

was putting into the total defense effort sixteen to eighteen per cent of its total production, while the British and French were putting in around nine or ten per cent and the other NATO partners a good deal less than that. But the European governments have heard about our plans for tapering off our military spending, and will never admit that they must increase their military spending while we reduce ours.

WITH NATO's administrative machinery creaking, and with everybody's minds on the possibility of truce in Korea and some form of "peace in our time," nobody expects to see anything very concrete emerging from Paris. What this meeting provides is the indispensable opportunity for a collective consultation, among all of the military powers of the Atlantic community, as to a common strategy and tactics that will be pursued in the uncertain months ahead. Our election campaign and the statements of some Republican extremists have created the fear abroad that any eventual discussions with the Communists would be strictly a Russian-American affair with the Allies left out. This fear can be allayed by frank negotiation about how to negotiate with the Kremlin. If it serves this purpose, the NATO meeting will have been well worth while, even if no decision is reached on what is to be paid by whom for what.

If Their Advice Were Only Taken

Another major business group has now come out for free trade, making it practically unanimous. The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce proposes that Congress pass a Trade Expansion Act that would reduce all tariffs by twenty per cent across the board next January 1. Ten per cent more would be taken off each year thereafter.

The U.S. Council thus formally joins the growing number of business organizations that call for steps toward eliminating the tariff as a part of the American way of life—notably the Committee for Economic Development ("Congress should grant to the President authority to reduce tariff duties unilaterally . . .") and the Detroit Board of Commerce

("the complete elimination of all [trade] barriers to be gradually achieved over a possible period of 10 years. . ."). The National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the National Foreign Trade Council also like free trade, but have been less specific about how to get there.

It is a fact of business politics that the most active members of these organizations are the executives of relatively large businesses. The businessmen who really kick and scream about more imports are mostly the owners of smaller businesses, which depend for their survival on their influence with legislatures, not on low-cost high-quality products.

That these smaller businessmen have great influence in Congress is not strange; Congress was created to reflect local pressures as well as the national interest. Freer trade is a nice phrase, but seasoned observers on the Hill are now saying flatly that the

nation will be lucky if this session of Congress ends without actually increasing the degree of trade restriction and tariff protection.

But curiously the business groups that advocate freer trade seem to have almost no influence on the policies of the Executive branch, which is so heavily staffed with their own men. Heavily discounting Congressional opposition in advance, the Administration has shied away from every issue of foreign economic policy that has come up so far.

Reading in the policy statement of the U.S. Council about the "tragically absurd situation into which the international trade of this country has been allowed to drift," we found ourselves wishing that those bureaucrats in Washington had some feel for the desires of big business, realized it was competition that made our country great, and were not so swayed by the manufacturers of hats, glassware, and briar pipes.

THE CAREER SANS MERCI

or Keats on the Civil Service

Oh what can ail thee, knight-at-desk,
Alone and palely loitering?
"The joy has withered from the job
And no bells ring—"

Oh what can ail thee, knight-at-desk,
So haggard and so woebegone?
"They're after me, the hounds of hell,
And I am done."

"I met a demon on the Hill,
Full terrible—a dragon's child—
His cheeks were dark, and forked his tongue,
And his works were wild."

"I saw pale civil servants there,
Pale witnesses, pale were they all,
Who cried, 'Committees sans merci
Have thee in thrall!'"

"I saw their starved lips in the gloam,
With horrid warning gapèd wide:
"The government's no place for thee!"
The fallen cried."

Oh what can ail thee, knight-at-desk,
Alone and palely loitering?
"The joy has withered from the job
And fear is king."

—SEC

CORRESPONDENCE

'WITH FIRM LOYALTY'

To the Editor: *The Reporter* has performed a real service to the country by putting out the issue of March 31 in which major attention is given to the psychological operations of the government.

I was particularly pleased to see the article "Red Propaganda Can Be Beaten," by Thomas W. Wilson, Jr. We are, of course, convinced the Red propaganda can be beaten, and I am glad to have the suggestions advanced in these articles.

It is unfortunately true that all the psychological operations this government has ever undertaken have been subjects of great argument, and a great many people have felt that the job could be done better. The atmosphere of disagreement has been so great that each change of leadership over our psychological programs has brought considerable changes of method. Until the day comes when the United States has built itself a corps of really experienced propagandists, there will continue to be considerable disagreements about the way the job should be done.

It is most unfortunate that for political reasons improper motives are sometimes ascribed to one set or other of leaders of these psychological operations. From examining the records and knowing a number of these leaders, I am convinced that they have all been men of great capacity who with firm loyalty to the best principles of Americanism have attempted to carry on the most effective psychological operations possible. The effectiveness of some of these operations can be questioned, but the motivation has always been of the best.

