THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON ..... Publisher
J. E. DOWD ..... General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH ..... Executive Editor
C. A. McKNIGHT ..... Editor

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1949

FRANK GRAHAM'S FARM STAND

SENATOR Frank Graham possesses many talents, not the least of which is the knack of describing in beauteous prose the humdrum things of this world. In a statement explaining his stand on the various farm subsidy plans (he favors the lavish Anderson plan, by the way) the Senator rhapsodized:

"The farmer brings into creative focus the earth, the sun, the air, the rains, and the, labor and intelligence of men and women on the farm for the production of the foods and fibers upon which depend the sustenance, the clothing, the shelter of all the families of men."

Hence, the Senator reasoned, the farmer should be guaranteed a prosperous level of existence by the two-pronged method of (1) forcing consumers to pay artificially high prices for those foods and fibers and their multiple derivatives, and (2) buying up the farmer's excess production, no matter how great, with tax money collected from those same consumers.

We grant that the farmer is a creative artist. So is a cow, which ingeniously combines grass and water to produce milk, and renders back to the soil a useful by-product in the process; or a bee which gleans the nectar from the earth's flowers to make honey.

So is a minister, who brings into creative focus the great truths of religion and thereby builds a shelter for our souls.

So is an airplane designer who brings into creative focus the lessons of mathematics and aerodynamics to give Man mastery over the air.

So is a University president who creates an atmosphere of academic freedom in which great minds toil to further research and knowledge.

So, for that matter, is the newspaperman who creates from the thousand assorted happenings of the day a package of information and entertainment for your doorstep containing, among other things, statements from Senators explaining their stand on farm prices.

Most of us who work at all bring something into creative focus, and a good many poor souls in this highly competitive industrial society of ours have to combat vicissitudes every bit as perplexing and dismaying as the quirks of the elements—and combat them without the help of Federal subsidy.

Senator Graham seems to admit as much when he goes on to say:

"Agriculture and industry are the twin economic foundations of our national economy and of our modern civilization. The farm is dependent upon the factory, and the factory is dependent upon the farm. Human society is basically dependent upon both."

If you follow him that far, then you must assume also that the men who run the factories and the men who labor in them and sell or distribute their products should be guaranteed a prosperous standard of living via government subsidy. You must fix a parity price for their product higher than the price determined by free competition, and then use tax money to buy up and junk all their excess production.

Therein lies the fundamental fallacy—and injustice to non-farmers—of the present farm subsidy theory. If the farmer is entitled to such protection, then many others in our economic pattern ought to have the same protection. Where, pray, do we stop?

Farm subsidy is one thing; farm *insurance* is another. You can accept the principle that the nation's farmers ought to be insured against disaster, and even against a sub-standard existence, just as our minimum wage laws, public housing, Social Security and the like insure some of the non-farmers against a sub-standard existence.

But there is a vast difference between farm insurance and the kind of farm subsidy which enables individual Maine potato producers to pocket hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax money for growing potatoes which the Government kept off the market by purchasing at parity, discoloring to make them unfit for human consumption, then selling them back to farmers for animal feed at a penny a bag, and even paying the freight to haul them to the purchaser.

Senator Graham fails to recognize that difference. By so doing, he lends his considerable influence and active assistance to those masters of Potomac-style angling who, at the moment, are mainly concerned with selecting the most attractive lure to dangle in front of farmer-voters.

NEWSPAPERBOY DAY

TODAY being National Newspaperboy Day, it might not be a bad idea for you to meet a couple of hypothetical youngsters.

The first of them, Joe, hasn't been too lucky. His father is dead. His mother works but hasn't the training necessary to hold down a really profitable job. Last year Joe wore a couple of pairs of patched knickers throughout the school year, had to skimp a little on lunch but his mother insisted that he continue in school.

This Summer, Joe got a newspaper route; things began to look brighter.

No, Joe's family isn't rolling in wealth now; Joe still doesn't have pocket money; but he's helping. And that makes any youngster feel good. And he's learning about business, meeting folks, taking cash for his service and writing out receipts.

