THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1949

NEW WORLD ORGANIZATION

ALTHOUGH Russian development of the atomic bomb has made international control of atomic energy the most dynamic and pressing item on the United Nations Assembly agenda, there is little hope that agreement can be reached on the basis of the proposals advanced thus far.

The U. N. has had before it two alternate and conflicting plans for controlling atomic energy.

1. The Baruch plan which would establish an international body to direct all atomic energy activities with the power to inspect and license these activities. There would be no veto in the international atom body, and present supplies of bombs would not be destroyed until the control system was in operation.

2. The Russian plan which would outlaw production and use of atomic weapons by international treaty. No inspection would be permitted, however, on the grounds that national sovereignty would be violated.

The U. N.'s Atomic Energy Commission was established in 1946 to consider these proposals. Hundreds of fruitless meetings were held in an effort to reach agreement, but neither the U. S. nor the Soviet Russia would budge from its basic position.

• • • •

BOTH the U. S. and Russian plans were based on the assumption that the United States had a monopoly on atom bomb-making technique. When that monopoly was punctured, the basic premise of the two plans was no longer valid. Some new approach to the problem is necessary.

It is easy enough to call for brave, new thinking by men whose ideas are not too firmly fixed. But is it possible in an age when we are far from what Senator Frank Graham likes to call the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man for a workable system of controlling atomic energy to be devised, no matter how brave and how new the thinking is?

It must be possible if the world is to have any choice other than resigning itself to another world war and tumbling madly for it. But the immediate stumbling block to international control of atomic energy — and, for that matter, of other new and deadly methods of waging war — is national sovereignty.

Nations which are truly striving for peace are willing to sacrifice national sovereignty in areas of aggression. But a nation like Russia, which has proved over and over that it is bent on world revolution, preferably by infiltration but by conquest if necessary, is unlikely to lift the iron curtain and open wide its productive facilities to close and regular inspection. Without inspection, the world could never be sure that some nation was not secretly preparing for conquest.

As long as the United Nations is rendered helpless by the indiscriminate use of the veto, that body can never curb any member's power to aggressive action. And there is no way to restrict the use of the veto.

• • • •

IT would appear, then, that a new international organization is needed which would correct the known deficiencies of the United Nations. Many suggestions as to the form this organization should take have been advanced. They have differed in detail but agreed in general that the new world organization should be formed within the framework of the United Nations along the lines of the North Atlantic Pact.

Such an organization would combine into a great alliance all the productive capacity and manpower resources of the peace-loving nations. The veto would be abolished in defined matters of aggression. Atomic energy would be placed under international control, and other armaments limited by a predetermined formula. An international police force, highly mobile and equipped to strike swiftly if aggression develops, would be formed.

Russia would be invited to participate in such an organization. If she refused, she would be faced with an unbeatable combination of actual and potential military power from the whole non-Communist world. If she agreed, she would have to play by the rules.

The time has become to begin thinking along these lines. Unless there is an abrupt about-face in the trend of events today, we will continue our insane flight away from peace toward another war more terrible than we can possibly imagine.

ROAD BOND BARGAIN

AS far as the interest rate on its first bloc of road bonds in concerned, North Carolina certainly got a bargain. The unusually low rate of 1.57687 per cent means that it will cost the State only $7,557,187.50 interest in the next twenty years to have the immediate use of $50,000,000 of borrowed money.

Figured another way, the State will pay roughly $1 on each $7 of principal it retires beginning in 1951. This is in sharp contrast to the road bonds of the 1920's which, with their 4 and 5 per cent interest rates, have called for the payment of almost a dollar in interest for each dollar of principal retired.

Governor Scott was confident all along that he would be able to peddle the road bonds for a low interest rate. No one seriously challenged him on that score, for it was obvious that the State of North Carolina, having paid off or made provision for every penny of its general fund and highway bonded indebtedness, was a pretty fair security risk for any potential investor.

