

Soviet Union among its members. I think nations like France and West Germany are likely to prefer dealing with us through Euratom, where they will not have to worry about the Soviet bloc looking over their nuclear shoulders, or are going to want to come to us directly through bilateral agreements.

As for Euratom, I am afraid that we may not get as much benefit out of it as we had hoped if we use it as an excuse for not building reactors in the United States. We are never going to be able to develop our reactor technology through watching the experience of other countries. We must build and operate reactors our-

selves in order to get the complete picture of their advantages and disadvantages.

MY ANALYSIS, in this review of our atomic-energy program, is frankly favorable to what Congress has said and done, because I am devoted to the causes for which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has consistently fought. The Atomic Energy Commission probably has a wholly different outlook and would surely evaluate its own efforts in more glowing terms. My words can represent no more than one man's opinion, but they are the words of a man who has long been in the

midst of many militant controversies.

This leads me to suggest that, because of the vast importance of the nation's atomic-energy program, it is becoming increasingly necessary that we improve the working relationships among the diverse persons and agencies involved in it. Unless there is a willingness by people on all sides to admit that there exist genuine differences of opinion, and unless there is a concerted effort to resolve these differences and work together, the United States will never achieve the world leadership in atomic energy which all of us involved in the program believe that it can and should attain.

TIMBER !! (Presidential) . . by Frederic W. Collins

ALTHOUGH every natural-born American can aspire to the Presidency, only a few hundred, including a bare ninety-eight in the Senate, are now actively campaigning for the vacancy which will occur (in the *de jure* sense, that is) in 1961. While the field is thus restricted, it may be accepted as being of dimensions sufficient to provide a representative sampling of the behavioral characteristics of persons who hear, or think they hear, a call to duty at the top of the heap.

In even a quick survey, certain idiosyncrasies of individual candidates are so conspicuous that they may be noted at once. There is more to Senator Jack Kennedy, for example, than a coiffure arranged, during his plastic years, by facing South in a strong East wind. The most notable thing about Mr. Kennedy is that he needs to form no organization because he was born into one which—from coast to coast and right down to the precinct level—is discovered upon examination to be composed of nothing but Kennedys and their kin by blood and marriage. As long as blood is thicker than politics, the Senator need have no worry

about the independent vote or the switch vote.

Outstanding in Nelson Rockefeller's motive pattern is a belief that Americans are a nation of masochists who like to be hit over the head by ever-heavier tax bills and who don't even give a thought to how good it would feel if it ever stopped. His hopes soar highest when he is being booed. Studies show the same background for Governor Ribicoff of Connecticut, who has found that throwing people into jail for speeding wins their massive support at the polls. On the other hand, Richard M. Nixon has concluded that sadism is the stronger strain in the psychopathology of American politics; he travels thousands of miles to be stoned in order to gain popularity. Senator Humphrey manages to be called a liar by Nikita Khrushchev, whose qualifications as a judge are beyond challenge. Senator Johnson races his motor in the hope that sheer manic activity will propel him into the White House. Senator Symington pins his hopes on Joy Through Strength, and Adlai Stevenson works the curious gimmick of not being a Senator, which may be the most ingenious and profitable of all.

With the exception, perhaps, of Mr. Rockefeller's determination to tax, tax and tax, the activities noted

above are classifiable simply as political maneuvering. Studies must be conducted on another level to identify the substantive policies favored by the respective candidates. It is seen at once that Mr. Kennedy's idea of a good, substantive program is to marry the labor movement in order to reform it. This subtle operation is complicated by the fact that he and his brother Bob, the chief counsel of what is known as the Senate rackets committee, have so little trouble in dissembling their love for labor. A sensitive unionist might get the idea that Jack didn't really like him or his cause, and that the Kennedy concept of reform might be fairly equated with bondage. Be that as it may, Mr. Kennedy is embarked on a course of introducing at least one item of labor legislation every day. On a rough count, seven pieces of mail bearing Senator Kennedy's frank thud each twenty-four hours onto the desks of Washington's news practitioners, and his zeal may be measured by the fact that now and then they actually come postage paid. His material on strengthening state unemployment-compensation systems cost him personally thirty cents per envelope. It is quite possible, indeed, that his campaign may collapse from sheer exhaustion of stationery. It is a bit puzzling to

FREDERIC W. COLLINS is Washington correspondent of the *Providence, R. I., Journal*.

