

ECCLES CALLS FOR SHIFT IN U. S. WORLD POLICY

Advocates Concessions to Russ, Enforced Peace If Necessary

(From Salt Lake City Herald Tribune, March 31, 1950)

Branding the present U. S. foreign policy a complete failure, Marriner S. Eccles, former chairman and now a member of the Federal Reserve board, Thursday advocated a positive, realistic program which recognizes the economic and military facts in the world.

He advanced his proposal in an address before a joint luncheon meeting of the Salt Lake Kiwanis Club and Chamber of Commerce.

This positive program, he said, necessarily would involve concessions to Russia. And the U. S. should be prepared in advancing it to enforce militarily the conditions which are necessary for world peace if they cannot be obtained by agreement.

Indicates Program--Mr. Eccles did not spell out details of the policy he proposed. But he indicated that it would be made up of Sen. Millard Tyding's disarmament program, plus Sen. Brian McMahon's foreign aid proposal plus military preparedness for offensive action if that became necessary.

He recommended that the U. S. and her allies move to "enforce the conditions of peace" only if reasonable and realistic concessions fail to bring about an agreement. But he maintained that it is urgent that this country be willing and able to enforce them.

Russian Sphere--Mr. Eccles did not directly specify the concessions he regarded as "realistic" in the light of economic and military facts. But in criticizing the present policy he indicated that they would include recognition of a Russian sphere of influence.

With the foundations of peace established, either by agreement or force, it would be possible, in Mr. Eccles' opinion, to make the United Nations what it was intended to be and give it the only substantial military force in the world.

Mr. Eccles emphasized the view that the change in foreign policy is urgent from the time standpoint.

Opportunity Passing--"We were better able to do it after the war than now," he said, "and we are better able to do it now than we will be five years hence."

Mr. Eccles objected to the present policy, or Truman doctrine, on the grounds it is not leading to a settlement either by cooperation or enforcement; that it is unrealistic so far as Russia is concerned; that it places continuing and expanding burdens on this country which will wreck our economy; that it is neither lenient nor tough.

At the end of the war, he said, the U. S. canceled lend-lease and demanded an accounting of all material given to Russia. Russia's application for a loan got no consideration. When United Nations was created the veto idea was ours, although Russia since has used it so persistently that U. N. is "no more

effective than the League of Nations was after the first World War. We protected our own sphere of influence with the Monroe doctrine and protected the British sphere of influence.

'Naive Belief'--"But when it came to Russia," the speaker continued, "we were so naive as to believe she would permit free democratic elections in countries on her border. Russia, of course, thought otherwise, and has since established her own sphere of influence."

Mr. Eccles stated flatly that the "cold war" already has been lost by the U. S. and her allies and that our position, relatively speaking, is constantly deteriorating. That is why, he emphasized, time is so vital. He drew a parallel between the U. S. in relation to Russia and England and France in relation to Germany after the first world war.

Cites Hitler Parallel--The British and French, he declared, might have done something in 1935 to save the world from World War II. But they could not do it in 1938.

His point was that the U. S. could have established conditions of peace after the war or now, but might not be able to do so five years hence.

Characterizing the present policy of containment as impossible, Mr. Eccles said it committed us to defend friendly allies in all parts of the world. "It just can't be done," he asserted.

He took the position that continuation of the present defense program (he called it an armament race) and foreign aid "without a terminal point" inevitably would wreck the economy of the country and destroy the things we are trying to protect.

"But if we adopt a positive program to bring about conditions necessary to peace," he continued, "we can afford to grant substantial aid to Europe."

In brief, his program would call for a shift to an offensive preparedness program instead of defensive preparedness; the offering of concessions to Russia which she could reasonably be expected to accept at this point, but at the same time making it clear that we would enforce "conditions of peace" if cooperation was rejected; a foreign aid program that would have a "terminal point" and then strengthening of United Nations.

Such an approach, Mr. Eccles contended, would rally world moral force behind the U. S. and western Europe. It would strike at the basic causes of the present world situation instead of at the effects.

'Most Serious Dilemma'--The speaker declared that the Atlantic pact, while serving as an umbrella as long as we retained an atomic bomb monopoly, does not now offer security. And he posed the question as to how long Russia is likely to stand by and permit the building up of military strength in western Europe which will be a menace to her.

"We are confronted," he continued, "with the most serious dilemma in the history of the world. By comparison all other issues fade into insignificance

...The economic effects of our present program will be to destroy what we are trying to save. No spark of freedom could survive another world war... We must find another solution and we must find it soon...It is a matter of life or death...We still have superiority; we want nothing for ourselves; we are willing to give to establish peace. Russia must be confronted with a condition instead of a theory while we still have superiority and are in a position to enforce the conditions of peace...*