But it is appropriate to remember that Mr. Scott inherited this fine state of affairs. He wasn't responsible for it. His predecessors in the Governor's chair, and the cautious Legislatures we have had in recent years, had enough foresight to use wartime surpluses to retire indebtedness and to hold current expenditures well within the range of anticipated income.

A new theory is in vogue in Raleigh these days, a theory much like that popular with the national administration. The 1949 Legislature, spurred by Mr. Scott, spent an accumulated surplus of some $110 million, authorized the expenditure of every penny of anticipated revenue during this biennium and $5 million more, and finally authorized votes on an additional $225 million in school and road bonds.

It won't take but one more Scott Legislature to slam us back in a financial morass deeper than that from which we have just emerged.

A MAN'S PHILOSOPHY

DR. HANS KINDLER, former conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra of Washington, D. C., made several unusual requests in his last will, among them the directions for a simple musical funeral service and a recommendation that "my friends and near ones eat and drink and be merry, right after the funeral."

The aproach of death was not a fearful thing to this quiet, thoughtful man, but rather the culmination of his life's work, an occasion of satisfaction rather than of sorrow.

He listed the music he wanted played at his funeral: the slow movement of the Haydn Quartet in C Major (the Gypsy) . . . "any of the better chorales of Bach" and a movement from one of the better Mozart quartets, "not by any means a slow and sad one, but, for instance, a good, fast one."

But most indicative of the man's peace of mind and contented spirit were these words:

"The making of a will should be a high point in a man's life, a moment where he disposes of his material acquisitions in order more fully to devote himself to matters of the spirit. Alas! Today this is no longer possible as it was in the past. The way of life has changed too definitely and too radically to allow of material security as well as most mental and spiritual certificates.

"We can but do the best under the circumstances. A few, a very few personal positives remain: The inherent values of understanding and unquestioning friendship, faith in the remains of the high and creative accomplishments of past generations, in the blessed belief of simple daily tasks, in the wonders of the soil, the seas, the skies, the rivers, and the stars.

"I thank the Creator also for allowing me to still believe in the eternal Trinity of Bach, Mozart and Beethoven, and for having enabled me to find relief from the cares and troubles and miseries of the world among friends, in nature—and in the lasting paradise of music. I hope and pray my children will in this same way be blessed as I have been.

"For my sins, and they are many, I ask forgiveness, and I humbly recommend my soul to the God of Music, in whose realm I have labored and found my reward ever since I can remember."

In this world of atomic bombs and bacteriological warfare, it is comforting to run across such contentment.

From The New York Times

VAUDEVILLE PEPS IT UP

IT is probably too early to whistle an optimistic tune about the successful revival of vaudeville — especially backstage in the dressing room, where it might "jinx" the act. However, the fact remains that since May 19, when Broadway's famed Palace Theatre revived vaudeville with an eight-act, four-a-day program, customers have been observed to throng the aisles and line up before the box office.

The revival really seems to be national. The hinterlands, "the road" of song and story, are beginning to refurbish long-unused stages. We hear reports of vaudeville reopening on a circuit of 300 theatres in up-state New York, of plans to revive Middle West circuits, of actual operations of a circuit in Texas, Arkansas and Oklahoma.

One wise old booking agent put his finger on a main difficulty—"teaching the talented youngsters to prune their acts and retain the essentials." It's the old familiar vaudeville cry at slow rehearsals —"Pep it up!" Like brevity in wit, pace is the soul of variety. No amount of audience nostalgia will tolerate a run-down routine or a tired line of humor. As vaudeville emerges from its suspended animation, let's hope it hasn't forgotten the self-disciplinary spark that kept it agile, fast-moving and a wonderfully intriguing form of entertainment.

