

Mr. Dulles

and

"Hands Across the Sea"



BY JOHN T. FLYNN

WHEN John Hay, Secretary of State under McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, died and Roosevelt was confronted with naming a successor, a Republican Senator said to him: "England has had our State Department for the last four years. Now don't you think it's America's turn?" I can conceive of a British statesman urging, when Eisenhower took over, that, as the Russians had had the State Department for so many years, it was now England's turn to run it. I assume that it would be an act of presumption if Americans were to timidly suggest that we ought to get an occasional inking at shaping our own foreign policies.

For some years our foreign policy has been based on something which is called "world security." But as we seek to discover what is the motive back of our vast and costly activities all over the globe, we will have to concede that these are formed in the interest of neither the United

States nor the wide world itself, but in the interest of whatever country at any given time has the strongest claims upon the affections of the gentlemen who wield that dangerous and costly weapon — the American State Department.

It is, I assume, a fair assumption that most of that sly and oily host of pro-Russian operatives either have been kicked out or have drifted out of the Department. John Foster Dulles is the new pilot of our foreign policy. We are justified, therefore, in seeking to know what interest influences the shaping of our foreign relations under the new leader. The inquiry necessarily involves an inspection of the sentiments and affections which act upon the head and heart of Mr. Dulles.

At the outset, however, this much is obvious. Whatever the intention, the effect of our foreign policies is clearly in the interest of the British Empire. This, of course, could be

American

MERCURY

OCTOBER 1953

See attached

It Cost You 775 Thousand Million Dollars	Paul Martin	5
Art Comes to Your Refrigerator	Howard Rushmore	11
Tails of the Capital	James L. Harte	13
Birdie's Book About Her Brothel	Irene Corbally Kuhn	16
Nightfall in Ireland	Joy M. Collins	20
The Man Who Tried to Forget	Harry Botsford	22
Mr. Dulles and "Hands Across the Sea"	John T. Flynn	25
South to the Pacific	Marian P. Ficks	31
What Flavor, Soldier?	H. A. Burr	34
Shall the United Nations Make Our Laws?	John W. Bricker	39
The Windy West	Stan Hoig	46
Down to Earth: The Miracle of Birds	Alan Devoe	49
America at Tussaud's	Trevor Holloway	53
Moscow's Medicine Men	J. B. Matthews	58
Miami Metamorphosis	Tom O. Smith	63
There Are Two Sides to Every Story	Ethel Wachs	67
America's Worst Badman	James R. Aswell	68
Foreign Money	Ben Masselink	74
The Web	Grace Lee Kenyon	78
The Man Who Bought Alaska	Carol Letcher	81
Dentistry Without Fear	Letha L. Patterson	85
In Our Readers' Opinion		88
Do You Know That —	Nora de Toledano	90
The Coming Battle on Tariffs	Patrick McMahon	91
The Art of Back-Fencing	Sandie Stevens	95
Wooden Warships Are Back Again	A. A. Hoehling	97
Is War Inevitable?	Walter M. Haushalter	100
Power From Wind	J. H. W. Kerston	105
Why Americans Can't Win at Marathoning	Clarence H. DeMar	107
Mary Mundt's Mite	Elizabeth Churchill	109
The Scotch Damn-Yankee	Diana Boettcher	113
The Lost Voice	Beatrice Stone	115
We Need a Doctor	Calvin R. Starnes, Jr.	116
Lesson in Russian	Frank Sisk	121
Alas, Poor Alice	Humphry Bullock	122
America, Where's Your Backbone?	Donald R. Wilson	124
About Pawnshops in China	Eva R. Saxl	128
Convicts Take the Cure	George Dolan	130
Sound on Disc		133
Nobody Likes Troublemakers	Alfred Kohlberg	135
Books in Review	Frank S. Meyer	136

on the theory that what is good for the British Empire is good for the United States. Or perhaps, having made a splendid success in establishing the Russian Empire upon a broad and solid base, it could be that in a spirit of fairness our State Department feels now called on to turn its attention to performing a similar service for Great Britain. And, if our country can hold out and our Treasury does not crack up in the process, it may be that in good time our government will get around to doing something for the poor old U.S.A. However, to get a clearer view of these mystic phenomena in the troubled and murky air of global politics, it is necessary to travel what may seem a bit afield and to assemble a few disconnected scraps of information relevant to our central research.

