'A CHOICE REAFFIRMED'

On Jan. 7 of this year THE NEW YORK TIMES expressed its hope that General Eisenhower would be nominated by the Republican party and declared its readiness to support him in the event that he became a candidate. We would make the same choice today, even in the absence of this prior commitment.

We would make this choice, despite the fact that we have disagreed, and openly expressed our disagreement, with some of the positions taken by General Eisenhower in the course of this campaign. We have deeply regretted that, though he himself used the strong word "un-American" to describe Senator McCarthy's tactics, General Eisenhower drew (for us) the totally wrong conclusion that considerations of party unity required him to endorse Mr. McCarthy for re-election. We have similarly regretted his endorsement of Messrs. Jenner and Revercomb. We have regretted that, in the matter of Senator Nixon's privately subscribed expense fund, he failed to indicate disapproval of a practice which, however blameless in this instance, certainly lends itself to vicious abuses and, as such, deserves condemnation.

We have not found fault with General Eisenhower's efforts to seek a working political agreement with the more conservative Taft wing of the Republican party. It has seemed to us just as logical and proper that he should do this as that Governor Stevenson should seek, as he has been seeking, a working political agreement with the more conservative wing of his own party in the South. It has been the great virtue of the two-party system in this country that it has tended to ameliorate rather than to sharpen sectional and "class" antagonisms, and we hope that it will continue to do so. The alternative is a system of splinter parties.

Nor do we share the opinion that in seeking such an agreement with the Taft wing of his party General Eisenhower has surrendered his own views on foreign policy to those of Mr. Taft. His subsequent description of himself as a "Vandenberg Republican," his frequent reiteration of the theme that "We must for our own safety lead the world to collective security" and his declared purpose to seek "genuine bipartisan cooperation" in all fields of foreign policy, rather than only in limited fields, must in all fairness, we believe, be accepted in good faith, especially considering his long record of devoted and successful service to these very causes.

At the same time, we are free to confess that in the area of foreign policy General Eisenhower has often spoken in terms that have seemed to us to be too general for the needs of the times, and that his campaign would have benefited from a sharper approach to various issues and a better coordination of his ideas. And in the field of domestic policy less concern about the requirements of party unity and a keener eye on the independent vote would have saved him and his supporters from needless embarrassment.

So much for the disappointments brought to us by our own candidate. And now what of the opposition candidate?

When Governor Stevenson was nominated we congratulated the Democratic party warmly on its choice and expressed the opinion that it had shown "the great good judgment to nominate its strongest available candidate for the Presidency." This is still our opinion. And we may say here, speaking as an independent newspaper, and speaking, too, in behalf of that mutual goodwill and national unity which we shall need so greatly in the months and years ahead, that we believe the American people are deeply fortunate to have this choice in 1952 between two men as able, as upright and as publicspirited as Adlai Stevenson and Dwight Eisenhower.

We do not, however, share all of the views expressed by Governor Stevenson in the course of the campaign, just as we do not share all of the views expressed by General Eisenhower. We think that Governor Stevenson has failed to make his position known on some important questions. We think that on other important questions the position he has taken has been far from

reassuring.

* * *

As an example of the issues which

have received from Governor Stevenson

less attention than we believe they have deserved we cite the whole question of American policy in China. It has been Governor Stevenson's advice to the American people not to waste time in "tearful and interminable postmortems" on what has happened there. We think that this is wrong advice, and that the policy we have pursued in China is an entirely proper field for discussion and debate. But even accepting Mr. Stevenson's counsel to forget the past in China and look to the future, what of this future?

Does Governor Stevenson think it is essential to keep Formosat out of Communist hands, or does he agree with a one-time assessment of the State Department that Formosa has "no special military significance" for the United States? If he thinks it is essential to keep Formosa out of Communist hands. would he keep the American fleet in Formosan waters for as long as is needed to achieve this purpose? Would he continue to give diplomatic, economic and military aid to the National Government on Formosa, despite any pressure that may be brought to bear in favor of admitting the Communist Government of China to the United Nations?

These are questions with which Governor Stevenson would immediately be confronted, if he were elected President. We think it is clear enough where General Eisenhower stands in these matters, and that the country is entitled to know Governor Stevenson's position.

As for issues on which Governor Stevenson has made his position clear enough, but, for us, with results which are by no means reassuring, consider first the crucial question of inflation.

Here Mr. Stevenson has vigorously endorsed the policies of the Truman Administration. In so doing, he has endorsed a program which consists essentially of attempting to check by the futile device of after-the-fact "price controls" the consequences of a vast credit and wage expansion engineered from Washington; a program of pursuing a pay-as-you-go tax-policy only to the point where taxation becomes politically unpalatable; a program of consistently attempting to subordinate the presumably independent Federal Reserve System to the needs and wishes of the Treasury. We find the prospect of a continuation of these policies more than a little frightening.