We Might Buy It If It Had A Steering Wheel

As One Editor Sees It

Two Kinds Of Democrats

By R. F. BEASLEY
(In The Union County Journal)

IN writing about the reformation of Congress Sen. Kefauver of Tennessee said that one trouble was the lack of strong party government. We are continually seeing how this lack of party government works when the President is unable to carry his measures because he cannot get the votes of all the Democratic members. While Congress is nominally in the hands of the Democrats it does not always go Democratic measured by the wishes of the President or by comparison with the party platform. It does not take a deep study of politics to see why this is true. It is because that Congress, composed of about 500 individuals, do not look to the President or to the party platform for justification or for inspiration for its acts. The individual members look to their individual constituents who elect them.

There are things in the party platform and objects urged by the President that a large number of the members of Congress, especially from the South, do not believe in. Yet so far as the party and the name go they are as regular Democrats as Mr. Truman and his friends. These men do not agree with the President on such matters and they know or assume that their constituents do not agree. Hence they vote against the President's wishes.

• • • •

WHAT is going on now in New York in a Senatorial campaign is a striking illustration of this situation. Sen. Wagner, who was appointed by Gov. Dewey to succeed Sen. Wagner till the coming election, is the Republican nominee for the place. Ex-Gov. Lehman is the Democratic nominee. Both are making speeches directly against each other's position. Mr. Lehman, who will probably be elected, is advocating all of Mr. Truman's civil rights and other measures.

In addition to these he is advocating Federal appropriations to education, including aid to Catholic schools in the way of transportation and certain welfare work. The latter idea is what Mrs. Roosevelt and Cardinal Spellman fell out about and had such a warm controversy. Mrs. Roosevelt at first opposed aid of any kind to Catholic schools because it was a combination of church and state. But she more or less backtracked. Gov. Lehman was somewhat in the same situation so he had to mollify the Catholics by taking their position.

When Gov. Lehman gets to the Senate he will find that as a general thing the Southern senators are against all these propositions. He has in New York been compelled to bow to the Catholics and the more radical liberals. Southern senators do not have to do this. No matter what plank is forced into a national platform Southern senators will not vote for the civil rights measures nor aid to Catholic schools. Mr. Lehman will be compelled to do so. How can you get any party discipline in such cases?

• • • •

IF Sen. Dulles, the Republican, should be re-elected, which does not seem possible since all the radical groups are against him, he would more nearly agree with the Southern senators. Mr. Truman has not only been compelled to sidetrack for this session his civil rights measures, but has been unable to secure a repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law which he strongly pledged and had written in the platform. On this measure Republicans and Southern Democratic senators outvote him.

The old political alliance between the South and New York and the states clustering about it has long been broken. From the Civil War to the Bryan regime this alliance worked. It has never worked since. Whereas the South has remained rather static on such things as civil rights and labor unions those other states have gone the whole way in the opposite direction. You scarcely ever see or hear of a public man in the South with a foreign name, while at the same time you see very few in New York and those other states that are not foreign. In these states the Democrats must get the radical vote, the foreign vote with several nationalities, the Catholic and other religious votes. So the South can never look again to that section for aid and comfort.

• • • •

TO be sure the Republican Party is about as much divided itself as the Democratic Party. Political observers are now saying that if Sen. Taft, a conservative, wins re-election in Ohio, it will demonstrate to the country that the Republican Party will have to nominate him for President. And if he is so nominated we will have a new type of campaign. They say it will be a conservative versus radical line up.

• • • •

Ever since the second election of Mr. Roosevelt the Republicans have carried on a kind of me-too campaign. It was designed to convince the voters that the Republicans were not reactionary or conservative but could carry out the progressive measures better than the Democrats were doing. They thought it futile to attack Mr. Roosevelt directly in front. Even in the campaign last year, Mr. Dewey discussed no issue but pleaded for unity and a general whooping up of things. And to the utter surprise of everybody Mr. Truman beat him.

• • • •

If the Republicans are now cured of the folly of being ashamed to be called conservative and are ready to go out and fight a real campaign, it will be a good thing for the country.

