

A SOUTHERN REPUBLICAN ADDRESSES LEONARD HALL

MR. LEONARD HALL, *Chairman*
Republican National Committee
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hall:

In the June issue of the Republican paper, *Straight from the Shoulder*, I noticed that the indirect attack on the work of Senator Joseph McCarthy, launched by one Republican Fair Dealer after another, is being made the national program of the Republican Party. In the interests of a united Republican Party, I should like to reason with you.

In the first place, Senator McCarthy is not expendable. If you do not wish to endorse him publicly, that is your right. He will continue to be loyal to you, even while you sell him down the river. But there is a large group of Republican voters who, like McCarthy, are not expendable, who will not follow you down the road to the ADA. Nor, if you insist on splitting the Republican Party by sabotaging McCarthy's loyal Republicanism, will they abandon Joseph McCarthy.

I refer to the perpetual snapping at his heels that has been promoted and encouraged for some months now. I refer to the special praise that has been officially lavished on anybody who attacked him, either from the front or from the rear — on Flanders, for example, and Murrow, and Stevens and Stassen. I refer to the skillful semantic manipulation of words like "strictly legal" — with which you describe the Justice Department's prosecution of Communists, in order to make McCarthy's work appear to be that of an outlaw. Not only are you insulting McCarthy's achievements by this clever device, but you are insulting the accomplishments of such men as Jenner, Mundt, and Velde; and you are minimizing, if not ignoring, the fine work that Nixon did *on a committee* to expose Alger Hiss. Whatever the purpose of the Administration in encouraging dotards like Flanders to synchronize his assaults on McCarthy with the charges brought against him in an outburst of wounded vanity by Robert Stevens (who, please note, did not hesitate to invoke Democrat aid in splitting the Republican

Party), you are alienating a large group of voters — Republicans and former Democrats — whose support you cannot afford to lose.

I beg you to remember that the Republican Administration cannot survive unless it can retain *all* the groups which joined forces to lead it to victory in 1952. The Democrats who left their party because they could not stomach the ADA or the Deals, New or Fair, will have to be salvaged. The Republican seats in Congress will not merely have to be maintained; they should, in fact, be increased. Yet the advisers close to the President — Dewey, Sherman Adams, Lodge, Brownell and Stassen — these narrow and ungenerous advisers have forgotten that it was not the ADA-Democrats who swelled the Republican ranks in 1952, but the conservatives. They forget that Robert Taft, who alone won, and alone deserved, the title, “Mr. Republican,” was a conservative; that General MacArthur, valiant casualty of Truman-Acheson intrigue, is a conservative.

THE REPUBLICANS rode to victory on a wave of *national* revulsion from the radicalism and softness towards Communism represented by the ADA and the Fair Deal wing of the Democrat Party. In short, they rode to victory on the conservative, not the radical, vote. When they insult the conservatives out of the party, they will not gain the radicals. They will have surrendered

the citadel to a group that is already committed to (and is gaining control of) the Democrat Party.

Now we stand by and watch the promises of 1952 broken, and the gains of 1952 jettisoned. We know that the word *McCarthyism* was coined by Owen Lattimore, and was first published in the Communist *Daily Worker*. We know that the most virulent use of the epithet that was ever made was on the night when ex-President Truman showed a torrent of abuse on the man and the term to cover up his alibis for promoting Harry Dexter White — alibis which J. Edgar Hoover shattered the next day under oath before a Congressional investigating committee.

We know that McCarthy burned no books, despite the Republican rumor. We know that McCarthy is not a lawless, reckless operator, but that on the contrary, he is a duly appointed investigator, authorized by Congress, with a right of subpoena, to examine and expose those who betray public trust, even those in the Executive branch of Government.

We know that it was Presidential blackouts such as the one most recently issued by the White House that kept traitors like Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White in high administrative posts, despite all that Congressional committees, *operating within the law*, could do to expose them. Was Nixon's action in showing up Alger Hiss not “strictly

legal?" Did it alienate the ADA and the Fair Dealers? Was it to mollify these people that the White House retained the services of a New Deal darling like Philip Young?

Do you think that millions of Americans consider that the Administration permitted McCarthy to have a fair trial in the Army controversy? Do you think that this proceeding on the Executive side, from its inception to its phoney emotional climax produced by Welch's crocodile tears, did not have all the elements of a kangaroo court?

(Was it a coincidence that the Administration, on the one hand, never lifted a finger to reward General MacArthur for having endured the abusive treatment of the Acheson-Truman axis, whose ruinous policies in Asia he heroically resisted at the expense of his command — while on the other, it gave special honors to the New Deal strategist, General Marshall? Was it an impertinence for us to protest that Secretary Stevens was solicitous of the dignity of General Zwicker, under whose command Major Peress was honorably discharged; but that he treated General Lawton slightly, who made such a valiant effort to rid Fort Monmouth of its security risks? Did that same Secretary of the Army pledge his word to the West Point graduates that *their* honor and dignity would always be "precious" to him while he was making it so evident to twenty million viewers that not even the

privacy of a private was sacred to him, as he ruthlessly bandied his name and private affairs around the caucus room day after day without being able to cite an offense worthy of an official charge or an official trial?)