April 4, 1959

open a piece of mail sent by Mr. Kennedy in an envelope of the Foreign Relations Committee and find inside the draft of a minimum-wage law; but this is balanced by a weighty speech on foreign economic assistance borne in an envelope of the Committee on Labor.

On the borderline between substance and tactics are some other Kennedy operations. He has won the support of Joe Alsop who, as is well known, is principally responsible for the nomination and election of Dwight Eisenhower in 1952. Mr. Alsop is now Laying Great Weight in the public prints on polls bought by Mr. Kennedy. The Senator has suffered the disregard of Mrs. Roosevelt, and in defense has politely pointed out that, being ill, he was not in the Senate at the peak of the McCarthy controversy, which as everyone knows was discussed only in the Senate and never mentioned anywhere else.

Senator Symington is as much a border-state man in policy as in geography. Once he has succeeded in building 1,000 intercontinental missiles for every Russian—man, woman, and child—alive, he can assume that he has gone about as far as a man decently can in serving an issue on which all elements of the national society might find themselves united. After that, he makes his perilous way along the swaying borderline between business and labor, farmers and consumers, spending and saving, and North and South. He maintains his balance by a mysterious gyroscopic device which induces those on the other side of any given issue to say, when he votes against them, "Oh, well, old Stu had to vote that way this time. He's really on our side." No man in the field is deriving more encouragement from less real support than old Stu, who may be fooling himself that Mr. Truman and Jack Arvey are not just two men, but a whole crowd of delegates. Mr. Symington is engaged in the cunning tactic of not projecting an image of himself to the country. If no one is for him, it is equally hard for anyone to be against him. He is a clean slate, and if friendly party professionals can nominate a clean slate, then he can swiftly fill in what-



Senator John Fitzgerald Kennedy

ever image might seem most marketable in 1960. The slogan he is trying to put across now, and with singular success, is: "Symington—who's he?" But one remembers the flight of doves in the Democratic convention of 1948, and wonders whether the Symington demonstration in 1960 will include a mass fly-over of B-52s.

Senator Humphrey stands for education, agriculture, disarmament and peace. Just now he is for Food for Peace, which has what might be called a nice tie-in with agriculture. But he is not likely to run out of Things for Peace. He can be for Cardiology for Peace, Talks with Khrushchev for Peace, Pharmacology for Peace, Loquacity for Peace, Scotch Tape (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co.) for Peace, Cowles Publications in Minnesota for Peace, Stumping for Peace, Run-

ning Humphrey for President for Peace, and finally, in the platform committee, for Peace for Peace. Chroniclers of Mr. Humphrey's activities find that he is always late for appointments. It might be thought that he is aiming for the 1962 convention, in case one may be held, but the competition had better watch out that he doesn't reach the convention in 1960 just tardily enough to be the answer to a deadlock.

If Senator Humphrey is the first American candidate ever to make a whistle-stop at Moscow, Senator Lyndon Johnson is the first to regard outer space as part of his constituency. Between space, preparedness and a strong voice in the appropriations for American diplomacy and propaganda, his interests obviously transcend the parochial, and

he has recently underscored this by making Texas a part of the West rather than the South. Senator Johnson, as he demonstrated at Chicago in 1956, has a limitless capacity to manage everything except his own candidacy for the Presidential nomination. But possessing a sense of mission and a compulsion to lead, he is also a man of whom it may be said, as was once said of a great British Liberal, that his spiritual home is the last ditch. Perhaps he had too good a chance in 1956. Perhaps his best gambit is to find himself in an absolutely hopeless position in 1960. If that happens, hold on to your hats.