Quote, Unquote

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

NOW is the chance of your life-time to help make the U. S. Government more economical and more effective. This is true whether you believe in much government or in little government. In fact, if you believe in much government, you have an even greater reason for wanting the Government to be efficient.

• • • •

Already, selfish interests are mobilizing to block action on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. These forces will succeed and this opportunity for better government will be lost unless there is a great counter-offensive from the people.

Such a counter-offensive is up to you.

If you believe that our Federal Government should be less wasteful and more efficient, I suggest that you write, and ask your friends to write, to your Representative and Senators and to the President of the United States to work for immediate and favorable action on the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

• • • •

This downfall of popular government in other parts of the world is due to the fact that they became so ineffective that they could no longer translate the aims of the people into action. This must not happen here.

• • • •

For every good citizen this, I repeat, is the chance of a lifetime to make your citizenship count. — Senator Henry Cabot Lodge Jr.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

Old Age Pension Demands On Increase

WASHINGTON

THE battle over old-age pensions in the steel industry is being watched by several million people not only in other industries but especially in Southern California and Florida where Dr. Townsend's old-age pension movement and the ham-and-eggers' have been so strong.

Regardless of how the steel dispute comes out, more and more demands for old-age pensions will follow.

One little-realized fact in the steel dispute is that, during the President's fact-finding board hearings, CIO Chief Phil Murray appealed to the steel industry to settle the old-age pension issue by supporting the social security bill now before Congress. He said:

"Look here, you fellows, there's a bill before Congress right now calling for increased old-age pensions for everyone. Will you join me in supporting it?"

Murray's remark was addressed to Enders Voorhees and John Stephens, executives of U. S. Steel; to C. M. White of Republic Steel, A. B. Homer of Bethlehem, Ben Morell of Jones-Laughlin and several others. However, he got no response. None offered to support the Congressional bill for old-age pensions.

Murray's inference was that if Congress had handled the pension matter for everyone, his union would not need to threaten a strike. As it is, however, the unions with sufficient strike power, such as the coal miners, auto workers, steel-workers, et al. can get pensions. But unskilled labor, farm labor, white-collar workers and oldsters who never belonged to unions will get second-rate pensions—or none.

Trygve Lie's English

FRIENDS of U. N. Secretary General Trygve Lie explain privately why the jovial diplomat doesn't like to make public utterances in English. He is fearful of a faux pas. For example:

One day, in a conference with his U. N. staff, Lie was discussing the proposal to build a prayer room in the new U. N. headquarters. Some had suggested that it be called a temple of prayer.

"No," said Lie, "that sounds too formidable. Let's just call it a rest room."

New Judge From Chicago?

CHARMING Dave Bazelon, assistant attorney general in charge of alien property, dropped in to see Paul Douglas, the hard-hitting Senator from Illinois, to get his help in being made a judge on the U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

As Bazelon sat down he noticed on the Senator's desk a clipping from a Chicago newspaper telling how Bazelon had contributed $200 to the campaign of GOP Sen. Curley Brooks, whom Douglas defeated.

"Perhaps that's not a very good introduction," remarked the red-faced Bazelon, referring to the clipping.

"Don't keep political books," replied the good-natured Douglas.

Bazelon's explanation is that Ed McGinnis, who was running Sen. Brooks' re-election campaign, had persuaded him to make the $200 contribution. But this glosses over the fact that Douglas and Truman were running against uphill odds, were never expected to win, while Sen. Brooks had all the power and money of the Chicago Tribune crowd behind him. In brief, Brooks was considered a sure bet, and the delightful Bazelon, though appointed to a job by Truman, was betting against him.

Trans-Atlantic Air Threatened

JUDGE T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, who wasn't afraid to fine John L. Lewis, signed a little-noticed order last week which is diplomatic dynamite. He cast serious doubt on the State Dept.'s right to enter into agreements with other governments without ratification by the Senate.

Ruling that the Canadian-American air agreement may be illegal, Judge Goldsborough required the executive departments to define where the President's power of executing agreements ends and the Senate's right to ratify treaties begins.