Joe's newspaper route keeps his mind off mischief, and gives him a desire to be as successful through his own efforts as the other boys who have routes.

Joe feels that he is part of the business world now; he feels that he is "doing something", and Joe is developing self-confidence.

Bill has a route in the same district with Joe.

Bill doesn't have to worry about his needs being cared for; his family is well fixed and, if it were not for something in Bill's character to prevent it, he might be idle, he might become one of a group well known in every city: youngsters with ready cash, hot-rod automobiles and an overwhelming desire to get around the law.

Bill's district manager calls him one of his best newspaperboys. He's courteous, dependable, has a well-developed sense of responsibility and, through competition, has developed a healthy ambition.

Bill's business training will make him a valuable asset in his father's business and Bill's background of industry, his sense of taking part in enterprise will make of him a valuable asset to society.

Today—Oct. 8—belong to the nation's newspaperboys; and so does Tomorrow.

NEW PLACES IN SOCIETY

It's been a good week for the physically handicapped. First, of all, observance of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week has taught a lot of people that the physically handicapped aren't people from another world, not merely persons to be pitied.

It has informed the public, through citing examples, that the loss of an arm doesn't mean loss of a person.

Secondly, according to Mrs. Eva Young of the North Carolina Employment Service, it has awakened employers. There have been numerous applications by employers for physically handicapped workers.

The activity of the NCES will give an example of the scope of the physically handicapped program.

In Charlotte alone, the Employment Service has sent 694 physically handicapped persons to employers. Of this number, 369 found jobs.

"That's a good record for physically handicapped persons," said Mrs. Young.

But more important than this success is the "active" file at the NCES.

There are 186 persons who now have applications in for jobs. These persons are physically handicapped. Doubtless many of them felt that during this week—when employment of the physically handicapped was promoted through speeches and displays all over the city—they would get a job.

The week has ended without these 186 persons being employed.

This means, clearly, that there can be no stop in the effort to rehabilitate the physically handicapped—and rehabilitation means more than readjustment.

It means a job, a useful place in society.

It is not enough to think about employing the physically handicapped for only one week in the year. We must all learn that there is a place for the physically handicapped—and that place is in a plant or an office or a store, not an easy chair on a front porch.

A detour is what the motorist with sense enough to lace his shoes takes when he sees one truck trying to pass another one while headed in his direction. — *Little Rock Arkansas Gazette.*

Brannan charges critics ignore the facts of his plan — and perhaps it is better so. Who asks where Beethoven found the statistics for his immortal Fifth Symphony? — *Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.*

Nothing like the Florida photo of all those grapefruit on the ground had been seen since Junior tipped over the pyramid in the super-market. — *Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.*

It's as simple as winding a watch to remove green paint from a pair of white trousers with ordinary paint remover, a stiff brush, a little elbow grease and a pair of shears. — *Little Rock Arkansas Gazette.*

One never realizes how the human voice can change until a woman stops scolding her husband — and answers the telephone. —*Mattoon (Ill.) Journal-Gazette.*

The electric razor is probably efficient enough for stay-whiskered men. It is not for us cactus-faced guys. — *Wichita Falls (Texas) Times.*

None of these fine courses in how to win friends explains what to do with them later. — *Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal.*

Dallas boasts of just about every blossom except the wallflower. — *Dallas (Texas) Morning News.*

We Recognize Him All Right

Joseph & Stewart Alsop

Point Of No Return

WASHINGTON.

ONE of the great turning points in the post-war history of Asia may well be reached in the early months of next year. There is every likelihood that a peace conference will then be called, with or without the participation of the Soviet Union, to write a peace treaty for Japan.

This is one result of the recent private talks between Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, in which a great deal more was accomplished than is generally known. Neither Acheson nor Bevin made any final commitments on Japan. But both agreed that a peace treaty is now urgently necessary. And they also agreed on what kind of treaty they wanted, and on how to go about getting it.