Mr. Nixon is following an old-fashioned routine of being all things to all men, which exposes a curious belief on his part that there is no intercommunication among various parts of the United States or among segments of its society. Intermittently he delivers another in his series of William McKinley Memorial Lectures to this or that encampment of the Old Guard; intermittently he leaps to the van of militant progressivism in lecturing some receptive audience like the C.E.D.

It never seems to occur to him that all that he says is reported all the time to all the people. Mr. Nixon has the advantage of having served what is now getting to be two terms under an institution having some of the characteristics of an un-President, which has made him look somewhat larger than he is; but he has had the disadvantage of being always in full view, which has had a somewhat contrary effect.

Mr. Rockefeller's line is dutiful diligence. He, like Mr. Dewey so often before him, finds himself too busy with the affairs of the State of New York to spare energy for Presidential nomination. He may even inherit Mr. Dewey's success in maintaining this pose in such a way as to enjoy a full career as a Presidential candidate without ever seriously interrupting the continuity of his tenure as Governor of New York.

Mr. Stevenson has two tricks in his bag. One is that, although twice defeated for the Presidency, he still maintains seniority and intellectual pre-eminence over anyone else the party currently has to offer; the other is to have lived long enough for the 22nd Amendment to eliminate

Dwight Eisenhower from the competition. He can give some weight to the prospect that by the time the Eisenhower era draws to a close, there will be enough Americans acutely regretful that they didn't vote for Stevenson in the first place to give him a handsome head start in the voting.

WITH ALL these pieces of information out on the table, the temptation is to seek among them some common denominator of candidate behavior. Summary diagnoses might be made as follows: Kennedy—*Personality*; Rockefeller—*Public Duty*; Symington—*One Big Issue*; Humphrey—*Gab*; Johnson—*Momentum*; Nixon—*Nixonism*; Stevenson—*If at First You Don't Succeed*.

There is no common denominator, except for the single characteristic that not one of them other than Mr. Nixon will admit he is a candidate. (Mr. Nixon, from his place on what he supposed was an escalator, could hardly deny his intentions.) The secret here is not that there is some one good way to run for the Presidency, but that no one running really knows what the best way is.

NATO: Appraisal and Forecast . . by Geoffrey Barraclough

London

ON APRIL 4 exactly ten years ago, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington. Appropriate ceremonies this week will mark the anniversary of its signature, which was undoubtedly the most important single occurrence of the postwar years, so far as the Western Hemisphere is concerned. No one can tell what course events would have taken had the pact not been signed. It may be, as its adherents affirm, that but for NATO Western Europe would have been overrun by Soviet Russia.

GEOFFREY BARRACLOUGH, a frequent contributor, is Professor of International Affairs at the University of London and author of *History in a Changing World* and other books.

April 4, 1959

Certainly at the time it was negotiated there were ample grounds for believing that the Kremlin was thinking in terms of an active, perhaps even of an aggressive, foreign policy. The Czech coup, the Berlin blockade, the civil war in Greece, the strength of communism in France and Italy and the possibility of the Communists gaining control in either or in both, all seemed to indicate that Western Europe was hovering on the edge of an abyss. These fears may have been groundless or exaggerated, but they were real; and they were shared not only by the Western governments but also by the Western peoples, the overwhelming majority of whom endorsed the policy of which NATO was the expression.

The object behind the North

Atlantic Treaty was to give the countries of Western Europe a sense of security by strengthening their defenses and putting American productive power behind them. No one, looking back, is likely to deny that in substance that objective was achieved. Nor, in the view of the overwhelming majority, was it merely a coincidence that, with the establishment of NATO, Soviet expansion in Europe came to a halt, and that it was halted without war. Thus NATO has come to be regarded, and is still generally regarded, as a bulwark of peace; and it is characteristic that even such notable European left-wing politicians as Nenni, Mendès-France and Aneurin Bevan do not advocate its dissolution. Many people would dissent from the view recently expressed by Paul-

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.