MR. DULLES is a pretty tough and crusty old warrior who has grown rich fighting the battles of great corporations as the head of one of the leading law firms in the world. However, tough and pragmatic as this gentleman is when breaking a lance with a professional adversary, he can, when he puts his weapons aside, adjust his wings, spread them bravely and take off into the circumambient clouds of religion, philosophy, and politics; and can turn flipflops and nose dives in competition with the professors, theologians, social philosophers and global architects on a most impressive scale. He can soar into so many altitudes amid

so many rosy-tinted cloud banks that it is a little difficult to follow him. Let us, therefore, limit our search for his objectives when he takes off on a flight to chart the future course of the United States.

When the Boer War ended fifty years ago, about the safest thing afloat was the British Empire. But Germany, France, Italy and Japan were in the field as dangerous competitors in this gaudy sport of empire-building. Cecil Rhodes, the great British expert in this field in Africa, saw this struggle coming. And he foresaw the time when England would need the support of the "lost colonies." When he died, he left his immense fortune — some \$150,000,000 — to further this aim. He established scholarships by which each year a large number of honor students from America and the Dominions would be given a three-year graduate course at Oxford — all expenses, including travel on the Continent, paid. They would be those students interested in literary and political affairs who, under the influence of the Oxford charm, would develop an Empire-consciousness and an affection for the "Old Mother."

Two of our Assistant Secretaries of State under Mr. Acheson were Rhodes scholars. As the United States was being maneuvered into the war in Asia, the man who sat at Hull's elbow as head of the Far Eastern Department, and exercised a fatal influence over his mind, was

THE AMERICAN MERCURY

11 EAST 36th STREET • NEW YORK



RUSSELL MAGUIRE
Chairman of the Board

JOHN A. CLEMENTS
Editor

JOSEPH B. BREED
Managing Editor

PATRICK McMAHON
Washington Editor

Contributing Editors

C. D. BATCHELOR
HARRY T. BRUNDIDGE
WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR.
ALAN DEVOE
JOSEPH F. DRURY, JR.
GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

RUTH A. INGLIS
IRENE CORBALLY KUHN
J. B. MATTHEWS
FRANK S. MEYER
HOWARD RUSHMORE
HAROLD LORD VARNEY

ROBERT HODGSON
Business Manager

ALMA E. DREWES
Subscription Manager

LOIS HANSEN
ADRIENNE SUDDARD
Editorial Assistants



Published monthly by the American Mercury Magazine, Inc. at 35 cents a copy. Annual subscription \$4.00 in U. S. and possessions; \$4.50 in Canada; \$5.00 in all other countries. Publication office, 10 Ferry St., Concord, N. H. Editorial and General Offices, 11 East 36th Street, New York 16, N. Y. Printed in the U.S.A. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Concord, N. H., September 29, 1936, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright 1953 by American Mercury Magazine, Inc. All rights, including translation into other languages, reserved. Protection secured under the International Copyright Convention and the Pan American Copyright Convention. No articles may be reprinted in whole or in part without written permission. The American Mercury is not responsible for the return of unsolicited manuscripts unless a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed.

China. Harassed by socialist invasion at home, Britain now faces the difficult problem of enlivening her economic energies by trade with Russia, China, and the whole Communist world. The Korean War had begun to irk Britain desperately, and she had shown a growing impatience with the United States' insistence on victory. Russia, on the other hand, also needs trade not only with Britain but with France and the world. Suddenly we have become aware that our devoted allies, who expect some four billion dollars this coming year and continuing billions later as gifts, are eager to partake of this Russian market. There is no doubt that the Korean settlement, however poor, was the consequence of the pressure from both Russia and Britain for a quick two-way trade between them, which will bind them as friends by hoops of trade, pounds and rubles.