Marquis Childs

Billion On Billion

WASHINGTON

THE political equation on the arms-for-Europe bill can be expressed as follows: The willingness of the Administration to yield on certain points plus the resolute stand of Senators Vandenberg and Dulles — and this is the biggest plus of all — the Russian atomic explosion equals virtually the full amount of money requested by President Truman.

Two months ago it seemed most unlikely that Congress would give anything more than a token of aid. Now the pledges implied in the Atlantic pact have been kept and a gloomy prediction made in this space in July has been proved wrong.

But whether it would have happened with the ease and speed that we are seeing in this last-minute rush without the atomic explosion somewhere in the mysterious fastness of the Soviet Union is a question. There were Republicans and Democrats in the House determined to hold out for cutting the billion dollars to the pact nations in half as the House had voted to do.

With the flash of the Russian explosion resolved the immediate problem, it does not answer the questions that loom ahead in the future. Among American military men there is a feeling that it might be wise to go slow next year and see how the initial assistance is used. That, at any rate, was the attitude before the announcement of Russian success in atomic fission.

There will, however, be great pressure for another arms-aid program next year. The Ministers of Defense and many of the Chiefs of Staff of the eleven pact nations will be meeting here next week.

Each will arrive with a list of military necessities marked urgent. From the viewpoint of the security of each individual nation, they will actually be urgent necessities. The lists will include items for defense such as a radar network and the arming of at least a minimum defense force.

If the initial concept is carried through, the bulk of the billion dollars now authorized for the pact nations will go to France to provide arms for nine French divisions. It also will provide a start for tooling French munitions plants to modernize production. But this will leave the Chiefs of Staff of the other nations in a most unhappy frame of mind.

They will understand the argument that the heart of Western Europe must be strengthened first. But with the Atlantic pact covering such a broad area, from Norway on the north to Portugal on the south, they will not want to be left completely defenseless on the fringes. The demand for a second arms-aid bill becomes almost irresistible.

But the question of spending and taxes is sharply to the fore at this point. It is related to the growing restiveness of the American taxpayer who is beginning to wonder whether there is any end to the need to help Europe, particularly as the benefits seem to him so remote and theoretical.

Allied to this is the feeling that if we can send all that money to Europe, then we can spend here at home, too. If I, as a Congressman, vote for aims for France, then surely I'm entitled to get a dam for my district and that's just the way my people feel about it.

This psychology has real dangers in terms of the national debt and the present deficit spending. From a small town in North Dakota comes a letter typical of many:

"Please tell the American people where the billions have disappeared. Let charity begin at home. We need schools, roads, etc."

The deficit for the current fiscal year stood on Sept. 23 at $1,665,634,878. Because of the upturn in business that deficit is less than had been anticipated. Perhaps for a country as rich as this with nearly 60,000,000 people at work it is not serious.

If, however, it continues at the present rate for the rest of the year, over six billions would be added to the national debt. What this points up is the immediate need to affix at some overall plan. It should be a plan that would take into account the total resources of the American economy in relation to urgent security requirements abroad and at home. Above all, it should take into account the new Soviet development.

Naturally, no such plan can be final and definitive in all its details. There always will be unforeseen eventualities. But without any plan, the impression is of almost day-to-day improvisation with a billion here and a billion there. And this feeling is accentuated when the people who must pay the bill are told so little about the whys and wherefores.

Robert C. Ruark

Get Down To Business

NEW YORK

THE informal reaction that I have encountered after President Truman's proclamation about Russian possession of the atomic bomb has been largely calm and somewhat heavily mixed with relief. I have talked to no generals or physicists—merely to the people who would have to catch it if the Russians threw it, and they seem remarkably unhysterical about the whole thing.