The American occupation of Japan is entering its fifth year. And that is why a peace treaty is so necessary. For the occupation is clearly beginning to reach the point of no return, as Gen. Douglas Mac Arthur long ago accurately predicted. The occupation, which started on its high ideals of idealism, is beginning to degenerate into a weary bureaucracy—feeding on its own red tape, futilely attempting to control every aspect of Japanese life, provoking dangerous racial tensions, and providing the Japanese Communists with their greatest political asset.

Clearly no military occupation of one country by another can usefully continue indefinitely. Yet there has been no peace treaty with Japan for an old, familiar reason—the Russians have obstructed a treaty. There has also been a secondary reason. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been sensibly reluctant to permit the withdrawal of American military power from Japan, in view of what has happened on the Chinese mainland.

Acheson and Bevin agreed that both these obstacles must be overcome. The Soviets have insisted that one four powers should write the treaty—the United States, Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union, with the Soviet Union exercising a veto power. The Western powers, with a wisdom gained from hard experience, have refused to fall into this trap. Instead, they have proposed that the treaty be written by all the eleven countries which participated in the war against Japan, and that there be no veto power.

Acheson and Bevin have concluded that the first step is to explore the Soviet attitude once more. This probing job will be done over the next two or three months, in the United Nations. If the Soviets refuse to change their position, then "very serious consideration" will be given to a radically novel course—that of simply by-passing the Russians and writing a treaty for Japan without them. The United States and Great Britain would jointly invite the other nations to a Japanese peace conference, and a treaty would be hammered out without benefit of the Kremlin's veto.

The sort of treaty envisaged by Acheson and Bevin falls into two parts. First, Japan would be granted complete internal sovereignty. The increasingly disastrous American effort to run everything in Japan from timber planting to factory sanitation would come to an abrupt end. Within certain broad limits, the Japanese would be free to govern themselves as they saw fit.

They would manage their own foreign relations, and exercise all other functions of sovereignty.

The objections to withdrawing all American forces from Japan would be met in the second part of the treaty. This might take the form of a separate, simultaneous Japanese-American accord, providing this country with military bases in Japan comparable to our bases in the Philippines. American troops would then be withdrawn entirely from Tokyo and the other great cities, where the daily contrast between the well fed ease of the conquerors and the grinding misery of the conquered has led to a deeply unhealthy situation. The limited base areas, away from the main centers of population, would hold the whole remnant of the occupation.

The Russians, inevitably, will loudly accuse the United States of dishonoring its pledges if the course outlined is followed. But the Western obstructionism to undermine their interests indefinitely, any more in Japan than in Germany. If the disastrous distintegration of the Western position in Asia is ever to be halted, a good place to start is in Japan, where a boldly revised policy is long overdue. And it is good news that the start is now at last likely to be made.

Background On Dispute

The Super-Carrier Decision

By ARTHUR KROCK
(In The New York Times)

WASHINGTON

THE "low morale" among Navy officers, which was the subject of the confidential memorandum of the admirals to Secretary Matthews that didn't stay confidential, bears at least a direct chronological relation to the cancellations by the Secretary of Defense of construction of the supercarrier "USS United States." Therefore, it was inevitable that, when the House Armed Services Committee decided to search for the basic trouble between the Navy and the Air Force, under "unification," it would include in a review of the roles and missions of the two services the background of Secretary of Johnson's cancellation order.

In the files of the Air Force is a recent document which gives this background fully and establishes it "as an example of confused allocation of responsibility" for military decisions. The author also discusses new procedure which, he believes, would end the confusion and make it unlikely hereafter that such an episode could be repeated. The author is W. Barton Leach, a Harvard Law School professor on frequent loan to the Air Force, where he has the rank of brigadier general. Allowing for natural bias on that account, the committee would find his contribution extremely valuable.

His description of the existing procedure as applies to the supercarrier is sketchily summarized as follows:

At present seven Government bodies take part in military decisions—the two Armed Services Committees, the two Appropriations Committees, the President, the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the three service Secretaries. The allocation of responsibility is only partly defined, which results in "undesirable overlapping and conflicts of authority."

