields beyond the horizon. Reaction to the Benson agricultural policy was mild, for he had sacrificed all to get the principle of the sliding scale in parity. Since prices remained as high under the elastic scale as under the old Democratic program, the farmers, a practical lot, preferred to stay with the Republicans. It absolved them of having to apologize to their grandsires. The Vice-President belabored the Communist bogey all over the West. He was supposed to be particularly popular there. When the final tallies were in, he had lost Senate seats in Wyoming, Nevada, and Oregon. The party fathers may now speculate if they would not have been in better shape had they leashed Richard Nixon for the duration. The precocious statesman of 1952 had become the *enfant terrible* in two short years. Though they hustled him off to Latin America in early 1955, when rapprochement with the Democrats had to be consummated, the party leaders were only implementing the hoary technique of locking the stable after the horse was stolen.

IN the quintessence of irony, the Democrats were enslaved by their own victory. It matters little that, in the elections, the Democrats picked up two Senate and nineteen House seats, giving them a slight, but working majority in each house. Under ordinary circumstances, they would initiate a few investigations of Republican administrative folly and would introduce and push through the Congress, with the expectation of presidential veto, the party legislative program. They may, and certainly will, make the investigations, for obvious reasons going no further back than 1953. The prospects are indeed inviting, but there is also the realization that the country is tired of this whole investigato-

rial business; if they embark upon an extensive program in this field, it will be tacit evidence that they are fearful of their chances in 1956.

In the field of legislation the Democrats are equally embarrassed. Implementing a Disraeli formula, Mr. Eisenhower has stolen the clothes of the Democratic urchins while they were in the old swimming hole. In foreign policy, with all the promises about "instant retaliation," seizing the initiative, unleashing Chiang Kai-Shek, the Acheson policy of containment is still being pursued. Mr. Dulles rushes off in all directions, berating our international enemies and threatening our friends with having to go to bed without their suppers. Like Mark Twain's father's increase in knowledge, from the time of Mark's passage from adolescence to manhood, it is amazing how difficult the Russians have become in the space of two short years! Mr. Acheson might have handled them if he had had the necessary instinct for it, but that chance is now apparently gone forever. The present Dulles formula, if we are to believe the "Island as such" pronouncement, is that the Communists had better be careful, for they can never know when we will strike back at them. Mr. Acheson lost China and then Korea, but the loss of Indo-China was only a necessary re-adjustment in the international situation.

In the domestic field, the inflation proceeds apace, the budget remains unbalanced, government employees (except Congressmen) are still underpaid, and the demands from the spokesmen for social security, education, and highways are as lusty as ever. Even so thorough a partizan as Speaker Rayburn appreciates the irony of the situation. Democratic votes must be found to enact the Eisenhower program, for which he gets the full credit. Though often charged by the Democrats with a painful lack of political astuteness, the President has, either through foresight or blundering, put the Democratic majorities to work on his own plantation. Rather, I would offer that Mr. Eisenhower, the military tactician, possesses a fine sense of position. He finds the Democrats on indefensible terrain, so he merely makes the most of that fortunate circumstance. The Democrats grumble and threaten, but he sends another message to Congress and they blithely vote for their and his future. The plain logic is that either the Democrats or Mr. Eisenhower is in the wrong political party or that political parties have become meaningless mechanisms in our handling of public affairs.

What does all this strange *contretemps* promise for 1956? Mr. Eisenhower's popularity has risen steadily since the Mc-

Continued page 32

we speak of a community of love, of giving and acceptance, wherein each person freely renders responsible service and receives deserved benefits.

A word about goals or ideals: *we live by them*. Put this way, it becomes a bit silly to speak of them as "impractical," as we sometimes do. If we live by them, they are surely practical. Of course, our ideals differ, especially with respect to loftiness; some shoot for bigger stakes, so to speak. Some live in larger worlds than others; thus their ideals are more comprehensive. Some have more mature imaginations than others; and their ideals are more sublime—for some the heavens declare the "glory of God," for others the heavens are at best the source of sunshine and rain, and, where the imagination is quite limited, the heavens may rarely be seen. Some live in the bright light of a great *faith* and envisage the "kingdom of God"; others live in the dimmer light of a more circumscribed faith, and vision is shortened. Yet, probably none is quite *without* goals: they serve as frames of reference, prompting, prodding, giving direction to present activity, making it possible to "Remould life nearer to the Heart's Desire."