Nor can we find cause for satisfaction in Governor Stevenson's shift of position on the Taft-Hartley Act. In recent years the most powerful lobby in Washington, organized labor, has put unrelenting pressure on the Federal Government, by the threat of boycotting its defense agencies, to scrap policies which the leaders of organized labor did not favor. At this moment John L. Lewis, bold enough to accuse a Government agency of "attempted thievery," is using the pressure of a coal strike in an effort to reverse a Government decision. Pressures of this kind are certain to continue. We do not find, in Governor Stevenson's prompt discovery, after his nomination, that he now favors "repeal" rather than "modification" of the Taft-Hartley Act, any early evidence either of intention or of ability to stand up to these pressures.

By way of contrast, let us note that in a statement made at Cleveland on Sept. 23 General Eisenhower dealt realistically and effectively with the causes and correctives of inflation, and that on the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act, while offering organized labor a friendly and cooperative hand, he has stood firmly by the safeguards which a bipartisan Congress put into that legislation for the protection of the public interest.

Here, in what we regard as a sounder position on two immediate issues of outstanding importance, are two of the reasons why we continue to favor the election of General Eisenhower. There are other reasons. They were all explicitly stated or implied in the endorsement which we gave to his potential candidacy last January, and they may be summed up here as follows:

First, General Eisenhower is the architect of victory in the greatest international coalition of military power ever to be assembled in the cause of self-defense. As such, he is known in every corner of the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain. He is a living symbol of the fact that democratic nations can cooperate successfully to de-

fend their liberties, and on our ability to make this fact clear beyond all doubt to the Communist world now hinges our best hope of peace.

Second, General Eisenhower is a soldier who understands that economic strength is a prerequisite to military strength. Three-fourths of our gigantic budget now goes to arms. It is a deadly serious question how long we can keep up the present pace of such spending without courting national bankruptcy or generating a runaway inflation. If there is any one man who is in a position to achieve substantial cuts in military expenditures without impairing military efficiency—to find a road that leads both to security and solvencyit is a man who has had General Eisenhower's first-hand experience with the problem of national defense on both sides of the Atlantic.

Third, General Eisenhower properly asks for the defeat of the Democratic party at the polls this year on the issue of corruption. The long story of trust betrayed in high public office, cronies favored, steps taken only belatedly and under pressure to set matters right, needs no repetition here. We credit Governor Stevenson with sincere intention to clean up "the mess" in Washington. But when, as in New York in the days before La Guardia, tin boxes are uncovered and the smell of graft is strong, we do not call for the same party to be returned to power, with the simple change of a new candidate for Mayor. We call instead for a change of parties, and most properly so. It is a good principle for Washington, as well.

Fourth, General Eisenhower's election promises to check a dangerous trend toward over-centralization of power in the national capital. By overcentralization of power we do not mean an expansion of social welfare legislation. This is both inevitable and desirable, in the times in which we live. We mean such over-centralization of power as is typified in the action of President Truman in "seizing" the steel industry without a shred of law to support his case—an action approved by many Congressional Democrats and terminated only by decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Here we have a perfect instance of the abuse of power resulting from the habit of possessing power over too long a period. Mr. Stevenson has had nothing to say about the steel seizure during the campaign. He does, however, favor legalized "seizure" as a method of dealing with national emergency strikes. We regard this practice as high-handed and undemocratic, and believe that the proper corrective for a situation in which power has overreached itself, as in the steel seizure, is a change of party control.

Finally, the election of General Eisenhower would revitalize the two-party system in the United States. It is not enough, of course, to recommend change merely for the sake of change. But if, as we have reasoned here, there is much to be gained by change, then this becomes a consideration of importance. The Republican party, no less than the Democratic party, has its quota of able, conscientious and progressive representatives in Congress. With the aid of men like Lodge and Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Smith of New Jersey, Duff of Pennsylvania, Ives of New York, and others, and with the immense prestige which a newly elected President enjoys, we believe that General Eisenhower could lead the Republican party into a position of new strength and usefulness, to the lasting benefit of the nation.

† On Oct. 24 THE TIMES carried this editorial:

In our leading editorial yesterday we overlooked these two sentences in a question - and - answer interview with Governor Stevenson at Portland, Ore., on Sept. 8:

Q.—What disposition should be made of that status of Formosa?

A.—We are pretty much agreed politically now that it is part of our defense perimeter in the Pacific and should stay under our jurisdiction, or the jurisdiction of the United Nations, or under someone we should designate.

we should designate.

We regret that we lost this important needle in the haystack, make this correction promptly to set the record straight, and welcome the reassuring fact that both Presidential candidates are determined not to permit Formosa

to fall into Communist hands.