That was demonstrated by the episode of the supercarrier. It was conceived during the final phases of the Second World War, planned in detail between 1946 and 1948, allocated funds in the 1949 budget and canceled a week after its keel was laid. Up to that time "no single supervisory authority performed the necessary task of (a) obtaining reasonably full information, . . . (b) hearing conflicting professional views, (c) accepting responsibility and coming to a decision."

* * *

THE weapons requirements memorandum which the Joint Chiefs sent to the Pinletter commission included four supercarriers and was taken by the Navy as unanimous JCS approval. But the Air Force "did not consider it had ever given its approval." Then at Key West the JCS was informed by the late Secretary of Defense Forrestal that a supercarrier was included in "the President's program," after which the chiefs gave it "some form of approval," taken by the Navy as unanimous but not by one member, Gen. Carl Spaatz. In a letter to the Senate committee he said he was "merely bowing to the authority of the constitutional Commander in Chief."

The JCS then forwarded to the President Navy and Air Force budgets for 1949 that included the supercarrier, still, however, divided on the basic strategy. It was now until April, 1949, that, at Secretary Johnson's request, General Eisenhower got opinion papers from the members of the JCS, showing two to one against the Navy project. "Certainly in 1948 the President did not request and did not receive" this expression of opinion; hence it "appears" that his approval related to the general budget without specific consideration to the supercarrier. At any rate, Mr. Truman "apparently was conscious of no obstacle of prior inconsistent action" when he approved Mr. Johnson's stop order. "Yet the situation is sufficiently subject to doubt so that Secretary Sullivan of the Navy, on resigning, could write that the construction had 'twice been approved by the President.'"

The Bureau of the Budget passed on no military issues; the tonnage authorizations from Congress for carriers "were, and still remain, blank checks." And, if the President did pass on the military issue, "he did so without receiving the assistance, direct or indirect," of his nominated military advisers, the JCS.

* * *

MR. LEACH, emphasizing that he intends no criticism of any official or body but only of procedure, then offers these suggestions:

In submitting any military appropriation the President should accompany it with a statement by the Secretary of Defense of the implicit military issues and the decision that has been made by them. If there is a service conflict in the record it should be referred by the Appropriations Committee to the Armed Services Committee for study and recommendation. To keep abreast of such problems the two committees should have competent counsel and a "watchdog" subcommittee, with special indoctrination and security clearances.

To make any interservice conflicts clean and open, and put Presidential decisions on the most informed base, three current traditions should be laid aside: (1) that there is something wrong about one service contesting the claims made for the weapons of another service; (2) that papers should not circulate freely among the services; (3) that any "agreed" JCS solution of an issue is preferable to a divided decision.

"But," writes Mr. Leach in a separate paper, "two-to-one votes in the JCS are likely to continue as long as service careers are dependent upon particular weapons and service personnel cannot be shifted freely from one weapon to another."

Quote, Unquote

Hertzog DeBlieux didn't have any cigars when I congratulated him on the arrival of Larry Hertzog, so I went over and charged a 16-cent cigar to him at McClung's. These Frenchmen ought to know they can't beat a Scotchman—especially one who's part French. —Natchitoches (La.) Times.

South Carolina has had many a great man in the last 174 years that it has been a state and not one was lunched at school by the taxpayers, Federal, state, county or city. —Charleston (S. C.) News & Courier.

The old-fashioned week-end was Sunday when everybody went to church or stayed at home. Now it is a 48-hour period which calls for a 300-mile hop across the country only to turn around and come back. —Pittsburg (Tex.) Gazette.

It is possible to get twice as much out of life by doubling what you put in.—Little Rock Arkansas Gazette.

It's hard to tell which is the derndest nuisance, a drunk or a chronic fisherman.—Abbeville (Ga.) Chronicle.