America is surrounded by all sorts of false friends. And I insist that the men who represent America in the world must be men of clear vision and undiluted loyalties who know an enemy when they see him. The capacity of a statesman to think with clarity about the many crusades launched against us will depend upon a few fundamental principles of life and government at the root of all his decisions. I do not question Mr. Dulles's loyalty to his country. But I look with profound concern upon his ideas of what is good for his country. The history of

the disasters sponsored by our State Department during Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Truman's regimes cannot be laid wholly to disloyalty. In many cases it was due to myopia.

It would not be fair to Mr. Dulles to say he will run the State Department on pro-British specifications. But this acquittal does not cover his case. He will represent America. But he cannot help having some respect for his own philosophy. He cannot drive from his heart certain illusions he has about Britain and certain other ideals he cherishes. It is difficult to give this subject words without risking an injustice to the man. Perhaps I can best explain it another way. There are clear evidences of confusions in his philosophy. He has looked with grave suspicion upon our economic system, as well as upon our political system. The tortured shape of the world has led many good men to look with misgivings upon our own system of organized life. Mr. Dulles is what might be called a "professional Christian," an important figure in a powerful church group which has toyed for years with a sort of radiant version of heavenly socialism. And he has clearly had his moments of painful doubts. In 1947, the now-dissolved Federal Council of Churches gave wide distribution to a pamphlet by an unnamed author. Recently Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam revealed that it was the work of Mr. Dulles. In it appears this paragraph:

Stanley Hornbeck, another Rhodes scholar. These are just samples which indicate that old Uncle Joe in Moscow did not have all the brains.

THE movement to bring about a Union of Britain and America was organized and is headed by Clarence Streit, a Rhodes scholar who has dedicated his life to this dream. Later he organized a more extensive movement called Federal Union, for the same purpose. The American-British alliance during World War II produced an hospitable atmosphere for this idea, which encouraged a number of wealthy and prominent Americans to organize in 1949 the latest and most powerful and ambitious adventure in this direction. It is called Atlantic Union. Clarence Streit is one of its directors. Its objective is a federal union of the United States, Canada and Great Britain, with France, Holland and Belgium thrown in as window-dressing and to take away the odor of a purely British union. But this is no mere effort of grateful Oxford scholars. The Atlantic Union Committee's board of governors and its council embrace hundreds of rich, influential and even powerful business, political, literary, educational and social leaders.

The movement is headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. Its vice-presidents are former Assistant Secretary of State Will J. Clayton and, until his death, former Secretary of War Robert

Patterson. Justice Roberts outlined its aims — the creation of a new sovereign entity to which the United States, Canada and Britain (and France, if she wishes to join) will delegate certain great over-all powers, in much the same manner in which our states delegate powers to the Federal Government. It will have a single foreign policy for its members and a Union defense force. There will be a Union free market and a common currency and postal system. There will be a common citizenship and the Union will have power to impose taxes on all the constituent members to defray the cost of its common army and its common foreign policy.

The seriousness of this drive to sink the sovereignty of the United States in a British-American union may be estimated from the fact that a resolution to summon a convention to begin work on this Union was introduced in the United States Senate by 27 Senators and in the House by 111 Congressmen. When Rhodes launched his plan for a British-American union, England was rich, prosperous, victorious in her African war, her empire at its height. Today all this is changed. Her empire is shattered. Her head is brought low. She is a pensioner of the United States. Her economic life is shattered by the twin disasters of war abroad and socialism at home. The lovers of Britain in America are spurred by a great rescue enterprise in which the United States is to

"Communism as an economic program for social control has points of contact with the social method of Christianity in its avowed concern for the underprivileged and its insistence on racial equality.