As a matter of fact, there seems much less public hysteria about the A-bomb now than just after the war, when it was the No. 1 cocktail topic and the ladies were muttering about getting their children in such a doom-sure world. The fact that the Russians have it now rather relieves the tension of waiting for the worst. It is roughly comparable to a childish expectation of a whipping, which turns out to be not so bad, after all.

A week-end has passed since Mr. Truman made his baleful announcement, and we still are not dead in our beds. The voices from on high already have begun to speak soothingly of the length of time it will take for the Soviets to stockpile enough of the big apples to mount an offensive with them. This estimation could be as wrong as the prediction that the Russians couldn't possibly find the combination before 1952, thereby setting us two years behind in our military program.

We now walk again into the popular theory that since both sides have it neither will dare to use it, just as gas was not employed in the last war. We didn't use gas because it was largely impractical, not for any sentimental reasons about its horrid effect on its victims. It was tricky to control, its use made terrain inhospitable to advancing troops, and it was not devastating as a weapon except under certain rare circumstances, such as a gas blast fired into a cave.

We encounter the hopeful thought that the futility of blasting cities on both sides would take some of the profit out of war; that it would be silly to polish off New York if our guys rubbed out Moscow in retaliation. We come back now to the ethical and consideration. Would the usually queasy United States willingly bomb Rome, London or Paris if the Russians took them over?

It is possible that we have had the atom on our hands for sufficient time to have lost its novelty, like a tiger grown fat and slothful in his cage, and since we have not looked like dying yet we flatter ourselves with the idea that the Russian tiger is just as fat and just as lazy as we are. Russia, in this place us all neck-deep in a slaughtered, some day, but the feeling exists.

One thing President Truman's announcement has inspired is an improvement with the petty bickerings of the armed forces. Forces which, in the four years of peace, have seemed to be more interested in each other than ever. The shoddy political squabbles in Washington, the bickering competition between the services, inspire little more than disgust today, if some sort of program must be solicited to make whatever menace the Russian A-bomb holds for us.

I suppose it would be presumptuous for an ordinary citizen to call on his leaders to bury themselves, now; to quit politicking aimlessly over deep-freeze and anonymous letters and get back on the ball; to choose the best of plans and equipment and knock off grinding axes for the sake of selfish interest. I suppose that would be too much to demand of our elected peers and their appointees, but the wish to demand it is here.

We on the street cannot know if the Russians wish to use their bombs, or how long it will take them to prepare it in sufficient quantities for use. We have little faith in the United Nations' ability to control it. But we would like its menace either to be amply met or prayerfully ignored—not a mixture of both, with futile fightings and the shouts of doom intermingled with whistles in the dark.

Merry-Go-Round

THE American embassy in Rome has informed Edda Ciano, Mussolini's daughter and Italy's Fascist foreign minister, that she can soon expect 30,000,000 lire from the USSA. The money is part of the royalties earned in the United States through the sale of Ciano's diaries. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder's office made the decision—believe it or not—on the grounds it can't be proved Edda was a Fascist. . . . Robert Hagerty, director of the Bureau of Census, and as such will dole out 150,000 jobs to find out how many people live in the United States in 1950. . . . Secretary of the Air Force Symington had a personal reason for sneaking the Navy court that is investigating the B-36 smear. Under Navy rules, Cedric Worth, who wrote the smear sheet attacking Symington, would have the right to cross-examine the witness. Rather than face Worth's questions, Symington ducked the hearing. (Feared he might lose his temper!) . . . One reason Democratic moguls have been worried about a short session is because it would cut off the cheap steel now desperately needed for new grain-storage bins in the farm belt. Democrats feel they won the election partly because of the grain-storage issue—and if they don't come through for the farmers it'll be bad news. . . . President Truman is so pleased with the Democratic conferences in the Midwest and Far West that he is considering another in the deep South—now very hostile territory. . . . Several Truman advisers are urging him to bring up the civil rights bill just before Congress is supposed to adjourn, with the idea that this would keep Southern congressmen filibustering until Christmas—when they might get tired and give in.