And here we speak of *the Goal* as a community of persons. Why the capital-letter "goal"? To suggest that man's highest vision is always transcendent, always beyond, the unrealized ideal pointing onward, the inexhaustible cause of advance. But it is also within, realized thus far in human experience, as in close friendship or between man and wife; elsewhere we would have no vision. And see how the circle completes (perfects) itself: our knowledge gives the hint; imagination or insight takes us beyond to grasp the Goal; the Goal serves as directive for further knowledge, larger experience.

A closing note: *In giving himself to the Goal man gains greater power to act, and opens the way to "endless advance."* So far as we can judge, man gains strength—power to act—from goals envisioned; and this activity may go on indefinitely long. Is this common experience in the loving devotion of husband and wife in planning the ideal home, in the commitment of the scholar to his work in his search for truth, and so on? Is this "religious voice" at its finest, everlasting life in unreserved devotion to God and neighbor?

The Roots of Communism . . .

Continued from page 30

labor organizations in under-developed areas. If the leaders and members of labor organizations cannot receive guidance and

assistance from the United States in practical democratic techniques, if they are ignored by us or just simply hated, they will turn for help to the ever-eager radicals and Communist agitators. The "instruction sheets" to our "gift parcels" and technological marvels should be filled out with suggestions of ways and means for a peaceful integration of workers, merchants, peasants, and landowners into a sound national economy. The workers and peasants in Central America need social reforms badly and most of all they need "bread and land." We can help them. If we do not, they will fall prey to the Soviets. The Soviet remedy calls for violence and destruction and will ultimately bring along the loss of freedom and the enslavement of the mind. Our approach, therefore, should be a peaceful and constructive one. We should offer techniques and ideas to the labor organizations and a working program for democracy rather than arms for small military cliques. I am convinced that we can go after the Communist workers in the labor organizations in Central America with an unemotional, but aggressive and constructive program, to show that the laborers and peasants "can have their bread, their land, and maintain their freedom, too." Without nourishment the roots of Communism will soon shrivel and die.

The 1954 Election . . .

Continued from page 21

Carthy debacle. And there is no doubt that he can get the nomination again if he will take it. The Democrats will presumably nominate Mr. Stevenson. But how could he hope to win, even though he richly deserves the office? He could only conduct a "me-too" type of campaign or throw overboard the Democratic program which has been painfully hammered out since 1932. The Brackin Lees, the Malones, and those reflecting the *Chicago Tribune* mentality may find the 1956 fare extremely putrescent, but they could hardly be expected to join the Stevenson dinner party. They are tied to Mr. Eisenhower with strands of steel. All of their talk of a third-party, composed of the intelligent Republicans and the intelligent Southern Democrats—and there are no others—appears only as a feeble effort to pull the President a bit toward the right. If they are serious, they need no more adding machines than they already have in their counting houses to tally the intelligent vote, for the American electorate will not forego the opportunity of choosing again between two of the most popular candidates who ever battled one another in our presidential sweepstakes.

From the present vantage point, I would think that the Democrats should hope, and pray, that the President would make a serious mistake within the next fifteen months or that the national economy would suffer a noticeable decline. Under such circumstances, if war did not come, they might win in 1956. Could we be about to witness the emergence of an entirely new phenomenon in our national politics—the election of a Republican President and Democratic majorities in both houses of Congress?

America's Defense Frontier . . .

Continued from page 27

ever, never be 100 per cent air defense possible.

Especially acute is the present security posture of the United States in the Arctic, both with reference to defensive and offensive operations, which would be launched in event of Soviet attack.

However, improvement of United States Arctic air capabilities along the lines recommended by Colonel Fletcher should do much to rectify this situation and enhance our ability, in the event of war, to seek out enemy air forces and their supporting installations. Much of it may have to be done by tactical fighter-bombers rather than long-range strategic aircraft. A tremendous geographical advantage will lie with such tactical forces, owing to the relative proximity of many military as well as economic and political targets to the Polar regions. The extent to which this advantage could be exploited will be dependent upon the rapidity and effectiveness with which such forces are developed, trained, and equipped for Arctic-type operations. In this connection, the most pressing military-technical problems are the development of Arctic-adapted aircraft and means of supplying them with fuel and lubricants.

Improvement of our Arctic offensive capabilities will serve to make the oft-repeated threat of our devastating retaliatory attack more real, and thereby serve as a more effective deterrent to Soviet aggression. Improvement in Arctic operational capabilities will also vastly increase the effectiveness of Air Defense over the North American Continent. Considering our relative weakness in the Arctic at present, there is a pressing need to become Arctic-minded, especially among both military and scientific-technological people.

In view of the critical nature of the present situation, with the danger of substantial and sizeable Soviet nuclear and thermonuclear attacks in the near future a real