"Neither state socialism nor free enterprise provides a perfect economic system. Each can learn from the experience of the other. The free enterprise system has yet to prove that it can assure steady production and employment. It has yet to prove it can provide industrial workers with the sense of individual creativeness which gives greater satisfaction than mere material possessions."

THIS does not stamp Mr. Dulles as a socialist. But it does reveal that while he was not satisfied with either communism or capitalism, the only good word proffered for either in this comparison was his discovery that communism did have "points of contact with the social method of Christianity in its concern for the underprivileged." And he feels that while communism can learn something from us, we can learn something from communism.

Along with this plight in which we find him swimming unhappily between communism and capitalism, he finds himself equally unhappy with a world which is made up of separate nations. In an address before a national church conference on February 27, 1940, he said:

"The sovereignty system is no longer tolerable. . . . It is surpris-

ing that mankind has for so long found tolerable this crude conception that sovereignty is absolute and unqualified, save by force."

What did he mean by this curious pronouncement? We find a clue in a speech to a church group on December 11, 1942. He said that the moral order calls for a "true community of nations." He did not mean a mere United Nations. He said there must be a power above the nations which "could safeguard the general welfare of all the peoples." He described the present world even with the United Nations as a world of anarchy which "must give place to a higher authority." What was he driving at? He tells us. Military establishments should be internationally controlled and subject to a community of nations. No American armies, save such as would take orders from a world government.

There must be other changes in the United States. He listed some: equal access of all nations to natural resources, economic collaboration, international control of tariffs, world government.

There is nothing ignoble in these fatuous dreams. But they define a person pathetically incompetent to manage our foreign affairs in the world as it is.

Mr. Dulles should be out leading a crusade for "Union Now" and for perfecting American capitalism with the finer elements of communism — not running the American State Department.

assume the financial and imperial redemption of this shattered and bankrupt empire. The vast colonial possessions of the empire will not be members of the union or subject to its decrees. Britain will still rule and exploit them, underwritten by that great Republic still paying lip service to the Declaration of Independence. America will formally underwrite the British Empire.

Now, what has all this to do with Mr. John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State? If you were managing the promotion of this gaudy rescue expedition, what would you consider the most important strategic post to occupy? Obviously, it would be that department of the American government which manages its foreign affairs. And this brings us to the framework within which Mr. Dulles's opinions are formed.

America is surrounded by enemies and, what are worse, false friends. The air is charged with dangerous "isms," decked out in the trappings of goodness and light. The defenders of America must be men alerted to the designs of both those who would attack and those who would exploit us. The dark history of the American State Department cannot be explained wholly in terms of treason, but in large part in the blindness of many men to the dangers lurking in the ideals and conduct of their companions, or to a tolerance of the objectives of other countries which they adopt as their intellectual fatherlands. Alger Hiss

could not possibly have been a danger if there had not been so many men in the State Department who did not recognize his intellectual coloration — men, for instance, like Mr. Dulles, who worked with him and took him from the State Department and made him executive officer of the rich Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

IT WAS ONCE fashionable for the man of large mind and lively fancy to have two countries — his own and France. The area of choice has been enlarged. The gentleman of expansive culture can now choose any country he wishes. And Mr. Dulles seems to have chosen his "other country." The best evidence of this is that he has endorsed the Atlantic Union scheme of Clarence Streit and Justice Roberts. In the *New York Times* of November 22, 1952, Clarence Streit hailed Mr. Dulles's appointment as Secretary of State, as well he might. He described Mr. Dulles as a good friend of Atlantic Union. And Mr. Dulles himself confirmed this fully when the Union met in Buffalo only a few days after Mr. Eisenhower announced his intention to name Mr. Dulles as Secretary of State. He sent a telegram to Justice Roberts and the Atlantic Union congratulating it on its work.

This is a matter of no small significance. A profound change has taken place in Britain's attitude toward Soviet Russia and Red