Robert C. Ruark

On Early Risers

NEW YORK

I WOULD like to quarrel a mite with the noted historian, Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman and, simultaneously, with his espousal of an assumption. I have battled bitterly since childhood. This is the old wives' tale that early to bed and early to rise, et cetera, . . .

Dr. Freeman is a man who hits the sack at 9 P. M. and is generally out of same, as chipper as an obnoxious mocking bird at 2:30 A. M. This is when the doctor starts his working day. He was recently quoted as saying that people go to bed too late and arise likewise, and that the nation could be vastly improved if everyone straggled from the feathers at sunup.

There has ever been a spurious nobility attached to early rising, possibly stemming from the days when work unfinished in sunlight went undone until next day. Whatever the germination of the habit, acorn has been heaped on the late riser. He has been taunted with the title of slug-abed, sleepy-head and generally described as a no-count triffer who can only wind up hawking apples or, if successful, peddling marijuana or running numbers.

The people who are forced, by circumstance, to unshest themselves in the dank dawn acquire the kind of abrasive arrogance of the man who takes mid-Winter baths through ice floes, or the woman who is constantly engrossed in a diet. They wear a halo with this hair shirt of habit and go about knocking more fortunate folks who can snuggle in the downy until noon.

I consider Dr. Freeman's habit of arising at 2:30 unnatural, antisocial, and less crammed with health-and-character building vitamins than my own cherished routine of preparing to think about getting ready to consider the idea of bed at about the same time. The days are packed with dullards; anybody can stalk around in the sunlight.

For some years I was forced by poverty's pinch to haul myself shuddering from the sheets at the loathsome hour of 5 A. M. — a dread milestone on the clock when man's resistance is at the lowest ebb, when the streets are naked, the birds still, and your conscience rides you like a witch. After some years of this debased existence I swore a solid swear that if God ever let me quit of the Navy, I would sleep until noon if it meant starvation.

For a long time I have tried to find something worth doing before noon and, apart from committing a suicide, I can think of nothing that cannot be done better after a stout lunch—at, say, about 3 P. M. This clarity of thought rarely arrives before midnight, nor does the party ever achieve the singing-in-the-kitchen stage before that time.

The Spaniards are a steady, frugal race, and they like to eat around midnight. They also like to sleep in the afternoon. The hardest working man I know is Billy Rose, and he never gets up from the sack before 11 A. M. What is all this noble thinking about early to bed, now that the electric bulb is fairly common in the land? Eight hours sleep is eight hours sleep, and if one man chooses to take his from 4 A. M. to noon, what makes him a dissolute bum?

I have observed that most big fights occur after breakfast table—or at the dinner table, if dinner is served exactly on the tick of 6:30 P. M. I do not knock early rating if the job actually demands it, because a farmer, or a laborer might be starving at that time. But this is only a matter of a man satisfying his appetite, and was never designed to be the 11th Commandment. The early eater, even as the early riser, is neither nobler in the mind nor stouter in the soul than the fellow of flexible habit. But such he has been made to appear.

Understand, I do not assault the habit of Dr. Freeman to get up with the larks, if he happens to like larks, nor do I challenge Dr. Freeman's odd habit of arising at 2:30 A. M.

But I quarrel with his effort to impose this disgusting practice on the people. I pay just as many taxes as the health fiend who leaps chortling from mattress to cold shower, and wish no more lectures on the magnificence of the dawn —unless, perchance, the dawn is described as a wonderful time to hit the hay.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

British Beat U. S. In Commercial Planes

WASHINGTON

THE aviation industry isn't advertising it, but the United States is about to lose its superiority in the manufacture of commercial airplanes.

For years, American-built planes have been used by the French, the Dutch, even the British. The familiar DC types "made in America" have been used by every commercial airline in the world, from Burma to Patagonia. But that day is about to pass.

The British are now ahead of us in commercial airplane design, while the Swedes are about even and will surpass us soon.

Alert Undersecretary of Commerce C. V. Whitney has been visiting Britain and trying to investigate British commercial air superiority and is reporting that the British already have a jet-propelled transport plane far ahead of anything even started in the USA.

