

February 22, 1954

R

"Hurry Up With That Dragon. The Audience Is Getting Impatient"

Defense 'New Look' And New Weapons

By Joseph and Stewart Alsop

Published
 Sent and General Manager
 Secretary
 Advertising Director

1954 PAGE 8

In the train of cir-
 to Colonel Schwable's
 physical and psycho-
 the moment of sud-
 of his comrade rather
 the man who agreed to
 ut germ warfare. In
 actions he had been
 ed with diabolical in-
 the disintegration and

were apparently sub-
 did not confess; and
 y enough to moralize,
 those who live in free-
 sleep comfortably in
 hless.

as right in saying that
 erience of a Chinese
 understand the mental
 n, or those agonies of
 in which he "would
 or guidance," or the
 zation which tempted
 rate compromise with
 andists.

program approved by
 ommittee last week is
 thing coming out of the
 te. The Federation of
 about it. Various other
 similar concern. John
 is Advisory Committee
 need that he will fight
 fund loan restored to
 from key figures in the
 the backs of the Com-
 District Committees to
 such a heavy tax load



NO DECISIONS of the Eisenhower Ad-
 ministration are more in need of under-
 standing than the great strategic decision
 of the "New Look" at American defense.
 And the best approach to the many prob-
 lems of the New Look is to see how it origi-
 nated.

The time was October 13, the place a
 meeting of the National Security Council.
 The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,
 Admiral Arthur Radford, had been invited
 to the meeting to present the results of
 what is usually regarded as the Joint
 Chiefs' new look, which was not the real
 New Look at all.

Three months earlier, on July 10, the
 President had instructed the new Joint
 Chiefs to re-examine the whole design of
 American defense in the expectation of a
 "long period of tension" and danger. The
 Chiefs had done many weeks of hard
 work. Admiral Radford now gave the Se-
 curity Council the results in the form of
 proposed force levels for the Army, Navy
 and Air Force. Through Radford, the
 Chiefs asked for bigger armed forces—
 somewhat bigger than we have now and
 substantially bigger than we shall have
 in 1955.

Big, immediate cuts in the defense
 budget were wanted by most of the men
 at the council table. When the comptrol-
 ler of the Defense Department, W. J. Mc-
 Neill, put an annual price tag of 43 billion
 dollars on the force levels Radford pro-
 posed, Budget Director Joseph Dodge and
 his allies were vocally horrified. Admiral
 Radford answered their protests with an
 historic little speech.

THE civilians, Radford said, had never
 told the military what sort of war to get
 ready for—whether a conventional big
 war or an atomic big war, an old-fashioned
 small war or an atomic small war. After
 Korea there was every reason to doubt
 that use of the new weapons would ever
 be permitted in any war, yet the new
 weapons were our real strength. Prepar-
 ing for every imaginable kind of war was
 necessarily costly.

Tell us what kind of war to fight, Rad-
 ford in effect summed up, and then the
 Joint Chiefs can have a real New Look
 and no doubt save you some money as well.

Not long after the October 13 meeting,
 therefore, the National Security Council
 directed the Joint Chiefs to plan on using
 the new weapons wherever and when-
 ever these would be effective.

This single change, from conventionally
 balanced forces to forces primarily de-
 signed to exploit the new weapons, is the
 strategic essence of America's New Look
 at defense. The change required larger
 investment in air power, allowed sharp
 cuts in the Army and Navy, with resulting
 over-all economy.

The decision to make this very far-
 reaching change of concept must also be
 judged against the background of the long
 evolution of the Eisenhower Adminis-
 tration's defense thinking. This has been
 complex indeed. Back in January, 1953,
 the leaders of the new teams had only
 two aims. The first was to end the Korean
 war at all cost. To achieve this aim, it
 can now be revealed, the President was
 getting ready, last March, to order na-
 tional mobilization and an unlimited effort
 to win a final victory. Then came the
 Chinese truce offer (probably stimulated
 by word of the President's decision passed

Letters To The Editor

Immunity For Critics

It is universally recognized
 that legislators must, for the
 adequate transaction of pub-
 lic business, enjoy immunity
 from suits for libel and slan-
 der in connection with their
 official utterances, and from
 arrest while engaged in pub-
 lic business. But if a Senator
 bound for the Capitol to at-
 tend a session of the upper
 house should physically as-
 sault a citizen going his peace-
 ful way, the citizen might re-
 sist the assault without render-
 ing himself liable to legal
 penalties. Does not simple
 justice require that, on a com-
 pletely parallel basis, all citi-
 zens should be immune to suit
 or prosecution for any state-
 ments they may speak or cause
 to be published concerning
 any legislator whose utter-
 ances enjoy the privilege of
 immunity as above described?

HENRY W. KAUFMANN,
 Phoenixville, Pa.

Law And School Board

of reason, at one and the same
 time is antagonistic to the cause
 of integration and to the order-
 ly administration of the exist-
 ing dual system. Thus, the
 basic issue before the board,
 viz., how to administer the
 existing dual system to the
 best interests of the entire Dis-
 trict community, which issue
 is essentially one of good and
 orderly government, has been
 so completely beclouded as to
 disappear from view.

R. N. SHEWMAKER,
 Washington.

Presidents' Loyalty

In his press conference Presi-
 dent Eisenhower said there
 were good Americans in both
 parties. However, the real
 question is, does the President
 believe that Franklin D.
 Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman
 were traitors to their country?
 That they were is the only con-
 clusion to be drawn from the
 Wisconsin Senator's charge of
 20 years of treason. A straight-
 out answer from the White
 House clearing the names of
 these two Presidents

Canadian Protest

In a recent newspaper arti-
 cle, Representative Nicholson
 says he will introduce legisla-
 tion to prevent Canadian inter-
 ests from gaining control of the
 New York, New Haven & Hart-
 ford Railroad.

For this gentleman's informa-
 tion, the Toronto, Hamilton &
 Buffalo Railroad with head of-
 fice in Hamilton, is owned and
 operated by the New York Cen-
 tral Railroad, who also have a
 large interest in the Canadian
 Pacific Railroad. Does he object
 to this control?

Does Mr. Nicholson object to
 United States firms operating in
 Canada?

If the Canadian is so obnox-
 ious to him, then it is time for
 our government to forbid the
 imports of American goods and
 the public to voice their objec-
 tions by refusing to buy them.

For the sake of the American
 people, I hope there are some
 men in your Government who
 have a little intelligence, and
 that they are not all McCarthys,
 Jaspers and Nicholsons.