Reaction in Nation
By W.H. LAWRENCE
New York Times (1857-Current file); Nov 2, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

Reaction in Nation

By W. H. LAWRENCE

War in the Suez Canal area and anti-Soviet uprisings in Eastern Europe appeared yesterday to have strengthened President Eisenhower's bid for re-election.

This was the consensus of New York Times correspondents surveying public opinion in more than a dozen cities across the country.

The prevalent theme among the voters they interviewed was that the crises overseas emphasized the need to keep in the White House the former five-star General who was the leader of victorious American troops in Europe in World War II.

The impact of international events probably was greatest on a body of hitherto-undecided voters, many of whom supported General Eisenhower four years ago. Until now, many of these

Continued on Page 19, Column 4

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOREIGN EVENTS HELP PRESIDENT

Continued From Page 1

voters had been considering switching to Adlai E. Stevenson.

The Suez crisis undoubtedly weakened the Republican campaign in some areas where pro-Israel sentiment is strong and where the Administration's condemnation of Israel for aggression against Egypt was unpopular. It could tighten the Presidential race in Florida, where there also is a large Jewish population and where General Eisenhower until now has had the edge.

But, on balance, in city after city, the conclusion of Times correspondents was that the two spectacular foreign developments at the climax of the campaign had helped, not hurt, President Eisenhower's cause.

Democrats Win Over Some

A few voters have picked up the Democratic arguments that the Suez Canal crisis in particular has shattered the Republican image of General Eisenhower as the real leader of the free world in its quest for peace, ably assisted by his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

"The way things are going in Egypt, it seems to me somewhere Dulles must have goofed," said an Albany housewife. "It doesn't make me want to vote for Eisenhower.

Another woman, in San Francisco, linked the crisis with the question of President Eisenhower's health and age, and the possibility he might not serve out a second four-year term. Her comment reflected hostility to Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

"I had intended to vote Republican on the basis of prosperity and good times," she said, "but this crisis has changed my mind, because it convinced me that the President's health is the most important issue under the circumstances and this nation could not risk Nixon at a time of war."

But these were exceptions rather than the rule. Most voters echoed, with slight changes in phraseology, the old campaign slogan about changing leaders in times of crisis.

A shoe store owner in Indianapolis put it this way:

"A lot of people won't want to be in the position of changing captains in mid-stream. Ike is the man who can do most for the people."

Gain for President Seen

A cafeteria manager in Indiana thought the Middle Eastern developments "will throw more support to Ike."

"This would not be the time to remove a military man from the White House," declared a Chicagoan, who said his political ties were not strong and binding.

But the Democrats were counterattacking sharply.

"What valid claim," asked another Chicagoan, "has Mr. Eisenhower to the role of world moderator and peace maker, if our two most important allies, Britain and France, and the nation we labored so hard to create, Israel, took actions of historic consequence without even consulting him?"

In Pennsylvania, some Republicans as well as Democrats said they thought General Eisenhower might be hurt somewhat by the Suez crisis because it had knocked the props from under the first half of his "peace and prosperity" slogan.

A Philadelphia food jobber, for instance, said that "if Ike had fired Dulles this morning, I would still vote for him, but never now."

A buyer for a retail store in Harrisburg commented, "I don't know who's right—but this isn't peace."

"I was strictly an Eisenhower man, but now I'm bewildered," said an insurance man in Philadelphia.

But, on the other hand, there were signs of restiveness among pro-Stevenson voters in Pennsylvania.

"If this business in Egypt gets real bad, I'll change to Ike," said an accountant in Philadelphia.

An office worker in Harrisburg said he'd planned to vote for Mr. Stevenson but now was undecided because "I want to see what happens overseas."

"I had some doubt about what I was going to do next Tuesday, but not any more," said a Des Moines business man. "I just can't see changing a government in the middle of this."

In Dallas, a telephone poll taken among sixty voters, selected at random in the directory, disclosed that forty thought the latest developments had strengthened General Eisenhower's position. Fifteen thought Mr. Stevenson had been helped. Five had no opinion.

A woman who said she lost a son in World War II offered this comment:

"I'd rather have a five-star general as President now than have an ex-Governor of Illinois."

The owner of a Dallas landscaping firm, who was inclined toward Mr. Stevenson, thought the latest happenings abroad proved that the Administration had not been telling the truth.

"We've been told everything is rosy, and now we find that it's not," he said.

Some anti-Dulles sentiment turned up also in Los Angeles. The Times' correspondent there reported frequent repetition of a jest that "this wouldn't have happened if Dulles had been alive."

Many correspondents emphasized these were initial reactions to the foreign situation, and that the full impact on the election results might not be measurable yet.

The Los Angeles correspondent suggested the final effect would hinge to a great extent on how bad the situation gets in the next few days, how the Administration deals with it, and the effectiveness with which the Democrats exploit it.

In Washington, where both parties maintain their national headquarters, a Times correspondent offered this analysis:

"On balance, it appears that the President and, with him, other major Republican candidates have suddenly been handed the chance to stop acting like politicians and start acting like statesmen. It is quite obvious that they have seized upon it eagerly, and the consensus here is that this will help rather than hurt them at the polls five days from now."

In Kentucky, where there is a neck-and-neck race for the state's ten electoral votes, The Times' correspondent reported that some Democrats expected the foreign developments were "helpful" to General Eisenhower's candidacy. Many voters were talking about "maybe not rocking the boat at this time," they said.

"Ike seems to have messed it up," was the countering arguments by Democratic partisans.

Some formerly Democratic voters, already made unhappy by Mr. Stevenson's suggested ban on hydrogen bomb tests and his bid to end the military draft, thought the new crises abroad had hurt him additionally. In Phoenix, Ariz., a Democrat who had voted for Mr. Stevenson four years ago said he was now switching to the President.

Peace a Major Issue

As it has been all through the campaign, the peace issue still is a potent weapon in the Eisenhower campaign arsenal.

"There's no change in my vote," said a Detroiter. "I'm for Eisenhower. If we had Stevenson in as President, we'd be in a war in six months."

In Denver some voters saw a lack of candor by the Administration in dealing with foreign problems.

"The Eisenhower Administration hasn't been fair or honest with the people in a lot of respects," said one Denverite. "If, because of the lack of positive action by the Republican Administration, we are forced into armed action I'd rather we didn't have a general in the White House. We'd need positive thinking by a man with a positive approach. Stevenson is that man."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.