REED HARRIS

Deputy Administrator

United States International Information

Administration

Department of State

Washington

(This letter was received before Mr. Harris's resignation.)

'THE WORD WAS NEVER USED'

To the Editor: On page 2 of the April 14 issue of *The Reporter*, I noted the following sentence: "It was the afternoon that Con-

gressman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., introduced a resolution calling for Velde's removal because of his attacks on Agnes Meyer and his threatened investigation of religion." The next paragraph starts out, "Our reporter wanted to know whether he had changed his mind about the need for investigating religion."

This is a dishonest distortion, because at no time did Congressman Velde "threaten" to investigate "religion." The word "religion" was never used in connection with the work of his committee.

The facts are now so well known as to what Congressman Velde actually said that there is no longer any excuse for an editor like yourself to distort the facts dishonestly.

Furthermore, it is obvious that your reporter did not ask Congressman Velde whether or not he has changed his mind about the need for "investigating religion" because had such a question been asked, Congressman Velde would have immediately corrected the reporter by pointing out that there has not been at any time any intention to investigate "religion." In fact, there has been no threatened investigation of the church, only a statement that an investigation of infiltration of Communism and Communists into the churches might be possible at some future date. That's all that Congressman Velde said about the possibility of any investigation of the church. I happen to know enough about Congressman Velde and the way he operates to know that he would never make such an answer as stated by your alleged reporters.

Your malicious attacks upon Senator McCarthy have also been guilty of downright dishonesty and deliberate distortion of the alleged facts.

ARTHUR I. BOREMAN
Des Moines, Iowa

(A United Press dispatch of March 10 stated, "Velde said it was his feeling that there was 'a field' for investigation in religion . . ." A special dispatch to the New York Times referred to the Congressman's "feeling that there was 'a field' for investigation in religion.")

MOUNTAINS AND MOLEHILLS

To the Editor: In "A Town by Any Other Name" (*The Reporter*, April 14), William S. Fairfield writes, "In 1949, the producers of a radio stunt program had persuaded a small Southern town to change its name from Mountain to Molehill." The people of Mole Hill, in Ritchie County, West Virginia, after a hundred years or so simply got tired of Mole Hill and had the name changed to Mountain. The name Mountain was not changed to Mole Hill, but it was the other way about, and the radio fellers had nothing to do with it.

The people of the community, however, will feel flattered at being referred to as a town.

CHARLETON C. PIERCE
Charleston, West Virginia

NO SPACE IN TIME

To the Editor: If you ever want to start a "Letters Time Didn't Publish" column, I offer you the attached:

To the Editor of *Time*: *Time*'s suggestion (in the March 23 issue) that Charles E. Bohlen's Moscow reports "could have an effect as misleading as those of Ambassador Joseph E. (Mission to Moscow) Davies" must represent a new low in innuendo, even for *Time*. In the period when pro-Soviet attitudes of the Davies type were in the ascendancy, *Time* said quite different things about Bohlen. It disapproved of him then, as now, but for the opposite reason. Ten years ago *Time* criticized Bohlen on the ground that he was too anti-Soviet.

I refer you to the issue of October 18, 1943, when *Time* attacked the State Department for its policies toward occupied Europe. "Washington and London," *Time* said, "have been—to say the least—out of touch with the tremendous democratic resurgence which sprang from the pressures of war and oppression in German Europe." *Time* had explained that the people in occupied Europe "most anxious for what ordinary Americans and Britons would call 'democracy' are also Russia's friends in those countries"; while the "people and politicians who do not represent what ordinary Americans and Britons would call 'democracy' at home are precisely those toward whom the U.S. State Department and the British Foreign Office have shown the most warmth."

Who was the villain in all this? "The Department's expert on Russia is bright and young Charles L. ('Chick') Bohlen. Tall, fair, long-faced, Bohlen descends from Prussia's aristocratic Bohlens, is related to the heads of Germany's vast Krupp arms works. Bohlen speaks fluent Russian, is for Russians as Russians, on his record is against the Soviet Government, as such."

Can *Time*'s true complaint about Charles E. "Chip" Bohlen be that he has maintained the steady, cool, dispassionate attitude of a diplomat while *Time* has exchanged one hysteria for another? But how can even this justify a comparison with Joe Davies? Or is this "Chick" Bohlen some other fellow?

As for George Kennan's being a "far weightier man" than Bohlen, this must refer to avoidupois. Both Kennan and Bohlen are brilliant, thoughtful, and devoted public servants. There is no point in denigrating one at the expense of the other. The United States is fortunate—and should be proud—to have had the services of both.

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

(We are glad to establish the precedent Dr. Schlesinger suggests. Much as we care for Time, however, we see no reason why we should not print letters that other nation-wide publications failed to print—provided, of course, that they are up to the standards of this one.)