Reason for the slump in commercial airplane design is that the Republican 80th Congress objected to Army funds being used for development of commercial planes. Hitherto, U. S. transport planes have been designed by Air Force funds used in co-operation with commercial companies. Now that money is cut off, and the big airplane manufacturers aren't designing new types.

NOTE—Both private industry and such GOP leaders as John Foster Dulles and Guy Gabrielson have been yelling about "statism." But when Government money is cut off from the aviation industry, it falls behind the rest of the world, and airplane manufacturers, most of them Republicans, want back the "statism" money cut off by the 80th Congress.

Cardinal Spellman's Trip

PRIOR to Cardinal Spellman's flight to The Vatican, it was authoritatively reported among the Catholic hierarchy that Spellman had lost his onetime position as favorite of His Holiness.

Those who have visited at The Vatican during and since Cardinal Spellman's dispute with Mrs. Roosevelt, report that the Pope was not pleased over Spellman's outburst and that this was the chief reason why the Cardinal later called on Mrs. Roosevelt at Hyde Park.

At one time Spellman was considered in line to be papal secretary and perhaps the first American pope in history. But now it's reported inside the hierarchy that among the American cardinals, wise old Cardinal Stritch of Chicago is more in favor at The Vatican.

These factors may be one reason for Cardinal Spellman's flight to Rome.

NOTE—When the newly named American cardinals-designate flew to Rome to receive their red hats, Spellman was the only one kissed by the Pope; which caused Cardinal Glennon of St. Louis to remark: "I hear Spellman wants to be papal secretary. He'll have us all in hot water."

The 'Usual' Senator Hoey

WHEN the mysterious John Maragon tried to smuggle French perfume into the U. S. labeled as champagne for the White House and later got the case squelched by the Justice Dept., amiable Clyde Hoey, the swallow-tailed Senator from North Carolina, described it all as "just the usual settlement."

Since then, this column has inquired of the Customs Bureau regarding other smuggling cases to see exactly what the "usual settlement" is. The Customs Bureau has been extremely loath to talk. One week of queries has disclosed no information whatsoever.

However, The New York Times contains the record of the case of one Jack Benny where the value of the goods involved was almost identical to that of Maragon's. Maragon's perfume was valued at $2,300. The jewelry which Benny tried to bring into the U. S. was valued at $2,191.

Maragon, thanks to his good friend, General Vaughan, was permitted to settle his case for a fine of only $1,500.

Jack Benny, however, had no General Vaughan inside the White House. So he paid a $10,000 fine, received a suspended jail sentence of 1 year and a day, and was placed on probation for one year. Benny had not smuggled the jewelry himself. Nor had he disguised it as a gift to the White House. He had sent it to James N. Chapman at the latter's suggestion that he would smuggle it for him.

Along with Benny, George Burns of the radio team of Burns & Allen was fined $6,000 and got a suspended jail sentence and probation. Mrs. Edgar J. Lauer, the wife of a New York Supreme Court Justice, also was fined $2,500 plus three months in jail, while public opinion forced her husband to resign from the bench.

In contrast, Maragon paid only $1,500—which Senator Hoey calls a "usual" settlement—while the gentleman who saved him from further punishment, General Vaughan, has not resigned but is still sitting pretty at the White House.

Detectives Enter B-36 Battle

IF the battle over the B-36 gets any hotter in actual aerial combat than it is on the ground in the piping times of peace, then we will see the hottest war in history.

For one airplane manufacturer—Glenn Martin—has even resorted to putting private detectives on the trail of blond handsome Stuart Symington, the Secretary for Air. Symington, devoted to his wife and leading an exemplary life, nevertheless has had the gumshoe men checking on him, especially in St. Louis where he used to live.

Unfortunately for the society column and the Navy they haven't come up with anything.

NOTE—Glenn Martin, who has specialized on Navy planes in the past, has been irked because of lack of orders from the Air Force.