MR. HALL, I pounded the pavements in a traditionally Democrat, Southern city in which the two daily papers fought the Republican Party all the way down the ADA line. By ringing doorbells and telephones, one by one, I helped to deliver my precinct and my ward to Eisenhower. Along with thousands of other earnest Republican workers, I had hopes of helping to stir up a two-party system in Georgia.

If I had known, and if thousands like me had known that the Fair Deal policies, ruinous to the dignity and safety of this country, and insulting to the intelligence of its people, were to be adopted by the Republican Fair Dealers *after* these policies had been overwhelmingly rejected at the polls in 1952; if we had suspected that brilliant and devoted Americans like MacArthur, Bricker, Jenner and McCarthy would be ignored, hamstrung, or lynched politically, and that Clarence Manion, an ornament to any administration, would be given a typical Sherman Adams booting from the White House — do you think that we would have worked to entrench this group in positions where they could belittle or refuse the services

of these Americans to the Republican Party?

IF THE American people rejected New Deal softness toward Russia and Alger Hiss in 1952 at the polls, do you think that they can be made *now* to respect Mr. Stassen's phoney argument in support of our allies' trade with the enemy? Do you think that they will swallow down Philip Young's plan to pension Alger Hiss? Cannot this administration make enough mistakes of its own without adopting the *proven* mistakes of the last administration? Can it expect other than the same fate if it cannot interpret the will of its people any more accurately?

When those of us who revered Robert Taft lost our battle, we tried to bear our defeat with as good grace as Taft himself had borne the knife that was stuck in his back by his "friends." We gathered together under his leadership to support the Republican Administration. *Was it too much for us to ask the Republican Administration in turn to support Republicans?*

Is it too much now to ask the White House advisers who have seized the power of the purge to remember that the will of the American people resides in its *elected*, not its appointed officials? Do any of these White House appointees consider themselves to be in a position closer to the grass-roots sentiment of the American people than any *elected* Senator, say, Bricker or

McCarthy? Does Mr. Lodge forget that he was rejected in the last Senatorial election? Does Mr. Stassen remember that he has failed in every bid for the Presidential nomination? Does Mr. Dewey think that the American people have forgotten that he and his adviser, Mr. Brownell, led the Republican Party down the road to defeat in two Presidential elections?

If the Administration cannot use all the faithful and loyal elements — especially the *elected* elements — of the Republican Party; if it must crowd to the wall all the conservatives — even the *elected* conservatives; if it must promote public feuds, perform unpopular hatchet-jobs on popular Republican figures, use Star Chamber tactics, adopt repugnant (and rejected) Fair Deal policies, how can it hope that even the personal popularity of Eisenhower can counterbalance the crucial mistakes of his advisers? How long will it be before Republicans start going fishing on election day?

It is time to tell the Administration that the Republican Party must not be a house divided against itself. It must not pull down the pillars of its own temple. If it cannot learn its lesson from the previous *divided* administration's defeat, it will not deserve to survive the next elections. In fact, it will *not* survive them.

Sincerely yours,

LOIS I. NICHOLS
Atlanta, Georgia



Westchester County *Adopts an* Adoption Plan

BY JOSEPHINE CONNOR

THE GIRL was only nineteen and beautiful beyond words. She was too young and too beautiful to die. But she wanted to die. She walked out of her room in the college dormitory, across the campus and into the river that flows so silently past the shore. For a second before the dark waters closed over her she saw all the golden-lighted windows in the little houses on the river's grassy banks. She heard voices calling and the happy laughter of children. In that last instant of life, she knew its value; and she made a desperate effort to save herself, to come back to the world whose cruelty she feared so greatly. With her last ounce of strength she gave one piercing cry.

A door flew open in one of the little houses on the shore, and a man and a woman ran down to the river. A pencil of light flowed out along the shining black surface of the water and found and held the girl's white face in its saving glow. The man plunged into the water. He swam out and caught her by her long blonde hair, turned and came

back with her along the pathway of light to the safety of the shore.

Oddly enough, no one else had heard her cry, only these two, the man and his wife, who now carried her into their house and brought her around.

The woman needed no word from the girl to tell her why she had tried to destroy herself. The revealing fullness of her slender body under its clinging, wet skirt told its own story, the tragic tale as old as time.

"Why couldn't it be me?" the woman cried passionately, her bitter, scalding tears dropping on the girl's cold, wet cheeks. "Why would a girl rather die than have a baby . . . and look at me . . . I'd die gladly if I could have one . . . just for a little while, even."

Her husband turned away. Sorrow was heavy on his face; it bowed his broad shoulders, settled on him like an overwhelming burden.

Here in one room were the principals in a tragedy of Nature's own capricious making — the childless couple yearning for a baby of their